Hybrid Predicates in Russian*

Hans Robert Mehlig

Abstract: Apart from elementary predications that can be classified clearly as Activities or Accomplishments, Russian has elementary predications that are hybrid in their actionality and can be classified as Activities as well as Accomplishments. With regard to the category of aspect in Russian, these hybrid predications are characterized by the fact that they can be coded perfective not only by a paired perfective verb but also by a so-called delimitative procedural verb. The first part of this paper examines the conditions under which elementary predications can be interpreted as hybrid. Two different types of hybrid Accomplishments will be distinguished. First, there are hybrid Accomplishments where the Activity component is conceptualized as a homogeneous continuous process and thus fulfills the principle of arbitrary divisibility. In this case the imperfective aspect, which forms the basis for coding the Accomplishment as perfective by a delimitative procedural verb, has durative-processual meaning. Second, there are hybrid Accomplishments where the Activity component consists of several randomly ordered subevents and thus fulfills the principle of cumulativity. In this case the Activity component has conative meaning. The second part shows that elementary predications that are not hybrid in their actionality can be reclassified in their actionality by temporal distributivity and in that case are also characterized as hybrid. The third part deals with predications with an inner argument modified by quantifying determiners and measure expressions. I show that these predications likewise allow a reclassification by temporal distributivity. However, this is only the case if the extent of the entities involved in the situation is determined in advance.

1. Accomplishments that Are Hybrid in Their Actionality

1.1. Accomplishments with a Homogeneous Activity Component

The term "hybrid predication" was coined by the Italian linguist Bertinetto (Bertinetto and Squartini 1995: 12), who works on the category of aspect in English and in the Romance languages. For Bertinetto, hybrid predications are predications that can be classified in their actionality in different ways. One of his examples is *to paint the wall*. A particularity of this predicate is that when it is used in the Simple form it can be modified not only by the inclusive durative adverbial *in two hours* but also by the non-inclusive durative adverbial *for two hours*.

(1)   We painted the wall in two hours / for two hours and left.

As a rule, English predications denoting changes of state in the Simple form can only be modified by an inclusive durative adverbial, as shown in examples (2) and (3).

(2)   We planted the tree we bought yesterday in half an hour / ?for half an hour.

(3)   We pitched our tent in ten minutes / ?for ten minutes.

Modifying these predications by a non-inclusive durative adverbial is only possible when using the Perfect Progressive:

(2)   a.   We have been planting the tree we bought yesterday for half an hour.

(3)   a.   We have been pitching our tent for half an hour now.

This restriction does not hold for hybrid predications. Hybrid predications also allow a modification with a non-inclusive durative adverbial when the Simple form is used. Thus according to the standard tests, hybrid predications can be classified both as telic and atelic. If our example *We painted the wall* is modified by *in two hours*, then according to Vendler's classification it is an Accomplishment

and thus a telic predication. But if this predication is modified by *for two hours*, then according to Vendler's classification it is an Activity and thus an atelic predication. A rather large number of English verbs can alternate between a telic and an atelic interpretation. Kratzer (2004: 396) lists among others the following verbs:

(4)   read, examine, analyze, iron, bathe, wash, comb, polish, cover, describe, survey

She correctly adds that her list is not complete. As I will show, such a list can never be complete because the possibility of interpreting a predication as hybrid is dependent not only on the semantics of the verb but also on the semantics and referential characteristics of the inner argument. Further, inherently telic predications can be reclassified in their actionality if they involve not a single event but several events summed up into one macro-event. In this case, they may be hybrid as well.

   In Russian the difference between Accomplishment predicates and Activity predicates is relevant for the category of aspect (Mehlig 1981, Bulygina 1982, and many others). Accomplishments belong to the class of telic predicates. Telic predicates denote changes of state, transitions that culminate in a new state or process. The situations denoted by Accomplishments are thus conceptualized as temporally heterogeneous, i.e., the initial and the final states of the situation are not identical. In Russian, telic predicates are distinct in that they form so-called aspectual pairs. This means that a telic predicate can ordinarily be expressed not only by an imperfective verb but also by a perfective partner verb that denotes the situation in question and includes the resulting state or process. Accomplishment predicates coded perfective by their paired perfective verbs can only be modified by an inclusive durative adverbial. Modification by a non-inclusive durative adverbial is impossible, as shown in the Russian translations of our English examples (2) and (3).

(2)   b.   My posadili^{PF} derevo, kotoroe my včera kupili, za polčasa / *polčasa.

          'We planted the tree we bought yesterday in half an hour / *for half an hour.'

(3) b. My postavili*PF* palatku za desjat' minut / *desjat' minut.

'We pitched our tent in ten minutes / *for ten minutes.'

Activities, on the other hand, belong to the class of atelic predicates. They conceptualize the situation denoted as not inherently bounded with no culmination point. For this reason, Activity predicates do not have paired perfective verbs. For them perfectivization can be realized only by means of "sublexical" (Smith 1991) or "superlexical" prefixes (Svenonius 2004), i.e., by means of prefixes (or in the case of semelfactive procedural verbs formed with the suffix -NU-) that limit the situation temporally by establishing an arbitrary temporal point in the situation. The number of these aspectual procedurals in Russian that allow us to perfectivize atelic predicates in this way is large. A comprehensive overview can be found in Šeljakin 1983. Among the procedurals that allow the perfectivization of predicates conceptualizing the denoted situation as not inherently bounded, the most productive is the so-called delimitative procedural verb, which is formed with the prefix PO-. As has been shown particularly by Sémon (1986) and Bogusławski (2004), Activity predicates can be coded perfective almost without exception by this procedural verb. The function of a delimitative procedural verb is to limit the situation denoted in its temporal extent. In this way delimitative procedural verbs—as Dickey (Dickey and Hutcheson 2003, Dickey 2006, 2007) has repeatedly emphasized—function as quasi-equivalents for the missing paired perfective verb which Activity predicates, like all atelic predicates, do not have. A predication coded as perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb—as is to be expected for atelic predicates—can be modified by a non-inclusive durative adverbial only.

(5) Saša segodnja časa dva porabotal*PF-DELIM* i ušel*PF*.

'Today Sasha worked for about two hours and left.'

In addition to elementary predications that can be clearly classified either as Accomplishments or as Activities, in Russian as in English there are predicates that are hybrid in their actionality, that is, predicates that can be classified both as an Accomplishment and as an Activity (Mehlig 1981: 111–17). In Russian, these hybrid predi-

cates are characterized by the fact that they likewise allow both types of perfectivization. First, they can be coded perfective by the paired perfective verb and second, by the delimitative procedural verb. Typical examples of such predicates are the following:

pisat'^{IMPF} stat'ju	'to write an article'
obsuždat'^{IMPF} vopros	'to discuss a question'
kopat'^{IMPF} jamu	'to dig a pit'
perevodit'^{IMPF} tekst	'to translate a text'
zapolnjat'^{IMPF} anketu	'to fill in a form'
igrat'^{IMPF} sonatu	'to play a sonata'

On the one hand, these predicates can be coded perfective by the corresponding paired perfective verb:

(6) Saša zapolnil^{PF} anketu, kotoruju emu dali, i pošel^{PF} v biblioteku.

'Sasha filled in the form given to him and went to the library.'

(7) Maša sygrala^{PF} sonatu Čajkovskogo i perešla^{PF} k ètjudam.

'Masha played a Tchaikovsky sonata and went on to the etudes.'

Use of the paired perfective verb informs us that the situation denoted has attained its inherent point of culmination. On the other hand, these predicates can be coded perfective with a delimitative procedural verb, a possibility that, as we have seen, exists only for predicates that are atelic. This is shown by the following (a) examples:

(6) a. Saša minut dvadcat' pozapolnjal$^{PF-DELIM}$ anketu, kotoruju emu dali^{PF}, i pošel^{PF} v biblioteku.

'Sasha spent about twenty minutes filling in the form given to him and went to the library.'

(7)   a.   Maša poigrala*PF-DELIM* sonatu Čajkovskogo minut desjat' i perešla*PF* k ètjudam.

'Masha played a Tchaikovsky sonata for about ten minutes and went on to the etudes.'

If these hybrid predicates are coded perfective with a delimitative procedural verb, they only refer to the activity that causes the change of state, and the culmination point of the denoted situations is irrelevant. As a rule, hybrid Accomplishments coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb denote a situation which has not attained its inherent point of culmination. Typical ways of continuing examples such as (6a) or (7a) are *ničego ne vyšlo*PF* 'nothing came of it' or *i brosili*PF* 'and quit':

(6)   b.   Saša minut dvadcat' pozapolnjal*PF-DELIM* anketu, kotorujemu dali*PF*, no ničego ne vyšlo*PF*.

'For about twenty minutes Sasha filled in the form given to him but nothing came of it.'

(7)   b.   Maša poigrala*PF-DELIM* sonatu Čajkovskogo minut pjat' i brosila*PF*.

'Masha played a Tchaikovsky sonata for about five minutes and quit.'

This is why Tatevosov and Ivanov (2009) term Accomplishments with a homogeneous Activity component coded as perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb "partial success" Accomplishments. If predications such as (6a) or (7a) are as a rule interpreted as denoting a change of state which has not reached the culmination point, this is nevertheless only a conversational implicature which results from the non-use of the paired perfective verb. This implicature can be cancelled, as shown by the way an example such as (8) can be continued.

(8) [Saša pozapolnjal*PF-DELIM* anketu, kotoruju emu dali, minut
     dvadcatʹ i pošel*PF* v biblioteku.]
     —A anketu do konca zapolnil*PF*?
     —Da, do konca. On ee uže otpravil*PF*.

     ʹ"[Sasha filled in the form given to him for about twenty
     minutes and left.]"
     "Did he fill in the form completely?"
     "Yes, he did. He has already sent it off"ʹ.

Since Tatevosov and Ivanov (2009) assume that Accomplishments
coded as perfective by means of the delimitative procedural verb
always denote a situation which has not attained its inherent point
of culmination, they take as the basis for their formal description of
these Accomplishments a Progressive Operator that corresponds to
the so called "focalized-progressive" meaning of the English Pro-
gressive form. In the focalized-progressive meaning the English
Progressive form denotes a situation which at the relevant point of
focalization is only partially realized (Bertinetto, Ebert, and de Groot
2000: 527–38). I would like to suggest, though, that the basis for cod-
ing as perfective an Accomplishment with a homogeneous Activity
component by means of a delimitative procedural verb is a Progres-
sive Operator that corresponds to the "durative-progressive"
meaning of the English Progressive form. In contrast to the focal-
ized-progressive meaning, which denotes a situation only partially
realized at the point of focalization, in the durative-progressive
meaning of the English Progressive form it remains open whether
the situation denoted reached its focalization point. Mittwoch (1988:
226) demonstrates the durative-progressive meaning of the English
Progressive form with examples such as (9) and shows that using
the English Progressive form in its durative-progressive meaning
leaves it unclear whether during the denoted period of time the
book was finished or not:

(9) Last year / When I was in Boston John was writing a book.

In Russian perfective encoding an Accomplishment with a ho-
mogeneous Activity component by a delimitative procedural verb is
based on a meaning of the imperfective aspect which corresponds to
the English Progressive form in its durative-progressive meaning.

This meaning of the imperfective aspect is called *processnoe, processual'noe*, or *durativnoe* (Apresjan 2009: 532). I will use the term *durative-processual*. This durative-processual meaning of the imperfective aspect is present in the following example:

(10)   Včera Saša četyre časa perevodil trudnyj tekst, a potom pošel*PF* v biblioteku.

'Yesterday Sasha was translating a difficult text for four hours and then went to the library.'

Coded as perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb the Activity component of the Accomplishment *perevodit'IMPF tekst* 'to translate a text' is conceptualized as temporally bounded. Therefore in English example (10a) is translated with the Simple form.

(10)   a.   Včera Saša časa četyre poperevodil*PF-DELIM* trudnyj tekst, a potom pošel*PF* v biblioteku.

'Yesterday Sasha translated a difficult text for about four hours and then he went to the library.'

It is important to note that whether the situation denoted has attained its inherent point of culmination remains open in both example (10) in the imperfective aspect as well as in example (10a) coded perfective by the delimitative procedural verb. The possible continuations of the example demonstrate this.

(10)   b.   —Včera Saša četyre časa perevodil*IMPF* / časa četyre poperevodil*PF-DELIM* trudnyj tekst, a potom pošel v biblioteku.
—A tekst-to on perevel*PF*?
—Da, perevel*PF*, no s bol'šim trudom. / Net, èto čto-to soveršenno neperevodimoe. / Net, poka ne ves', no ostalos' nemnogo.

'"Yesterday Sasha was translating a difficult text for four hours/ translated a difficult text for about four hours and then he went to the library.

"Did he finish translating the text?"
"Yes, he translated it, but only with great difficulty. / No, it's untranslatable. / No, not quite yet. But there is only a little bit left."'

If an Accomplishment coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb is modified by a durative adverbial, it is only our knowledge of the world that decides whether the situation denoted has attained its inherent point of culmination. An example such as (11) denotes a situation that has not reached its point of culmination because a novel like *War and Peace* cannot be read in four hours.

(11) Včera Saša časa četyre počital*PF-DELIM Vojnu i mir*, a potom pošel*PF* v biblioteku.

'Yesterday Sasha read *War and Peace* for about four hours and then went to the library.'

In contrast to *War and Peace*, an article of normal length can easily be read in four hours. Therefore a predication such as (12) may denote a situation which has reached its point of culmination, as shown by the way the example is continued.

(12) —Včera Saša časa četyre počital*PF-DELIM* stat'ju, kotoruju ty emu dal*PF*, a potom pošel*PF* v biblioteku.
—Do konca dočital*PF*?
—Da. Uže napisal*PF* recenziju.

'"Yesterday Sasha read the article you gave him for about four hours and then went to the library."
"Did he read it entirely?"
"Yes, he did. He has already written his review."'

Of course, hybrid Accomplishments denoting situations that have not reached the point of culmination can only be coded as perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb.

What conditions allow us to interpret elementary predications denoting a change of state as hybrid? With respect to syntax, verbs used in hybrid predications are often characterized by the fact that they can be used in the *absoljutivnaja konstrukcija* (Apresjan 2009:

487), that is, without specification of the inner argument. Examples are given in (13).

(13) *čitat'*[IMPF] / *počitat'*[PF-DELIM]   'to read'

     igrat'[IMPF] / *poigrat'*[PF-DELIM]   'to play'

     pisat'[IMPF] / *popisat'*[PF-DELIM]   'to write'

But verbs that are exclusively transitive can also be interpreted as hybrid, as shown in (14).

(14) *vspominat'*[IMPF] / *povspominat'*[PF-DELIM] *vstreču*

     'to remember a meeting'

     rešat'[IMPF] / *porešat'*[PF-DELIM] *krossvord*

     'to solve a crossword puzzle'

Further, it is important to note that the possibility of interpreting imperfective verbs as hybrid is not restricted to simplex imperfectives. As the following examples show, prefixed secondary imperfective verbs can also be modified by delimitative verbs:

(15) *raskrašivat'*[IMPF] / *poraskrašivat'*[PF-DELIM] *kartinku*

     'to color a picture'

     zapolnjat'[IMPF] / *pozapolnjat'*[PF-DELIM] *anketu*

     'to fill in a form'

     perevodit'[IMPF] / *poperevodit*[PF-DELIM]*'* *tekst*

     'to translate a text'

In addition, there are purely formal reasons that may prevent an Accomplishment predication from being characterized as hybrid. In Russian the prefix PO- is polysemous. One of its functions is to form paired perfective verbs, for example *stroit'*[IMPF] – *postroit'*[PF] *dom* 'to build a house'. In this case, delimitative procedural verbs cannot usually be formed. But even here there are exceptions, such as *krasit'*[IMPF] – *pokrasit' stenu* 'to paint the wall'. The prefix PO- is homonymous in this example, and the prefixed verb *pokrasit'* 'to paint' can be interpreted either as a paired perfective verb or as a delimitative

procedural verb. Used as a paired perfective verb, it can be modified only with an inclusive durative adverbial.

(16)   Saša pokrasil^{PF} stenu *za dva časa*.

'Sasha painted the wall *in two hours*.'

If we interpret the prefix PO- as a delimitative procedural verb, the predication can be modified only by a non-inclusive durative adverbial:

(16)   a.   Saša *časa dva* pokrasil$^{PF-DELIM}$ stenu i ušel^{PF}.

'Sasha painted the wall *for about two hours* and left.'

Thus we have one of the very rare cases in Russian when a perfective verb formed with the prefix PO- is ambiguous in its actionality. Further examples are *podumat'* 'to think', *pobrit'* 'to shave', *počesat' len* 'to comb flax', and *pošeptat'* 'to whisper' (Sigalov 1975: 167).

Are there any semantic criteria that allow or disallow the classification of a predication as hybrid? A general condition is that predications can be coded perfective by the delimitative procedural verb only if we are dealing with controllable dynamic situations. This is also valid for hybrid Accomplishments. The Activity component causing the change of state can be coded perfective by the delimitative verb only if the situation in question is caused by an active agent.[1] A further condition for coding an Accomplishment as perfective by means of a delimitative verb is that it involves a process component causing the change of state. This is why Achievement predicates such as *žertvovat'*^{IMPF} *figuru* 'to sacrifice a chess-man' are excluded from a hybrid interpretation. Achievements do not have a process component. They denote "happenings" (Bach 1986: 6), an instant change, and conceptualize the situation denoted as momentary (Apresjan 1995: 223). Therefore, Achievement predications, as

---

[1] There are a few exceptions. One is *Sneg potajal*$^{PF-DELIM}$ *nekotoroe vremja, a potom opjat' podmorozil*^{PF}. 'The snow melted for a while and then froze again.' Bogusławski, who has given a comprehensive semantic description of the Russian delimitative procedural verb, suggests differentiating between real delimitatives, which he calls "personal delimitives," and the very small group of "metereological delimitives" (2004: 73).

long as they refer to a single individualized event, i.e., denote an elementary situation, cannot be coded as perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb. They are inherently telic and never hybrid.

In contrast to Achievements, Accomplishments have an Activity component causing the corresponding change of state. Therefore they fulfill a necessary condition for classifying changes of state as hybrid in their actionality. However, the presence of a process component is a necessary but not sufficient condition for interpreting an Accomplishment predication as hybrid. Not all Accomplishments are hybrid, as the English examples mentioned earlier have already shown. Let us consider the conditions under which Accomplishment predications are hybrid, comparing the following examples:

(17) Saša sidel^{IMPF} za stolom i zapolnjal^{IMPF} anketu.

‘Sasha was sitting at the table filling in a form.’

(18) Maša igrala^{IMPF} sonatu Čajkovskogo.

‘Masha was playing a Tchaikovsky sonata.’

(19) Mal’čiki stavili^{IMPF} palatku.

‘The boys were pitching their tent.’

(20) My sažali^{IMPF} derevo.

‘We were planting a tree.’

All four of these predications can be interpreted as Accomplishments and are associated with a paired perfective verb. The situations denoted by these predications are durative. Used in the imperfective aspect, they can be modified by phase verbs such as *načat'* ‘to begin’ or *perestat'* ‘to stop’. This means that all four of these examples involve a process component causing a change of state. Furthermore, all four predications denote situations that are realized in stages, step by step.[2] A form is filled in step by step, a tent is pitched

---

[2] In Glovinskaja’s classification all four verbs belong to the first type of aspectual opposition, specifically to subtype B within the first type. Predicates belonging to this type denote change of state realized in stages. The imperfective aspect (in its

stage by stage. Therefore these predications, if they are related to an individualized situation and the imperfective aspect is used in its durative-processual meaning, always denote a situation where the change of state is at least partially realized. Nevertheless, only examples (17) and (18) are hybrid. Only these examples allow perfectivization by means of a delimitative procedural verb and thus can be classified as hybrid in their actionality. The same is not true of examples (19) and (20). They cannot be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb. Why is this so?

As I have shown in Mehlig 2006, conceptualizing a change of state as both telic and atelic is possible, if the Activity component causing the change of state can be conceptualized as homogeneous. This is the case for predicates like *igrat'*^{IMPF} *sonatu* 'to play a sonata' and *zapolnjat'*^{IMPF} *anketu* 'to fill in a form'. A sonata need not be played through from the beginning to the end. One can interrupt it arbitrarily at any point and continue from any point. And as playing a sonata is something that can be repeated, some individual parts of it can be played over and over. Whenever and however often playing a sonata is interrupted, the Activity, the playing, is always the same. With filling in a form the situation is similar. One need not fill in a form systematically, blank by blank. In contrast to the sonata, one cannot repeatedly fill in one and the same form (disregarding the fact that one can strike out and erase entries). But it is possible and even sometimes necessary, to fill in forms randomly. And the process of filling in a form can be interrupted at any point and continued randomly later. Here, too, the Activity causing the change of state consists of more or less identical phases that repeat themselves.

In contrast, predicates such as *stavit'*^{IMPF} *palatku* 'to pitch a tent' or *sažat'*^{IMPF} *derevo* 'to plant a tree' do not imply a homogeneous Activity but a strictly ordered series of actions. Pitching a tent involves a well-ordered series of actions that are normally not repeated within a single situation. First the tent is unpacked, then it is rolled out, the ground sheet is fastened with pegs, then the poles are assembled, then the tent is raised and covered with the rain flap. Planting a tree it is similar. In planting a tree, one first digs a hole,

---

focalized processual meaning) denotes an action "which has partially attained its result"; the paired perfective aspect denotes an action "which has completely attained its result" (2001: 91). For a description of this type of aspectual opposition in formal semantic terms, see Braginsky and Rothstein 2008.

then fertilizes the soil, trims the roots, and so on. Not all the subevents that constitute these situations are obligatory. There are tents with no rain fly. A tree can be planted without fertilizing the soil. But the order of these actions constituting the situations denoted is not arbitrary. There are causal connections between the subevents. The poles can by raised only when they are put together. A tree can be planted only when a hole has been dug. It is true that the situations denoted by predicates such as *pitching a tent* and *planting a tree* can be interrupted at any point, as can situations involving a homogeneous activity. But if situations with a well-ordered sequence of subevents are continued after interruption, they must be continued from the exact point of interruption. Since the subevents constituting situations such as *pitching a tent* or *planting a tree* are arranged in a strict order, the situations denoted will be understood as inherently bounded. Therefore, predications such as *pitch a tent* or *plant a tree*—as long as they denote elementary situations—can only be coded perfective with the paired perfective verb.[3]

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that conceptualizing the Activity component causing the change of state as homogeneous is not only a question of the semantics of the verb. Whether the Activity causing the change of state can be conceptualized as homogeneous depends on the semantics of the inner argument as well. With predicates such as *pisat'^{IMPF} stat'ju* 'to write an essay' or *pisat'^{IMPF} roman* 'to write a novel', a homogeneous conceptualization of the Activity causing the change of state is plausible. In this case, we have situations extending over a relatively long period of time, and this usually means that the writing is interrupted repeatedly and then taken up again. In contrast, predicates such as *pisat'^{IMPF} zapisku* 'to write a note' or even better *pisat'^{IMPF} bukvu na doske* 'to write a letter on the blackboard' denote situations that are not normally interrupted and continued repeatedly. Thus, the temporal extension of the Activity component causing the change of state is simply too short to be conceptualized as a homogeneous process. Therefore,

---

[3] The same is true for English. Rothstein (2004: 115), using the examples *reading a book, wiping the table*, and *polishing a vase*, has shown that in English Accomplishments can be interpreted as atelic, if "the activity part of the accomplishment is a simple repetition of a single event type, rather than a complex activity."

although in principle possible, coding such predications as perfective with a delimitative procedural verb is very unlikely.

To recapitulate, an Accomplishment predication can be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb if the Activity causing the change of state is conceptualized as a homogeneous process. But in Russian coding situations perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb is also possible if the Activity component consists of different subevents in the absence of arbitrary divisibility. This is shown in the next section.

1.2. Accomplishments with a Conative Activity Component

As I have shown in the preceding section, Accomplishments referring to a single individualized situation are hybrid in their actionality if the Activity component causing the change of state is conceptualized as a homogeneous process and thus shows arbitrary divisibility. But there are counterexamples. In Russian, Accomplishments referring to a single situation can be hybrid and coded perfective by means of the delimitative procedural verb even if the activity causing the change of state consists of different actions and lack arbitrary divisibility. In Mehlig 2006 I demonstrated this with an example beloved by Russian aspectologists: *otkryvat'*^{IMPF} *okno* 'to open a window'. In contrast to the examples discussed so far such as *zapolnjat'*^{IMPF} *anketu* 'to fill out a form' or *sažat'*^{IMPF} *derevo* 'to plant a tree', a predicate such as *otkryvat'*^{IMPF} *okno* denotes a change of state that cannot be realized partially. A window is either open or closed.[4] Therefore the Activity component causing the change of state is related to the preliminaries that precede the actual change of state. The change of state itself is instant. More examples of Accomplishments where the Activity component is related to the preliminaries preceding the actual change of state are *vydavat'*^{IMPF} *knigu* 'check out a book', *prinimat'*^{IMPF} *tabletku aspirina* 'to take an aspirin', *razžigat'*^{IMPF}

---

[4] Since opening a window is gradable—a window can be opened wider or less wide—the situation denoted with the predicate *to open a window* can be continued even when the window is already open. But this semantic component is not relevant for the further discussion.

koster 'to light a campfire', or *vključat'*^{IMPF} *pribor* 'to turn on an appliance'.[5]

For a situation such as opening a window, the activities causing the change of state, i.e., the subevents which precede the actual change of state, are normally strictly ordered. First you take the handle, turn it, and then pull. The actual change, the change from the closed to the open state of the window, is momentary. Between the subevents causing the change of state there is a causal order. Only when you have turned the handle is it reasonable to pull it. In other words, the arrangement of the subevents is not arbitrary. Given this scenario, the Activity component cannot be interpreted as homogeneous and coding it perfective by the delimitative procedural verb is not possible. For *vydavat'*^{IMPF} *knigu* 'check out a book' or *prinimat'*^{IMPF} *tabletku aspirina* 'to take an aspirin' it is also true that under ordinary circumstances the actual change of state is preceded by of a series of subevents that occur in a well-defined order. Checking out a book in a library involves the librarian taking the order, fetching the book, checking the borrower's membership, registering his name, and so on.

However, for situations such as opening a window there still might be different scenarios. For example, the wooden window frame is swollen after a heavy rain and therefore the window is difficult to open. In this case the normal order of subevents would have no result and there might be a completely different scenario. For instance, first you try to open the window by pulling hard and, if this is not successful, then by using different tools such as a knife, pliers, or a chisel. If the window stays stuck, these tools may be used many times and in any order. With a scenario like this—as one of the anonymous reviewers but also Tatevosov and Ivanov (2009: 119) rightly commented—the Activity component causing the change of state is not homogeneous but consists of different actions and does not show arbitrary divisibility. Given this scenario, the Accomplishment *otkryvat' okno* 'to open a window' can be coded perfective

---

[5] In Glovinskaja's classification predicates such as *otkryvat' okno* 'to open a window' belong to the third type of aspectual opposition. The third type differs from the first type in that a predication used in the imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual meaning does not denote a situation which is partially realized but denotes only the preliminaries which precede the actual change of state.

by the delimitative procedural verb, as shown by the following example:

(21)   [Ja ne mogu otkryt'^{PF} okno. Ramka okna razbuxla^{PF} ot doždja.]

Ja ego pootkryval$^{PF-DELIM}$ minut desjat', no ničego ne vyšlo^{PF}.

'[I can't open the window. The frame is swollen from the rain.]

I tried to open it for about ten minutes but nothing came of it.'[6]

Coded as perfective by the delimitative procedural verb, the Activity component denotes an attempt to attain the change of state through several different actions. I will refer to Accomplishments where the Activity component is related to several subevents which are interpreted as an attempt to attain the change of state as *conative Accomplishments*.[7] These are translated into English using expressions such as *to try* or *to make attempts*.

Accomplishments with a conative Activity component are also hybrid in their actionality in Russian. They can be coded as perfective by both the paired perfective verb and the delimitative procedural verb. Coded perfective by the delimitative procedural verb, the subevents that cause the attainment of the change of state are bounded and limited in their temporal extent. The number, kind, and sequence of the subevents causing the change of state remain indefinite. A predication such as (21) only informs us that the Activity opening the window consisted of several possibly different subevents. As (21a) shows for a conative Accomplishment in Russian, it is typical that the verb form coded as perfective by means of the de-

---

[6] Tatevosov and Ivanov (2009: 84) also demonstrate this use of the delimitative procedural verb with the verb *otkryvat'* in the context of a door with a broken lock. *Vasja otkryval*$^{PF-DELIM}$ *dver' pjat' minut i brosil*^{PF}. 'Vasja tried to open the door for five minutes and gave up'.

[7] There are many interrelationships between conativity and the category of aspect in Russian; see Plungjan 2001, Zel'dovič 2003, Miljutina 2006.

limitative procedural verb is repeated, emphasizing the plurality of attempts.[8]

 (21)   a.   Pootkryval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, pootkryval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ ja okno, no ničego ne vyšlo^{PF}.

            'I tried and tried to open the window, but nothing came of it.'

Furthermore, as example (21a) shows, a conative Accomplishment coded as perfective by means of the delimitative procedural verb often has a marked word order: the reduplicated verb form is topicalized and emphasized by using Bryzgunova's IK 3. A predication such as (21a) refers hyperbolically to several attempts where each attempt consists of possibly different subevents and is delimited in its temporal extent. As each attempt is temporally delimited it is possible to sum up these attempts as a unity as in (21a).

    The following are additional examples of conative Accomplishments where the Activity component is related to the preliminaries of the change of state and which (analogous to our example *pootkryvat'*$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ *okno* 'to open the window') may denote not only the normal way but also the attempt to attain a change of state:

> *povklučat*$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ *pribor* 'to try to turn on an appliance', (if it is new and one does not know how to do it)
>
> - Ja povklučal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, povklučal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ novyj pribor i v konce koncov on vklučilsja^{PF}.
>
>   'I tried and tried to turn on the new appliance and finally it turned on.'
>
> *porazžigat'*$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ *koster* 'to try to light a campfire', (when the wood is damp)

---

[8] For the semantics of reduplication of the verb form, see Plungjan and Raxilina 1996 or Plungjan 2001, who point out that predications with a reduplicated verb form are often interpreted as conative.

- My porazžigali$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, porazžigali$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ ogon', no èto ne udalos'^{PF}.
  'We tried and tried to light the campfire but didn't succeed.'

povytaskivat'$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ *gvozd'* 'to try to pull out a nail', (when it is driven way in)

- Ja povytaskival$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, povytaskival$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ gvozd', no tak i ne smog^{PF}.
  'I tried and tried to pull out the nail but I couldn't.'

poproglatyvat'$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ *tabletku aspirina* 'to try to swallow an aspirin', (e.g., without water)

- Ja poproglatyval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, poproglatyval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ tabletku i vypljunul^{PF}.
  'I tried and tried to swallow the aspirin, then spat it out.'

povyprjamljat'$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ *provoloku* 'to try to straighten a wire' (it is very crooked)

- Ja povyprjamljal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, povyprjamljal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ provoloku i ostavil^{PF} ètu zateju.
  'I tried and tried to straighten the wire and gave up.'

If Accomplishments are interpreted as conative, there must be something preventing a change of state from occurring in the usual way. The reason for this may be certain characteristics of the entity denoted by the inner argument. The wire is too bent to straighten easily. The window is stuck fast. But the reason can also be the agent and his limited abilities, for instance, the agent does not know how to turn on the new appliance, or he is too weak to straighten the wire.

Not all Accomplishments with an Activity component related to the preliminaries that precede the actual change of state allow a conative interpretation, as shown in examples (22) and (23).

(22) $^?$Ja poprinimal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, poprinimal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ tabletku aspirina i brosil^{PF}.

'I tried and tried to swallow the aspirin but gave up.'

(23) $^?$Bibliotekar′ povydaval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, povydaval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ ètu knigu i sdalsja^{PF}.

'The librarian tried and tried to check out this book and gave up.'

If for these predications a conative interpretation is excluded it is only because possible obstacles cannot be related to the situations as a whole but only to the situations' subevents. For (22) *prinimat′^{IMPF} tabletku aspirina* 'to take an aspirin' it could be the opening of the packet or the swallowing of the pill.

As a rule Accomplishments with a conative Activity component coded as perfective by means of the delimitative procedural verb denote situations that have not attained their inherent point of culmination. Usually they are followed by utterances such as *ničego ne vyšlo^{PF}* 'nothing came of it′ *brosit′^{PF} / sdat′sja^{PF}* 'to give up', *ničego ne polučaetsja^{IMPF}* 'nothing works'. That is why Tatevosov and Ivanov (2009) have termed accomplishments with a conative Activity component as "failed attempt" Accomplishments. Although it is true that Accomplishments with a conative Activity component coded as perfective by a delimitative procedural verb usually denote a failed attempt, this is only a conversational implicature that arises from the non-use of the associated paired perfective verb and which can be cancelled. Fortunately, attempts sometimes can be successful. Continuations such as "and I succeeded" or some other indication that the change of state was attained also yield a coherent text, as shown by the following examples:

(24) My pootkryvali$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, pootkryvali$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ okno i nakonec ono otkrylos′^{PF}.

'We tried and tried to open the window and finally it opened.'

(25) —Tebe udalos'^{PF} vključit'^{PF} novyj pribor?
      —Udalos'^{PF}. Ja ego povključal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, povključal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ i v
        konce koncov on načal rabotat'^{IMPF}.

      '"Did you succeed in turning on the new appliance?"
      "Yes, I did. I tried and tried to turn it on and in the end it
        started working."'

Up to now we have discussed the conative interpretation of Accomplishments with examples where the Activity component is related to the preliminaries to the actual change of state and therefore cannot be conceptualized as a homogeneous process. But Accomplishments even then can be interpreted as conative if the situations denoted are realized in stages. If these Accomplishments are associated with a homogeneous Activity component as, for instance, *perevodit'*^{IMPF} *tekst* 'to translate a text', then these predications coded as perfective by means of the delimitative procedural verb allow two different interpretations, as shown by comparing (26) and (27).

(26) Snačala Saša časa poltora poperevodil$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ tekst, kotoruju
      emu dali, a potom on pošel^{PF} v biblioteku.

      'Sasha first spent about half an hour translating the text given
      to him and then went to the library.'

(27) [Èto očen' trudnyj tekst.] Ja ego poperevodil$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$,
      poperevodil$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$, a potom brosil^{PF}. Ja takie teksty
      perevodit'^{IMPF} ne mogu.

      '[This is a very difficult text.] I tried and tried to translate it
      and then gave it up. I can't translate such texts.'

In (26) the Activity component is related to the homogeneous process of translating. Coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb, this continuous process is limited in its temporal extension. In (27), on the other hand, the Activity component is not related to the continuous process of translating but to a process which is frequently interrupted and renewed. Perhaps at first the translator was only able to translate parts of the text, then tried to translate more with the help of special dictionaries or by consulting literature on the topic. Doubling the verb form, as is typical of conative

Accomplishments, emphasizes that the translation is not done in sequence but in several attempts. If Accomplishments such as *poperevodit'*[PF-DELIM] *tekst* 'to translate a text' are interpreted as conative, it is presumed that there must be something preventing the change of state from being caused in the usual way. The reason for this may be certain characteristics of the entity denoted by the inner argument. For instance, the text to be translated is difficult or incomprehensible. But it could also be insufficient linguistic knowledge on the part of the translator.

As a rule, conative Accomplishments denoting a situation that is realized in stages and coded perfective by the delimitative procedural verb are also understood as denoting a situation that has not attained its point of culmination. But again, this is only a conversational implicature which arises from the non-use of the paired perfective verb. This implicature can be cancelled, as shown by the way (27) can be continued:

(27) a. [Èto očen' trudnyj tekst.] Ja ego poperevodil[PF-DELIM], poperevodil[PF-DELIM] i, nakonec, polučilsja[PF] očen' xorošij variant.

'[This is a very difficult text.] I tried and tried to translate it. Finally, an excellent translation resulted.'

Because Accomplishments such as *perevodit' tekst* 'to translate a text' or *sokraščat' stat'ju* 'to shorten an article' denote situations that can be partially realized, the result of the conative activity can be that the change of state was partially attained, as shown in (28):

(28) —Posokraščal[PF-DELIM], posokraščal[PF-DELIM] ja ètu stat'ju i sdalsja[PF].
—Ty ee xot' na dve stranicy sokratil[PF]?
—Da, no ee nado bylo by sokratit[PF] na 10 stranic.

'"I tried and tried to shorten this article and gave up."
"Did you at least shorten it by two pages?"
"Yes, but it had to be shortened by ten pages."'

For a conative Accomplishment such as *otkryvat'*^{IMPF} *okno* 'to open a window' such an interpretation is excluded because, as we have seen, it denotes a change that cannot be partially realized.

Let us summarize our observations. If an Accomplishment such as *otkryvat'*^{IMPF} *okno* 'to open a window' is perfectivized by the paired perfective verb, the Activity component is related to a sequence of different subevents which cause the change of state. But even when perfectivized by means of the delimitative procedural verb, the Activity component can be related to different subevents. A predication such as *Saša pootkryval*^{PF-DELIM}, *pootkryval*^{PF-DELIM} *okno i brosil*^{PF} 'Sasha tried and tried to open the window and gave up' normally will be understood to mean that the attempt to effect the change of state consisted of different actions. In other words, neither perfectivizing with the paired perfective verb nor perfectivizing with the delimitative procedural verb admits arbitrary divisibility of the Activity. The question therefore is under which conditions a change of state caused by different subevents can be conceptualized as not inherently bounded, i.e., as atelic. To answer this question it is useful to compare the telic–atelic contrast in the verbal domain with the contrast between count nouns and non-count nouns in the nominal domain.

That the difference between telic and atelic predicates in the verbal domain corresponds to the difference between count nouns and non-count nouns in the nominal domain is a matter of general consensus (for Russian, see Mehlig 1996, but also Rothstein 2004). Count nouns such as *stul* 'chair' or *škaf* 'cupboard' are based on a concept "which isolates what falls under it in a definite manner, and which does not permit any arbitrary division of it into parts" (Frege 1953: 66). This inherent boundedness is a result of a strict arrangement of the parts that constitute entities denoted by count nouns. As every IKEA customer knows, a pile of boards and screws only becomes a cupboard when the parts are arranged in a well-defined order, and it is this well-defined configuration of the parts that distinguishes the denoted entity from others. This is valid for telic predicates as well. By analogy with count nouns, telic predicates denote situations which are inherently bounded. The inherent boundedness of temporal entities denoted by telic predicates is also a result of the strict order of the subevents constituting the situation. As we have shown with examples such as *sažat'*^{IMPF} *derevo* 'to plant a tree' or

prinimat'[IMPF] tabletku aspirina 'to take an aspirin', the temporal or-
dering of the subevents of telic predicates is not random. Taking an
aspirin means first opening the little packet, then taking out the pill,
dissolving it in water, and then swallowing it. Not all subevents are
necessary for this situation. An aspirin can be taken without dis-
solving it in water. But between the different subevents which con-
stitute a situation such as taking an aspirin there is a causal connec-
tion. An aspirin can be swallowed only when it has been taken from
the packet. It is this well-defined configuration of the temporal parts
that results in an inherent boundedness of the situation denoted by
telic predicates.

In contrast to count nouns, non-count nouns denote entities
which are not inherently bounded, e.g., spatial entities such as *sneg*
'snow' and *bagaž* 'luggage' or temporal entities such as *šum* 'noise'
and *zapax* 'smell'. Within non-count nouns there are two classes,
first, the so-called mass nouns such as *gaz* 'gas', *klej* 'glue', or *saxar*
'sugar' and second the so-called uncountable collective nouns such
as *bagaž* 'luggage', *musor* 'rubbish', or *mebel'* 'furniture'. For both
mass nouns and uncountable collective nouns, the entities denoted
are conceptualized as not inherently bounded and therefore not
countable: **tri saxara* 'three sugars', **dva bagaža* 'two luggages'. But
between the two classes in the non-count domain there is an impor-
tant difference. Mass nouns denote either substances such as *gaz*
'gas' or scattered entities such as *saxar* 'sugar'. The entities denoted
by mass nouns are conceptualized as homogeneous. They meet the
criterion of arbitrary divisibility: a part of a quantity of sugar can
also be denoted as sugar. In other words each quantity of sugar is—
down to a certain degree—an instance of the whole. Furthermore
mass nouns meet the criterion of cumulativity (Quine 1960: 91) or
additivity (Carlson 1981: 50): a combination of entities denoted by
mass nouns results in an entity of the same name. Each total of the
parts which make up sugar is also sugar itself. In contrast to this,
non-countable collective nouns such as *bagaž* 'luggage' or *mebel'*
'furniture' do not meet the criterion of arbitrary divisibility. They
fulfill only the principle of cumulativity or additivity. If two piles of
luggage are combined they again constitute a pile of luggage. But for
non-countable collective nouns the principle of arbitrary divisibility
is not valid, because the entities denoted consist of different parts. If
the entities denoted by non-countable collective nouns, despite the

diversity of their parts, are nevertheless unbounded, it is because the arrangement of their parts is random. The inherent boundedness of an entity, as we have seen, presupposes a well-defined configuration of its parts. It is precisely this condition that is not met for entities denoted by uncountable collective nouns. The order of the parts is random and therefore no inherent bounding is possible.

To summarize, both count nouns and non-countable collective nouns denote entities that consist of heterogeneous parts. The difference between them is that with count nouns the heterogeneous parts of which the entity consists are arranged in a well-defined way. The order of the parts cannot be changed. In contrast to count nouns, un-countable collective nouns denote entities in which the order of the parts is random. Since the arrangement of the parts is arbitrary, there is no inherent boundedness. From this it follows that mass nouns, which fulfill not only the principle of cumulativity but also the principle of arbitrary divisibility, can only denote entities that are inherently unbounded. Inherent boundedness presupposes het-erogeneity of the parts, a condition that mass nouns do not fulfill as they denote entities which consist of identical parts.

Now let us return to the verbal domain. In the verbal domain the equivalent of non-count nouns are atelic predicates. Atelic predi-cates denote entities that are not inherently bounded in the same manner as non-count nouns. By analogy with non-count nouns, two classes of atelic predicates must be differentiated. First, atelic predi-cates can denote activities which, down to a certain degree, consist of more or less identical subevents. This is the case for the Activity component of Accomplishments such as 'to fill in a form' or 'to play a sonata'. Second, atelic predicates can also denote situations con-sisting of different subevents in a manner analogous to non-count-able collective nouns. This is the case with conative Accomplish-ments, where the Activity component consists of several different subevents that are arbitrarily ordered.

If atelic predicates denote situations that consist of heterogene-ous subevents, for these predicates the subevents causing the change of state are not temporally ordered in a manner analogous to non-countable collective nouns. The arrangement of the subevents is ar-bitrary. From this it follows that verbal predicates consisting of dif-ferent subevents can be telic or atelic. If the subevents constituting the situation are arranged in a well-defined temporary order, the

situation is inherently bounded. Thus we have a telic predicate. For both telic predicates and count nouns the inherent boundedness follows from the well-defined order that constitutes the entity denoted. In Russian, telic predicates as a rule are associated with a paired perfective verb that denotes the attainment of this boundary. If on the other hand the different subevents constituting the situation are arbitrarily arranged, the situation can never have an inherent boundary, because inherent boundedness presupposes a well-defined order of the parts constituting the entity. There are no contours that might separate the situation from others. In this case we have an atelic predicate that corresponds to uncountable collective nouns. For both uncountable collective nouns and atelic predicates the heterogeneous parts constituting the entity are arbitrarily arranged. In Russian, atelic predicates have no paired perfective verb because they denote situations which, on account of the arbitrary arrangement of the parts, constitute a situation which cannot have an inherent boundary. That is why they are not associated with a paired perfective verb. They can be coded perfective only by aspectual procedural verbs that impose a temporal boundary on the situation in one way or other. As inherent boundedness presupposes heterogeneity of the parts, predicates consisting of identical subevents can only denote situations that are not inherently bounded. Boundedness presupposes the heterogeneity of the parts constituting the situation, a condition which situations conceptualized as homogeneous do not fulfill.

We can summarize our results as follows. First, agentive Accomplishments related to single individualized situations are hybrid in their actionality if the Activity component causing the change of state is conceptualized as a continuous homogeneous process and thus the principle of arbitrary divisibility is fulfilled. Second, Accomplishments related to a single individualized situation can be hybrid in their actionality when the Activity component consists of several different subevents. In this case the Activity component has conative meaning and corresponds to uncountable collective nouns such as *bagaž* 'luggage' or *musor* 'rubbish' in the nominal domain. By analogy with uncountable collective nouns, the Activity component does not meet the criterion of homogeneity but (on account of the arbitrary arrangement of the subevents) it fulfills the principle of cumulativity. Homogeneity entails cumulativity. Thus in the end it is

not the principle of homogeneity or of arbitrary divisibility but the principle of cumulativity that is a necessary condition for an Accomplishment related to a single individualized situation to be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb.

In what follows I attempt to show that even inherently telic predicates such as *to plant a tree* or *to check out a book*, which as long as they refer to single situations cannot be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb, can become secondarily homogeneous and then likewise be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb. They thereby become hybrid in their actionality.

2. The Reclassification of Inherently Telic Predications in Their Actionality through Temporal Distributivity

As we have seen, Accomplishments denoting situations realized in stages are inherently telic if the Activity component cannot be conceptualized either as a homogeneous process or as conative. As long as such Accomplishments refer to a single event, perfectivity coding by the delimitative procedural verb is not possible. Our example was *sažat'^{IMPF}* / *posadit'^{PF} derevo* 'to plant a tree'. The same holds true for Accomplishments denoting situations where the actual change of state is instant and therefore the Activity component is related to the preliminaries that precede it. As long as these Accomplishments denote ordinary actions and not attempts to cause the change of state, they are inherently telic as well; compare examples such as *vybrasyvat'^{IMPF}* / *vybrosit'^{PF} pis'mo* 'to throw away a letter' or *prinimat'^{IMPF} prinjat'^{PF}tabletku aspirina* 'to take an aspirin'. However, inherently telic predications can be reclassified in their actionality by reference to several events that do not occur simultaneously. This recategorization occurs in three different cases**.** The first case is *temporal distributivity*, where the predication is related to a series of entities involved in a situation not simultaneously but step by step, such as *časa dva vybrasyvat'^{IMPF} starye pis'ma* 'to throw away old letters for about two hours'. The second case is *iterativity*, where identical situations are repeated and these repetitions are summed up in a macro-situation, e.g., *polčasa prygat'^{IMPF} s vyški* 'to bungee jump for half an hour'. The third case is *frequentativity*, where the predication with a bounded inner argument is related to several identical time intervals which are distributed over a macro-interval, e.g., *nedelju*

prinimat'[IMPF] *lekarstvo po tri tabletki večerom* 'to take three pills every evening for a week'. If the repetitions described above are not bounded in their quantity, then in each of these cases we have a secondary homogenization, i.e., atelic predications, and in Russian they can only be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb that expresses the temporal delimitation of the given macro-situation:

(29) —Gde bibliotekar'?
      —Ne znaju. On nemnogo / časa dva povydaval[PF-DELIM] studentam knigi i ušel[PF].

      '"Where is the librarian?"
      "I don't know. He checked out books to the students for a while / for about two hours and left."'

(30) Včera Saša snačala nemnogo poprygal[PF-DELIM] s vyški, a potom poplaval[PF-DELIM].

      'Yesterday Sasha first bungee jumped for a while and then he swam.'

(31) Poprinimajte[PF-DELIM] èto lekarstvo po tri tabletki večerom i posmotrim[PF], kak vy sebja budete čuvstvovat'[IMPF].

      'Take three pills every evening (for a while) and we will see how you feel.'

As shown in Mehlig 1996 (101–07), these recategorizations are arranged in a hierarchical order. Temporally distributive predications where the inner argument is related to a bounded amount of entities may be secondarily reclassified by iteration. Iterative predications that are related to a limited number of events may be secondarily reclassified by frequentation.

    In what follows, I elaborate on the semantically lowest form in this hierarchy of reclassification, which is the recategorization of actionality by temporal distributivity. Temporal distributivity is present when a verbal predication refers to several entities involved not simultaneously but sequentially in the given situation. In an imperfective predication such as (32) the plural *pis'ma* 'letters' permits two different interpretations.

(32)   Saša vybrasyval^{IMPF} starye pis'ma.

       'Sasha threw / was throwing away old letters.'

First, the plural can be understood collectively. In this collective reading, all the letters are involved in the situation simultaneously. With this collective plural the actionality of the predication does not change: we are still concerned with an inherently telic predication, related not to a single letter but to a group of letters.

   Second, however, the plural in (32) permits a non-collective reading too. This would be the case if the letters were thrown away not all at once but one at a time. In this reading, the predication refers to a situation that is a compound of several events. This series of events is related to a specific time interval and is thus united into a macro-event. In this temporal-distributive interpretation the elementary predication is reclassified with regard to its actionality and this recategorization of actionality is relevant for the category of aspect. The elementary predication that is present when a single letter or several letters together are thrown away can only be coded perfective by the paired perfective verb:

(32)   a.   Saša snačala vybrosil^{PF} starye pis'ma, a potom prinjalsja^{PF} za fotografii.

           'First of all Sasha threw away the old letters and then he turned to the photos.'

However, in the temporal-distributive reading, if the letters are thrown away one after the other, the predication can be coded perfective not only by its paired perfective verb but also by a delimitative procedural:

(32)   b.   Saša snačala nekotoroe vremja povybrasyval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ starye pis'ma, a potom prinjalsja^{PF} za fotografii.

           'First of all Sasha threw away old letters for a certain time and then he began on the photos.'

   Predications interpreted as temporally distributive denote situations where there is an interdependence between the temporal extent of the situation and the quantity of entities involved: the longer

the situation lasts, the greater the number of entities involved. Thus we have an 'incremental action' (*nakopitel'noe dejstvie*), as Ju. S. Maslov described it already in 1948: "Each particle of action directly deposits in its object a corresponding particle of result" (Maslov 1948/2004: 85). In our example *Saša dva časa vybrasyval starye pis'ma* 'Sasha threw away old letters for two hours', the plural *pis'ma* 'letters' is a "secondary incremental argument" derived by temporal distributivity.[9] Predications with this interdependence between the temporal extent of the situation and an increase or decrease in the quantity of the entities involved have been thoroughly discussed in formal semantic analyses by Krifka (1989), Dowty (1991), Partee (1997), Filip (1999), and most recently by Padučeva (2004). These discussions have shown that the classification of an incremental predication as telic or atelic can depend on whether the incremental argument involves a bounded or unbounded quantity. If the secondary incremental argument in an example such as *He threw away old letters* denotes an unbounded quantity, then we have an atelic predication. In this case, the predication is not referring to a heterogeneous change of state but to a homogeneous Activity. Therefore, the predication is only compatible with a non-inclusive durative adverbial: *He threw away letters for half an hour*. A telic interpretation of this example, and hence a modification by an inclusive durative adverbial, is only possible if the secondary incremental argument is related to a bounded quantity: *He threw away the letters in half an hour*.

In Russian the classification of a temporal-distributive predication as telic or atelic is relevant for the category of aspect. If the extent of the entities denoted by the secondary incremental argument

---

[9] The term "incrementality" is currently used in two different ways. On the one hand, it refers to predications in which there is a connection between the temporal duration of the situation denoted and the quantity of the entities involved, i.e., where the incremental theme is used up bit by bit and the state of the theme can be used to measure the progress of the event. On the other hand, it is used to refer to all predications denoting situations which progress in ordered stages to an end-point (Rothstein 2004, Padučeva 2004, Braginsky and Rothstein 2008). Given this interpretation for Russian, all Accomplishments which belong to the first type of aspectual opposition would have to be classified as incremental. In what follows I use the terms "increment" and "incremental relation" in the first sense. There is an incremental relation if the extent of entities involved in the situation increases or decreases with the temporal duration and thus the change of state is related to the extent of the entities denoted.

is not bounded, then perfectivization with the paired perfective verb is excluded. In this case, perfectivization is possible only with a delimitative procedural verb, which for its part is only compatible with a non-inclusive durative adverbial.

(33) Bibliotekar' časa dva povydaval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ studentam knigi i zakryl^{PF} biblioteku.

'The librarian checked out books to the students for about two hours and closed the library.'

Perfectivization of temporal-distributive predications with paired perfective verbs is only possible if the secondary incremental argument denotes a quantity bounded in its extent. In this case, the predication in Russian can be modified only by an inclusive durative adverbial:

(33) a. Bibliotekar' vydal^{PF} knigi za polčasa.

'The librarian checked out the books in half an hour.'

Thus, it would seem that for predications interpreted in a temporal-distributive way there is an interdependency, on the one hand, between an incremental argument denoting a bounded quantity with a telic interpretation and, on the other hand, an incremental argument denoting an unbounded quantity with an atelic interpretation. However, there is in fact no such straightforward interdependency. It is correct to say that predications with an unbounded secondary incremental argument only permit an atelic interpretation in Russian and thus can only be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb. However, predications with a bounded incremental argument are hybrid in their actionality. They can be interpreted both as telic and atelic and thus coded perfective not only by the paired perfective verb but also by the delimitative procedural verb. In examples (34) and (35) we have a telic interpretation. Since perfectivization here is by means of the paired perfective verb, we are informed that the situation has attained its point of culmination. All the letters have been thrown away, all the certificates have been handed out.

(34) [Posle smerti otca Saša našel^{PF} v ego kabinete očen' mnogo
      pisem.]
      On vybrosil^{PF} èti pis'ma *za dva časa*.

      "'[After his father's death Sasha found very many letters in
      his study.]
      He threw away these letters *in two hours*.'"

(35) [Saša dolžen byl vydat'^{PF} bol'šoe čislo udostoverenij.]
      On ix vydal^{PF} *za desjat' minut*.

      "'[Sasha had to hand out a large number of certificates.]
      He handed them out *in ten minutes*.'"

But if the inner arguments are related to a bounded amount es-
tablished in the preceeding text, perfectivity coding by means of a
delimitative procedural verb is also possible:

(34) a. [Posle smerti otca Saša našel^{PF} v ego kabinete očen' mnogo
          pisem.]
          Segodnja utrom on minut dvadcat' povybrasyval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ ix
          i prinjalsja^{PF} za fotografii.

          "'[After his father's death Sasha found very many letters
          in his study.]
          This morning he spent about twenty minutes throwing
          them away and turned to the photos.'"

In (34a) the anaphoric pronoun *ix* 'them' refers to a bounded set of
entities established in the preceding text. Thus, the predication is
related to a bounded amount of entities and therefore denotes a het-
erogeneous situation that does not meet the criterion of arbitrary di-
visibility. Nevertheless, as (34a) shows, perfectivization with a de-
limitative procedural verb is possible.

The following example also shows that a temporal distributive
predication related to a bounded amount of entities can be coded as
perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb. In other
words, if a predication is interpreted as temporally distributive, an
inner argument denoting a bounded amount of entities and atelicity
are not incompatible.

(35) a. [Saša dolžen byl vydat'^{PF} bol'šoe čislo udostoverenij.]
On ix povydaval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ minut desjat' i ušel.

[Sasha had to hand out a great number of certificates.]
He handed them out for about ten minutes and left.

b. Saša minut dvadcat' povydaval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ te udostoverenija, kotoroye emu dali^{PF}, i ušel^{PF}.

'Sasha handed out those certificates which had been given to him for about ten minutes and left.'

c. Do togo kak Saša ušel^{PF}, on minut dvadcat' povydaval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ te udostoverenija, kotorye emu dali^{PF}.

'Before Sasha left he handed out those certificates which had been given to him for about twenty minutes.'

In example (35a) the anaphoric pronoun *ix* 'them' is related to the bounded number of certificates introduced in the preceeding text. In examples (35b) and (35c) the demonstrative pronoun *te* 'those' has a cataphoric function and is related to the information given in the relative clause following. In both examples the inner argument is used referentially. The statement can be continued by asking about the exact number of certificates handed out.

(35) d. [Do togo kak Saša ušel^{PF}, on minut dvadcat' povydaval$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ te udostoverenija, kotorye emu dali.]
Skol'ko on vydal^{PF}?

'[Before Sasha left he handed out those certificates which had been given to him for about twenty minutes.]
How many did he hand out?'

Temporally distributive predications related to a bounded amount of entities such as (34) and (35) do allow a homogeneous conceptualization of the Activity component because the activity causing the change of state of the macro-event consists of a repetition of more or less identical subevents. Throwing away a larger number of letters means repeatedly throwing away one or more letters. In other words, a temporally distributive predication such as *throwing away many letters for about two hours* implies an activity compounded from similar phases. Handing out a certain amount of

certificates one after the other implies the homogeneous activity of handing out certificates for a certain time. This is why predications with a bounded secondary incremental argument are hybrid in their actionality and therefore can be coded perfective not only with their paired perfective verb but also with a delimitative procedural verb.[10]

If predications such as (34) and (35) are coded perfective with the paired perfective verb, then in principle it is an open question whether we are dealing with an elementary predication (i.e., a collective interpretation of the plural) or a temporal-distributive predication with a secondary incremental argument (i.e., a non-collective interpretation of the plural). The reason is that if the predication is coded perfective with the paired perfective verb, only the attainment of the point of culmination is relevant. However, when the predication is coded perfective with a delimitative procedural verb, the argument *pis'ma* 'letters' must be understood non-collectively because only a non-collective interpretation of the plural allows a predicate such as *vybrasyvat'*[IMPF] *pis'ma* 'to throw away letters' to involve a homogeneous Activity. If it is coded perfective with a delimitative procedural verb, the predication is related to the homogeneous Activity involved in the change of state, and this Activity is bounded temporally. Since predications coded perfective with delimitative procedural verbs are related to the Activity and not to the change of state of the situation in question, it is unclear how many of the counted entities have been involved in the situation, as (34b) shows:

(34) b. [Saša nekotoroe vremja povybrasyval[PF-DELIM] èti pis'ma i
           prinjalsja[PF] za fotografii.]
           —On vse vybrosil[PF]?
           —Da, vybrosil[PF] vse. / Net, vrode vsego polovinu.

           '[Sasha spent a certain time throwing away these letters
           and turned to the photos.]

---

[10] S. Tatevosov (p.c.) has drawn my attention to the fact that examples such as (34) and (35) allow a homogeneous interpretation only if the inner argument is related to a relatively large amount. This can easily be explained with an example from the domain of spatial entities: since three acorns can hardly be conceptualized as a homogeneous mass, they will normally be counted. However, a large number of acorns is usually not individually counted, but measured.

"Did he throw away all of them?"
"Yes, all of them. / No, only about half of them."'

If such temporal-distributive predications coded perfective by a de-limitative procedural verb are as a rule understood as referring to situations that are not completely realized, then we again have a conversational implicature that results from the non-use of the paired perfective verb.

Our examples *vybrasyvat'*[IMPF] *pis'mo* 'to throw away a letter' and *vydavat'*[IMPF] *udostoverenie* 'to hand out a certificate', which we used to demonstrate the reclassification of inherently telic predicates by temporal distributivity, belong to Accomplishments the Activity component of which is related to the preliminaries which precede the actual change of state. But this possibility of recategorizing in-herently telic predications by temporal distributivity also exists for Accomplishments that denote situations that are realized in stages, step by step. As we have seen, predicates that belong to this type of aspectual opposition are inherently telic if the Activity component cannot be conceptualized either as a homogeneous process or as co-native. If in the tree-planting situation the inner argument is plural (*derev'ja*) there are two possible interpretations. The plural can be in-terpreted collectively, with all the trees somehow simultaneously in-volved in the situation (for instance, first all the holes are dug, then the roots of the trees are shortened, and so on). But the plural can also be interpreted distributively. That would be the case if the trees were planted one after the other. Given this interpretation, the inher-ently telic predication is reclassified in its actionality. If the amount of entities involved in the situation is not bounded, the predication is inherently atelic and can be coded perfective only by the delimita-tive procedural verb.

(36) Do togo kak Saša ušel[PF], on časa dva posažal[PF-DELIM] derev'ja.

   'Before Sasha left he planted trees for about two hours.'

But if the amount is bounded then the predication is hybrid in its actionality and can be coded perfective not only by the paired per-fective verb but also by the delimitative procedural verb.

(36) a. Do togo kak Saša ušel*PF*, on časa dva posažal*PF-DELIM* te
derev'ja, kotorye my včera kupili*PF*.

'Before Sasha left he planted the trees we bought
yesterday for about two hours.'

In this example the inner argument again is introduced with the
demonstrative pronoun *te* 'those', which has a cataphoric function
and informs us that the inner argument is related to the bounded
quantity of trees which had been bought yesterday. In a language
with articles such as English the inner argument will typically be
introduced with the definite article (as in the translation). This ex-
ample shows further that a reclassification of inherently telic predi-
cations by temporal distributivity is possible not only for predica-
tions with secondary imperfective verbs such as *vydavat'IMPF* or
vybrasyvat'IMPF but also for primary imperfective verbs such as
sažat'IMPF 'to plant'.

As we have seen, changes of state as they are denoted by imper-
fective elementary hybrid predications such as *obsuždat'IMPF vopros*
'to discuss a question', *raskrašivat'IMPF kartinku* 'to color a picture', or
zapolnjat'IMPF anketu 'to fill in a form' imply a homogenous Activity
and therefore can be coded perfective not only with their paired per-
fective verbs but also with delimitative procedural verbs:

(37) Deputaty obsudili*PF* pervyj vopros za desjat' minut.

'The representatives discussed the first question in ten
minutes.'

(38) Deputaty poobsuždali*PF-DELIM* pervyj vopros minut desjat' i
zakryli*PF* zasedanie.

'The representatives discussed the first question for about ten
minutes and adjourned the meeting.'

For these hybrid predications—and only for these—there are
two different readings if they are coded perfective with a delimita-
tive procedural verb, as in (39).

(39) [V povestku dnja vxodilo*IMPF* mnogo voprosov.]
Deputaty nemnogo poobsuždali*PF-DELIM* èti voprosy i zakryli*PF*
zasedanie.

'[There were many questions on the agenda of the meeting.]
The representatives discussed these questions for a while and
adjourned the meeting.'

If the extent of the entities involved in the situation is known
from the preceeding text, as in this example, then perfectivization
with the delimitative procedural verb can collectively refer to the
totality, i.e., to the sum of the subevents involved. In this interpreta-
tion it remains unclear how far the discussion has progressed, i.e.,
how many of the questions have been discussed, as is shown by the
continuation of our example:

(39) a. Deputaty poobsuždali*PF-DELIM* èti voprosy vsego polčasa i
zakryli*PF* sobranie.
Pravda, obsudili*PF* ne vse. Do dvux poslednix ne došli*PF*. /
Obsudili*PF* nesmotrja na limit vremeni vse.

'The representatives discussed these questions for only a
half an hour and adjourned the meeting.
In fact, they didn't discuss all of them. The last two they
didn't even start discussing. / Despite the time limitation
they discussed all of them.'

On the other hand, the predication with the delimitative proce-
dural verb in (39) can refer to each of the entities involved in the
situation. In this case, there is no incremental relation. In this inter-
pretation all the entities were involved simultaneously for a limited
time, though it remains open how many reached their point of cul-
mination. For our example, this would mean that all the questions
were discussed for a while but it is unclear how many were finished:

(39) b. Deputaty poobsuždali*PF-DELIM* èti voprosy vsego polčasa i
zakryli*PF* sobranie. Obsudili*PF* do konca vsego tri voprosa.

'The representatives discussed these questions only half
an hour and adjourned the meeting. They finished
discussing only three of them.'

In this case, the delimitative procedural verb is distributively related to each of the subevents.

This second interpretation, in which the delimitative procedural verb refers distributively to each of the subevents, is excluded for predications such as *sažat'*[IMPF] *derevo* 'to plant a tree' because, as we have seen, it is inherently telic. It is not associated with a homogeneous Activity. For an example such as *vydavat'*[IMPF] *knigu* 'to hand out a book' it is excluded too, because such predicates cannot denote a situation partially realized. That is the reason why (40) is self-contradictory:

(40)   *Saša nemnogo povydaval[PF-DELIM] knigi, no ni odnoj ne vydal[PF].

'Sasha handed out books for a while but didn't hand out a single one.'

A predication such as *vydavat'*[IMPF] *knigi* 'to hand out books' can only be coded perfective with a delimitative procedural verb if there is an incremental relation, and that means that at least one book was handed out. In contrast to (40), example (41) is thus an acceptable statement:

(41)   Saša nemnogo pozapolnjal[PF-DELIM] ankety, no ni odnoj ne zapolnil[PF].

'Sasha filled in forms for a while, but didn't fill in even one entirely.'

The predicate *zapolnjat'*[IMPF] *anketu* 'to fill in a form' is hybrid in its actionality, so it can be interpreted either as telic or atelic, even if it denotes a single event. Therefore, the delimitative procedural verb can refer distributively to each of the subevents.

3. The Reclassification of Inherently Telic Predications with Inner Arguments Modified by Numerals or Other Expressions of Measure

As we have seen, inherently telic predications can be reclassified in their actionality by temporal distributivity. If these reclassified

predications are related to a bounded amount of entities, they are hybrid in their actionality and therefore can be coded perfective not only by a paired perfective verb but in principle also by a delimitative procedural verb. Reclassifying predications as temporally distributive does not appear to be possible if the inner argument is modified by quantifying determiners or measure expressions. In a very stimulating article Tatevosov (2001: 889) has denied the acceptability of examples such as (42):

(42) *Vasja popisal$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ pjat' pisem / neskol'ko pisem / malo pisem / mnogo pisem / vse pis'ma.

'Vasja spent a while writing five letters / some letters / a few letters / many letters / all the letters.'

Tatevosov suggests that a delimitative procedural verb and an inner argument modified by quantifying determiners or measure expressions are incompatible. I would like to show that this hypothesis is not quite valid. I take as a point of departure the so-called focalized-processual meaning of the imperfective aspect because it is this use of the imperfective aspect where the compatibility between quantificationally bounded arguments and aspect has been discussed in detail (Wierzbicka 1967 for Polish; Košelev 1996, Padučeva 1996, 1998 and Glovinskaja 1982/2001 for Russian; and Filip 1999: 254–59 for Czech). The cited authors have shown that the inner arguments in examples such as (43) and (44), without further context, do not allow a temporally distributive interpretation, which means they cannot be interpreted as incremental arguments.

(43) Kogda ja vošel^{PF}, Maša raskrašivala^{IMPF} dve kartinki, kotorye ona prinesla^{PF} iz detskogo sada.

'As I came in Masha was coloring two pictures which she had brought home from kindergarten.'

(44) —Gde Saša?
—Na kuxne. On est^{IMPF} dva banana, kotorye ja emu dal^{PF}.

'"Where is Sasha?"
"In the kitchen. He is eating two bananas I gave him."'

These examples can be interpreted only as meaning that the counted entities are somehow simultaneously involved in the situation and none of the subevents may have reached its culmination at the focalization point. In other words, the imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual meaning is distributively related to each of the counted subevents. The inner argument cannot be understood as an incremental argument. We cannot continue (43) as in (43a):

(43)   a.   [Kogda ja vošel*PF*, Maša raskrašivala*IMPF* dve kartinki,
            kotorye ona prinesla*PF* iz detskogo sada.] *Vtoruju ona
            ešče ne načala*PF* raskrašivat'*IMPF*.

            '[As I came in Masha was coloring two pictures which she
            had brought home from kindergarten.] The second one
            she hadn't started coloring yet.'

With a continuation like that we must understand the inner argument *dve kartinki* 'two pictures' as a secondary incremental argument. But this contradicts the imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual meaning, since continuing the example in this way would mean that only one picture is involved in the process described at the focalization point. However, using the imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual meaning presupposes that all the enumerated entities are involved in the situation at the focalization point. This is the reason why the focalized-processual meaning of the imperfective aspect is completely excluded for predications where the inner argument can only be understood as an incremental argument as, for instance, in a predicate such as *est'*IMPF* polkilo bananov* 'to eat a pound of bananas':

(45)   —Gde Saša?
       —Na kuxne. *On est*IMPF* polkilo bananov, kotoroe ja emu
       dal*PF*.

       '"Where is Sasha?"
       "In the kitchen. He is eating the pound of bananas I gave
       him."'

The same is true for Activity predications when they are modified by measure expressions of time or space and thus have a point of culmination:

(46) [Tixo!] *Deduška spit^{IMPF} dva časa.

'[Be quiet!] Grandfather is sleeping two hours.'

(47) *Ja prišel $^{[PF]}$, kogda deduška spal $^{[IMPF]}$ dva časa.

'I came when grandfather was sleeping two hours.'

It is not possible to use the imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual meaning in these examples either, because you cannot sleep two hours simultaneously. One hour of sleep must be followed by the other. Therefore an example such as *On spit^{IMPF} dva časa* will be understood as historical present, as *praesens pro futuro*, or as referring to an iterative situation, and in English it can only be translated by the Simple form *He sleeps two hours*. A translation by the Progressive form is excluded. In the past tense and in the future tense a general-factual interpretation would be possible as well:

(48) Deduška kak-to uže spal^{IMPF} dva časa posle obeda.

'Grandfather has already slept two hours after dinner.'

These restrictions on the focalized-processual imperfective aspect apply in the same way to the durative-processual imperfective aspect. The durative-processual meaning of the imperfective aspect is present if the situation denoted is not related to a focalization point but is represented as on-going over a stretch of time, as in the following example:

(49) —Čto ty včera delal^{IMPF}?
—Včera ja perevodil^{IMPF} tri pis'ma, kotorye prišli^{PF} iz konsul'stva.

'"What did you do yesterday?"
"Yesterday I was translating three letters which came from the consulate."'

Without further context this example does not permit a temporally distributive interpretation either. The inner argument *tri pis'ma* 'three letters' cannot be understood incrementally. The predication must be understood in such a way that each of the counted entities is involved in the situation simultaneously. Without some further context, our example cannot be continued in the following manner:

(49)   a.   *Poslednee ja ešče ne načal^{PF} perevodit'^{IMPF}.

'I haven't started translating the last one yet.'

And for the durative-processual meaning of the imperfective aspect it is also true that it cannot be used in predications which can be understood only as temporally distributive and where the inner argument must be understood as an incremental argument. Therefore (50) similarly as (49) without further context is not an acceptable statement if the imperfective aspect is used in its durative-processual meaning:

(50)   —Čto ty včera delal^{IMPF}?
        —$^?$Ja bežal^{IMPF} tri kilometra.

'"What were you doing yesterday?"
"I was running three kilometers."'

Thus all examples given seem to confirm a hypothesis repeatedly formulated for the Slavic languages: the imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual and its durative-processual meaning is incompatible with an incremental argument modified by quantifying determiners and measure expressions. But in fact this is not true. There are contexts in which the imperfective aspect occurs in its processual meaning and arguments modified by numerals or measure expressions can be understood as secondary increments. As shown in Mehlig 1995: 186, this is always the case if the inner argument modified by numerals or other measure expressions is introduced by the reflexive possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his'.

(51) a. —Gde Saša?
　　　—Na kuxne. On p'et^{IMPF} dve čaški čaja.

　　　'"Where is Sasha?"
　　　"In the kitchen. He is drinking two cups of tea."'

　　b. —Gde Saša?
　　　—Na kuxne. On p'et^{IMPF} svoi dve čaški čaja.

　　　'"Where is Sasha?"
　　　"In the kitchen. He is drinking his two cups of tea."'

An example such as (51a) does not allow a temporally distributive interpretation. But (51b) does and thus the inner argument could be understood incrementally, i.e., with Sasha drinking the two cups of tea one after the other.

　　As we have seen, a statement such as that in (44a) contains a contradiction:

(44) a. —Gde Saša?
　　　—Na kuxne. On est^{IMPF} dva banana, kotorye ja emu dal^{PF}. *Odin on uže s"el^{PF}.

　　　'"Where is Sasha?"
　　　"In the kitchen. He is eating two bananas I gave him. He has already eaten one of them."'

If both of the bananas are involved in an on-going process, then neither of them can be finished at the focalization point. But if the inner argument is modified by the reflexive possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his', then the banana example permits such a reading and the inner argument can be understood as an incremental argument, as shown by the following example:

(44) b. —Gde Saša?
　　　—Na kuxne. On est^{IMPF} svoi dva banana. Verojatno, on odin uže s"el^{PF}.

　　　'"Where is Sasha?"
　　　"In the kitchen. He is eating his two bananas. He has probably already eaten one of them."'

Even Activity predications modified by measure expressions of space or time, which therefore have a point of culmination, allow the processual meaning of the imperfective aspect if the measure expression is introduced by the reflexive possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his':

(52)   a.   *Ja prišel^{PF}, kogda deduška spal^{IMPF} dva časa.

'I came when grandfather was sleeping two hours.'

   b.   Ja prišel^{PF}, kogda deduška spal^{IMPF} *svoi* dva časa.

'I came when grandfather was sleeping *his* two hours.'

(53)   —Gde Saša?
       —On bežit^{IMPF} *svoi* tri kilometra.

'"Where is Sasha?"
"He is running *his* three kilometers."'

The question is why this should be so. Why can these predications with an argument introduced by a reflexive possessive pronoun be interpreted in a temporal-distributive way and thus as an incremental relation? The reason is that predications with an incremental argument introduced by the reflexive possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his' can be understood in such a way that the on-going situation occurs frequently, more or less regularly. As a result, the extent of the entities denoted by the incremental complement is already determined in advance. As Declerck (1979: 782) has explained with examples from English, measuring a situation requires that the situation be finished. This excludes the use of the English progressive in its on-going meaning with an incremental argument modified by quantifying determiners. But, he adds, the use of the Progressive form is always possible if "the subject is performing an Activity that has been measured before." This also holds true for the focalized-processual and durative-processual meaning of the imperfective aspect in Russian. If the extent of the entities denoted by the secondary incremental argument has been determined in advance, then the imperfective aspect can be used in its processual meaning.

Knowledge of the extent of the entities denoted by the incremental argument does not entail that the action occur regularly or habitually. It is always predetermined if reference is made to an amount already specified. Padučeva (1998: 79) has observed that the

imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual meaning can be used if, as she says, the argument has a "marker of definiteness." In fact, all the examples discussed could be interpreted as an incremental relation if the complement were introduced by the demonstrative pronouns *ètot* 'this' or *tot* 'that'. The reason is that these pronouns make reference to an amount already specified in the preceding text or known from the situation. Without further context, predications such as (54) and (55) can only denote situations realized simultaneously.

(54) Saša na kuxne. On est^{IMPF} dva banana, kotorye ja emu dal^{PF}.

'Sasha is in the kitchen. He is eating two bananas I gave him.'

(55) Kogda ja vošel^{PF}, Saša perevodil^{IMPF} tri trudnyx pis'ma, kotorye prišli^{PF} iz posol'stva.

'When I came in Sasha was translating three difficult letters which had come from the embassy.'

In this case, the imperfective aspect in its processual meaning is distributively related to each of the counted subevents. Each of the subevents is presented as on-going at the focalization point and none of them may have reached its culmination. Interpreted in this way, the inner argument is not an incremental argument. But if the inner argument is modified by the demonstrative pronoun and refers to entities the quantity of which has been determined beforehand, then these examples can be understood in such a way that the entities counted are involved in the situation one after the other:

(54) a. Segodnja utrom ja dal^{PF} Saše dva banana. V dannyj moment on est^{IMPF} èti dva banana.

'This morning I gave Sasha two bananas. At the moment he is eating the two bananas.'

(55) a. Kogda ja vošel^{PF}, Saša perevodil^{IMPF} te tri trudnyx pis'ma, kotorye prišli^{PF} iz posol'stva.

'When I came in Sasha was translating the three difficult letters which had come from the embassy.'

In example (54a) the demonstrative pronoun *èti* 'these' has an anaphoric function and is related to the amount specified in the preceeding text. In example (55a) the demonstrative pronoun *te* 'those' has a cataphoric function and is related to the information given in the relative clause following. This information is assumed to be known and repeated as necessary for the re-identification of the entities established earlier. In this case predications with an inner argument modified by numerals or expressions of measure can be understood as an incremental relation and our examples could be continued by saying *Odin on uže s"el^{PF}* 'He has already eaten one of them' or *Odno on uže perevel^{PF}* 'He has already translated one of them'.

(54) b. Segodnja utrom ja dal^{PF} Saše dva banana. V dannyj moment on est^{IMPF} èti dva banana. Odin on, verojatno, uže s"el^{PF}.

'This morning I gave Sasha two bananas. At the moment he is eating those two bananas. He has probably already eaten one of them.'

(55) b. Kogda ja vošel^{PF}, Saša perevodil^{IMPF} te tri trudnyx pis'ma, kotorye prišli^{PF} iz posol'stva. Dva iz nix on uže perevel^{PF}.

'When I came in Sasha was translating the three difficult letters which came from the embassy. He had already translated two of them.'

If the inner argument in examples such as (54b) and (55b) is understood as an incremental argument, then the imperfective aspect in its focalized processual meaning is not related distributively to each of the counted subevents but collectively to their totality, to their sum. In definite nominal groups such as *èti dva banana* 'these two bananas' or *te tri pis'ma* 'those three letters' the numerals are related to a quantification that has already been realized beforehand in the preceeding text or situation. Therefore, the imperfective aspect in its processual meaning can be related collectively to the totality, the

sum of the subevents already quantified in the preceeding text or situation.[11]

To sum up, the imperfective aspect used in its processual meaning and an inner incremental argument modified by numerals or other measure expressions do not, in principle, exclude each other. But a predication with the imperfective aspect in its processual meaning is only compatible with a bounded quantity incremental argument if the extent of the entities denoted by the incremental argument has been determined in advance.

Now let us turn to the question of whether predications with an inner incremental argument modified by quantifying determiners or measure expressions allow perfectivization by a delimitative procedural verb. As already mentioned, Tatevosov (2001: 889) has denied this possibility, giving the example repeated here as (56).

(56) *Vasja popisal$^{PF-DELIM}$ pjat' pisem / neskol'ko pisem / malo pisem / mnogo pisem / vse pis'ma.

'Vasja spent a while writing five letters / some letters / a few letters / many letters / all the letters.'

On the basis of this example, Tatevosov suggests that a delimitative procedural verb and an inner argument modified by quantifying determiners or measure expressions exclude each other. I would like to show that this hypothesis is not quite valid. If we assume, as Tatevosov does, that an Accomplishment such as *Vasja pisal^{IMPF} pis'mo* 'Vasja was / has been writing a letter' is hybrid in its actional-

---

[11] Knowledge of the quantity of the entities involved in the situation, which permits us to relate the imperfective aspect in its focalized-processual meaning to the sum of the distributively ordered situations, does not presuppose that the quantity is explicitly mentioned. An example such as *V dannyj moment Saša bežit^{IMPF} tri kilometra* 'At the moment Sasha is running three kilometers' would be an acceptable statement if Sasha is competing in a pentathlon and the addressee knows that running three kilometers is part of this competition (Šatunovskij 2009: 41).

The same is true for English. The English Progressive with an incremental complement denoting entities bounded in their extent is acceptable if we are dealing with an intentional or planned situation. Jayez (1999: 152) writes that a predication such as *Mary is drinking three glasses of beer* "improves significantly if one takes into account Mary's intention. If Mary intends to drink three glasses of beer in a row because of some stupid bet, this example sounds like a description of what she is actually doing." See also Glasbey 1996: 355f. and Zucchi 1999: 202–09.

ity and thus can be coded perfective not only by the paired perfective verb *napisat'* but also by the delimitative procedural verb *popisat'*, then in principle example (56) can also be coded perfective by the delimitative procedural verb even if the inner argument is modified by numerals or measure expressions. Let us try to contextualize the following example:

(57)   Vasja nemnogo popisal*PF-DELIM* pjat' pisem i leg*PF* spat'.

 'Vasja wrote five letters for a while and went to bed.'

This example can only be understood in such a way that Vasja was somehow engaged in writing all five of the letters for a while simultaneously. In other words, the delimitative procedural verb must be related to each of the counted subevents. All five of the subevents are presented as on-going for a limited period of time and it remains open whether any of the five letters was finished. Such an interpretation of example (57) is certainly possible, but it contradicts our knowledge of the world. Normally one does not write five letters simultaneously, but one after the other. So it comes as no surprise that Tatevosov marks this example as unacceptable. Yet in (58) this simultaneous interpretation is much more likely, because it is quite normal for a child to be coloring three pictures simultaneously, as opposed to one after the other.

(58)   Maša nemnogo poraskrašivala*PF-DELIM* tri kartinki, kotorye ona prinesla*PF* iz detskogo sada, i pobežala*PF* igrat'*IMPF*.

 'For a while Masha colored three pictures she brought home from kindergarten and went out to play.'

The delimitative procedural can relate to each of the counted subevents only for elementary predications which are hybrid in their actionality, such as *pisat'*IMPF* pis'mo* 'to write a letter' or *raskrašivat'*IMPF* kartinku* 'to color a picture'. As we have seen, inherently telic predicates such as *sažat'*IMPF* derevo* 'to plant a tree' or *vybrasyvat'*IMPF* pis'mo* 'to throw away a letter' do not satisfy this condition. Therefore, in contrast to examples (57) and (58), the delimitative procedural verb in (59) cannot be related to each of the counted subevents. Example (59) is not interpretable without further context.

(59) *Saša nekotoroe vremja povybrasyval$^{PF-DELIM}$ 200 pisem i prinjalsja^{PF} za fotografii.

'Sasha spent a certain time throwing away 200 letters and turned to the photos.'

Predicates such as *vybrasyvat'^{IMPF} pis'ma* 'to throw away letters' or *vydavat'^{IMPF} knigi'* 'to check out books' can only be perfectivized by the delimitative procedural if the plural of the inner argument is interpretated as distributive, because in this case the delimitative procedural can be related collectively to the totality, the sum of the subevents of the situation. That means the predication must be understood as a secondary incremental relation. But as we saw earlier, when the imperfective aspect is used in its processual meaning, a predication with a quantificationally bounded argument can be understood as an incremental relation only if the extent of the entities involved in the situation has been predetermined in advance. This condition applies in the same way to the use of delimitative procedural verbs to code a predication such as (59) as perfective. Likewise, predications with an inner incremental argument modified by numerals or measure expressions can only be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb if the extent of the entities denoted is already known from the situation or the context. Therefore, if the inner argument in an example such as (59) is introduced by a marker of definiteness and the argument refers to an amount previously quantified, this example allows a temporal-distributive interpretation and can be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb.

(59) a. Saša nekotoroe vremja povybrasyval$^{PF-DELIM}$ te 200 pisem, kotorye ostalis'^{PF} ot otca i prinjalsja^{PF} za fotografii.

'Sasha spent a certain time throwing away the 200 letters, which his father had left him, and turned to the photos.'

Example (59a) informs us that Sasha was busy for a while throwing away the two hundred letters left by his father before starting to throw away the photographs. How many letters actually are thrown away before starting with the photographs remains unclear. Interpreted in this way, the delimitative procedural verb is related to the sum of the counted subevents.

Thus it is evident that with predications with an inner argument modified by numerals or expressions of measure there is an interesting parallel between the use of the imperfective aspect in its processual meaning, on the one hand, and the use of a delimitative procedural verb, on the other. In both cases, these predications can only be interpreted as temporally distributive and thus as incremental relations provided the extent of the entities denoted by the incremental arguments is determined in advance. And in both cases the initial quantification must occur in the preceeding text or situation. Accordingly, it is evident that the use of delimitative procedural verbs to code temporally distributive predications as perfective is based on imperfective predications in which the imperfective aspect is used in its durative-processual meaning. In other words, the durative-processual meaning of the imperfective aspect and the use of delimitative procedural verbs are mutually dependent.

One last point. As we have seen, elementary hybrid predications such as *zapolnjat'*[IMPF] *anketu* 'to fill in a form' or *raskrašivat'*[IMPF] *kartinku* 'to color a picture', i.e., predications which when referring to a singular situation can be coded perfective by either the paired perfective verb or the delimitative procedural verb, allow two different interpretations if the imperfective aspect is used in its processual meaning and the inner argument denotes a bounded quantity where the extent of the entities denoted is determined in advance. In an example such as (60) the imperfective aspect in its processual meaning can be related either collectively to the totality, i.e., to the sum of the subevents, or distributively to each of the quantified subevents. In the first case we have an incremental relation, but in the second we do not.

(60) Maša minut desjat' raskrašivala[IMPF] te tri kartinki, kotorye ona prinesla[PF] iz detskogo sada, i pobežala[PF] igrat'.

'For about ten minutes Masha colored the three pictures she brought home from kindergarten and went out to play.'

This twofold interpretation exists also for elementary hybrid predications coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb if the inner argument is related to an amount that has been specified in advance.

(61)   Maša minut desjat' poraskrašivala$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ te tri kartinki,
       kotorye ona prinesla^{PF} iz detskogo sada, i pobežala^{PF} igrat'.

       'For about ten minutes Masha colored the three pictures she
       brought home from kindergarten and went out to play.'

On the one hand, the delimitative procedural verb can be collectively related to the sum of the counted subevents. In this case the predication is temporally distributive and the quantificationally bounded argument is a secondary incremental argument. Interpreted in this way, it remains open how far the coloring has progressed, i.e., how many of the pictures were colored:

(61)   a.   [Maša minut desjat' poraskrašivala$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ te tri kartinki,
            kotorye ona prinesla^{PF} iz detskogo sada, i pobežala^{PF}
            igrat'.]
            Dve iz nix ona raskrasila^{PF}, k tret'ej ona ne pristupila^{PF}.

            '[For about ten minutes Masha colored the three picture
            she brought home from kindergarten and went out to
            play.]
            She had colored two of them. The third she didn't start
            coloring.'

On the other hand, the delimitative procedural verb can be distributively related to each of the counted subevents. In this case there is no incremental relation and therefore the number of entities involved need not be determined in advance. In this second case the example informs us that each of the pictures was colored for a limited time and it remains open how many of them were finished:

(60)   b.   [Maša minut desjat' poraskrašivala$^{PF\text{-}DELIM}$ *(te)* tri kartinki,
            kotorye ona prinesla^{PF} iz detskogo sada, i pobežala^{PF}
            igrat'.] Ni odnoj iz nix ona do konca ne raskrasila^{PF}.

            '[For about ten minutes Masha colored (the) three pictures
            she brought home from kindergarten and went out to
            play.] She didn't finish any of them.'

This second interpretation, in which the delimitative procedural verb is related distributively to each of the counted entities, is ex-

cluded for predications which are not associated with a homogeneous Activity such as *vybrasyvat' pis'mo* 'to throw away a letter' or *vydavat' knigu* 'to check out a book'. These predications can only be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb if it is related collectively to the totality, to the sum of the counted entities, i.e., if there is an incremental relation. But this presupposes that the extent of the entities involved in the situation has been determined in advance. If this condition is not satisfied, these predications coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb are not interpretable.

4. Summary

1. Russian has Accomplishments that are hybrid in their actionality, i.e., Accomplishments which can be read as either telic or atelic. Such Accomplishments can be coded perfective by either their paired perfective verb or a delimitative procedural verb. Two different types of hybrid accomplishments have been distinguished. First, there are hybrid Accomplishments where the Activity component has durative-processual meaning and is conceptualized as a homogeneous continuous process and thus fulfills the principle of arbitrary divisibility. In this case the Activity component corresponds to mass nouns in the nominal domain. Second, there are hybrid Accomplishments where the Activity component consists of different subevents arranged arbitrarily. In this case the Activity component has conative meaning and does not meet the criterion of homogeneity, but rather the principle of cumulativity. It corresponds to uncountable collective nouns in the nominal domain.

2. The classification of a predication as hybrid is not only a question of the semantics of the verb. Predications that are inherently telic can be recategorized where they refer to repeated events. One of these possibilities is the recategorization of inherently telic predications by temporal distributivity, i.e., recategorization by reference to several entities which are not collectively involved in the situation in question, but sequentially, one after the other. If such a recategorization occurs, the inner argument is a derived and thus secondary incremental argument.

3. If the secondary incremental argument denotes entities not bounded in their extent, then a temporally distributive predication is atelic. It can be bounded only temporally, i.e., it can only be coded as perfective by means of a delimitative procedural verb. In contrast, temporal-distributive predications with a secondary increment bounded in its extent are hybrid in their actionality, because temporally distributive predications with a bounded incremental argument entail a homogeneous Activity. Therefore, they permit not only a telic but also an atelic interpretation and can thus be coded perfective not only with the paired perfective verb but also with a delimitative procedural verb. With a delimitative procedural verb, the predication is related to the homogeneous Activity connected with the change of state.

4. Temporally distributive predications with an inner argument modified by quantifying determiners or measure expressions are only hybrid in their actionality if the inner argument is related to an amount specified in the preceeding text or the situation.

References

Apresjan, Ju. D. (1995) "Glagoly momental'nogo dejstvija i performativy". *Izbrannye trudy*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 219–41.

—————. (2009) *Issledovanija po semantike i leksikografii*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur.

Bach, Emmon. (1986) "The algebra of events". *Linguistics and philosophy* 9: 5–16.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco and Mario Squartini. (1995) "An attempt at defining the class of 'gradual completion verbs'". Pier Marco Bertinetto, Valentina Bianchi, James Higginbotham, and Mario Squartini, eds. *Temporal reference, aspect, and actionality*, Vol. 1. *Semantic and syntactic perspectives*. Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier, 11–26.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco, Karen H. Ebert, and Casper de Groot. (2000) "The progressive in Europe". Östen Dahl, ed. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 517–58.

Bogusławski, Andrzej. (2004) "Small is beautiful: A note on small events". A. P. Volodin, ed. *Tipologičeskie obosnovanija v grammatike*. Moscow: Znak, 61–75.

Braginsky, Pavel and Susan Rothstein. (2008) "Vendler classes and the Russian aspectual system". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 16(1): 3–55.

Bulygina, Tat'jana V. (1982) "K postroeniju tipologii predikatov v russkom jazyke". *Semantičeskie tipy predikatov*. Moscow: Nauka, 7–85.

Carlson, Lauri. (1981) "Aspect and quantification". *Tense and aspect*: *Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic Press, 31–64.

Dahl, Östen. (2000) "Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe". Östen Dahl, ed. *Empirical approaches to language typology*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Declerck, Renaat. (1979) "Aspect and the bounded/unbounded (telic/atelic) distinction". *Linguistics* 17: 761–94.

Dickey, Stephen. (2006) "Aspectual pairs, goal orientation, and PO-delimitatives in Russian". *Glossos 7*. http://seelrc.org/glossos/7.

———. (2007) "A prototype account of the development of delimitative PO- in Russian". Dagmar Divjak and Agata Kochańska, eds. *Cognitive paths into the Slavic domain*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 326–371.

Dickey, Stephen and Julie Hutcheson. (2003) "Delimitative verbs in Russian, Czech, and Slavic". *American contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists*. Vol. 1: *Linguistics*. Robert A. Maguire and Alan Timberlake, eds. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 23–36.

Dowty, David R. (1991) "Thematic proto-roles and argument selection". *Language* 67: 547–619.

Filip, Hana. (1999) *Aspect, eventuality types, and nominal reference.* New York: Garland.

Frege, Gottlob. (1884/1953) *The foundations of arithmetic*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Glasbey, Sheila. (1996) "The progressive: A channel-theoretic analysis". *Journal of semantics* 13: 331–61.

Glovinskaja, Marina Ja. (2001) *Mnogoznačnost' i sinonimija v vidovremennoj sisteme russkogo glagola*. Moscow: Azbukovnik.

Jayez, J. (1999) "Imperfectivity and progressivity: The French imparfait". Tanya Matthews and Devon Strolovich, eds. *Proceedings*

from Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 9. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 145–162.

Košelev, Aleksej D. (1996) "Referencial'nyj podxod k analizu jazykovyx značenij". *Moskovskij lingvističeskij al'manax* 1: 82–194.

Kratzer, Angelika. (2004) "Telicity and the meaning of objective case". *The syntax of time*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 389–423.

Krifka, Manfred. (1989) *Nominalreferenz und Zeitkonstitution*. Munich: Fink.

Maslov, Jurij S. (2004) *Izbrannye trudy*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Mehlig, Hans Robert. (1981) "Satzsemantik und Aspektsemantik im Russischen: Zur Verbalklassifikation von Zeno Vendler". Peter Hill and Volkmar Lehmann, eds. *Slavistische Linguistik 1980*. Munich: Sagner, 95–151. [*Slavistische Beiträge,* 147.] (Abridged translation: "Semantika predloženija i semantika vida v russkom jazyke". *Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike*, No. 15. Moscow: Progress, 227–49.)

———. (1995) "Wesen und Funktion des Präsens im Slavischen". Helmut Jachnow and Monika Wingender, eds. *Temporalität und Tempus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 176–98. [*Studien zu allgemeinen und slavistischen Fragen*, 6.]

———. (1996) "Some analogies between the morphology of nouns and aspect in Russian". *Folia linguistica* 38: 87–109.

———. (2006) "Glagol'nyj vid i vtoričnaja gomogenizacija oboznačaemoj situacii posredstvom kvantifikacii. K upotrebleniju delimitativnogo sposoba dejstvija v russkom jazyke". Volkmar Lehmann, ed. *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida IV*. Munich: Sagner, 235–76. [*Slavolinguistica*, 7.]

Miljutina, Marina G. (2006) *Semantika konativnosti i potencial'naja modal'nost': Kompleks "popytka i rezul'tat" i ego vyraženie v sovremennom russkom jazyke*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Ekaterinburg.

Mittwoch, Anita. (1988) "Aspects of English aspect: On the interaction of perfect, progressive, and durational phrases". *Linguistics and philosophy* 11: 203–54.

Padučeva, Elena V. (1996) *Semantičeskie issledovanija*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

———. (1998) "On non-compatibility of partitive and imperfective in Russian". *Theoretical linguistics* 24: 73–82.

Padučeva, Elena V. (2004) "Nakopitel' èffekta i russkaja aspektologija". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5: 46–57.

Partee, Barbara. (1997) "Vid i interpretacija imennyx grupp". Marina Ju. Čertkova, ed. *Trudy aspektologičeskogo seminara filologičeskogo fakul'teta MGU 3*. Moscow: MGU, 121–40.

Plungjan, Vladimir A. (2001) "Antirezul'tativ: Do i posle rezul'tata". *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki 1*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 50–88.

Plungjan, Vladimir A. and Elena V. Raxilina. (1996) "*Tušat-tušat–ne potušat*: Grammatika odnoj glagol'noj konstrukcii". *Issledovanija po glagolu v slavjanskix jazykax: Glagol'naja leksika s točki zrenija semantiki, slovoobrazonanija, grammatiki*. Moscow: Filologija, 106–15.

Quine, Willard Van Orman. (1960) *Word and object*. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Rothstein, Susan. (2004) *Structuring events: A study in the semantics of lexical aspect*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Šatunovskij, I. B. (2009) *Problemy russkogo vida*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj literatury.

Šeljakin, Mixail A. (1983) *Kategorija vida i sposoby dejstvija russkogo glagola: Teoretičeskie osnovy*. Tallinn: Valgus.

Sémon, Jean-Paul. (1986) "*Postojat'* ou la perfectivité de congruence: Definition et valeurs textuelles". *Revue des études slaves* 58: 609–35.

Sigalov, Pavel S. (1975) "Istorija russkix ograničitel'nyx glagolov". *Trudy po russkoj i slavjanskoj filologii 23, Serija lingvističeskaja*. Tartu: Tartuskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, 141–81.

Smith, Carlota. S. (1991) *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Svenonius, Peter. (2004) "Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP". *Nordlyd* 32(2): 205–53.

Tatevosov, Sergei G. (2001) "A theory of Slavic aspect and the Russian delimitative". Peter Kosta, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist, and Marzena Żygis, eds. *Investigations into formal Slavic linguistics: Contributions to the Fourth European Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 873–91.

Tatevosov, Sergei and Mikhail Ivanov. (2009) "Event structure of non‑culminating accomplishments". Lotte Hogeweg, Helen de

Hoop, and Andreï L'vovich Mal'chukov, eds. *Cross-linguistic semantics of tense, aspect, and modality*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Vendler, Zeno. (1967) "Verbs and times". *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 97–121.

Wierzbicka, Anna. (1967) "On the semantics of the verbal aspect in Polish". *To honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. The Hague: Mouton, 2231–49.

Zel'dovič, Gennadij M. (2003) "Konativnye glagoly i glagoly ustranennogo rezul'tata: Dva fiktivnyx glagol'nyx klassa". *Izvestija AN, Serija literatury i jazyka* 62(3): 47−53.

Zucchi, Sandro. (1999) "Incomplete events, intensionality, and imperfective aspect". *Natural language semantics* 7: 179−215.

Institut für Slavistik
Christian-Albrechts-Universtät Kiel
Leibnizstr. 10
24098 Kiel
Germany
mehlig@slav.uni-kiel.de