

Hans Robert Mehlig

Hybrid predicates in Russian

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. In the first part of this paper I examine the conditions under which elementary predications can be interpreted as hybrid. Two different types of hybrid accomplishments will be distinguished. First, 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 impf. aspect, which forms the basis for coding as perfective by a delimitative procedural verb the Accomplishment, has durative-processual meaning. Second, 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. In the second part, I show 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 P. M. Bertinetto (Bertinetto & 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:

- (2a) We have been planting the tree we bought yesterday for half an hour.
- (3a) 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 Z. 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. A. 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).

- (2b) 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.'
- (3b) 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 temporally 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 so-called "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 J. P. Sémon (1986) and A. 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 S. Dickey (Dickey & 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: 111-117). In Russian, these hybrid predicates are characterized by the fact that they likewise allow both types of perfectivization. First, they can be coded perfective by the paired perfective verb; second, by the delimitative procedural verb. Typical examples of such predicates are the following:

<i>pisat'</i> ^[IMPF] <i>stat'ju</i>	‘to write an article’
<i>obsuždat'</i> ^[IMPF] <i>vopros</i>	‘to discuss a question’
<i>kopat'</i> ^[IMPF] <i>jamu</i>	‘to dig a pit’
<i>perevodit'</i> ^[IMPF] <i>pis'mo</i>	‘to translate a letter’
<i>zapolnjat'</i> ^[IMPF] <i>anketu</i>	‘to fill in a form’
<i>igrat'</i> ^[IMPF] <i>sonatu</i>	‘to play a sonata’

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

- (6) Saša zapolnil ^[PF] anketu, которuju 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 over to the etudes.’

Using the paired perf. 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.

- (6a) Saša minut dvadcat' pozapolnjal ^[PF-DELIM] anketu, которuju emu dali ^[PF], i pošel ^[PF] v biblioteku.
 ‘Sasha for about twenty minutes filled in the form given to him and went to the library.’
- (7a) Maša poigrala ^[PF-DELIM] sonatu Čajkovskogo minut desjat' i perešla ^[PF] k ètjudam.
 ‘Masha played a Tchaikovsky sonata for about ten minutes and went over to the etudes.’

If these hybrid predicates are coded perfective with a delimitative procedural verb, then they only refer to the activity that causes the denoted 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 or *ničego ne vyšlo* ^[PF] ‘nothing came out of it’ or *i brošili* ^[PF] ‘and gave up’.

- (6b) Saša minut dvadcat' pozapolnjal ^[PF-DELIM] anketu, которuju emu dali ^[PF], no ničego ne vyšlo ^[PF].
 ‘For about twenty minutes Sasha filled in the form given to him but nothing came out of it.’

- (7b) Maša poigrala ^[PF-DELIM] sonatu Čajkovskega minut pjat' i brosilila ^[PF].
'Masha played a Tchaikovsky sonata for about five minutes and gave up.'

This is the reason why S. Tatevosov & M. 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, then this is nevertheless only a conversational implicature which arises from the non-use of the paired perf. 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 dvadcat' i pošel ^[PF] v biblioteku.]
- A anketu do konca zapolnil ^[PF]?
- Da, do konca. On ee uže otpravil ^[PF].
'[Sasha filled in the form given to him for about twenty minutes and left.]
- Has he filled in the form completely?
- Yes, he has. He has already posted it.'

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 Progressive 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 et al. 2000: 527-538). I would like to suggest though that the basis for coding as perfective an Accomplishment with a homogeneous Activity component by means of a delimitative procedural verb is a Progressive Operator that corresponds to the “durative-progressive” meaning of the English Progressive form. In contrast to the focalized-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 has reached its focalization point. A. 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 it is unclear whether the book during the denoted period of time was finished or not.

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

In Russian the basis for coding perfective an Accomplishment with a homogeneous Activity component by a delimitative procedural verb is a meaning of the impf. aspect which corresponds to the English Progressive form in its durative-progressive meaning. In Russian this meaning of the impf. aspect is called “processnoe”, “processual'noe” or “durativnoe” (Apresjan 2009, 532). I will use the term “durative-processual”. This durative-processual meaning of the impf. aspect is present in the following example:

- (10) Včera Saša četyrie časa perevodil ^[IMPF] trudnyj tekst, a potom pošel ^[PF] v biblioteku.
'Yesterday Sasha was translating a difficult text for four hours and then he 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.

- (10a) 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 impf. aspect as well as in example (10a) coded perfective by the delimitative procedural verb. The possible continuations of the example demonstrate this.

- (10b) - 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'shim 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.
- Has he finished translating the text?
- Yes, he has 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, then 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 he 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, ktoruju ty emu dal^[PF], a potom pošel^[PF] v biblioteku.

- Do konca dočital^[PF]?

- Da. Uže napisal^[PF] recenziju.

‘- Yesterday Sasha for about four hours read the article you gave him and then he went to the library.

- Did he read it entirely?

- Yes, he did. He has already written the peer-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 “absolutivnaja konstrukcija” (Apresjan 2009: 487), that is, without specification of the inner argument. Examples are given in (13).

(13)	<i>čitat'</i> ^[IMPF] / <i>počitat'</i> ^[PF-DELIM]	‘to read’
	<i>igrat'</i> ^[IMPF] / <i>poigrat'</i> ^[PF-DELIM]	‘to play’
	<i>pisat'</i> ^[IMPF] / <i>popisat'</i> ^[PF-DELIM]	‘to write’

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

(14)	<i>vspominat'</i> ^[IMPF] / <i>povspominat' vstreču</i> ^[PF-DELIM]	‘to remember a meeting’
	<i>rešat'</i> ^[IMPF] / <i>porešat' krossvord</i> ^[PF-DELIM]	‘to solve a crossword’

Further, it is important to note that the possibility of interpreting impf. verbs as hybrid is not restricted to simplex imperfectives. As the following examples

show, prefixed secondary impf. verbs can also be modified by delimitative verbs:

- (15) *raskrašivat'* ^[IMPF] / *poraskrašivat' kartinku* ^[PF-DELIM] 'to colour a picture'
zapolnjat' ^[IMPF] / *pozapolnjat' anketu* ^[PF-DELIM] 'to fill in a form'
perevodit' ^[IMPF] / *poperevodit' tekst* ^[PF-DELIM] 'to translate a text'

In addition, there are purely formal reasons that may exclude an Accomplishment predication to be characterized as hybrid. In Russian the prefix *PO-* is polysemous and has many different functions. One of its functions is to form paired perf. 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, as in the case of *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 both as a paired perf. verb and as a delimitative procedural verb. Used as a paired perf. 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, then the predication can be modified only by a non-inclusive durative adverbial:

- (16a) 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 do or do not allow us to classify 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

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

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 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) Malčiki 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 impf. aspect, they can be modified by phase verbs like *načat'* ‘to begin’ or *perestat'* ‘to stop’. This fact means that all four of these examples involve a process component causing the denoted change of state. Further 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 piece by piece. Therefore these predications, if they are related to an individualized situation and the impf. aspect is used in its durative-processual meaning, always denote a

² In Glovinskaja’s classification all four verbs belong to the first type of aspectual opposition, specifically to subtype B within this the first type. If predicates belong to this type then the denoted change of state is realized in stages. The impf. aspect (in its focalized processual meaning) denotes an action “which has partially attained its result” – the paired perf. aspect an action “which has completely attained its result” (2001: 91). For a description of this type of aspectual opposition in formal semantics see Braginsky & Rothstein (2008).

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 for examples (19) and (20). They cannot be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb. The question is why this is so.

As I have shown in (Mehlig 2006) conceptualization a change of state both as 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 very beginning to the very end. One can interrupt it arbitrarily at any point and continue from any point in the sonata. And, as playing one and the same sonata is something that can be repeated, some individual parts of it can be played over and over again. 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, if we disregard the fact that one can strike out and erase entries. But it is possible and even sometimes necessary, to fill in forms haphazardly. And the process of filling in a form can be interrupted at any point and continue as haphazardly 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 different actions: Pitching a tent consists of a well-ordered series of different 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 put together, then the tent is raised and covered with the rain fly. With planting a tree it is similar. Whoever plants a tree, digs first of all a hole, fertilizes the soil, trims the roots, and so forth. 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 and not reversible. There are causal connections between the subevents. The poles can only be raised when they are put together. A tree can only be planted 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 caused by a homogeneous activity. But if situations with a well-ordered sequence of subevents are continued after interruption then 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 perf. 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 dosku* ‘to write a letter at the blackboard’ denote situations that are not normally interrupted and continued repeatedly. Thus, the temporal extension of the Activity component causing the denoted change of state is simply too short to be conceptualized as a homogeneous process. Therefore, 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 denoted 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 and thus the principle of arbitrary divisibility is not fulfilled. This is shown in the next section.

1.2. Accomplishments with a conative Activity component

As we 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 fulfills the principle of 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 thus the principle of arbitrary divisibility is not fulfilled. In (Mehlig 2006) I have 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 in a form’ or *sažat'*^[IMPF] *derevo* ‘to plant a tree’ a predicate such as *otkryvat'*^[IMPF] *okno* ‘to open a window’ denotes a

³ The same is true for English. S. 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”.

change of state that cannot be partially realized. 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 instantly. 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] *kostër* 'to light a camp-fire' 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 of state, the change from the closed to the opened 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 reversible. Therefore, given this scenario, the Activity component cannot be interpreted as homogeneous and coding it perfective by the delimitative procedural verb is not possible. For examples such as *prinimat'*^[IMPF] *tabletku aspirina* 'to take an aspirin', *razžigat'*^[IMPF] *kostër* 'to light a camp-fire', *vydavat'*^[IMPF] *knigu* 'to check out a book' it is also true that under ordinary circumstances the preliminaries preceding the actual change of state consist 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. Whoever takes an aspirin, opens the packet, takes the tablet out, dissolves it in water and swallows it.

However, for situations such as opening a window there still might exist different scenarios. For example, this would be the case if 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. Therefore there will be a completely different scenario for this situation. For instance first you try to open the window by pulling hard and if this not successful then by using

⁴ As the result of a situation such as opening a window is gradable - a window can be opened more or less wide – the situation denoted with the predicate 'to open a window' can be continued, even when the window is already open. Since this semantic component is not relevant for the further discussion it will not be taken into account.

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 impf. aspect in its durative-processual meaning does not denote a situation which is partially realized but denotes only the preliminaries which precede the actual change of state. M. Glovinskaja (2001: 104) describes the semantics of this third type of aspectual opposition in Russian as follows: The impf. aspect as interpreted as "acting in a certain way with the aim that as a result of this action a situation P begins to exist", the paired perf. verb as "acting in a certain way with the aim that as a result of this action a situation P begins to exist and as a result of this action a situation P began to exist".

different tools such as a knife, pliers or a chisel. As long as there is no success it is very possible that these tools are used many times and in any order. If we have a scenario like this then - as one of the anonymous reviewers but also Tatevosov & Ivanov (2009: 119) rightly commented - the Activity component causing the change of state is not homogeneous. It consists of different actions and thus does not fulfill the principle of arbitrary divisibility. But nevertheless, given this scenario in Russian the Accomplishment *otkryvat' okno* 'to open a window' can be coded perfective 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-DELM] minut desjat', no ničego ne vyšlo ^[PF].
 'I can't open the window. The window-wood is swollen from the rain.]
 I tried to open it for about ten minutes but nothing came out 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 term 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 If the Activity component of an Accomplishment has conative meaning then when translated into English expressions denoting the attempt such as *to try* or *to make attempts* must be chosen.

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 to cause the attainment of the change of state are bounded and limited in their temporal extent. Number, the kind and the 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 shown by example (21a) for conative Accomplishments in Russian it is typical that the verb form coded as perfective by means of the delimitative procedural verb is repeated and thus the intensity of the attempt is emphasized.⁸

⁶ Tatevosov & Ivanov (2009) also demonstrate this use of the delimitative procedural verb with the verb *otkryvat'* and chose as context a door with a broken lock. *Vasja otkryval ^[PF-DELM] 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).

⁸ For the semantics of reduplication of the verb form see Plungjan & Raxilina (1996) and Plungjan (2001). The authors point out, that predications with a reduplicated verb form are often interpreted as conative. "Reduplication of the verb form expresses an action constantly renewing itself and that permits the assumption that the action is constantly renewed because the preceding attempts were without result (Plungjan 2001: 62).

(21a) *Pootkryval* ^[PF-DELIM], *pootkryval* ^[PF-DELIM] *ja okno, no ničeho ne vyšlo* ^[PF].
'I tried and tried to open the window, but nothing came out 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 the third intonational pattern (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 example (21a).

More examples for conative Accomplishments where the Activity component is related to the preliminaries of the change of state and which are analogous to our example *pootkryvat'* ^[PF-DELIM] *okno* 'to open the window' may denote not only the normal way but also the attempt to attain the change of state are the following:

povključat' ^[PF-DELIM] *pribor* 'to try to turn on an appliance', if it is a new one and one does not know how to turn it on.

Ja povključal ^[PF-DELIM], *povključal* ^[PF-DELIM] *novyj pribor i v konce koncov vključilsja* ^[PF].

'I tried and tried to turn on the new appliance and in the end it was turned on.'

porazžigat' kostër ^[PF-DELIM] 'to try to light a camp-fire', if the camp-fire is difficult to light because of the damp wood.

My porazžigali ^[PF-DELIM], *porazžigali* ^[PF-DELIM] *ogon', no èto ne udalos'* ^[PF].

'We tried and tried to light the camp-fire but didn't succeed.'

povytaskivat' gvozd' 'to try to pull out a nail', which is very tight.

Ja povytaskival ^[PF-DELIM], *povytaskival* ^[PF-DELIM] *gvozd', no tak i ne smog* ^[PF].

'I tried and tried to pull out the nail but I couldn't.'

poproglatyvat' ^[PF-DELIM] *tabletku aspirina* 'to try to swallow an aspirin', if it is swallowed without water.

Ja poproglatyval ^[PF-DELIM], *poproglatyval* ^[PF-DELIM] *tabletku i vypljunil* ^[PF].

'I tried and tried to swallow the aspirin and then spat it out.'

povyprjamljat' ^[PF-DELIM] *provoloku* 'to try to straighten a wire' which is difficult to unbend.

Ja povyprjamljal ^[PF-DELIM], *povyprjamljal* ^[PF-DELIM] *provoloku i ostavil* ^[PF] *ètu zateju*.

'I tried and tried to straighten the wire and resigned.'

If Accomplishments are interpreted as conative, then there must be something preventing a 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. The wire is too thick, so it cannot unbend easily. The window is jammed so it is difficult to open. But the reason can also be the agent and his limited abilities, for instance the agent is not clever enough to turn on the new appliance or he is too weak to unbend a thick wire and therefore it is difficult to bring about the change of state. Whether an Accomplishment allows a conative reading is ultimately decided by our knowledge of the world. For predications such as *vydavat'*^[IMPF] *knigu* ‘to check out a book’ or *prinimat'*^[IMPF] *tabletku aspirina* ‘to take an aspirin’ it would be difficult to find a scenario which excludes the normal process to attain the change of state. Examples such as (22) and (23) are difficult to interpret.

(22) [?]Ja poprínimal^[PF-DELIM], poprínimal^[PF-DELIM] tabletku aspirina i brosil^[PF].
 ‘I tried and tried to take an aspirin but gave up.’

(23) [?]Bibliotekar' povydaival^[PF-DELIM], povydaival^[PF-DELIM] ètu knigu i sdalsja^[PF].
 ‘The librarian tried and tried to check out this book and gave up.’

Whether Accomplishments can denote the attempt to change the state also depends on the semantics of the inner argument. For a predicate such as *otkryvat'*^[IMPF] *okno* ‘to open a window’, as we have seen, an interpretation of an attempt is possible. For a predicate such as *otkryvat'*^[IMPF] *knigu* ‘to open a book’ an interpretation of an attempt seems to me to be impossible.⁹

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 continued by utterances such as *ničego ne vyšlo*^[PF] ‘nothing has come of it’ *brostit'*^[PF] / *sdat'sja*^[PF] ‘to give up’, *ničego ne polučaetsja*^[IMPF] ‘without any result’. That is why Tatevosov & 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 nevertheless 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 any other indication that the change of state was attained also yield a coherent text as shown by the following examples.

⁹ U. Junghanns to whom I am very grateful for his attentive, thoughtful and observant reading of the manuscript even for this example has found a situation which makes possible a conative reading of the Activity component. It would be the case if a child or a person with physical disabilities tries to open a book.

- (24) My pootkryvali ^[PF-DELIM], pootkryvali ^[PF-DELIM] okno i nakonec ono otkrylos' ^[PF].
 'We tried and tried to open the window and in the end it was open.'
- (25) - Tebe udalos' ^[PF] vključit' ^[PF] novyj pribor?
 - Udalos' ^[PF]. Ja ego povklučal ^[PF-DELIM], povklučal ^[PF-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 which precede the actual change of state and therefore in principle cannot be conceptualized as 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 example (26) and example (27).

- (26) Snačala Saša časa poltora poperevodil ^[PF-DELIM] tekst, kotoryj emu dali, a potom on pošel ^[PF] v biblioteku.
 'First Sasha translated the text given to him and then he went to the library.'
- (27) [Èto očen' trudnyj tekst.] Ja ego poperevodil ^[PF-DELIM], poperevodil ^[PF-DELIM], a potom brosil ^[PF]. Ja takie teksty perevodit' ^[IMPF] ne mogu.
 '[This is a very difficult text.] I have tried and tried to translate it and then gave it up. I can't translate such texts.'

In example (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 example (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 has only been able to translate parts of the text, then tried to translate more with the help of special dictionaries or consulting literature on the theme, and so forth. Doubling the verb form, as is typical of conative Accomplishments, emphasizes that the translation is not done in sequence but consists of several attempts. If Accomplishments such as *poperevodit'* ^[PF-DELIM] *tekst* 'to translate a text' are interpreted as conative then it is always 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 and incomprehensible. But it could also be the insufficient linguistic knowledge on part of the translator that does not allow him to translate the text in the “ordinary” way.

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 perf. verb. This implicature can be cancelled as shown by the way an example such as (27) can be continued.

- (27a) [Èto očen' trudnyj tekst.] Ja ego poperevodil ^[PF-DELIM], poperevodil ^[PF-DELIM] i, nakonec, polučilsja ^[PF] očen' chorošij variant.
'[This is a very difficult text.] I tried and tried to translate it. Finally, an excellent translation was the result.'

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 example (28).

- (28) - Posokraščal ^[PF-DELIM], posokraščal ^[PF-DELIM] ja ètu stat'ju i sdalsja ^[PF].
- Ty ee chot' na dve stranicy sokratil ^[PF]?
- Da, no ee nado bylo sokratit' ^[PF] na 10 stranic.
'- I tried and tried to shorten this article and gave up.
- Have you shortened it by at least 2 pages?
- Yes, but it ought to be shortened by 10 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 perf. verb, then the Activity component is related to a sequence of different subevents which cause the denoted change of state. But even when perfectivized by means of the delimitative procedural verb then the Activity component can be related to different subevents as we have seen. 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 in such a way that the attempt to attain the change of state consisted of different actions. In other words, both by perfectivizing with the paired perfective verb and by perfectivizing with the delimitative procedural verb the principle of arbitrary divisibility is not valid. The question therefore is under which conditions a change of state caused by different subevents can be conceptualized as not

inherently bounded, that means as atelic. To answer the question of how several different subevents can yield an atelic interpretation 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.

There is a general consensus (but see Rothstein 2004) 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, for Russian see (Mehlig 1996). 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). This inherent boundedness is a result of a strict arrangement of the parts, of which entities denoted by count nouns consist. As every IKEA customer knows, a mixed 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 a strict and irreversible 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 ordering of the subevents of telic predicates is not random. Taking an aspirin means first to open the little packet, than to take out the pill, to dissolve it in water and to swallow it. Not all subevents are necessary for this situation. An aspirin can be taken without dissolving it in water. But between the different subevents which constitute a situation such as taking an aspirin there is a causal irreversible connection. An aspirin can be swallowed only when it has been taken from the packet. A tree can only be planted when a planting hole has been dug. 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 the non-count nouns there are two classes, firstly the so called mass nouns such as *gaz* ‘gas’, *klej* ‘glue’ or *saxar* ‘sugar’ and secondly the so called uncountable collective nouns such as *bagaž* ‘luggage’, *musor* ‘rubbish’ or *mebel'* ‘furniture’. For both of them, mass nouns as well as uncountable collective nouns, it is true that the entities denoted are conceptualized as not inherently bounded. And therefore the entities denoted by them are not countable **tri saxara* ‘three sugars’, **dva багаža* ‘two luggages’. But between these two classes within the non-count noun domain there is an important 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 fulfill the principle of arbitrary divisibility: A part of a quantity of sugar can, in turn

still 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 fulfill the principle of cumulativity (Quine 1960: 91) or additivity (Carlsson 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 *bagaz* 'luggage' or *mebel* 'furniture' do not fulfill the principle of arbitrary divisibility. They fulfill only the principle of cumulativity or additivity. If two piles of luggage are put together than this is again a pile of luggage. 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 then it is because the arrangement of their parts is random. Inherent boundedness of an entity, as we have seen, presupposes a well-defined configuration of the parts of which the entity consists. It is precisely this condition that is not fulfilled 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 uncountable 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 because inherent boundedness presupposes heterogeneity of the parts, a condition that mass nouns do not fulfill as they denote entities which consist of identical parts.

Now let us turn to the verbal domain. In the verbal domain the equivalent of non-count nouns are atelic predicates. Atelic predicates 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 predicates 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 consisting of different subevents in a manner analogous to non-countable collective nouns. This is the case with conative Accomplishments, where the Activity component consists of several different subevents that are arbitrarily ordered.

If atelic predicates denote situations that consist of heterogeneous subevents then 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 arbitrary. From this it follows that verbal predicates consisting of different subevents can be both telic or atelic. If

the subevents constituting the situation are arranged in a well-defined irreversible temporary order, then the situation on account of this ordering of its temporal parts 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 of which the entity is constituted. 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 the reason 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 fulfill the principle of homogeneity but on account of the arbitrary arrangement of the subevents it fulfills the principle of cumulativeness. Homogeneity implies cumulativeness. Situations conceptualized as homogeneous always fulfill the principle of cumulativeness. Thus, in the end, it is not the principle of homogeneity, of arbitrary divisibility, but the principle of cumulativeness that is a necessary condition for coding perfective by a delimitative procedural verb an Accomplishment which is related to a single individualized situation.

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 the delimitative procedural verb, as 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 the actual change of state. As long as these Accomplishments denote "ordinary" actions and not attempts to cause the change of state they are inherently telic as well. We had 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 re-categorization occurs in three different cases.

The first case is *temporal distributivity*, i.e., 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*, i.e., identical situations are repeated and these repetitions are summed up in a macro-situation, i.e., *polčasa prygat'*^[IMPF] *s vyški* 'to jump from the diving board for half an hour'.

The third case is *frequentativity*, i.e., the predication with a bounded inner argument is related to several identical time intervals which are distributed over a macro-interval, i.e., *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 jumped from the diving board 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 are.’

As shown in (Mehlig 1996, 101-107), these re-categorisations are arranged in a hierarchical order. Temporally distributive predications where the inner argument is related to a bounded amount of entities may be secondarily re-classified by iteration. Iterative predications that are related to a limited number of events may be secondarily re-classified by frequentation.

In what follows, I elaborate on the semantically lowest form in this hierarchy of re-classification, which is the re-categorization 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 impf. 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, which means 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 of our example (32) permits a non-collective reading too. This would be the case if the letters were thrown away not together but step by step. 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 thus united into a macro-event. In this temporal-distributive interpretation the elementary predication is reclassified with regard to its actionality and this re-categorization 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 perf. verb:

- (32a) 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 began on 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:

- (32b) Saša snačala nekotoroje vremja povybrasyval ^[PF-DELM] 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 in question and the quantity of entities involved in the situation: 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 already described in 1948: "Each part of the action implies a corresponding part of the result for the object" (*Každaja častica dejstvija neposredstvenno otlagaet v ob"ekte sootvetstvujuščuju časticu rezul'tata*) (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.¹⁰

Predications with such interdependence between the temporal extent of the situation and an increase or decrease in the quantity of the entities involved in the situation have been thoroughly discussed in the formal semantic analyses by M. Krifka (1989), D. Dowty (1991), B. Partee (1997), H. Filip (1999), and most recently by E. V. Padučeva (2004). These discussions have shown that the classification of an incremental predication as telic or atelic can depend on

¹⁰ It is important to mention that 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 & Rothstein 2008). Given this interpretation in 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.

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 thus 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 is not bounded, then perfectivization with the paired perf. 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-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 perf. 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:

(33a) 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 perf. 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 denoted 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 očēn' 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 all the 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 as in our examples are related to a bounded amount established in the pretext then perfectivity coding by means of a delimitative procedural verb is also possible as shown in the following examples.

- (34a) [Posle smerti otca Saša našel ^[PF] v ego kabinete očēn' mnogo pisem.]
 Segodnja utrom on minut dvadcat' povybrasyval ^[PF-DELIM] ix i
 prinjalsja ^[PF] za fotografii.
 ‘[After his father's death Sasha found very many letters in his study.]
 This morning he threw them away for about twenty minutes and began on
 the photos.’

In example (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 heterogeneous situation that does not fulfill the principle of arbitrary divisibility. Nevertheless, as the example shows, perfectivization with a delimitative 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, then an inner argument denoting a bounded amount of entities and atelicity do not exclude each other.

- (35a) [Saša dolžen byl vydat' ^[PF] bol'šoe čislo udostoverenij.]
 On ix povydaval ^[PF-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.
- (35b) Saša minut dvadcat' povydaval ^[PF-DELIM] *te* udostoverenija, kotoroye emu dali ^[PF], i ušel ^[PF].
 ‘Sasha handed out *the* certificates given to him for about ten minutes and left.’
- (35c) Do togo kak Saša ušel ^[PF], on minut dvadcat' povydaval ^[PF-DELIM] *te* udostoverenija, kotoroye emu dali ^[PF].

‘Before Sasha left he handed out *the* certificates 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 pretext. In example (35b) and (35c) the demonstrative pronoun *te* ‘these’ 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.

(35d) [Do togo kak Saša ušel^[PF], on minut dvadcat’ povydavaj^[PF-DELIM] *te* udostoverenija, kotorye emu dali.] Skol’ko on vydal^[PF]?
‘[Before Sasha left he handed out *the* certificates 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 greater amount 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 the reason why predications with a bounded secondary incremental argument are hybrid in their actionality and therefore can be coded perfective not only with their paired perf. verb but also with a delimitative procedural verb.¹¹

If predications such as (34) and (35) are coded perfective with the paired perf. 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 perf. 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

¹¹ S. Tatevosov has drawn my attention to the fact that examples such as (34) and (35) do allow a homogeneous interpretation only if the inner argument is related to a relatively large amount. This can be easily explained with an example from the domain of spatial entities: Three acorns can hardly be conceptualized as a homogeneous mass, they will normally be counted. But a large number of acorns is usually not individually counted, but measured.

denoted 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 the possible continuation of examples (34a) shows:

- (34b) [Saša nekotoroe vremena povybrasyval^[PF-DELIM] èti pis'ma i prinjalsja^[PF] za fotografii.]
- On vse vybrosil^[PF]?
- Da, vybrosil^[PF] vse. / Net, vrode vsego polovinu.
'[Sasha threw away these letters for a certain time and began on the photos.]
- Has he thrown away all of them?
- Yes, all of them. / No, only about half of them.'

If such temporal-distributive predications coded perfective by a delimitative 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' *vydavat'*^[IMPF] *a certificate* 'to hand out a certificate' which we used to demonstrate the re-classification of inherently telic predicates by temporal distributivity belong to Accomplishments, where the Activity component is related to the preliminaries which precede the actual change of state. But this possibility of recategorization of inherently 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 can be conceptualized neither as a homogeneous process nor as conative. We had the example 'to plant a tree'. If in an example such as *sažat' derevo*^[IMPF] 'to plant a tree' the inner argument is in the plural *sažat'*^[IMPF] *derevja* 'to plant trees' then this example has two different interpretations. The plural can be interpreted collectively. This would be the case if all the trees are somehow simultaneously involved in the situation, for instance first holes are dug for all the trees, then the roots are shortened and so forth. But the plural can also be interpreted distributively. That would be the case, if the trees are planted one after the other. Given this interpretation, the inherently 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 delimitative procedural verb.

- (36) Do togo kak Saša ušel^[PF], on časa dva posażal^[PF-DELIM] derevja.
'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 perfective verb but also by the delimitative procedural verb.

- (36a) Do toho kak Saša ušel ^[PF], on časa dva posażal ^[PF-DELIM] *te* derevja, 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* 'these' 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 be introduced with the definite article as shown by the translation. This example shows further that a reclassification of inherently telic predications by temporal distributivity is possible not only for predications 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 impf. elementary hybrid predications, such as *obsužadat'* ^[IMPF] *vopros* 'to discuss a question' *raskrašivat'* ^[IMPF] *kartinku* 'to colour 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 perf. 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 closed the meeting.'

For these hybrid predications – and only for these – there are two different readings if they are coded perfective with a delimitative 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 closed the meeting.'

If the extent of the entities involved in the situation is known from the pretext, 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 interpretation, 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:

(39a) 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 half an hour only and closed the meeting.

In fact, they didn't discuss all of them. The last two they didn't even start discussing. /

Despite of the shortness of time they discussed all of them.’

On the other hand, the predication with the delimitative procedural verb in (39) can refer to each of the counted entities involved in the situation. In this case, there is no incremental relation. In this second interpretation, the example informs us that all the counted entities were involved in the situation for a limited time, though it remains open how many reached their point of culmination. For our example, this would mean that all the questions were discussed for a while but it is unclear how many were finished:

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

‘The representatives discussed these questions for half an hour only and closed 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' derevo* ^[IMPF] ‘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 ‘to hand out a book’ it is excluded too, because predicates such as *vydavat' knigu* ^[IMPF] ‘to check out a book’ cannot denote a situation partially realized. That is the reason why an example such as (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' knigi* ^[IMPF] ‘to check 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 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' anketu* ^[IMPF] 'to fill in a form' is hybrid in its actionality that means it can be interpreted both as telic and 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, then 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. This possibility of reclassifying predications as temporally distributive does not appear to exist if the inner argument is modified by quantifying determiners and measure expressions. In a very stimulating article S. Tatevosov (2001: 889) has denied the acceptability of examples such as

- (42) *Vasja popisal ^[PF-DELIM] pjat' pisem / neskol'ko pisem / malo pisem / mnogo pisem / vse pis'ma.
'Vasja wrote five letters / some letters / a few letters / many letters / all the letters for a while.'

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.

I take as a point of departure the so called focalized-processual meaning of the impf. aspect, because it is this use of the impf. 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, (Filip 1999: 254-259) for Czech. These authors have shown that the inner arguments in examples such as (43) and (44), without further context, do not allow a temporally distributive interpretation, with the result that 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 colouring 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 denoted subevents may have reached its culmination at the focalization point. In other words, in these examples the impf. 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 our example (43) by saying

(43a) [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 colouring two pictures which she had brought home from kindergarten.] The second one she hadn't started colouring 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 impf. 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 impf. aspect in its focalized-processual meaning presupposes that all the entities counted are involved in the situation at the focalization point. This is the reason why the focalized-processual meaning of the impf. 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 a 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 impf. aspect in its focalized-processual meaning in these examples too, because you cannot sleep two hours simultaneously. They must be slept one after the other. Therefore an example such as *On spit^[IMPF] dva časa* will be understood as a historical present, as *praesens pro futuro* or as referring to an iterative situation and in English 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 impf. aspect apply in the same way to the durative-processual impf. aspect. The durative-processual meaning of the impf. 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:

(49a) *Poslednee ja ešče ne načal^[PF] perevodit'^[IMPF].
'I haven't even started translating the last one yet.'

And for the durative-processual meaning of the impf. 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 thus be understood as an

incremental argument. Therefore, an example such as (50), similar to example (49), without further context is not an acceptable statement if the impf. 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 kilometres.’

Thus, all examples given seem to confirm a hypothesis repeatedly formulated for the Slavic languages: The impf. aspect in its focalized-processual and its durative-processual meaning is incompatible with an incremental argument modified by quantifying determiners and measure expressions. In fact, this is not true. There are contexts in which the impf. 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) - Gde Saša?
- Na kuxne. On p'et ^[IMPF] dve čaški čaja.
‘-Where is Sasha?
- In the kitchen. He is drinking two cups of tea.’
- (51a) - 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.’

As noted by A. Mittwoch (1988: 226) an example such as (51) does not allow a temporally distributive interpretation. But example (51a) allows this and thus the inner argument could be understood incrementally. That means that Sasha is drinking the two cups of tea one after the other.

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

- (44) - 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 up 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.

(44a) - 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. Probably, he has already eaten up one of them.’

And even Activity predications modified by measure expressions of space or time and thus having a point of culmination allow the processual meaning of the impf. aspect if the measure expressions are introduced by the reflexive possessive pronoun *svoj* ‘his’.

(52) *Ja prišel ^[PF], kogda deduška spal ^[IMPF] dva časa.

‘I came when grandfather was sleeping two hours.’

(52a) 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 kilometres.’

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 for this is that predications with an incremental argument introduced by the reflexive possessive pronoun *svoj* ‘his’ can be understood in such a way that the denoted 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. In fact, as R. Declerck (1979: 782) has explained with examples from English, measuring a situation requires that the situation should be finished, which - as he writes - 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, as he says, “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 impf. aspect in Russian. If the extent of the entities denoted by the secondary incremental argument has been determined in advance then the impf. 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 must occur regularly or habitually. It is always predetermined if reference is made to an amount already specified in the

pretext or the situation. E. V. Padučeva (1998: 79) has observed that the impf. 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 was introduced by the demonstrative pronouns *étot* ‘this’ or *tot* ‘that, this’. The reason is that by using these pronouns reference is made to an amount already specified in the pretext or 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 came from the consulate.’

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

- (54a) 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.’
- (55a) 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 came from the consulate.’

In example (54a) the demonstrative pronoun *èti* ‘these’ has an anaphoric function and is related to the amount specified in the pretext. In example (55a) the demonstrative pronoun *te* ‘these’ 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 up one of them’ or *Odno on uže perevel*^[PF]. ‘He has already translated one of them’.

(54b) *Segodnja utrom ja dal*^[PF] *Saše dva banana. V dannyj moment on est*^[IMPF] *èti dva banana. Odin on, verovatno, uže s"el*^[PF].

‘This morning I gave Sasha two bananas. At the moment he is eating *these* two bananas. Probably, he has already eaten one of them.’

(55b) *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 consulate. 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 impf. 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* ‘these three letters’ the numerals are related to a quantification that has already been realized in the pretext or the situation beforehand. Therefore, the impf. aspect in its processual meaning can be related collectively to the totality, the sum of the subevents already quantified in the pretext or situation.¹²

To sum up, the impf. 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 impf. 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

¹²Knowledge of the quantity of the entities involved in the situation denoted which permits us to relate the impf. aspect in its focalized-processual meaning to the sum of the distributively ordered situations does not presuppose that the quantity is explicitly mentioned in the pretext. An example such as *V dannyi 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. In the literature on the English Progressive several observations have been made according to which a predication with an incremental complement denoting entities bounded in their extent is acceptable if we are dealing with an intentional or planned situation. J. 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.” Cf. also S. Glasbey 1996: 355f., S. Zucchi 1999: 202-209.

mentioned, Tatevosov (2001: 889) has denied this possibility giving the example here repeated as (56).

- (56) *Vasja popisal ^[PF-DELIM] pjat' pisem / neskol'ko pisem / malo pisem / mnogo pisem / vse pis'ma.
'Vasja wrote five letters / some letters / a few letters / many letters / all the letters for a while.'

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 actionality 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 a predication such as *Vasja pisal* ^[IMPF] *pjat' pisem* 'Vasja was / has been writing five letters' 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 delimited period of time and it remains open whether any of these five letters has been finished. Such an interpretation of example (57) is certainly possible, but it contradicts our knowledge of the world. Normally five letters are not written simultaneously, but one after the other. So it comes as no surprise that Tatevosov marks this example as unacceptable. Yet in an example such as (58) this simultaneous interpretation is much more likely, because it is quite normal for a child to be colouring 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 coloured three pictures she brought home from kindergarten and went out to play.'

However, the possibility of such an interpretation, i.e., that a predication with an inner argument denoting a counted amount of entities and coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb as meaning that the delimitative procedural is

related to each of the counted subevents, exists only for elementary predications which are hybrid in their actionality, that means for predicates such as *pisat'*^[IMPF] *pis'mo* 'to write a letter' or *raskrašivat'*^[IMPF] *kartinku* 'to colour a picture', which can be coded perfective by both a paired perfective verb and a delimitative procedural verb, even when referring to a single situation. In other words, this interpretation is only possible if the elementary predication denotes a change of state which involves a homogeneous Activity. This is not the case for inherently telic predicates such as *sažat'*^[IMPF] *derevo* 'to plant a tree' or *vybrasyvat'*^[IMPF] *pis'mo* 'to throw away a letter'. As long as they refer to single events they cannot be coded perfective by the delimitative procedural verb. Therefore, in contrast to examples (57) and (58), in example (59) the delimitative procedural verb cannot be related to each of the counted subevents and is therefore unacceptable.

- (59) *Saša nekotoroje vremja povybrasyval^[PF-DELM] 200 pisem i prinjalsja^[PF] za fotografii.
 'Sasha threw away 200 letters for a certain time and began on the photos.'

The only way to perfectivize predicates such as *vybrasyvat'*^[IMPF] *pis'mo* 'to throw away a letter' or *vydavat'*^[IMPF] *knigu* 'to check out a book' by the delimitative would be to relate them collectively to the totality, to the sum of the counted subevents so that the predications are understood as temporal-distributive. As we have seen earlier, when the impf. 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 determined 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 pretext or the situation. Therefore, if the inner argument in an example such as (59) is introduced by a marker of definiteness and the argument thus refers to an amount previously quantified in the pretext, then this example allows a temporal-distributive interpretation and can therefore be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb.

- (59a) Saša nekotoroje vremja povybrasyval^[PF-DELM] *te* 200 pisem, kotorye ostalis'^[PF] ot otca i prinjalsja^[PF] za fotografii.
 'Sasha threw away *the* 200 letters, which his father had left him, for a certain time and began on 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 totality collectively, to the sum of the counted subevents. In other words, predications with a secondary inner incremental argument modified by quantifying determiners or measure expressions can be coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb. But this is only possible if the extent of the entities involved in the situation denoted is determined in advance. Only under this condition can predications with inner arguments modified by numerals or measure expressions be interpreted as temporally distributive with the result that the inner argument is understood as an incremental argument.

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 impf. 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 if 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 pretext or the situation beforehand. Accordingly, it is evident that the use of delimitative procedural verbs to code temporally distributive predications as perfective is based on impf. predications in which the impf. aspect is used in its durative-processual meaning. In other words, the durative-processual meaning of the impf. aspect and the use of delimitative procedural verbs are mutually dependent.

And now a last point. As we have seen, elementary hybrid predications such as *zapolnjat'*^[IMPF] *anketu* 'to fill in a form' or *raskrašivat'*^[IMPF] *kartinku* 'to colour a picture', i. e., predications which when referring to a singular situation can be coded perfective by both the paired perfective verb and 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 impf. aspect in its processual meaning can be related on the one hand collectively to the totality, i.e. to the sum of the subevents, and on the other hand 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 coloured *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-DELIM] *te* tri kartinki, kotorye ona prinesla ^[PF] iz detskogo sada, i pobežala ^[PF] igrat'.
'For about ten minutes Masha coloured *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 colouring has progressed, i.e., how many of the pictures have been coloured.

- (61a) [Maša minut desjat' poraskrašivala ^[PF-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 coloured *the* three pictures she brought home from kindergarten and went out to play.] She had coloured two of them. The last one she had not started colouring.'

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 has been coloured for a limited time and it remains open how many of them have been finished.

- (60b) [Maša minut desjat' poraskrašivala ^[PF-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 coloured (*the*) three pictures she brought home from kindergarten and went out to play]. She had not finished any of them.'

This second interpretation, in which the delimitative procedural verb is related distributively to each of the counted entities, is excluded 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 fulfilled, then these predications coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb are not interpretable.

Summary

1. Russian has Accomplishments that are hybrid in their actionality, i.e., Accomplishments which can be read as either telic or atelic. Accomplishments hybrid in their actionality can be coded perfective by both their paired perf. verb and a delimitative procedural verb. Two different types of hybrid accomplishments have been distinguished. First, 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, hybrid Accomplishments where the Activity component consists of different subevents which are arranged arbitrarily. In this case the Activity component has conative meaning and does not fulfill the principle 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 re-categorized by referring to repeated events. I have described one of these possibilities, the re-categorization of inherently telic predications by temporal distributivity, i.e., re-categorization by reference to several entities which are not collectively involved in the situation in question, but sequentially, one after the other. If such a re-categorization 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 perf. verb, but also with a delimitative procedural verb. When coded perfective by a delimitative procedural verb, the predication is related to the homogeneous Activity connected with the denoted 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 pretext or the situation.

References

- Apresjan, Ju. D. (1995) "Glagoly momental'nogo dejstvija i performativy". Izbrannye trudy, tom 2. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 219-241.
- Apresjan, Ju. D. (2009) Issledovanija po semantike i leksikografii, tom 1. Paradigmatika. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur.
- Bach, E. (1986) "The algebra of events". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9: 5-16.
- Bertinetto, P. M. & Squartini, M. (1995) "An Attempt at Defining the Class of 'Gradual Completion Verbs'". P. M. Bertinetto et al., eds. *Temporal Reference, Aspect and Actionality*, Vol. 1. Semantic and Syntactic Perspectives. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier, 11-26.
- Bertinetto, P. M. et al (2000) "The progressive in Europe". Dahl, Ö., ed. *Tense and Aspect in the languages of Europe* Berlin. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 517-558.
- Bogusławski, A. (2004) "Small is beautiful: A note on small events". A. P. Volodin, ed. *Tipologičeskie obosnovanija v grammatike*. Moskva: Znak, 61-75.
- Braginsky, P. & Rothstein, S. (2008) "Vendler Classes and the Russian Aspectual System". *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16 (1): 3-55.
- Bulygina, T. V. (1982) "K postroeniju tipologii predikatov v russkom jazyke." *Semantičeskie tipy predikatov*. Moskva, Nauka, 7-85.
- Carlson, L. (1981) "Aspect and Quantification". *Tense and Aspect: Syntax and Semantics* 14. New York: Academic Press, 31-64.
- Dahl, Ö., ed, (2000) *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, Euro-Typ 20-6. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Declerck, R. (1979) "Aspect and the bounded/unbounded (telic/atelic) distinction". *Linguistics* 17: 761-794.
- Dickey, S. (2006) "Aspectual Pairs, Goal Orientation and PO-Delimitatives in Russian." *Glossos* 7. <http://seelrc.org/glossos/7>
- Dickey, S. (2007) "A Prototype Account of the Development of Delimitative PO- in Russian". D. Divjak and A. Kochanska, eds. *Cognitive Paths into the Slavic Domain*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 326–371.
- Dickey, S. & Hutcheson, J. (2003) "Delimitative Verbs in Russian, Czech and Slavic". *American Contributions to the 13th International Congress of Slavists*, Vol. 1, Linguistics. Robert A. Maguire and A. Timberlake, eds. Bloomington: Slavica, 23–36.
- Dowty, D. R. (1991) "Thematic proto-roles and argument selection". *Language* 67: 547-619.
- Filip, H. 1999. *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Nominal Reference*. New York & London: Garland.
- Frege, G. (1884/1953) *The Foundations of Arithmetic*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Glasbey, S. (1996) "The Progressive: A Channel-Theoretic Analysis". *Journal of Semantics* 13: 331-361.
- Glovinskaja, M.Ja. (2001) *Mnogoznačnosť i sinonimija v vido-vremennoj sisteme russkogo glagola*. Moskva: Azbukovnik.
- Jayez, J. (1999) "Imperfectivity and Progressivity: The French Imparfait". T. Matthews and D. Strolovich, eds. *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) IX*. Ithaca: Cornell University, 145-162.
- Košev, A. D. (1996) "Referencial'nyj podxod k analizu jazykovyx značenij". *Moskovskij lingvističeskij al'manax* 1: 82-194.
- Kratzer, A. (2004) "Telicity and the Meaning of Objective Case". *The Syntax of Time*. Cambridge Mass., MIT Press, 389-423.
- Krifka, M. (1989) *Nominalreferenz und Zeitkonstitution*. München: Fink.
- Maslov, Ju.S. (2004) *Izbrannye trudy*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

- Mehlig, H. R. (1981) "Satzsemantik und Aspektsemantik im Russischen. Zur Verbalklassifikation von Zeno Vendler". P. Hill & V. Lehmann, eds. Slavistische Linguistik 1980 [Slavistische Beiträge 147], München: Sagner, 95-151.
Abridged translation: "Semantika predloženiya i semantika vida v russkom jazyke".
Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike, vyp. XV. Moskva: Progress, 227-249.
- Mehlig, H.R. (1995) "Wesen und Funktion des Präsens im Slavischen". H. Jachnow & M. Wingender, eds. Temporalität und Tempus. Studien zu allgemeinen und slavistischen Fragen. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 176-198.
- Mehlig, H.R. (1996) "Some Analogies between the Morphology of Nouns and Aspect in Russian". Folia Linguistica XXX: 87-109.
- Mehlig, H. R. (2006) "Glagol'nyj vid i vtoričnaja gomogenizacija oboznačemoj situacii posredstvom kvantifikacii. K upotrebleniju delimitativnogo sposoba dejstvija v russkom jazyke". V. Lehmann, ed. Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida IV. [Slavolinguistica 7]. München: Sagner, 235-276.
- Miljutina, M. G. (2006) Semantika konativnosti i potencial'naja modal'nost': Kompleks "popytka i rezul'tat" i ego vyraženie v sovremennom russkom jazyke. Avtoreferat doktorskoj dissertacii. Ekaterinburg.
- Mittwoch, A. (1988) "Aspects of English aspect: On the interaction of perfect, progressive and durational phrases". Linguistics and Philosophy 11: 203-254.
- Padučeva, E.V. (1996) Semantičeskie issledovanija. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- Padučeva, E.V. (1998) "On non-compatibility of partitive and imperfective in Russian". Theoretical Linguistics 24: 73-82.
- Padučeva, E.V. (2004) "Nakopitel' efekta i russkaja aspektologija". Voprosy jazykoznanija 5: 46-57.
- Partee, B. "Vid i interpretacija imennyx grupp". M. Ju. Čertkova, ed. Trudy aspektologičeskogo seminara filologičeskogo fakul'teta MGU. Moskva: MGU.
- Plungjan, V. A. (2001) "Antirezul'tativ: do i posle rezul'tata". Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki 1, Moskva: Russkie slovari, 50-88.
- Plungjan, V. A. & Raxilina, E. V. (1996) "Tušat-tušat – ne potušat: grammatika odnoj glagol'noj konstrukcii". Issledovanija po glagolu v slavjanskix jazykax: Glagol'naja leksika s točki zrenija semantiki, slovoobrazovanija, grammatiki. Moskva: Filologija, 106-115.
- Quine, W. V. O. (1960) Word and Object. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Rothstein, S. (2004) Structuring Events. A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Šatunovskij, I. B. (2009) Problemy russkogo vida. Moskva, Jazyki russkoj literatury.
- Šeljakin, M.A. (1983) Kategorija vida i sposoby dejstvija russkogo glagola. Teoretičeskie osnovy. Tallin: Valgus.
- Sémon, J.-P. (1986) "Postojat' ou la perfectivité de congruence: definition et valeurs textuelles". Revue des Études Slaves LVIII: 609-635.
- Sigalov, P. S. (1975) "Istorija russkix ograničitel'nyx glagolov". Trudy po russkoj i slavjanskoj filologii XXIII, Serija lingvističeskaja. Tartu: Tartuskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, 141-181.
- Smith, C. S. (1991) The Parameter of Aspect. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Svenonius, P. (2004) "Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP". Nordlyd 32,2: 205-253.
- Tatevosov, S. G. (2001) "A theory of Slavic Aspect and the Russian Delimitative". P. Kosta et al., eds. Investigations into Formal Slavic Linguistics. FDSL IV. Frankfurt, Peter Lang, 873-891.
- Tatevosov, S. & Ivanov, M. (2009) "Event structure of non-culminating accomplishments". L. Hogeweg et al. eds., Cross-linguistic semantics of tense, aspect and modality. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Vendler, Z. (1967) "Verbs and Times". *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 97-121.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1967) "On the semantics of the verbal aspect in Polish". To honor Roman Jakobson. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 2231-2249.
- Zel'dovič, G. M. (2003) "Konativnye glagoly i glagoly ustranennogo rezul'tata: dva fiktivnyx glagol'nyx klassa". *Izvestija AN. Serija literatury i jazyka*, t. 62(3): 47-53.
- Zucchi, S. (1999) "Incomplete Events, Intensionality and Imperfective Aspect". *Natural Language Semantics* 7: 179-215.

Acknowledgements

This article is based on a lecture I gave in August 2007 at the Second Annual Meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society in Berlin. In April 2008 it was accepted for publication in the "Collected Papers" of this conference. This volume, however, was not published. The belated possibility of publication was a welcome reason to revise the article and to take into account not only the stimulating and constructive thoughts and questions of two anonymous reviewers but also Tatevosov's article published on the same topic in 2009. I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers and also Anita Mittwoch, Norbert Nübler, Barbara Partee, Susan Rothstein, Stephen Dickey, Svetlana Šuvalova and Sergej Tatevosov for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. The author is responsible for any shortcomings remaining.

I use the following abbreviations: [IMPF] = imperfective verb, [PF] = paired perfective verb, [PF-DELIM] = perfective delimitative procedural verb formed with the prefix *PO-* delimiting the situation denoted temporally.