

Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect / edited by Susan Rothstein. *Linguistics Today* 110. Amsterdam/Philadelphia 2007: Benjamins, p. 257-290. ISBN 978 90 272 3374 5

## **Aspect and bounded quantity complements in Russian**

Hans Robert Mehlig  
University of Kiel

This paper investigates the actional recategorization of agentive accomplishment- and achievement-predications when interpreted in a temporally distributive manner. Temporal distributivity is present in a verbal predication if it refers to several entities involved in the given situation not simultaneously but sequentially, i.e., one after the other. In this case we have an incremental relation and the complement, interpreted distributively, is a derived and thus a *secondary increment*. Therefore, the terminative or aterminative actionality of temporally distributive predications is dependent on whether the secondary increment involves a bounded or unbounded quantity. This paper attempts to show that predications with a secondary increment bounded in its extent are *hybrid* with regard to their actionality, i.e., they can be both terminative and aterminative and thus in Russian permit perfectivization not only by the paired perf. verb but also by the delimitative procedural.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 explains the connection between terminativity and the category of aspect in Russian on the basis of elementary predications. Section 2 shows how elementary terminative predications (accomplishments and achievements) can be recategorized in respect of actionality by temporal distributivity. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the conditions under which predications, recategorized in their actionality with an increment bounded in its extent, permit the use of the ipf. aspect in the so-called processual reading. In particular, section 3 treats the focalized-processual reading of the ipf. aspect, section 4 the durative-processual reading. Section 5 analyzes why and under which conditions predications with a secondary bounded increment can be interpreted as aterminative and thus be perfectivized with a delimitative procedural verb, delimiting the given situation temporally. The last section concludes with a summary.

I use the following abbreviations: IMPF.= imperfective verb, PF.= paired perfective verb, PF-DELIM = perfective delimitative procedural verb which results from perfectivizing an imperfective verb which is aterminative by means of the prefix *PO*-delimiting the situation denoted temporally.

Key words: incremental relation, aspect, actionality, progressive, definiteness, Russian

## 1. Aspect and terminativity

In all Slavic languages the impf. aspect is regarded as the marked member of the aspectual opposition. The function of the PERF. aspect is to represent a given situation as bounded, or delimited. PERF. verbs make reference to a boundary, whereas IMPF. verbs present a given situation without regard to boundaries: the latter can denote both bounded and unbounded situations. Not all verbal predications can be bounded with PERF. verbs, and for those that can, the way in which it is done depends on their actional content, the actionality of the situation in question. For the aspectual opposition on the level of situation aspect, on the level of actionality, there are two distinctions that are important, and they are arranged hierarchically. The highest is the distinction between individual-level and stage-level predications (G. Carlson 1977). This distinction determines whether perfectivization is permitted or not. Individual-level predications cannot be bounded with PERF. verbs, as they denote states of affairs which are not related to some specific interval on the time axis.

In contrast, stage-level predications do allow perfectivization. The manner in which this perfectivization is achieved is determined by the actionality of the situation in question. Predications that denote situations with an inherent boundary, and thus temporally heterogeneous situations – for which the criterion of arbitrary divisibility is not satisfied – do usually have the so-called paired PERF. verbs. Following Slavic linguistic tradition (Nübler 1992, Padučeva 1996: 107, Schlegel 1999, Petruchina 2000, Breu 2005), I term stage-level predications that conceptualise a given situation as a change-of-state, i.e., as heterogeneous, *terminative predications*. Within terminative predications I differentiate further between changes-of-state with an inherent definite culmination point (*absolute-terminative*, or telic predications) and those in which a culmination point can be determined only relative to a previous point, as is the case of the so-called degree achievements (*relative terminatives*). Following Slavic linguistic tradition I term stage-level predications that conceptualise a given situation without inherent boundaries, and thus as homogeneous, *aterminative predications*.

### 1.1. Aspect and individual-level predications

Stage-level predications denote situations which are located on the time-axis in a discrete manner. They denote “accidentia” (Bolinger 1973), “episodic basic particulars” (Strawson 1959: 66), “second-order entities” (Lyons 1977: 444) “appearances” [javlenija] (Bulygina 1982: 13–22); in other words, they denote temporal entities which can be said to occur or not to occur, to happen or not to happen, to be the case or not at some point or interval in time. In contrast, individual-level predications denote “essentia”, “third-order entities” (J. Lyons 1977: 443), “qualities” [kačestva] (Bulygina 1982: 13–22) and thus temporal entities that are located on the time-axis in a non-discrete manner. Essentia, as they are denoted by individual-level predications, correspond – as J. Goldsmith and E. Woisetschlaeger (1982: 80) suggest – to our structural knowledge of the world. In contrast to stage-level predications, they do

not describe what happens in the world, but rather “how the world is made so that a certain state-of-affairs may happen in it”. In Z. Vendler’s classification, individual-level predications are identical to his “states”.<sup>1</sup> And it is important to note that, as Z. Vendler clearly points out, the difference between state-predications and non-state-predications is not only a matter of verbs. He emphasises that the situations denoted by stage-level predications – i.e., by accomplishments, activities or achievements – can be raised to the rank of states as well.

Z. Vendler terms these derived states “specific states”.<sup>2</sup>

In Russian, individual-level predications are outside the aspectual opposition. This means that IMPF. verbs such as *znat’* ‘to know’, *imet’* ‘to possess’, *sostojat’* ‘to consist of’, *sootvetstvovat’* ‘to correspond to’ or *stonit’sja ljudej* ‘to shun people’, which in Russian can only denote “essentia”, are never perfectivized. They have neither a so-called corresponding paired PERF. verb, nor can they be modified by PERF. procedural verbs that limit the situation temporally. This is also true for stage-level predications that have been raised to the rank of individual-level predications, for specific states. If an accomplishment-predication such as *Igor’ čital Pravdu* ‘Igor read Pravda’ denotes a prior property of Igor and thus is used as an individual-level predication, i.e., as a state in terms of Z. Vendler, then this predication cannot be perfectivized either with the corresponding paired PERF. verb *pročitat’* or with the so-called delimitative procedural verb *počitat’* ‘to read for a while’, denoting a temporally delimited quantity of the denoted situation.

## 1.2. Aspect and stage-level predications

In contrast to individual-level predications, stage-level predications denote “accidentia” (Bolinger 1973) or episodic particulars (Strawson 1959: 66), i.e., situations that are located on the time-axis in a discrete manner. In the threefold classification of J. Lyons (1977: 444), they correspond to second-order entities. Stage-level predications may denote situations that can be observed, such as *stavit’ palatku* ‘to pitch a tent’, *zapolnjat’ anketu* ‘to fill in a form’ or *ležat’ na solnce* ‘to lie in the sun’, but also more complex situations that take place over a longer period of time and consist of different sub-situations tied to a macro-situation, such as *razvodit’ lošadej* ‘to breed horses’, *ulučšat’ ocenku v fizike* ‘to improve the mark in physics’ or *rabotat’ v universitete* ‘to work at university’, cf. A. Galton’s (1984: 85) distinction between a “narrow” and a “broad” progressive.

---

1. Cf. Vendler’s previously unpublished commentaries on his classification of verbal predications in Beck (1987: 72).

2. Breu (2005) refers to this function of the IMPF. aspect as “status-aspect” delimiting it from the focusing function.

### 1.2.1. Terminatives

Stage-level predications may be perfectivized. How this perfectivization occurs, whether a qualitative or only a temporal bounding is possible, depends on the actional content of the situation in question, i.e., whether we are dealing with a terminative or an aterminative predication. Terminative predications denote changes-of-state, transitions which culminate in a new state or process, and thus heterogeneous temporal entities. The situations denoted by terminatives do not have the sub-interval property, i.e., they do not satisfy the criterion of arbitrary divisibility, as the initial and the final states of the situation are not identical. The change-of-state denoted by terminative predications can be absolute, as in the case of accomplishments, but it can also be relative, as in the case of degree achievements (Dowty 1979, Bondarko 1997). Absolute-terminative (telic) IMPF. predications (accomplishments), such as *zapolnjat' anketu* 'to fill in a form', *pisat' dissertaciju* 'to write a thesis' or *naxodit' kvartiru* 'to find a flat', denote situations with a definite inherent endpoint. Relative IMPF. terminatives (degree achievements), such as, for instance, *xudet'* 'to lose weight', also denote changes-of-state and thus temporally heterogeneous situations, but they are not telic. Here again it is true to say that the prior and the subsequent states are not identical. However, the situations denoted by relative terminatives have a result at every point during their temporal extent. This means that a point of culmination can only be defined relative to the previous state. At any time while one has been losing weight one has also already lost weight.

Both absolute and relative terminative predications can denote changes-of-state that have duration, but also changes-of-state that are conceptualised as momentary. Within these non-durative terminative predications there is a further subdivision between those allowing preliminary activities, i.e., the so-called "culminations" (Bach 1986: 6) or "end-in-sight achievements" (Chaput 1990: 289) such as *prygat' s vyški* 'to jump from the diving board' or *vyigryvat' igru* 'to win a game', and those which do not allow them, i.e., the so-called "pure achievements" (Vendler 1967: 103), "true achievements" (Chaput 1990: 289) or "happenings" (Bach 1986: 6), for instance, *naxodit' kvartiru* 'to find a flat'.<sup>3</sup>

As a rule, IMPF. verbs denoting changes-of-state enter into so-called aspectual pairs, which means that a terminative IMPF. verb usually has a PERF. partner denoting the corresponding situation, including the resulting state or process. This is independent of whether the change denoted by the terminative IMPF. verb is absolute or relative, and whether the change is of duration or not. These paired PERF. verbs have a dual function. They tell us that the situation in question has reached its inherent culmination point and thus simultaneously limit the temporal extent of this situation, as the qualitative change achieved always implies temporal boundedness. In Russian, aspectual pairs are

---

3. There is considerable disagreement as to defining properties for a classification of actionality. There is also a great diversity in the naming of these classes. Cf. the overview by S. Tatevosov (2002: 317–324).

basically formed in two ways: first, by the derivation of paired IMPF. verbs from PERF. verbs with suffixes (currently the only suffix that can still form IMPF. paired verbs is the suffix -*yva-*) and second, by adding prefixes to impf. verbs. As prefixes in Russian are not only a means of forming aspectual pairs but also of forming new lexemes and moreover a means of the temporal delimitation of aterminatives, a prefix forming a so-called aspectual pair is considered to be devoid of lexical content and merely a grammatical marker of perfectivity.<sup>4</sup> Since Ju. S. Maslov (2004 [1948]: 76f.), the obligatory change to IMPF. verbs in contexts where the aspectual opposition is neutralized is used as a semantic test to determine which PERF. verbs are paired. An example is the narrative present, where a PERF. paired verb must be replaced by the corresponding paired IMPF. verb: *On napisal*<sup>PF</sup> *pis'mo i leg*<sup>PF</sup> *spat'* 'He wrote a letter and went to bed' → *On pišet*<sup>IMPF</sup> *pis'mo i ljažet*<sup>IMPF</sup> *spat'* 'He writes a letter and goes to bed'.

### 1.2.2. Aterminatives

Terminative predications involve change, aterminative predications do not. The latter conceptualise the situation in question as homogeneous. For them, the principle of arbitrary divisibility is valid, i.e., the so-called subinterval property. In contrast to terminative predications, they denote situations without an inherent culmination point and as such have no paired PERF. verbs. The situations denoted by aterminatives allow only an "external" bounding (Bondarko 1986: 15). This can be achieved by focusing on a certain temporal quantity of the homogenous continuum, i.e., a limited period of its duration. This is done with the delimitative procedurals formed with the prefix *PO-*. The delimitative procedural is exceptionally productive and can be derived from all aterminative predicates denoting controllable situations (Sémon 1986, Bogusławski 2004). Temporal limitation can also be realized by singling out a particular phase of the denoted situation. Thus, it is possible to denote the starting point of a situation, by means of the so-called ingressive procedurals formed with the prefix *ZA-*, or its endpoint, by means of the so-called finitive procedurals formed with the prefix *OT-*.

Furthermore, there are aterminative predications denoting situations that may be divided into separate, more or less identical stages, e.g., *stučat'* 'to knock' or *kivat' golovoj* 'to nod'. In this case, the temporal limitation of the homogeneous continuum can also be effected with the so-called semelfactive procedurals formed with the suffix *-NU-*. Semelfactives denote a single phase of the homogeneous temporal continuum.

---

4. Cf. the classification of prefixed perfective verbs within the scope of a semantic map of Russian aspectual relationships by L. Janda (2007):

1. Natural Perfectives  
napisat' to write paired perfective verb
2. Complex Acts  
popisat' to write (for a while) aspectual procedural verb
3. Specified Perfectives  
perepisat' to copy new semantic content

They correspond to the so-called singulative forms, which Russian has for mass nouns (*sneg* ‘snow’, *snežinka* ‘snow-flake’).

Finally, in addition to arbitrary boundedness of atterminative predications, Russian has the possibility of expressing various degrees of intensity of such situations, such as the fact that by doing something too much one becomes tired of it, expressed by the so-called saturative procedurals formed with the prefix *NA-* and the postfix *-SJA* (e.g., *guljat* ‘to walk’ → *naguljat’sja* ‘to walk one’s fill’). Another possibility is the formation of evolutive procedurals with the prefix *RAZ-* and the postfix *-SJA*, meaning the full development of an atterminative situation (e.g., *govorit* ‘to speak’ → *razgovorit’sja* ‘to gradually get talking’).

All these procedural verbs formed by perfectivizing IMPF. atterminative verbs by means of an affix limit the situation denoted, establishing an arbitrary point in a situation conceptualised as homogeneous. There are far more examples of these procedurals than I have mentioned here. (For a complete overview cf. M.A. Šeljakin 1983: 188–192.) And far from all atterminative verbs form all of the above-mentioned procedurals. But what is true for all these procedural verbs is that they can only be derived from atterminative IMPF. verbs. I term them *aspectual procedural verbs*, as opposed to lexical procedural verbs, which are derived from terminative verbs and which fulfil no such perfectivizing role, as a terminative paired PERF. verb already exists for a given IMPF. terminative verb.

Aspectual procedurals are the quasi-equivalents of the missing paired IMPF. verb that atterminatives lack. In a sequence of events, such as *Igor’ vstal<sup>PF</sup>, poxodil<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> po komnate i snova sel<sup>PF</sup>* ‘Igor stood up, paced the room and sat down again’, where in Russian the use of PERF. verbs is obligatory, the aspectual procedurals are substitutes for the paired PERF. verbs that atterminative predications lack because they do not denote a change-of-state. That is the reason why aspectual procedurals must be considered to be part of the verbal paradigm of atterminative verbs. They cannot be regarded as independent verbs or lexemes, because the lexical content of the corresponding atterminative IMPF. verb is not changed but only modified through affixation. All these aspectual procedural verbs derived are – to quote Carlota Smith (1991: 76) – “superlexical morphemes which modulate the focus on the situation”.

### 1.2.3. Hybrid Predications

In addition to elementary IMPF. predications, which can be clearly classified as terminative or atterminative, Russian has IMPF. predications that are hybrid in their actionality.<sup>5</sup> They can be classified both as accomplishments, i.e., as absolute-terminative (telic), and as activities, i.e., as atterminative. Good examples are *obsuždat’ vopros* ‘to discuss a question’, *kopat’ jamu* ‘to dig a pit’, *perevodit’ pis’mo* ‘to translate a letter’, *zapolnjat’*

---

5. I have taken over the term “hybrid” from M.P. Bertinetto / M. Sqartini (1995: 12). They use the term “hybrid” for predications which can belong to different classes of actionality as for

*anketu* ‘to fill in a form’, *igrat’ sonatu* ‘to play a sonata’. These predications can, on the one hand, be bounded qualitatively by the corresponding paired PERF. verb:

- (1) a. My obsudili<sup>PF</sup> pervyj vopros na povestke dnja i zakryli<sup>PF</sup> sobranie.  
 ‘We discussed the first question on the agenda and closed the meeting.’
- (2) a. Maša sygrala<sup>PF</sup> sonatu Čajkovskogo i perešla<sup>PF</sup> k étjudam.  
 ‘Masha played a Tchaikovsky sonata and went over to the etudes.’

On the other hand, they can be bounded temporally with the delimitative procedural, a possibility that, as we have seen, exists only for agentive predications that are aterminative:

- (1) b. My kakoe-to vremja poobsuždali<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> pervyj vopros na povestke dnja i zakryli<sup>PF</sup> sobranie.  
 ‘We discussed the first question on the agenda for a certain time and closed the meeting.’
- (2) b. Maša poigrala<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> sonatu Čajkovskogo minut desjat’ i perešla<sup>PF</sup> k étjudam.  
 ‘Masha played a Tchaikovsky sonata for about ten minutes and went over to the etudes.’

If these hybrid predications are perfectivized with the delimitative procedural verbs, then they only refer to the activity that causes the change-of-state and the culmination point of these situations is irrelevant.

As I have shown elsewhere (Mehlig 2006: 250–258), this possibility of conceptualising a change-of-state both as terminative and aterminative presupposes that the activity causing the change-of-state can be conceptualised as homogeneous. This is the case for predications like *to play a sonata* or *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. There is a similar situation with filling in a form. One need not fill in a form systematically, point by point. 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 sometimes even necessary, to fill in forms haphazardly. And the process can be interrupted at any point and continue as haphazardly later.

---

example *He painted the wall* which can be classified both as accomplishment- and as activity-predication and therefore in English can be modified both by an inclusive and a non-inclusive durativum: *He painted the wall in / for half an hour*. R. Declerck (1979: 768) and I. Depraetare (1995: 45) denote predications belonging to different Vendler-classes as “zero-telic”, V. Lehmann (1999: 28) and T. Anstatt (2001) as “diffuse”, S. G. Tatevosov (2002: 378) as “weak telic”.

In contrast, situations denoted by verbal predications, such as *stavít' palatku* 'to pitch a tent' or *sažat' 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 more or less well ordered chain of different actions that are normally not repeated within a single situation. One must put up the tent poles, hammer in the pegs, raise the canvas, tighten the ropes and so on. Whoever plants a tree, first of all, digs a hole, fertilises the soil, shortens the tree roots and so forth. As it is difficult to interpret the activity associated with these changes-of-states as homogeneous, these predications are inherently terminative and therefore can – as long as they denote elementary singular situations – only be perfectivized qualitatively, i.e., with the paired PERF. verb. Nevertheless, conceptualizing the activity associated with a change-of-state as homogeneous is not really a question of linguistics, but of world knowledge. Even for predications such as *otkryvat okno* 'to open the window' one could find situations allowing a homogeneous interpretation of the relevant activity. An example could be the opening of a window frame which has swollen after a heavy rain. In this case, the *opening* could consist of several attempts at opening the window and then a homogeneous interpretation of the activity causing the change-of-state is possible:

- (3) a. Ja nemnogo pootkryval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> okno, no iz ètogo ničego ne vyšlo<sup>PF</sup>.  
'I was busy for a while trying to open the window, but there was no result'.

The homogeneity of the activity can be emphasized by repetition of the delimitative procedural verb and putting it in the first position:

- (3) b. Pootkryval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup>, pootkryval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> ja okno, no ničego ne vyšlo<sup>PF</sup>.

S. Rothstein (2004: 115) has shown that in English there is also the possibility of interpreting predications that denote changes-of-state both as terminative and aterminative. Her examples are *wiping the table* and *polishing the vase*, and her commentary on these examples makes clear that an interpretation of these predications as aterminative is possible under the same conditions as in Russian, if, as she suggests, "the activity part of the accomplishment is a simple derivation of event type, rather than a complex activity."

Hybrid predications temporally bounded by delimitative procedural verbs only involve the homogeneous activity causing the corresponding change-of-state. Whether the situation in question has reached its culmination point remains open. If predications such as *Lena nemnogo poraskrašivala<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> kartinku* 'Lena coloured a picture for a while' or *Igor' časa dva poperevodil<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> pis'mo i ušel* 'Igor translated a letter for about two hours and left' are usually understood as referring to an incomplete, i.e., only partially realized situation, then it is only a conversational implicature, although a very strong one.

To summarize, within IMPF. verbal predications that describe changes-of-state in the external world, we must distinguish between two subgroups. First, IMPF. predications that can be classified only as absolute-terminative (telic) and second, hybrid predications which can be classified as both absolute-terminative (telic) and also aterminative.



This is the case, if the activity causing the change-of-state can be interpreted as homogeneous.

## 2. Secondary homogenization of agentive absolute-terminative (telic) predications through temporal distributivity

Achievement-predications, such as *vybrasyvat' / vybrosit' staroe pis'mo* 'to throw away an old letter', *prygat' / prygnut' s vyški* 'to jump from the diving board' or *povtorjat' / povtorit' trudnoe slovo* 'to repeat a difficult word', and accomplishment-predications with which usually no homogeneous activity is associated, such as *stavit' / postavit' palatku* 'to pitch a tent', *sažat' / posadit' derevo* 'to plant a tree' or *perepletat' / pereplesti knigu* 'to bind a book' can be classified only as terminative as long they refer to a single situation. However, if these predications refer to several situations they permit a recategorization in their actionality, their situation aspect. This recategorization occurs in three different cases, which are arranged in a hierarchical order (Mehlig 1996: 101–107):

The first case is *temporal distributivity*, i.e., if the predication denotes a series of entities involved in a situation not simultaneously but step by step, such as *dva časa vydavat' studentam knigi* 'to hand out books to the students for two hours.'

The second case is *iterativity*, i.e., if identical situations are repeated and these repetitions are summed up in a macro-situation, i.e., *polčasa prygat' s vyški* 'to jump from the diving board for half an hour'.

The third case is *frequentativity*, i.e., if the predication refers to a bounded amount of entities that is related to several time intervals, which are summed up to a macro-interval, i.e., *nedelju prinimat' lekarstvo po tri tabletki večerom* 'to take three pills of the medicine every evening for a week'.

If these repetitions are not bounded in their quantity, then in all these cases we have a *secondary homogenisation*, i.e., ateterminative predications, and in Russian they can only be perfectivized – if at all – by the delimitative procedural verb delimiting the temporal extent of the given macro-situation:

- (4) [Gde Igor'?] On nemnogo / časa dva povydaval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> studentam knigi i ušel<sup>PF</sup>.  
'[Where is Igor?] He handed out books to the students for a while / for about two hours and left.'
- (5) Včera Igor' snačala nemnogo poprygal<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> s vyški, a potom poplaval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup>.  
'Yesterday Igor first jumped from the diving board for a while and then swam.'
- (6) Poprinimajte<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> èto lekarstvo po tri tabletki večerom i posmotrim<sup>PF</sup>, kak vy sebja budete čuvstvovat'<sup>IPF</sup>.  
'Take three pills of this medicine every evening (for a while) and we will see how you are.'

In what follows, I elaborate on the lowest form in this hierarchy of reclassification, which is the recategorization of actionality by temporal distributivity. An IMPF. achievement-predication with an inner argument in the singular such as

- (7) *Kogda ja vošel<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' vybrasyval<sup>IMPF</sup> važnoe pis'mo.*  
 'As I came in Igor was throwing away an important letter.'

must be classified as absolute-terminative, that is, as telic. It can be modified neither by a non-inclusive durative adverbial such as *dva časa* 'for two hours', nor by phase-verbs such as *načat'* 'to begin' or *perestat'* 'to stop'. If, on the other hand, the inner argument is in the plural, e.g., *pis'ma* 'letters', then this example permits two different interpretations.

- (8) *Igor' vybrasyval<sup>IMPF</sup> starye pis'ma.*  
 'Igor 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 a non-durative telic predication, i.e., an achievement-predication related not to a single letter, but to a group of letters.

Second, however, the plural of our example (8) permits also a distributive reading. 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 which is a compound of several achievements. This series of achievement-events is related to a specific time-interval and thus united into a macro-event. By this temporal-distributive interpretation, the elementary predication is recategorized with regard to its actionality. In contrast to the elementary predication (7), it denotes a situation with duration. Therefore, it is compatible with non-inclusive durative adverbials (8a) and phase verbs (8b):

- (8) a. *Igor' časa dva vybrasyval<sup>IMPF</sup> starye pis'ma.*  
 'Igor was throwing away old letters for about two hours.'  
 b. *Igor' načal<sup>PF</sup> vybrasyvat'<sup>IMPF</sup> starye pis'ma.*  
 'Igor has begun to throw away old letters.'

In Russian, this recategorization of the actionality of a predication in cases of temporal distributivity 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 perfectivized by the paired PERF. verb:

- (9) a. *Igor' snačala vybrosil<sup>PF</sup> starye pis'ma, a potom prinjalsja<sup>PF</sup> za fotografii.*  
 'First of all Igor threw away the old letters and then began on the photos.'

However, in the temporal-distributive reading, the predication can be perfectivized not only by its paired perfective verb but also by a delimitative procedural:

- (9) b. *Igor' snačala nemnogo povybrasyval<sup>PF-DELM</sup> starye pis'ma, a potom prinjalsja<sup>PF</sup> za fotografii.*  
 'First of all Igor threw away old letters for a while and then began on the photos.'

This kind of temporal-distributive recategorization of predications is also possible with objects consisting of mass nouns, because the entities denoted by mass nouns are also divisible. A mass noun can denote several entities, as can a distributively interpreted plural. For an example such as

- (10) Kogda ja prišiel<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' brosal<sup>IMPF</sup> v vodu pesok sovkom.  
 'As I came Igor was throwing sand into the water with a shovel.'

this would mean that the sand is thrown into the water bit by bit. A third possibility for recategorizing the actionality in a temporal-distributive way exists if the complement does not denote a given individual "token" but rather the "type" of the denoted entity:

- (11) Bibliotekar' nemnogo povydaval<sup>PF-DELM</sup> studentam novyj učebnik, a potom zakryl<sup>PF</sup> biblioteku.  
 'The librarian handed out the new textbook to the students for a while and then closed the library.'

Not only achievement-predications but also accomplishment-predications allow a temporally distributive recategorization of their actionality by distributive reference to several entities which are involved in a situation gradually, one after another. With accomplishment-predications such as *sažat' derevo* 'plant a tree', there is ordinarily no association with a homogeneous activity, as we have seen. That is why perfectivization by the delimitative procedural is excluded when referring to a single situation. However, if the predication refers to several entities – in our example to several trees planted one after the other – then again we have a recategorization and a temporal bounding by the delimitative procedural is possible:

- (12) [Gde Igor'? – Ne znaju.]  
 On nemnogo posażal<sup>PF-DELM</sup> dererev'ja i ušel<sup>PF</sup>.  
 '[Where is Igor? – I don't know.]  
 He planted trees for a while and left.'

Predications interpreted as temporal-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 is the amount of entities involved. Thus we have an 'incremental relation' [nakopitel'noe sootnošenie], as Ju. S. Maslov had already described in 1948: "*Každaja častica dejstvija neposredstvenno otlagaet v ob'ekte sootvetstvujuščuju časticu rezul'tata*" ['Each part of the action implies a corresponding part of the result for the object'] (Maslov 2004 [1948]: 85). In our example *Igor' vybrasyval starye pis'ma* 'Igor threw away old letters', the plural *pis'ma* 'letters' in the distributive reading is a *secondary increment* derived by temporal distributivity. Predications having such an interdependence between the temporal extent of the situation and the increase or decrease of the quantity of the entities involved in the situation have been thoroughly discussed in formal semantics (Krifka 1989, Dowty 1991, Partee 1997, Filip 1999, see also Padučeva 2004). These discussions have shown that the classification of an incremental predication as

terminative or aterminative can depend on whether the increment involves a bounded or unbounded quantity. If the secondary increment in an example such as *He threw away old letters* involves an unbounded quantity, then we have an aterminative 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 terminative interpretation of this example, and thus a modification by an inclusive durative adverbial, presupposes that the secondary increment involves a bounded quantity: *He threw away the letters in half an hour*.

In Russian, the classification of a temporal-distributive predication as terminative or aterminative, as determined by the bounded or unbounded quantity, is relevant for the category of aspect. If the extent of the secondary increment is not bounded, then, as we have seen already, perfectivization with the paired PERF. verb is excluded. Perfectivization is possible only with a delimitative procedural verb, which, for its part, is only compatible with a non-inclusive durative adverbial:

- (13) a. Bibliotekar' časa dva povydaval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> studentam knigi i zakryl<sup>PF</sup> biblioteku.  
 'The librarian handed out books to the students for about two hours and closed the library.'

Perfectivization of temporal-distributive predications with paired PERF. verbs presupposes that the secondary increment involves a quantity bounded in its extent. In this case, the predication in Russian can be modified only by an inclusive durative adverbial:

- (13) b. Bibliotekar' vydal<sup>PF</sup> knigi za polčasa.

Perfectivized by the paired PERF. verb, the secondary increment *knigi* 'books' must necessarily involve a bounded quantity. That is why in example (13b), in languages having an article, such as English or German, the increment needs a definite article or another marker of definiteness:

- (13) c. The librarian handed / has handed out *the* books in half an hour.  
 Der Bibliothekar händigte *die* Bücher in einer halben Stunde aus /  
 hat *die* Bücher in einer halben Stunde ausgehändigt.

Thus, it would seem that, for predications interpreted in a temporal-distributive way, there is an interdependency between a bounded increment and a terminative interpretation, on the one hand, and an unbounded increment and an aterminative interpretation, on the other hand. In what follows, I show that there is no such straightforward interdependency. It is correct to say that predications with an unbounded increment only permit an aterminative interpretation in Russian and thus can only be perfectivized by a delimitative procedural verb. However, predications with a bounded increment are hybrid in their actionality. They can be interpreted both as terminative and

aterminative and thus perfectivized not only by the paired PERF. verb but also by the delimitative procedural. In what follows, I show under what conditions an aterminative reading and thus perfectivization by a delimitative procedural verb is possible for predications with a bounded secondary increment.

In order to show that predications with a secondary incremental complement bounded in its extent by numerals or other expressions of measure allow an aterminative interpretation, we start by considering the so-called *aktual'no-dlitel'noe značenie* [ongoing reading] of the IMPF. aspect, because it is this use of the IMPF. aspect for which the compatibility between bounded complements and aspect has been discussed in detail (A. Wierzbicka (1967) for Polish, A.D. Košelev (1996) and E.V. Padučeva (1996, 1998) for Russian, H. Filip (1999: 254–259) for Czech).

### 3. The IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading and bounded complements

The so-called actual-ongoing [*aktual'no-dlitel'noe*] or synchronic use of the IMPF. aspect is present if the IMPF. aspect, used in its “event-in-process” meaning, is related to a so-called focalization point, a point which includes the situation in question. I term this use of the Russian IMPF. aspect *focalized-processual*, following the terminology of the Eurotyp Project 20-6 “Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe” (Dahl 2000), as this use of the IMPF. aspect is very much comparable with (although not identical to) the English progressive in its focalized-processual reading.<sup>6</sup> The primary point of focus for the focalized-processual use of the IMPF. aspect is the moment of speech. A secondary point of focus could be specified in the past and future with temporal adverbials such as *v dva časa* or with predications in the PF. aspect: *V dva časa / Kogda ja vošel<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' zapolnjal<sup>IMPF</sup> anketu* ‘At two o'clock / As I came in Igor was filling in a form’. In the case of the focalized-processual use of the IMPF. aspect, the situation in question is presented as being ongoing at this point of focus, i.e., after the beginning and before the end. Whether the situation will continue after the point of focus remains open. Accomplishment-predications referring to a single situation with the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading denote a situation only partially realized at the point of focus. In the case of achievement-predications, the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect, when possible, denotes the preliminary activity preceding a situation, suggesting that the event will soon occur, though it is not occurring at the point of focus.

---

6. Dahl et al. (2000) differentiate between focalized and durative *progressivity*. On account of the political connotations which the term *progressive* has, especially in Russian, I have substituted the term *progressive* by the term *processual*.

Predications in which the IMPF. aspect is used in its focalized-processual reading are not compatible with an incremental complement bounded in its extent. For Russian, A.D. Košelev (1996: 169) has shown this by comparing the following examples:

- (14) Maša varit <sup>IMPF</sup> 100 gr. mjasa.  
‘Masha is cooking 100 g. of meat.’
- (15) #Maša est <sup>IMPF</sup> 100 gr. mjasa.  
‘Masha is eating 100 g. of meat.’

Both predications have an inner argument bounded in its extent and both predications denote a change-of-state, but in Russian, without some further contextual information only (14) is an acceptable statement. The reason for this is that in contrast to (15), the denoted change-of-state in (14) is not related to the quantity but the quality of the meat. Thus, there is no incremental relation in M. Krifka’s terms.<sup>7</sup> The whole amount of meat is involved in the change-of-state in question from the very beginning. The quite possible change of the meat in its extent during the cooking is irrelevant for this predication. In contrast, in example (15), there is a change-of state which directly involves the extent of the meat, and thus an incremental relation. As it is hardly possible to put the entire 100 g. of meat in your mouth at once, in a situation denoted by *est’ 100 gr. mjasa* ‘eating of 100 g. meat’, we have a parallel between the temporal duration of the situation and the amount of meat consumed. The meat will be eaten gradually and thus the quantity of the meat eaten will gradually increase. The actual amount consumed, as denoted by the incremental complement, can only be determined when the situation in question has ended. However, using the *impf.* aspect in its focalized-processual reading means that the situation denoted is presented before its possible end. In other words, there is a contradiction between the focalized-processual *impf.* aspect denoting the situation before its end and the information about the amount of the meat eaten, which will only be known after the situation has reached its end. This is why an example like (15) is not acceptable without some further context.<sup>8</sup>

---

7. 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 (to appear)). I use the term *increment* and *incremental relation* in the first sense. There is an incremental relation if the extent of the entities involved in the situation increases or decreases with temporal duration and thus the change-of-state is related to the extent of the entities denoted.

8. Of course, example (14) could be related to the quantity specified in its extent and thus be understood as an incremental relation, too. This would be the case if the 100 gr. meat is not being cooked together but one piece after another. In this interpretation, the complement

The use of the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading is also excluded in the case of activity-verbs bounded with measure expressions of space or time, and thus having a culmination point:

- (16) [Gde Igor'?]–#On begaet <sup>IMPF</sup> dva kilometra.  
 '[Where is Igor?]-He is running two kilometres.'
- (17) [Kogda ja prišel <sup>PF</sup>, Igorja ne bylo.] #On begal <sup>IMPF</sup> dva časa.  
 '[When I arrived Igor wasn't there.] He was running two hours.'

For these predications, it is also true that the de-facto length or duration of running can be determined only after the situation has ended.

Without some further context, predications with mass nouns that are individuated by container expressions, such as *butylka* 'bottle' or *tarelka* 'plate', do not allow the IMPF. aspect in a focalized-processual reading either, because such container expressions are understood as measure expressions in this context, i.e., non-referentially (Birkenmaier 1978, Padučeva 1996: 191):<sup>9</sup>

- (18) [Gde Igor'? – Na kuxne.] #On p'et <sup>IMPF</sup> butylku piva.  
 '[Where is Igor? – In the kitchen.] He is drinking (one) bottle of beer.'
- (19) #Kogda ja vošel, Igor' el <sup>IMPF</sup> tarelku salata.  
 'As I came in Igor was eating (one) plate of salad.'

*Pit' butylku piva* means 'to drink *one* bottle of beer', where the numeral is not emphasized by contrast accent.

To summarize, predications with an incremental complement bounded in its extent do not seem to allow the use of the IMPF. aspect in its ongoing reading. Without further contextual information, the IMPF. aspect must be read as a historical present, as a habitual or an existential in all these examples.

Distributive-temporal predications denoting macro-situations with a bounded secondary incremental complement are subject to the same restrictions. If the entities bounded in their quantity are involved in the situation in question one after another, the use of the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect is likewise precluded. Using the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading, an example such as (20), without some further context, can only mean that the three eggs are being boiled at the same time and not one after the other, this means that the plural of the complement must be understood collectively.

---

*100 gr. mjaso* '100 gr. meat' is an increment and without further context the use of the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-progressive reading is impossible.

9. For the shift from container-expressions to measure-expression cf. V. Borschev & B. Partee 2001, 147–151.

- (20) [Gde Igor'? – Na kuxne.]  
 On varit <sup>IMPF</sup> tri jajca, kotorye ja emu dal.  
 '[Where is Igor? – In the kitchen.]  
 He is boiling three eggs I gave him.'

This predication does not refer to three events which are realized one after another, but rather to one event in which the three eggs are involved as a group. Thus, the *IMPF.* aspect denotes the process which precedes the actual change-of-state and all the three entities are involved in this process collectively. In contrast to (20), accomplishment-predications in examples such as (21–23) denote situations which cannot be realized simultaneously in the real sense of the word.

- (21) [Gde Igor'? – Na kuxne.]  
 On est <sup>IMPF</sup> dva jajca, kotorye ja emu prigotovil <sup>PF</sup>.  
 '[Where is Igor? – In the kitchen.]  
 He is eating two eggs I have made for him.'
- (22) V dannyj moment Igor' est <sup>IMPF</sup> dva banana.  
 'At the moment Igor is eating two bananas.'
- (23) Kogda ja vošel, Igor' zapolnjal <sup>IMPF</sup> tri ankety, kotorye emu dali <sup>PF</sup> v konsul'stve.  
 'As I came in Igor was filling in three forms given to him at the consulate.'

Of course, you can find situations for these predications, which analogous to (20) make a strictly simultaneous reading possible. In the case of example (21) there could be a simultaneous reading when the two eggs are used for an omelette or scrambled eggs, and in example (23) this is possible if the three forms are being duplicated with carbon paper. However, without such an explanatory context, the situations denoted are understood as not being realized simultaneously in the real sense of the word, i.e., the plural of the complement must be interpreted as a distributive plural. A distributive interpretation of the plural means that the situations denoted are pluralized. The most obvious reading would then be that the situations involved occur one after the other. If this were so, we would have an incremental relation. However, it is precisely this interpretation that is precluded when using the *IMPF.* aspect in its focalized-processual reading. Without some further context, these examples will be interpreted in such a way that each of the denoted entities is involved alternately in the situation, and none of the counted events may have reached its culmination point at the point of focus. In other words, the *IMPF.* aspect in its focalized-processual reading is distributively related to each of the counted events. This means that neither (24b) nor (24c) could occur as a continuation of (24a).

- (24) a. [Gde Igor'? – Na kuxne.]  
 On raskrašivaet <sup>IMPF</sup> dve kartinki, kotorye emu dali <sup>PF</sup>.  
 [Where is Igor? – In the kitchen.]  
 'He is colouring two pictures given to him.'



- b. #Vtoruju on ešče ne načal<sup>PF</sup> raskrašivat'<sup>PF</sup>.  
 'The second one he has not started colouring yet.'
- c. #Pervuju on uže raskrasil<sup>PF</sup>.  
 'The first one he has already finished.'

Example (24b) is excluded because, continued in this way, we must understand the complement *dve kartinki* 'two pictures' as a secondary increment. But this contradicts the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading, since continuing the example in this way would mean that only one picture is involved in the process described at the point of focus. 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. Example (24c) could not be used as a continuation of the text either. When the IMPF. aspect is used in its focalized-processual reading, the situations denoted are presented having begun but not yet completed. For an accomplishment-predication such as *raskrašivat' kartinku* 'to colour a picture', that means that the situations denoted are only partially realized at the point of focus. Thus, neither of the pictures can be finished.

When the IMPF. aspect is used in its focalized-processual reading, predications that have a mass noun bounded by measure expressions as a complement can also only be understood so that the denoted entities are involved in the situation somehow alternately. An example such as (25a) cannot be understood in such a way that the cups are emptied one after the other.

- (25) a. Kogda ja vošel<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' pil<sup>IMPF</sup> dve čaški čaja.  
 'As I came in Igor was drinking two cups of tea.'

At any rate, neither of the two cups can in any way have been finished at the point of focus. Thus, it becomes clear that using the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading, each of the situations is presented in its ongoing process.

To summarize, all the examples we have discussed up to now seem to confirm a thesis repeatedly formulated for the Slavic languages: Predications with an incremental complement bounded in its extent cannot be presented as progressive, as ongoing. In other words, the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading and an incremental complement bounded in its extent by numerals or other expressions of measure would seem to be mutually exclusive.

In fact, this is not the case. There are contexts in which the IMPF. aspect occurs in its focalized-processual reading and bounded complements can be understood as increments related to the extent of the situation. This is always the case if the complement bounded in its extent is introduced by the possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his', as shown by contrasting the examples (26a) and (26b):

- (26) a. [Gde Igor'? – Na kuxne.] #On p'et<sup>IMPF</sup> čašku čaja.  
 '[Where is Igor? In the kitchen.] He is drinking a cup of tea.'
- b. [Gde Igor'? – Na kuxne.] On p'et<sup>IMPF</sup> svoju čašku čaja.  
 '[Where is Igor? – In the kitchen.] He is drinking *his* cup of tea.'

The same is true for activity verbs bounded with measure expressions of time or space:

- (16) a. [Gde Igor'?] – #On begaet <sup>IMPF</sup> dva kilometra.  
'[Where is Igor?]' – He is running two kilometres.'  
b. [Gde Igor'?] – On begaet <sup>IMPF</sup> *svoi* dva kilometra.  
'[Where is Igor?]' – He is running *his* two kilometres.'

And even predications involving several entities bounded in their extent permit a successive reading if the complement is introduced with a possessive pronoun; this means the complement could then be understood incrementally:

- (25) b. *Kogda ja vošel* <sup>PF</sup>, Igor' pil <sup>IMPF</sup> *svoi* dve čaški čaja.  
'As I came in Igor was drinking *his* two cups of tea.'  
(21) b. Igor' est <sup>IMPF</sup> *svoi* dva jajca.  
'Igor' is eating *his* two eggs.'

A statement such as that in (22a) contains a contradiction if it is without the possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his'.

- (22) a. #V dannyj moment Igor' est <sup>IMPF</sup> dva banana. Odin on uže s'el <sup>PF</sup>.  
'At the moment Igor is eating two bananas and he has already finished one of them.'

If both of the bananas are involved in an ongoing process, then neither of them can be finished. But if the complement bounded in its extent is modified by the possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his', then the banana-example permits such a reading:

- (22) b. V dannyj moment Igor' est <sup>IMPF</sup> *svoi* dva banana. Verojatno, on odin uže s'el <sup>PF</sup>.  
'At the moment Igor is eating *his* two bananas. Probably, he has already finished one of them.'

The question is why this should be so. Why can these predications with a complement modified by a possessive pronoun be understood as incremental relations? The reason for this is that predications with an increment introduced by the possessive pronoun *svoj* 'his' can be understood in such a way that the denoted ongoing situation occurs frequently, more or less regularly. As a result, the extent of the entities denoted by the incremental complement is already determined at the point of focus. 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 focalized-processual meaning with an incremental complement bounded in its extent. But he adds that its use is always possible if, as he says, "the subject is performing an activity that has been measured before".<sup>10</sup> This is

---

10. 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

also true for the focalized-processual use of the IMPF. aspect in Russian. If the extent of the entities denoted by the incremental complement has been predetermined at the focalization point, then the IMPF. aspect can be used in its focalized-processual reading. Knowledge of the extent of the entities denoted by the incremental complement beforehand 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 context or the situation. E.V. Padučeva (1998: 79) observes that the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading can be used if, as she says, the bounded complement has a “marker of definiteness”. In fact, all the examples discussed could be interpreted as an incremental relation if the complement is introduced by the demonstrative pronouns *étot* ‘this’ or *tot* ‘that, this’. The reason is that by using these pronouns there is a reference to an amount already specified in the context or situation beforehand and therefore known at the point of focus. The demonstrative pronoun *étot* can have both an exophoric as well as an endophoric function and thus refer to an amount given in the context or the situation:

- (22) c. [Segodnja utrom ja dal <sup>PF</sup> Igorju dva banana.] V dannyj moment on est <sup>IMPF</sup> *éti* dva banana. Verojatno, odin on uže s”el <sup>PF</sup>.  
 ‘[I gave Igor two bananas this morning.] At the moment he is eating *these* two bananas. Probably he has already finished one of them.’

The demonstrative pronoun *te* ‘these’ has a cataphoric function and thus refers to the information given in the following relative clause. This information is assumed to be known and necessary for the identification of the amount denoted.

If reference is made to an amount already specified in the pretext, then the plural in an achievement-predication such as (27) can also be interpreted distributively and thus the predication could be understood as an incremental relation:

- (27) V dannyj moment Igor’ vydaet <sup>IMPF</sup> *te* desjat’ knig, kotorye prišli <sup>PF</sup> iz drugoj biblioteki. Dve iz nix on uže vydal.  
 ‘At the moment Igor is handing out *the* ten books which came from another library. Two of them he has handed out already.’

This predication denotes several events which are realized one after the other. Thus, we have an incremental relation, and the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading is not related to each of the events, but collectively to the totality, to the sum of these counted events. In this case, how many of the counted events have taken place at the focalization point remains open, as the continuation of the dialog shows.

---

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.

In contrast to achievement-predications, accomplishment-predications denote situations with a process-component. Therefore, the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading can involve each of the counted sub-situations. But, as we have seen, without further context a predication such as (28a) must be understood in such a way that the pictures are being coloured alternately and neither of them has reached its inherent boundary at the point of focus.

- (28) a. Kogda ja vošel<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' rasskrašival<sup>IMPF</sup> tri kartinki.  
 'As I came in Igor was colouring three pictures.'

If, on the other hand, the extent of the entities denoted by the complement is determined by endophoric or exophoric reference, then an accomplishment-predication with a bounded complement can be understood in a manner analogous to the achievement-predication in (27) as an incremental relation. This means that the pictures are coloured one after another. In this case, the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect no longer involves each of the counted events individually, but involves the collective sum of these events, i.e., the macro-event consisting of three sub-events. In this case, the number of sub-events already realized at the focalization point remains open. Possible continuations of our examples show this, as in e.g., (28b):

- (28) b. Kogda ja vošel<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' rasskrašival<sup>IMPF</sup> *te* tri kartinki, kotorye ja emu dal<sup>PF</sup>. Tretjuju on ešče ne načal<sup>PF</sup> raskrašivat'<sup>IMPF</sup>.  
 'As I came in Igor was colouring *the* three pictures I gave him. He hadn't started colouring the third one yet.'

From this it follows that accomplishment-predications with a complement involving several entities that are determined in their extent beforehand always allow two readings. A predication such as (29) can refer to several events which are realized alternately.

- (29) V dannyj moment Igor' perevodit<sup>IMPF</sup> *te* tri pis'ma, kotorye on polučil<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul'stva.  
 'At the moment Igor is translating *the* three letters which he received from the consulate.'

In this case, there is no incremental relation. In this reading – which is also possible if the extent of the entities involved in the situation is not determined beforehand – the IMPF. aspect, in its focalized-processual reading, is related to each of the counted events. All of them are presented as ongoing and none of them can have reached its result at the focalization point:

- (29) a. V dannyj moment Igor' perevodit<sup>IMPF</sup> (*te*) tri pis'ma, kotorye on polučil<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul'stva. Poka on ni odnogo iz nix ne perevel<sup>PF</sup>.  
 'At the moment Igor is translating (*the*) three letters which he received from the consulate. He hasn't translated any of them yet.'

Moreover, these predications can involve several events which are realized one after another. In the latter, the IMPF. aspect is related collectively to the sum of all these counted events:

- (29) b. V dannyj moment Igor' perevodit<sup>IMPF</sup> *te* tri pis'ma, kotorye on polučil<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul'stva. Vtoruju on ečše ne načal<sup>PF</sup> perevodit'<sup>IMPF</sup>.  
 'At the moment Igor is translating *the* three letters which came from the consulate. He hasn't even started translating the second one yet.'

To sum up, it has been shown that predications with an incremental complement measured in its extent allow the use of the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect only if the extent is already determined at the point of focus. With this in mind, let us return to our original question. Is it possible to interpret predications with bounded incremental complements as atterminative? And if it is possible, what are the conditions necessary for perfectivization with delimitative procedural verbs?

#### 4. The IMPF. aspect in its durative-processual reading and bounded complements

Predications with a focalized-processual IMPF. aspect denote situations that are only partially realized at the point of focus. Bounding with PERF. verbs is therefore impossible. However, the IMPF. aspect in its process meaning is not restricted to the focalized-processual reading. It can also be used in this function in predications that do not involve a point of focus, but an interval that includes the denoted situation. I will call this use of the IMPF. aspect, following the Eurotyp project 20-6 "Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe" (Dahl 2000), *durative-processual*.<sup>11</sup> A comparison of the following examples reveals the difference between these two uses of the IMPF. aspect:

- (30) Kogda ja vernulsja<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' raskrašival<sup>IMPF</sup> kartinku.  
 'When I came back Igor was colouring a picture.'  
 (31) Segodnja utrom Igor' raskrašival<sup>IMPF</sup> kartinku.  
 'This morning Igor was colouring a picture.'

---

11. It is important to make a difference between the durative-processual and the *evaluative-processual* use of the IMPF. aspect. The evaluative-processual use of the IMPF. aspect is present if the predication informs us about the speed in which a situation is realized, i.e., if there is a relation between the duration of the situation and the extent of the entities and thus the completion of the situation is evaluated as quick or slow: *Predstav' sebe! Odnu anketu on zapolnjal<sup>IMPF</sup> celyj čas = Emu ponadobilos' celyj čas dlja zapolnenija odnoj ankety*, Just imagine. He has been filling in one form for a whole hour = He has needed one hour to fill in one form. Evaluative-processual predications can not be perfectivized with delimitative procedural verbs.

In example (30), the IMPF. aspect is used in its focalized-processual reading. The temporal sub-clause has two functions. First, it provides the temporal location of the situation in question, and second, the focalization point to which the predication is oriented. The time denoted by the temporal sub-clause *Kogda ja vernulsja* ‘As I came back’ is included in the temporal stretch of the situation denoted by the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect, and this situation is viewed as still in progress at the relevant moment. If we are dealing with an absolute-terminative and thus a telic predication, then the predication with the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect denotes a situation which has not achieved its result, i.e., a situation only realized partially at the point of focus. If in the context of (30), the PERF. aspect is used instead of the IMPF. aspect, then, with this perfectivization, a change of the temporal localisation of the situation in question occurs:

- (30) a. *Kogda ja vernulsja*<sup>PF</sup>, Igor’ uže raskrasil<sup>PF</sup> kartinku.  
 ‘When I came back, Igor had already coloured a picture.’

In this case, the situation in question is no longer localized simultaneously but before the point of temporal orientation. The temporal sub-clause *kogda ja vernulsja* ‘when I came back’, in this case, is merely a point of temporal orientation and not a point of focus.

In example (31), on the other hand, we have the durative-processual use of the IMPF. aspect. The adverbial *segodnja utrom* ‘this morning’ is only the temporal frame, which includes the situation presented by the durative-processual IMPF. aspect. The IMPF. predication denotes a situation which was going on for an indefinite length of time during the interval in question. In contrast to the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect, it is unclear whether the denoted situation has reached its culmination point during the relevant period of time. It could be a situation which has reached its culmination point, but also one which has not reached this point. The possible text continuations make this clear:

- (31) a. *Segodnja utrom Igor’ raskrašival*<sup>IMPF</sup> kartinku.  
 On raskrasil<sup>PF</sup> ee do konca. / On ee do konca ne raskrasil<sup>PF</sup>.  
 ‘This morning Igor was colouring a picture.  
 He finished colouring it. / He didn’t finish colouring it.’

As the translation of (31a) shows, the same is true for the English progressive used in its durative-processual reading. A predication such as *Last year / When I was in Boston John was writing a book* contains no information as to whether the book was finished during the relevant period of time, cf. A. Mittwoch 1988: 229.

The focalized-processual and durative-processual uses of the IMPF. aspect can be differentiated in the future tense as well:

- (32) *Kogda ty prideš*<sup>PF</sup>, ja budu perevodit’<sup>IMPF</sup> tekst, kotoryj prišel<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul’stva.  
 ‘When you come I will be translating the text which came from the consulate.’
- (33) *Zavtra utrom ja budu perevodit’*<sup>IMPF</sup> tekst, kotoryj prišel<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul’stva.  
 ‘Tomorrow morning I will be translating the text which came from the consulate.’

In example (32), the IMPF. predication is related to the point of focus specified by the temporal sub-clause in the IMPF. aspect. This point of focus is included in the temporal stretch of the situation presented in the IMPF. aspect. The IMPF. predication denotes a situation only partially realized at this point of focus. Thus, with perfectivization we have again a change in the temporal localisation. Using the PF. aspect the temporal sub-clause is no longer a focalization point, but merely a point of temporal orientation and the denoted situation is located before this point:

- (32) a. Ja uže perevedu<sup>PF</sup> tekst, kogda ty prideš<sup>PF</sup>.  
 ‘I will have translated the text already by the time you come.’

In example (33), on the other hand, the IMPF. aspect is used in its durative-processual reading. The adverbial *zavtra utrom* ‘tomorrow morning’ denotes again only the frame for the situation represented in the IMPF. aspect. The predication refers to a situation that will continue for an indefinite period of time during the interval denoted by the adverbial *tomorrow morning* and we get no information as to whether or not the situation will have been finished during this interval.

As the IMPF. aspect used in the durative-processual reading provides no information as to whether or not the situations ended during the time denoted, situations that ended during the interval in question permit perfectivization. Terminative predications are perfectivized with the paired PF. verb, and ateterminative predications with a delimitative procedural verb. For predicates that are hybrid in their actionality, such as *raskrasivat’ kartinku* ‘to colour a picture’ or *perevodit’ tekst* ‘to translate a text’ both possibilities exist:

- (34) a. Segodnja utrom Igor’ raskrasil<sup>PF</sup> kartinku.  
 ‘This morning Igor coloured a picture.’  
 b. Segodnja utrom Igor’ nemnogo poraskrašival<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> kartinku i pošel igrat’.  
 ‘This morning Igor coloured a picture for a while and went out to play.’
- (35) a. Zavtra utrom ja perervedu<sup>PF</sup> tekst, kotoryj prišel<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul’stva, i poidu<sup>PF</sup> v universitet.  
 ‘Tomorrow morning I will translate the text which came from the consulate and go to university.’  
 b. Zavtra utrom ja nekotroie vremja poperevožu<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> tekst, kotoryj prišel<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul’stva, i poidu<sup>PF</sup> v universitet.  
 ‘Tomorrow morning I will translate the text which came from the consulate for a certain time and go to university.’

If paired PERF. verbs are used, we are clearly informed that the situations in question have reached (34a) or will reach (35a) their point of culmination during the time denoted and thus are conceptualized as including their termination. However, if perfectivization results from a delimitative procedural verb, then the predication only refers to the activity causing the denoted change-of-state and we are informed that this activity was

(34b) or will be terminated (35b) during the relevant time interval. Whether the situation in question has reached or will reach its point of culmination during the relevant interval remains unclear. The situation is only temporally bounded.

As we have seen, predications with the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect denote situations that are only partially realized at the focalization point. However, predications with the durative-processual IMPF. aspect denote situations, for which it remains unclear whether or not the termination of the situation is included during the relevant interval. From this it follows that in the durative context predications that do *not* reach termination during the relevant interval can only be presented in the IMPF. aspect. However, situations that reach termination during the relevant interval can be presented both in the PERF. and the IMPF. aspect, as the durative-processual use of the IMPF. aspect leaves it unclear whether the denoted situation reaches termination or not. Thus, for terminative predications denoting situations which have reached their inherent culmination point, in the durative context there is possible to present identical events from different perspectives. Using the PERF. aspect for an absolute-terminative (telic) predication such as *peredvigat' pianino* 'to move the piano', we focus on the achievement of the culmination point, as in (36); using the IMPF. aspect, we focus on the process of the situation, which might well have reached its inherent boundary, as in (37):

- (36) –Vy našli<sup>PF</sup> novoe mesto dlja pianino?  
 –Da, my ego peredvinuli<sup>PF</sup>.  
 –‘Did you find a new position for the piano?’  
 –Yes, we did. We moved it.’
- (37) –Čto éto byl za šum včera za stenoj?  
 –Naši sosedi peredvigali<sup>IMPF</sup> pianino.  
 –‘What was that noise yesterday in the neighbour flat?’  
 –Our neighbours were moving the piano.’

Now let us return to the question posed above. What are the conditions for using the IMPF. aspect in its durative-processual reading in predications with an incremental complement bounded in its extent? As we have seen, the IMPF. aspect in its focalized-processual reading is only compatible with an incremental complement if the extent of the entities involved in the situation is determined at the point of focus. In a similar way, this condition applies to the IMPF. aspect in its durative-processual reading as well. Without further context, an example such as

- (38) Včera ja perevodil<sup>IMPF</sup> tri pis'ma, kotorye prišli iz konsul'stva.  
 ‘Yesterday I was translating three letters which came from the consulate.’

cannot be understood as involving an incremental relation without some further context, despite the distributive interpretation of the plural since the IMPF. aspect in the durative-processual reading involves each of the counted events in the same way as it does in the focalized-processual reading. Thus, all of the counted entities must be involved in the situation simultaneously. Without some further context, our example cannot be continued in the following manner:



- (38) b. #Poslednee ja ešče ne načal<sup>PF</sup> perezodit'<sup>IMPF</sup>.  
 'I haven't even started translating the last one yet.'

Despite these similarities between the focalized- and the durative-processual IMPF. aspect, there is an important difference between these two uses. A predication in the focalized-processual, such as (39a) denotes three events which are partially realized at the point of focus.

- (39) a. Kogda ja vošel<sup>PF</sup>, Igor' perezodil<sup>IMPF</sup> tri pis'ma, kotorye prišli<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul'stva.  
 'As I came in Igor was translating three letters which came the consulate.'

None of them can have reached its culmination at the focalisation-point. In contrast, when the impf. aspect is used in its durative-processual reading, how many of the counted events have reached their point of culmination remains unclear, because they are not assessed relative to a point of focus:

- (39) b. –Čto ty včera delal<sup>IMPF</sup>?  
 –Včera ja perezodil<sup>IMPF</sup> tri pis'ma, kotorye prišli<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul'stva.  
 –'What were you doing yesterday?'  
 –'Yesterday I was translating three letters which came from the consulate.'

An adverbial such as *včera* 'yesterday' is only the temporal frame that includes the situation presented by the durative-processual IMPF. aspect. This predication with the durative-processual IMPF. aspect does not exclude the termination, i.e., the complete realization of the denoted events. In our example all, some, or none of the events may have reached their point of culmination. To provide precise information, we must use the paired PF. verb. As a predication in the durative-processual IMPF. aspect leaves open whether the denoted situations have reached their point of culmination or not, situations that are completed can be presented in a durative context both as perfective and imperfective:

- (39) c. Včera ja perevel<sup>PF</sup> / perezodil<sup>IMPF</sup> tri pis'ma, kotorye prišli<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul'stva.  
 'Yesterday I translated / was translating three letters which came from the consulate.'

Using the IMPF. aspect, we focus on the process, using the PERF. aspect, we focus on the result. However, the speaker is not absolutely free in his choice of the perspective. Consider the following example:

- (39) d. –Počemu u tebjā takoj ustaljy vid?  
 –Ja perezodil<sup>IMPF</sup> tri složnyx pisem, kotorye prišli<sup>PF</sup> iz konsul'stva.  
 –'Why are you looking so tired?'  
 –I have been translating three difficult letters which came from the consulate.'

In this context we would expect the IMPF. aspect, even if the letters are finished, because the tiredness can be better explained with the activity of translating than with the result.

As we have seen, a complement bounded in its extent can only be understood incrementally if its extent is determined at the point of focus. This condition applies in a similar fashion to the IMPF. aspect in its durative-processual reading. If the number of the entities involved in the situation is not determined beforehand in an example such as (40a) there would be no coherent text.

- (40) a. Igor' vsego polčasa zapolnjal <sup>IMPF</sup> tri ankety, kotorye emu dali <sup>PF</sup> v konsul'stve. #Poètomu poslednjiju on ešče daže ne načal <sup>PF</sup> zapolnjat' <sup>IMPF</sup>.  
 'Igor was filling in three forms given to him at the consulate, but for half an hour only. That is why he hadn't even started filling in the last one yet.'

However, if the complement is modified by a marker of definiteness and thus refers to an amount specified beforehand, then we have a coherent text, as the predication with a complement determined in its extent beforehand can be interpreted as an incremental relation:

- (40) b. Igor' vsego polčasa zapolnjal <sup>IMPF</sup> *te* tri ankety, kotorye emu dali <sup>PF</sup> v konsul'stve. Poètomu poslednjiju on ešče daže ne načal <sup>PF</sup> zapolnjat'.  
 'Igor was filling in *the* three forms given to him at the consulate, but for half an hour only. That is why he hasn't even started filling in the last one yet.'

In this case, the IMPF. aspect in its durative-processual reading does not refer to each of the counted events individually, but collectively to their totality, to their sum. From our observations it follows that accomplishment-predications with a complement related to a predetermined amount of entities in the durative-processual reading of the IMPF. aspect always have two different interpretations, analogous to the focalized-processual IMPF. aspect. First, the durative-processual IMPF. aspect can be related to each of the counted events distributively:

- (41) a. [V gostinice na vtorem ètaže desjat' numerov.]  
 Gorničnaja vsego polčasa ubirala <sup>IMPF</sup> ix (= èti desjat' numerov), a potom polučila <sup>PF</sup> drugoe zadanie. Poètomu poslednie dva ona do konca ne ubrala <sup>PF</sup>.  
 '[There are ten rooms on the first floor of the hotel.]  
 The chambermaid was tidying them (= these ten rooms) for half an hour only and then she was given another job. That is why she hasn't finished the last two rooms.'

Second, it can be an incremental predication, where the durative-processual IMPF. aspect is collectively related to the sum of the counted events. In this second interpre-

tation, there is no information as to how many of the numerically specified entities were involved in the situation, i.e., how far the chambermaid had got in her work:

- (41) b. [V gostinice na vtorem ètaže desjat' nomerov.]  
 Gorničnaja vsego polčasa ubirala <sup>IMPF</sup> ix (= èti desjat' nomerov), a potom polučila <sup>PF</sup> drugoe zadanie. Poètomu ona tak i ne načala <sup>PF</sup> ubirat' poslednie dva nomerov.  
 '[There are ten rooms on the first floor of the hotel.]  
 The chambermaid was tidying them (= these ten rooms) for half an hour only and then she was given another job. That is why she hasn't started tidying the last two rooms.'

### 5. The perfectivization of predications with bounded complements by means of delimitative procedural verbs

One should expect that a predication with an incremental complement bounded in its extent can be interpreted only as absolute-terminative (telic). If a given amount of entities bounded in its extent is involved in a situation gradually, incrementally, then the criterion of arbitrary divisibility is not fulfilled, since, by dividing the amount, we have different amounts (as long as it is not halved). However, predications with an incremental complement bounded in its extent do allow such an aterminative interpretation and therefore also a perfectivization with delimitative procedural verbs, as shown in the following examples:

- (42) [My dali Igorju pjat' desjat knig.]  
 On minut desjat' povydaval <sup>PF-DELIM</sup> ix (= èti 50 knig) i ušel <sup>PF</sup>.  
 '[We gave Igor fifty books.] He handed them out for about ten minutes and left.'

- (43) [V nasledstve ot otca Igor' polučil PF bolee dvuxsot pisem i očen' mnogo fotografij.] Segodnja utrom on nemnogo povybrasyval PF-DELIM eti pis'ma i prinjalsja PF za fotografii.  
 [Igor has inherited more than two hundred letters from his father and a lot of photos.] This morning he threw away these letters for a while and began on the photos.

In these examples, the anaphoric pronoun *ix* 'them' and the complement *eti pis'ma* 'these letters' refer to entities established in the previous text. Thus, the predication involves a definite amount of entities and therefore denotes a heterogeneous situation that does not fulfill the criterion of arbitrary divisibility. Nevertheless, as the examples show, perfectivization with a delimitative procedural verb is possible and, as we have seen, such delimitative verbs can only perfectivize predications in which the situation in question is conceptualised as homogeneous. Thus, we have the same situation that was described earlier for elementary hybrid predications such as *zapolnjat' anketu* 'to fill in a form' or *perevodit' pis'mo* 'to translate a letter'. These changes-of-state are also characterised by the fact that they can be conceptualised both as absolute-terminative (accomplishments) and as aterminative (activities). As we have seen, this possibility exists only if the denoted changes-of-state include a homogeneous activity. The same is true for predications with a secondary increment bounded in its extent. These predications can be interpreted as homogeneous because, in predications with a secondary increment, the activity causing the change-of-state of the macro-event consists of a repetition of more or less identical sub-events. Handing out a greater amount of books to many students means repeatedly handing out one or more books. In the same way, a temporal-distributive predication such as *throwing away more than two hundred letters for about two hours* implies that one or more letters are thrown away repeatedly, and thus also implies the presence of an activity compounded from similar phases. Since such predications with a secondary increment imply the corresponding homogeneous activity, they are hybrid in their actionality and therefore can be perfectivized not only with their paired IMPF. verb but also with a delimitative procedural verb:

- (42) a. [My dali Igorju pjat' desjat knig.]  
 On vydal PF *ix za desjat' minut* i ušel PF.  
 On povydaval PF-DELIM *ix minut desjat'* i ušel PF.  
 '[We gave Igor fifty books.]  
 He handed them out *in ten minutes* and left.  
 He handed them out *for about ten minutes* and left.'
- (43) a. [V nasledstve Igor' polučil bolee dvuxsot pis'em ot svoego otca.]  
 On vybrosil PF *ix za desjat' minut*.  
 On *nemnogo* *ix povybrasyval* PF-DELIM *i prinjalsja* za fotografii.  
 '[Igor inherited more than two hundred letters from his father.]  
 He threw them away *in ten minutes*.  
 He threw them away *for a while* and began on the photos.'

If perfectivization is effected with the paired PF. 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 predication with a secondary increment (i.e., a distributive interpretation of the plural). The reason is that by perfectivizing with a paired PF. verb, only the reaching of the culmination point is relevant. However, if perfectivization is effected with a delimitative procedural verb, then the complements *knigi* ‘books’ and *pis'ma* ‘letters’ must be understood distributively. The reason is that only a distributive interpretation of the plural allows predicates such as *vydavaj' knigi* ‘handing out books’ or *vybrasyvat' pis'ma* ‘throwing away letters’ to involve a homogeneous activity. If perfectivized with a delimitative procedural verb, these predications involve this homogeneous activity in connection with the denoted changes-of-state, and this activity is bounded temporally. Since predications perfectivized 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 continuations (42c) of example (42) show:

- (42) c. –My dali<sup>PF</sup> Igorju 50 knig. On povydaval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> ix minut desjat' i ušel<sup>PF</sup>.  
 –On vse vydal<sup>PF?</sup>  
 –Da, vydal<sup>PF</sup> vse. / Net, vrode vsego polovinu.  
 –‘We gave Igor fifty books. He handed them out for about ten minutes and left.  
 –Has he handed out all of them?  
 –Yes, all of them. / No, only about half of them.’

I intentionally chose examples such as *handing out fifty books* or *throwing away two hundred letters* in which the complement involves a relatively high number of individual entities. If the complement in the examples (42) and (43) refers to a relatively low number of entities, perfectivization with the delimitative procedural verb is hardly possible. There are two different reasons for this. Due to our world knowledge, predications such as *vybrasyvat' tri pis'ma* ‘throwing away three letters’ is usually understood in such a way that the three letters are thrown away together so that the plural is interpreted collectively. In this case, the complement is not a secondary increment. We are dealing with an achievement-predication denoting a singular situation and perfectivization with a delimitative procedural verb is therefore impossible. But even if the plural *tri pis'ma* ‘three letters’ is interpreted distributively, and there is thus a secondary increment, the macro-situation arising does not necessarily imply a homogeneous activity, because it is not necessarily the case that one letter is thrown away each time. The number of the letters thrown away each time can change. Therefore, for temporal-distributive predications involving low numbers of entities the condition for homogeneity is not necessarily fulfilled.

As we have seen, changes-of-state, as they are denoted by IMPF. elementary hybrid predications, such as *obsuždat' vopros* ‘to discuss a question’ *raskrašivat' kartinku* ‘to colour a picture’ or *zapoln'jat' anketu* ‘to fill in a form’, are connected to a homogenous

activity on the basis of our world knowledge and therefore can be perfectivized not only with their paired PF. verbs but also with delimitative procedural verbs:

- (44) a. Deputaty obsudili<sup>PF</sup> pervyj vopros za desjat' minut.  
'The deputies discussed the first question in ten minutes.'
- b. Deputaty poobsuždali<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> pervyj vopros minut desjat' i zakryli<sup>PF</sup> sobranie.  
'The deputies 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 perfectivized with a delimitative procedural verb, as I will illustrate with one last example:

- (45) [V povestku dnja vxodilo<sup>IMPF</sup> pjat' voprosov.]  
Deputaty nemnogo poobsuždali<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> èti voprosy i zakryli<sup>PF</sup> sobranie.  
'[There were five questions on the agenda of the meeting.]  
The deputies 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 our example, then perfectivization with the delimitative procedural verb can collectively refer to the totality, i.e., to the sum of the situations 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:

- (45) a. Deputaty poobsuždali<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> èti voprosy vsego polčasa i zakryli<sup>PF</sup> sobranie.  
Pravda, obsudili<sup>PF</sup> ne vse. Do dvux poslednix ne došli<sup>PF</sup>. /  
Obsudili<sup>PF</sup> nesmotrja na limit vremeni vse.  
'The deputies 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 haven't even started discussing. /  
In spite of the shortness of time they discussed all of them.'

On the other hand, perfectivization of our example with the delimitative procedural verb can refer to each of the counted entities involved in the situation. In this case, there is no incremental relation and therefore the number of the entities involved in the situation need not be determined beforehand. 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 have been discussed for a while but it is unclear how many have been finished:

- (45) b. Deputaty poobsuždali<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> èti voprosy vsego polčasa i zakryli<sup>PF</sup> sobranie. Obsudili<sup>PF</sup> do konca vsego tri voprosa.

‘The deputies discussed these questions for half an hour only and closed the meeting. They finished discussing only three of them.’

In this case, the numeral has wide scope relative to the delimitative procedural verb and the latter is distributively related to each of the counted sub-situations.

This second interpretation, in which the delimitative procedural verb refers distributively to each of the situations counted, is excluded in principle for achievement-predications, as they do not have a process-component. You cannot finish handing out a book. For accomplishment-predications such as *sažat’ derevo* ‘to plant a tree’ or *stavit’ palatku* ‘to pitch a tent’ it is excluded, too, because the situations denoted by these accomplishments are not usually connected with a homogeneous activity. That is the reason why an example such as (46) is self-contradictory.

- (46) \*Igor’ nemnogo povydaval<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> knigi, no ni odnoj ne vydal<sup>PF</sup>.  
 ‘Igor handed out books for a while but didn’t hand out a single one.’

An achievement-predication such as *vydavat’ knigi* ‘handing out books’ can only be perfectivized 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 (46), example (47) is an acceptable statement:

- (47) Igor’ nemnogo pozapolnjal<sup>PF-DELIM</sup> ankety, no ni odnoj ne zapolnil<sup>PF</sup>.  
 ‘Igor filled in forms for a while, but didn’t fill in a single one (completely).’

The phrase *zapolnjat’ anketu* ‘to fill in a form’ is an elementary accomplishment-predication that is hybrid in its actionality and can be interpreted both as terminative and aterminative. Therefore, the delimitative procedural verb can refer distributively to each of the sub-situations, which is not possible for achievement-predications.

## Summary

1. Describing the aspect category in Russian, it is essential to distinguish between actional and aspectual boundedness, or in terms of C. Smith (1991), between “situation aspect” and “viewpoint aspect”. Terminative predications denote changes- of-states, – situations with a point of culmination and thus temporally heterogeneous situations, i.e., situations for which the criterion of arbitrary divisibility is not valid. As a rule, IMPF. terminative predications have a paired perfective verb which denotes that the corresponding situation has reached its point of culmination. On the other hand, IMPF. aterminative predications denote temporally homogeneous situations for which the criterion of arbitrary divisibility is satisfied. They can be perfectivized, if at all, only with aspectual procedurals.
2. Russian has predications which are hybrid in their actionality, i.e., predications which can be read as either terminative or aterminative. This is the case if the

activity causing the denoted change-of-state can be conceptualized as homogeneous, i.e., if the activity consists of several repeated events that are more or less identical. In principle, hybrid predications in Russian can be perfectivized by both their paired PF. verb and the delimitative procedural verb.

3. The classification of a predication as terminative or aterminative is not only a question of the semantics of the verb. Elementary predications that are terminative can be recategorized by referring to repeated events. In this paper I have described one of these possibilities, the recategorization of inherently terminative predications by temporal distributivity, i.e., recategorization by reference to several entities which are not simultaneously involved in the situation in question, but sequentially, one after another. If such a recategorization occurs, then the relation is incremental. In this case, the complement is a derived and thus secondary increment.
4. When the IMPF. aspect occurs in its processual reading, complements bounded in their extent by numerals or expressions of measurement can be interpreted as a secondary increment only if the extent of the entities denoted is determined from the context or the situation. In this case, the IMPF. aspect refers collectively to the sum of the sub-events, and how many of these sub-events are involved in the denoted macro-event remains unclear.
5. If the secondary increment is not bounded in its extent, then a temporal-distributive predication is aterminative. It can be bounded only temporally and allows, if at all, perfectivization only 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, if the secondary increment involves a relatively high number of entities. In this case, predications with a bounded incremental complement entail the corresponding activity. Therefore, they permit not only a terminative but also an aterminative interpretation and can thus be perfectivized not only with their paired IMPF. verb, but, in principle, with their delimitative procedural verb as well.

## Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Anita Mittwoch, Barbara Partee, Susan Rothstein, Stephen Dickey and Sergej Tatevosov for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. I am also grateful to Natalia Lange for her help as a native speaker. They are in no way responsible for any shortcomings that remain.

## References

- Anstatt, T. 2001. Die Quantelung des zweiten Arguments im Russischen. Der Typus s''est' jabloko – poest' supu. In *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik IX*, T. Daiber (ed.), 7–30. München: Sagner.



- Bach, E. 1986. The algebra of events. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9: 5–16.
- Beck, G. 1987. *Verb – Satz – Zeit. Zur temporalen Struktur der Verben im Französischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Bertinetto, P.M. & Squartini, M. 1995. An attempt at defining the class of ‘gradual completion verbs’. In *Temporal Reference, Aspect and Actionality*, Vol. 1: *Semantic and Syntactic Perspectives*, P.M. Bertinetto et al. (eds.), 11–26. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Birkenmaier, W. 1978. “Wodkaflasche” und “Flasche Wodka” auf Russisch. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* XVI: 219–228.
- Bogusławski, A. 2004. Small is beautiful: A note on small events. In *Tipologičeskie Obosnovanija v Grammatike*, A.P. Volodin (ed), 61–75. Moskva: Znak.
- Bolinger, D. 1973. Essence and accident. In *Issues in Linguistics: Papers in Honour of Henry and Renee Kahane*, B.B. Kachru et al. (eds.), 58–69. Urbana IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Bondarko, A.V. 1986. Semantika predela. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 35: 14–25.
- Bondarko, A.V. 1997. Semantika vida i tendentivnaja / netendentivnaja predel’nost’ glagolov. In *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida*, S. Karolak (ed.), 31–48. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP.
- Borschev, V. & Partee, B.H. 2001. Genitive modifiers, sorts, and metonymy. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 24: 140–160.
- Braginsky, P. & Rothstein, S. To appear. Vendler classes and the Russian aspectual system. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*.
- Breu, W. 2005. Verbalaspekt und Sprachkontakt. Ein Vergleich der Systeme zweier slavischer Minderheitssprachen (SWR/MSL). In *Slavistische Linguistik 2003*, S. Kempgen (ed.), 37–95. München: Sagner.
- Bulygina, T.V. 1982. K postroeniju tipologii predikatov v russkom jazyke. In *Semantičeskie tipy predikatov*, O.N. Seliverstova (ed.). Moskva: Nauka.
- Chaput, P.R. 1990. Temporal semantic factors affecting Russian aspect choice in questions. In *Verbal Aspect in Discourse*, N.B. Thelin (ed.), 285–306. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carlson, G. 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English*. Amherst MA: University of Massachusetts.
- Dahl, Ö. (ed.). 2000. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, Euro-Typ 20-6*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Declerck, R. 1979. Aspect and the bounded/unbounded (telic/atelic) distinction. *Linguistics* 17: 761–794.
- Depraetere, I. 1995. The effect of temporal adverbials on (a)telicity and (un)boundedness. In *Temporal Reference, Aspect and Actionality*. Vol. 1: *Semantic and Syntactic Perspectives*, P.M. Bertinetto et al. (eds.), 43–53. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Dowty, D.R. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Filip, H. 1999. *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Nominal Reference*. New York: Garland.
- Galton, A. 1984. *The Logic of Aspect. An Axiomatic Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Glasbey, S. 1996. The progressive: A channel-theoretic analysis. *Journal of Semantics* 13: 331–361.
- Goldsmith, J. & Woisetschlaeger, E. 1982. The logic of the English progressive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 79–89.
- Janda, L. 2007. Aspectual Clusters of Russian Verbs. *Studies in Language* 31(3): 607–648.
- Jayez, J. 1999. Imperfectivity and progressivity: The French imparfait. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) IX*, T. Matthews & D. Strolovich (eds.), 145–162. Ithaca NY: Cornell University.
- Košelev, A.D. 1996. Referencial’nyj poxod k analizu jazykovyx značenij. *Moskovskij lingvističeskij al’manax* 1: 82–194.

- Krifka, M. 1989. *Nominalreferenz und Zeitkonstitution*. München: Fink.
- Lehmann, V. 1999. Aspekt. *Handbuch der sprachwissenschaftlichen Russistik und ihrer Grenzdisziplinen*, H. Jachnow (ed.), 214–242. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Maslov, Ju. S. [1948] 2004. *Izbrannye trudi*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- 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 situaciji posredstvom kvantifikaciji: K upotrebleniju delimitivnogo sposoba dejstvija v ruskom jazyke. In *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida IV. Sbornik materialov konferencii "Slavjanskij vid i leksikografija"*, Hamburg 2001 [Slavolinguistica 7], V. Lehmann (ed.), 235–276. München: Sagner.
- Mittwoch, A. 1988. Aspects of English aspect: On the interaction of perfect, progressive and durational phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11: 203–254.
- Nübler, N. 1992. *Untersuchungen zu Aktionsart und Aspekt im Russischen und Tschechischen*. Regensburg: Roderer.
- Padučeva, E.V. 1996. *Semantičeskie issledovanija*. Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj 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 ruskaja aspektologija. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5: 46–57.
- Partee, B. 1997. Vid i interpretacija imennyx grupp. *Trudy aspektologičeskogo seminara filologičeskogo fakul'teta MGU*, Vol. 3, M. J. Čertkova (ed.), 121–140. Moskva: MGU.
- Petruchina, E.V. 2000. *Aspektual'nye kategorii glagola v ruskom jazyke*. Moskva: Izd. Moskovskogo universiteta.
- Rothstein, S. 2004. *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schlegel, H. 1999. *Zur Rolle der Terminativität/Aterminativität (T/AT) im Aspekt- und Aspektbildungssystem der russischen Sprache der Gegenwart*. München: Sagner.
- Šeljakin, M.A. 1983. *Kategorija vida i sposoby dejstvija ruskogo glagola. Teoretičeskie osnovy*. Tallin: Valgus.
- Sémon, J.-P. 1986. 'Postojat' ou la perfectivité de congruence: Définition et valeurs textuelles. *Revue des études slaves* LVIII: 609–635.
- Smith, C.S. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Strawson, P.F. 1959. *Individuals*. London: Methuen.
- Tatevosov, S.G. 2002. The parameter of actionality. *Linguistic Typology* 6: 315–401.
- Vendler, Z. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1967. On the semantics of the verbal aspect in Polish. *To Honour Roman Jakobson*, 2231–2249. The Hague: Mouton.
- Zucchi, S. 1999. Incomplete events, intensionality and imperfective aspect. *Natural Language Semantics* 7: 179–215.