

## ARTICLES

## Expressing Ingressivity in Slavic: The Contextually-Conditioned Imperfective Past vs. the Phase Verb *stat'* and Procedural *za-*\*

Stephen M. Dickey

*Abstract.* This article discusses different modes of expressing ingressivity in the Slavic languages—the grammatical expression of ingressivity (by means of imperfective verb forms) and its lexical expression (by means of the use of *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb or perfective procedural verbs prefixed with *za-*)—and relates them to one another as two competing systems. It is shown that these phenomena are in complementary distribution: languages that employ the contextually-conditioned imperfective past to a high degree only employ *stat'* and *za-* to express ingressivity to a very low degree or not at all, and vice-versa. More specifically, the contextually-conditioned imperfective past is characteristic of the extreme western end of Slavic (Czech, Slovak, Sorbian, Slovene), whereas *stat'* and *za-* are characteristic of an eastern group of languages (Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Bulgarian); two languages (Polish and Serbo-Croatian) occupy a “transitional” position between the two groups. Finally, the respective modes of expressing ingressivity are discussed within the theory of Slavic aspect developed in Dickey 1997.

### 0. Introduction and Theoretical Background

In Dickey 1997, I examined Slavic aspectual usage in several categories of discourse context—repeated events, the general-factual, the historical present, the scenic present and other kinds of instructions, performatives and other cases of coincidence, the use of imperfectives in sequences of events, and also the effect of aspect semantics on the derivation of verbal nouns—and presented abundant evidence that Slavic aspect is not a monolithic phenomenon. Rather, the Slavic languages pattern into two distinct groups: an eastern group (Ru, Uk, Br, Bg)<sup>1</sup> and a western group (Cz, Sk, Sor, Sn); Pol and SC are transitional zones between them.

---

\* I would like to thank Susan Kresin, Gary Toops, and Charles Townsend for valuable comments on a conference presentation of this paper. I am also grateful to Lilia Burganova (Russian), Boris Kovatchev (Bulgarian) and Dariusz Tołczyk (Polish) for production of and/or comment on examples. Two anonymous *JSL* reviewers also gave many helpful criticisms. Of course, none of the above are responsible for any errors or inaccuracies contained in this paper.

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used in this article:

ipf imperfective	Cz Czech	Sk Slovak
pf perfective	Pol Polish	Sn Slovene
Bg Bulgarian	Ru Russian	Sor Sorbian
Br Belarusian	SC Serbo-Croatian	Uk Ukrainian

On the basis of details of aspectual usage in the different languages, I offered a theory of the semantic meaning of aspect in the respective groups. In the western group, the pf aspect views a situation as an integral, complete whole (**totality**, the meaning often ascribed to the pf in all of Slavic), and the ipf aspect carries a meaning of the assignability of a situation to more than one point in time (**quantitative temporal indefiniteness**). In the eastern group, the pf aspect views a situation as a complete whole occupying a single, *unique* point in time relative to other situations in the fact structure of a discourse (**temporal definiteness**), and the ipf aspect expresses the contradictory opposite, the inability of a situation to be assigned to a single, unique point in time (**qualitative temporal indefiniteness**). For details, the reader is referred to Dickey 1997. This discussion will relate one of the parameters I discussed, the (primarily ingressive) use of ipf verbs in sequences of events, and compare it to the use of *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb and ingressive procedural verbs in *za-*.

The theory of language employed in this discussion is that of Cognitive Grammar (CG; for details, see Langacker 1987). In CG, meaning is what motivates all aspects of language and its use. The meanings of linguistic units are categories, which have internal structure. A category's internal structure is centered around a **prototype**, a term which has already acquired different meanings in different analyses; this discussion employs Taylor's (1990: 529) slight modification of Langacker's (1987: 371) definition: a prototype is a "**mental representation (possibly, one quite rich in specific detail)** of a typical instance of a category, such that entities become assimilated to the category on the basis of perceived similarity to the prototype" [my emphasis—SMD].

Dickey 1997 argues that the prototype of the eastern pf is temporal definiteness, as defined above, and that the prototype of the eastern ipf is qualitative temporal indefiniteness. Further, in the western languages, the prototype of the pf is totality; the prototype of the western ipf is quantitative temporal indefiniteness. This discussion will not hinge on the issues motivating such a prototype approach to Slavic aspect (the interested reader is referred to Dickey 1997). What is important here is that these categories of totality and temporal definiteness form the central semantic mechanisms of the respective aspectual categories in the various languages, motivating different strategies in expressing ingressivity.

The relationship of aspect to lexico-semantic types of predicates will be relevant in section 2 and elsewhere. Since Vendler 1957, verbs have generally been divided into four classes: states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements. States are "nondynamic situations without

natural conclusions" (e.g., know, hate); activities are "dynamic processes where any part is of the same nature as the whole" (e.g., dance, read); accomplishments are "goal directed situations [...] characterized by the presence of an activity preceding the end-point" (e.g., read a book, walk a mile); achievements are "instantaneous leaps from one state into another without an accompanying activity" (e.g., notice, begin).<sup>2</sup>

## 1. The Contextually-Conditioned Imperfective Past

In his 1961 study, Svetomir Ivančev described for the first time in detail the widespread use of ipf verbs in Cz to denote events occurring in sequence. He labeled this phenomenon the "contextually conditioned ingressive use of imperfective verbs in Czech" (*kontekstovo obuslovena ingresivna upotreba na glagolite ot nesvâršen vid v češkija ezik*; henceforth **contextually-conditioned ipf past** or **CCIP**).<sup>3</sup> Ivančev's study is in fact more than a treatment of Cz: he also discusses the phenomenon in a majority of the modern Slavic languages, as well as in Old Church Slavic (Old Bulgarian), Old East Slavic (Old Russian) and Old Czech. Outside of Cz and Sk the CCIP is less common and reaches a minimum in the east (Ru and Bg). On the basis of cross-Slavic data for the CCIP, Ivančev divides Slavic into a western group (consisting of Cz, Sk, and Sor) and an eastern group (consisting of East Slavic and Bg) and considers Pol, Sn and SC to be transitional zones in the north and south (respectively), even using that very term (*prehodna zona*; Ivančev 1961: 49).

In the following sections, the CCIP is described largely on the basis of Ivančev's excellent collection of data, examined and then explained in terms of the theory of aspect offered in Dickey 1997. Then, an examination is made of *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb and ingressive procedural verbs in *za-* in the various Slavic languages. The distributions of the CCIP on the one hand, and of the special ingressive verbs on the other are found to be complementary, and the division is then incorporated into the theory of aspect offered in Dickey 1997.

### 1.1. The Contextually-Conditioned IpF Past in Czech

In its broadest definition, the Cz contextually-conditioned ipf past is the use of an ipf past-tense form in narrated sequences of events, where some

<sup>2</sup> The descriptions here are Brecht's (1984: 10–11) concise paraphrases of Vendler 1957.

<sup>3</sup> The reason for omitting the word "ingressive" of the original is that, as pointed out below, ingressivity is not in fact the core meaning of the form, but rather one contextual interpretation. I specify past, since this discussion is limited to past-tense narratives.

other Slavic languages (Ru and Bg, for instance) generally require a pf form or strongly prefer it. Ivančev (1961: 5) observes:

In its purest and simple form this phenomenon occurs in complex clauses, in which the predicates of individual simple clauses, joined by the conjunction *a* ['and'], are in the past tense (preterite), have one and the same subject (either singular or plural), and the first is a verb of the perfective aspect which denotes the completion of an action, whereas the one immediately following the conjunction *a* is a verb of the imperfective aspect and denotes an ingressive action, the beginning of the action that is expressed by the verb.<sup>4</sup>

The following example is representative:

- (1) Zvedl<sup>p</sup> se tedy a šel<sup>i5</sup> k východu.

'Then he got up and went to the exit.'

[Cz; Ivančev 1961: 11; Drda, *Městečko na dlani*]

As noted in a number of studies (e.g., Ivančev 1961; Galton 1976; Stunová 1993), motion verbs account for a large number of occurrences; however, verbs of other types are quite common:

- (2) Sedl<sup>p</sup> si a psal<sup>i</sup>.

'He sat down and started writing.'

[Cz; Ivančev 1961: 6]

The examples to be considered here are largely limited to Ivančev's basic structure, which involves a "pf verb... *a* + ipf verb", although what is really important is the presence of a predicate coded as ipf in a sequence of foregrounded events.

Ivančev (1961: 5–6) emphasizes that, in his opinion, the expression of ingressive actions in sequences of events in Cz is more commonly expressed by means of ipf forms than by the combinations of phase verb + infinitive or other kinds of ingressive procedural verbs exemplified in (3):

- (3) a. Sedl<sup>p</sup> si a začal<sup>p</sup> psáti.

'He sat down and began to write.'

<sup>4</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all translations and glosses are my own.

<sup>5</sup> Czech specialists almost unanimously consider Cz *jít* 'go' to be ipf. For details, the reader is referred to Bondarko 1961 and Kopečný 1961.

- (3) b. Sedl<sup>p</sup> si a rozepsal<sup>p</sup> se.  
 'He sat down and got started writing.' [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 6]

Křížková 1963: 287 seconds his opinion.

Although the CCIP often occurs in contexts where ingressivity is an appropriate interpretation, several studies (Ivančev 1961: 83; Křížková 1963: 287; Galton 1976: 70; Stunová 1993: 107) point out that ingressivity is not necessarily expressed, i.e. it is not an entailment. Other aspectual nuances are possible, even, according to Stunová, "terminativity". In the context of a narrative sequence containing pf forms, the presentation of an action from within its midst via an ipf form leaves the immediately prior beginning of that action as an inference. In this regard, Křížková's (1963: 287) observations on the connection to ingressivity are particularly helpful:

In cases when it is impossible in Russian or especially in Bulgarian to leave ingressivity unexpressed, in the Czech linguistic consciousness [ingressivity] does not come to the fore. Only on the basis of a logical analysis and comparison with other languages does a Czech determine that he is actually expressing an action which in another Slavic language is conceptualized as in its beginning. What a speaker of Russian or Bulgarian conceptualizes as a beginning action is felt by a speaker of Czech to be neutral with respect to ingressivity, lacking an explicit meaning of the beginning of an action. Between perfective actions, which are projected onto the time axis as points, imperfective verbs appear as [linear stretches]; the speaker actually stylizes the [action] in such way that it is impossible to be conceived synoptically with its beginning and end, **we are, as it were, in the middle of it.** [emphasis mine—SMD]

The first sentence of Křížková's remark means that, in cases where Cz uses an ipf form which is often interpreted as expressing ingressivity, Ru and Bg necessarily view these actions as ingressive, and must express this by means of pf phase verbs (e.g., Ru *načat'*, *stat'* 'begin') or special ingressive procedural verbs (e.g., Ru *zaigrat'* 'start playing', *pojti* 'set out [on foot]'). This will be illustrated in examples in 1.2.

The idea of viewing a situation as from within its midst is particularly important; Stunová (1993: 126–27) gives this concept the label *in medias res* (the term adopted here). Another important effect of the CCIP

on the textual level is what Galton (1976: 70) calls the **continuity of action**: “the ipf. verb makes the action join on immediately to the preceding one, almost without a seam”. Ivančev (1961: 82) describes the CCIP in compatible terms: “Above all, this mode of expression enables actions occurring successively to be presented **without clearly defined contours**, whereas their concrete aspectual semantics are only alluded to...” [emphasis mine—SMD]. In my view, these are the most salient and relevant properties of the CCIP; although each scholar characterizes the phenomenon in his or her own way, their intuitions are complementary and often overlap, expressing the same idea in different terms.

Before examining concrete instances, however, it should be pointed out that some of the adduced examples may be explained effectively in other ways. This is Galton’s (1976: 69) opinion: “Ivančev has collected many excellent examples to illustrate his ‘contextually-conditioned’ function of the ipf. past, but different interpreters will, needless to say, explain some of his illustrations differently, e.g., *verba dicendi* and related ones need not belong here, others are clearly conative, etc.” Yet, as Galton goes on to say, given the abundance of examples there can be no doubt that this is a real phenomenon in Cz. One case which I do think is worth separating from more canonical instances is one which Stunová includes in the category of *in medias res*; in my opinion it belongs more properly to backgrounding than to sequences of foregrounded events. Stunová includes many examples in which the ipf past is introduced by *když* ‘when’. Consider (4):

- (4) Ale když už jsem **seděl**<sup>i</sup> ve vagóně a vlak se hnul<sup>p</sup>, já jsem se, pane, dal<sup>p</sup> do breku jako malý kluk...

‘When I was already sitting in the car and the train lurched forward, I began sobbing, sir, like a little boy...’

[Cz; Stunová 1993: 142; Čapek]

In this case it is doubtful that the ipf form denotes a **foreground event** sandwiched between other foregrounded pf forms; in my opinion this ipf verb (as well as the pf *se hnul*) sets up a (new) static background against which other sequential (perfective) events will be foregrounded. The presence of *když* ‘when’ suggests that *seděl* is simply functioning to form the background of an episode. Such cases can also be found in Ru narratives, even within Stunová’s discussion:

- (5) Kogda ja uže **sidel**<sup>i</sup> v vagone, poezd tronulsja<sup>p</sup>, i tut ja zaplakal<sup>p</sup>...

[Ru; = (4)]

Ivančev does not include cases of stative ipf past forms introduced by *když* ‘when’ in his data (note that they do not conform to his original definition), and I think that they are best treated separately as cases of backgrounding.<sup>6</sup> This discussion will be limited to examples that appear to be most representative of the phenomenon, leaving out *verba dicendi* and other arguably marginal types.<sup>7</sup>

Let us now examine some further examples of the CCIP. Although the CCIP usually occurs after a pv past-tense verb within a single sentence, Stunová gives a rather interesting example of *three* ipf forms denoting foregrounded events:

- (6) *Když me viděl<sup>i</sup>, poroučel<sup>i</sup> se té paničce a šel<sup>i</sup> ke mě.*

‘When he saw me, he took leave from the lady and came up to me.’

[Cz; Stunová 1993: 112; Čapek]

Stunová observes that the “interpretation of a sequence is preferred here”. This is certainly true: no one would claim that the events depicted are strictly simultaneous. However, my informants confirmed that the events are easily interpreted as “partially overlapping”, and in fact preferred this interpretation. Accordingly, the interpretation is that the man began taking his leave while still looking at the narrator. Informants also confirm Galton’s idea of the seamless continuity of the actions, i.e. the smooth transition from one action to the next, as opposed to a clear articulation of events occurring in strict sequentiality. The latter must be coded as pf in Cz as well:

- (7) *Když me uviděl<sup>p</sup>, odporoučel<sup>p</sup> se té paničce a přistoupil<sup>p</sup> ke mě.*

[Cz; Stunová 1993: 112 = (6)]

Galton gives another example of the continuity of action:

<sup>6</sup> It should be kept in mind that narratives are not all neatly divisible into two simple categories of backgrounded and foregrounded actions. Thelin (1990) subdivides foreground into **actual foreground** and **contextual foreground**, and background into **actual background** and **proper background** (for details, see Thelin 1990: 22–29). In addition, narratives often consist not a single episode, but of several constituent, self-contained episodes (Koschmieder’s (1979: 143) term is *Knoten* ‘knots’ of events), each of which contains its own background and foregrounded events. In examples such as (4) and (5), the ipf form is part of the introduction of a new episode, forming a background against which new foregrounded events will appear.

<sup>7</sup> Ivančev himself (1961: 79) suggests that *verba dicendi* should probably be treated separately.

(8) Hasiči přestali<sup>p</sup> stříkat, zatroubili<sup>p</sup> a jeli<sup>i</sup> domu.

‘The firemen stopped spraying water, sounded the horn and went home.’  
[Cz; Galton 1976: 70; Čapek]

Here Galton observes that there is no “joint” between the signal and the fire brigade’s incipient ride home—they gave the signal as they were setting into motion. One may consider the effect of *in medias res* in the following manner: by placing the reader’s perspective in the midst of an action which directly follows another, the beginning boundary of the second action is ignored or defocused, not only yielding the smoothness of transition mentioned by Galton, but also allowing the related interpretation of partial overlap of the actions.

## 1.2 The Contextually-Conditioned Ipf Past in Other Languages

Ivančev (1961: 40–48) provides abundant data from other West and South Slavic languages. According to Ivančev, the CCIP is most characteristic of Cz, but is well-represented in the other West Slavic languages. Sk examples are given in (9):

(9) Chytil<sup>p</sup> ma za ruku a t’ahal<sup>i</sup>.

‘He grabbed me by the arm and started pulling.’  
[Sk; Ivančev 1961: 44; Ondrejov, *Šibeničné pole*]

However, Ivančev notes his impression that Sk employs the CCIP somewhat less than Cz, occasionally opting for a pf verb or a pf phase verb + infinitive:

(10) a. Ujo Gajdošik ma schytil<sup>p</sup> okolo hrdla a pohli<sup>p</sup> sme sa na mesto.

‘Uncle Gajdošik grabbed me by the throat and we left for the city.’  
[Sk; Ivančev 1961: 45; Ondrejov, *Šibeničné pole*]

b. Zašvihol<sup>p</sup> som prútom a začal<sup>p</sup> som zaháňat’ pochabý krdlik na mesto.

‘I lashed with the switch and began to drive the raucous little herd into the town.’

[Sk; Ivančev 1961: 45; Ondrejov, *Šibeničné pole*]

The phenomenon is also represented in Upper and Lower Sor. Examples are given in (11) and (12):



- (11) Zeńdźechmoj<sup>p</sup> na łubju a **čakachmoj**<sup>i</sup> z nowa.  
 ‘We went down to the deck and started waiting again.’  
 [Upper Sor; Ivančev 1961: 46; Łaras, *Zastojčki*]
- (12) Šwjela zejmej<sup>p</sup> šapku a **bjatowašo**<sup>i</sup> “Woše naš”.  
 ‘Šwjela took off his hat and started praying the *Pater noster*.’  
 [Lower Sor; Ivančev 1961: 46; *Chrestomatija dolnoserbskego pismowstwa*]

In (9, 11–12) we see that in the other languages of the western group the CCIP is fairly well-represented.

Ivančev (1961: 48) considers Sn to be the beginning of a transitional zone that includes SC. He implies that the CCIP is less frequent in Sn than Cz, but points out that he did not have access to extensive data. Thus, a precise description of Sn in this respect still needs to be made. Representative Sn examples are given in (13):

- (13) a. Marijan je zgodaj ustal<sup>p</sup>, poklical<sup>p</sup> psa s seboj in **šel**<sup>i/p</sup> čez travnik.  
 ‘Marijan got up early, called his dog to him and went through the meadow.’  
 [Sn; Bajec et al. 1971: 202]
- b. Župan je naslonil<sup>p</sup> plečati hrbet na klop in **je gledal**<sup>i</sup> mrko.  
 ‘The mayor leaned his broad back on a bench and watched darkly.’  
 [Sn; Ivančev 1961: 48; Cankar]

Indicative of the relative rarity of the CCIP in Sn is the fact that it apparently occurs to a greater degree with the verb of motion *iti* ‘go’, and not as frequently with other types of verbs. A complicating factor is that Sn *iti* appears to be biaspectual (as is the SC equivalent *ići*), so that the only clear examples of the phenomenon are those with unambiguously ipf verbs, such as (13b).

On the basis of Pol translations of Cz originals as well as Pol originals, Ivančev (1961: 41) determines that the CCIP “is not completely unknown to Polish, but [...] it is relatively very rare and consequently [...] an element of the style of individual writers” (the emphasis on the individual styles of Pol writers was seconded by my informant). He observes that the dialect background of an individual writer determines the extent of his predilection for the CCIP. He also notes that in Pol the CCIP occurs primarily with verbs of motion. The examples in (14) are representative of motion verbs:

- (14) a. ... i wnet wysunęła<sup>p</sup> się kobiecina niska, okryta szarą płachtą i **szła**<sup>i</sup> po ławie, płaczący za wodę...
- ‘... and soon a low woman emerged, wrapped in a grey sheet, and went along the bench, crying, for water...’
- [Pol; Ivančev 1961: 41; Orkan, *Komornicy*]
- b. Poszedł<sup>p</sup> w las, a Małwa wybiegł<sup>p</sup> na drogę i jak szalony **pędził**<sup>i</sup> ku Morzelanom.
- ‘He went into the forest, but Małwa ran out onto the road and rushed as if mad toward Morzelany.’
- [Pol; Ivančev 1961: 41; Dygasiński, *Zajac*]

Ivančev also gives examples from other types of verbs, e.g.:

- (15) a. Jakub usiadł<sup>p</sup> na łóżku i **szlochał**<sup>i</sup>.
- ‘Jakub sat down on the bed and started sobbing.’
- [Pol; Ivančev 1961: 42; Nałkowska, *Niecierpliwi*]
- b. Czerwony krzyż w Lublinie wyłamał<sup>p</sup> nareszcie furtkę na pole umęczonych więźniów, **dostarczał**<sup>i</sup> chorym pożywnych zup i...
- ‘The Red Cross in Lublin finally broke down the wicker gate to the field of exhausted prisoners, started delivering nutritious soups to the ill and...’
- [Pol; Ivančev 1961: 42; Orzeszkowa, *Meir Erofowicz*]

Ivančev (1961: 47) notes that CCIP occurs much more rarely in SC than in the western group. In fact, he gives no good examples, only cases where the Cz ipf past is translated into SC either with a pf phase verb + infinitive (16) or with a pf verb (17):

- (16) a. Několik dní to pomáhalo, Gierke se drobet uklidnil<sup>p</sup>, ale pak zase **pobíhal**<sup>i</sup> od okna k oknu a **lomcoval**<sup>i</sup> těmi mřížemi, aby se přesvědčil...
- ‘That helped for a few days, Gierke calmed down a little, but then he started running from window to window again and shaking the grating to make sure...’
- [Cz; Čapek]
- b. To je nekoliko dana pomoglo, Girke se malo smirio<sup>p</sup>, ali naskoro je opet **počeo**<sup>p</sup> **da trčkara** od prozora do prozora, drmajuci pri tom rešetkama da se uveri...
- [SC; Ivančev 1961: 47]

- (17) a. V tu chvíli tam vrazil<sup>p</sup> Oberhuber, fialový vztekem, a **křičel<sup>i</sup>** už ve dveřích.  
 ‘At that moment Oberhuber burst in, livid with rage, and screamed from the doorway.’ [Cz; Čapek]
- b. U taj čas uleteo<sup>p</sup> je unutra Oberhuber, crven i modar od besa, i već s vrata **povikao<sup>p</sup>**. [SC; Ivančev 1961: 47]

Ivančev’s opinion that such ipf usage occurs in SC much less than in the languages of the western group is accurate. However, infrequently one does find similar usage of the ipf in SC. One very good colloquial example which I have found is (18):

- (18) Nakon što je došlo<sup>p</sup> do pogađanja ovog traktora kao što sam opisao, nastala<sup>p</sup> je velika panika i ljudi su **bežali<sup>i</sup>**, a svi ovi ljudi i žene koji su bili u mom traktoru iskočili su iz prikolice [...]  
 ‘After this tractor was hit, as I described, a great panic ensued and the people started running, and all the men and women who were in my tractor jumped out of the trailer [...]

Consider also (19), which, while not representative of Ivančev’s phenomenon in a narrow sense, is a good example of *in medias res*, the placing of one’s perspective in the midst of a situation in a sequential relationship with other situations:

- (19) Međutim prolazili su meseci pa i godine a novac nije stizao. Momci su **napuštali<sup>i</sup>** posao.  
 ‘However, months passed and even years, but the money did not arrive. The workers started leaving their jobs.’  
 [SC; Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*]

Informants, when asked exactly what the ipf *napuštali* means in the context, readily paraphrase it as *momci su počeli da napuštaju posao* ‘the workers began to leave their stations’, but point out that the ingressive meaning of (20) is not as distinct as that expressed by a phase verb; a phase verb pinpoints the time when the action started and foregrounds it.

Ivančev 1961: 48 observes that farther eastward, in Ru and Bg, occurrences of the CCIP reach a minimum. (He gives no data for Uk or Br but suggests that the situation in those languages is identical to that in Ru. Although this is very likely the case, I have not yet had the opportunity to confirm this with Uk and Br informants, and therefore must refrain from

including them in the parameter for the CCIP.<sup>8</sup>) He gives numerous examples where a Cz ipf past form is translated into Ru with a pf phase verb (often *stat'* 'begin') + ipf infinitive:

- (20) a. ... zvolna si sedl<sup>p</sup> vedle mne a Joseka, položil<sup>p</sup> hlavu do dlaně a **díval<sup>i</sup> se** na mne.  
 '... he sat down quietly beside Josef and me, put his head in his hands and looked at me.' [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 36; Němcová]
- b. ... on tixo sel<sup>p</sup> vozle menja i Iosefa, sklonil<sup>p</sup> golovu na ruki i **stal<sup>p</sup> smotret'** na menja. [Ru]
- (21) a. ... pak vyprovodila<sup>p</sup> Bára Elšku domů a od té doby **chodívaly<sup>i</sup>** zase k sobě.  
 '... then Bára accompanied Elška home and from that time they began to go to one another's homes again.' [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 37; Němcová]
- b. ... Bara provodila<sup>p</sup> Ělšku domoj. I s tex por oni opjat' **stali<sup>p</sup> xodit'** drug k drugu, kak i prežde. [Ru]

Particularly illustrative of the eastern extreme are examples in which Cz and Pol have ipf past forms, but the Ru translation has a pf verb/phase verb:

- (22) a. Jednou k nám přišel<sup>p</sup> a já **brečela<sup>i</sup> a žalovala<sup>i</sup> si** mu na tu chudobu.  
 'Once he came to our place and I started sniveling and complaining about that poverty.' [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 39; Němcová]
- b. Raz przyszedł<sup>p</sup> do nas, a ja **beczałam<sup>i</sup> i skarżyłam<sup>i</sup>** mu się na tę biedę. [Pol]
- c. Odnadždy prišel<sup>p</sup> on k nam. Ja **stala<sup>p</sup> xnykat'** i **žalovat'sja** na niščetu... [Ru]

<sup>8</sup> Since the writing of this article, however, I have had an opportunity to question two Uk informants, both of whom rejected ipf verbs in ingressive contexts, as shown in the following examples:

- (i) Vin siv ta **\*pysav<sup>i</sup> / stav<sup>p</sup> pysaty / počav<sup>p</sup> pysaty**.  
 'He sat down and started writing.' [Uk; = (2)]
- (ii) Jakos' ja vzjav klarnet ta **\*hrav<sup>i</sup> / zahrav<sup>p</sup>**.  
 'Once I picked up the clarinet and started playing.' [Uk; = (27)]

This informant data confirms Ivančev's opinion, and Uk will therefore be included in the eastern group for this parameter.

However, Ivančev gives just as many examples in which Pol patterns like Ru, as in (23):

- (23) a. Jednou vzal<sup>p</sup> jsem klarinet a **pískal**<sup>i</sup>; učitel to slyšel...  
 ‘Once I picked up the clarinet and started playing; my teacher listened...’ [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 38; Němcová]
- b. Raz wziąłem<sup>p</sup> klarnet i **zaigrałem**<sup>p</sup>... [Pol]
- c. Raz kak-to vzjal<sup>p</sup> klarnet i **zaigral**<sup>p</sup>... [Ru]

In the last example, the Ru equivalent employs an ingressive procedural verb where Cz has a simple ipf past; occasionally one runs into an ordinary pf verb in the Ru equivalent, as exemplified in (24):

- (24) a. ... vykřikla<sup>p</sup> na plno, až hoch uskočil<sup>p</sup> leknutím, a chodci **se zastavovali**<sup>i</sup>...  
 ‘... she shouted so loud that the boy jumped up in fear, and the passers-by started stopping...’  
 [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 39; Pujmanová, *Na křižovatce*]
- b. ... zakřičala<sup>p</sup> ona tak gromko, čto Ondrej vzdrognul<sup>p</sup>, a proxožie **ostanovilis**<sup>p</sup>... [Ru]

Ivančev does note, however, that even in Ru one can find sporadic instances of similar usage. Consider the examples in (25):

- (25) a. Vse rabočie, ustanoviv svoi raboty, podnjav topory, dolota prekratili<sup>p</sup> stukotnju i **smotreli**<sup>i</sup> v ožidanii.  
 ‘All the workers, having stopped their work and raised their hatchets and chisels, stopped their hammering and watched in expectation.’  
 [Ru; Ivančev 1961: 43; Gogol’, *Taras Bul’ba*]
- b. Potom ona vdrug obratilas<sup>p</sup> k knjazju i, grozno naxmuriv<sup>p</sup> brovi, pristal’no ego **razgljadyvala**<sup>i</sup>.  
 ‘Then she suddenly turned to the prince and, having frowned threateningly, began to examine him closely.’  
 [Ru; Ivančev 1961: 43; Dostoevskij, *Idiot*]

Such examples, however, do not seem to be entirely parallel to those from Cz and the other western languages; there is a tendency for the ipf past form in Ru to occur with certain kinds of adverbials focusing on the

manner of action or slowing it down, or to occur in sequence with pf verbal adverbs (25b), which are not generally employed in the denotation of foregrounded events in an episode. In any case, examples that might qualify as the CCIP do not occur nearly as frequently in Ru as in the languages of the western group. This is confirmed by Stunová's (1993: 112) frequency counts for Ru and Cz predicates in sequences of events: out of a total of 140, Ru had 135 pf forms (96%) and 5 ipf forms (4%), whereas Cz had 75 pf forms (54%) and 65 ipf forms (46%).<sup>9</sup>

Ivančev observes that examples of the CCIP are very rare in Bg. Examples with the ipf aorist are, according to Ivančev (1961: 35), isolated, and occur with only a very few lexical items. He gives examples with *čakam* 'wait' and *plača* 'cry':

- (26) a. Bojčo se prituli<sup>p</sup> pak zad edin kamâk i **čaka**<sup>i</sup> da vidi Marijka, kato trâgne...  
 'Bojčo hid again behind a rock and waited to see Marijka leave...'  
 [Bg; Ivančev 1961: 35; Vazov]
- b. Stremski koleniči<sup>p</sup> i **plaka**<sup>i</sup>.  
 'Stremski knelt and began crying.' [Bg; Ivančev 1961: 35; Vazov]

Ivančev also gives a few examples of ipf imperfects, such as the following:

- (27) 'Sega e minutata da izfirjasa, bez da go usetjat'—misleše si Kovačev, kato xvârli bârz, znamenatelen pogled na Levski, kojto stana<sup>p</sup> ot stola si i **si popravjaše**<sup>i</sup> vratovrâzkata pred ogledaloto.  
 "'This is the moment for him to disappear, without them noticing him"—Kovačev thought to himself as he threw a quick, meaningful glance at Levski, who got up and began straightening his necktie in front of the mirror.'  
 [Bg; Ivančev 1961: 35; Vazov]

Again, Ivančev notes that such cases occur only in isolation. Moreover, he points out that the context allows for a past-perfect interpretation, i.e. *kojto beše stanal<sup>p</sup> ot stola si i si popravjaše<sup>i</sup> vratovrâzkata pred ogledaloto* 'who had gotten up from the table and was straightening his tie', so that the ipf form is not really denoting an event in an articulated sequence of foregrounded events. (It should be noted that some of his Ru examples can also be explained in the same manner.)

<sup>9</sup> Stunová 1993 Chapter 3 is an excellent data-oriented study of aspect usage in sequences of events in narratives, based on Cz and Ru parallel texts.

Regardless of whether one considers the Ru and Bg examples (25–27) to be exceptions or explains them in another manner, Ivančev’s observation holds: where Cz and the western languages are likely to employ ipf verbs in sequences of events, the eastern languages still prefer a pf phase verb + infinitive or some other kind of pf verb in the vast majority of cases.

Figure 1 gives a broad impression of the geographic distribution of the CCIP:

**Figure 1. “Geography” of the CCIP in Slavic**

West +	Transitional (+)	East –
	POLISH	Russian
SORBIAN		(Belarusian?)
CZECH		Ukrainian
SLOVAK		
SLOVENE		Bulgarian
	SERBO-CROATIAN	

## 2. Incorporating the CCIP into a Theory of Aspect

In the preceding section, the high frequency of the CCIP in Cz was demonstrated, largely on the basis of data contained in Ivančev’s study. It was shown that farther eastward the CCIP occurs less frequently, so that in SC and Pol we find it only occasionally, to a very limited extent; in the eastern languages it is almost entirely absent.

Ivančev attempts no theoretical semantic explanation of the variation he discovered, and with the exception of Stunová, neither has anyone else. According to Stunová (1993: 128), “[t]he imperfective in Czech expresses either an intraterminal, i.e. middle phase of the event, such as a process or a state (for instance *in medias res*), or is neutral to this or can even be interpreted with the support of the contexts as implicitly ingressive, terminative or delimitative”. On the basis of this, she concludes that “in Czech the choice of aspect is primarily determined by factors related to the internal structure of events, while in Russian discourse factors are highly relevant”. Here her analysis becomes self-contradictory to some degree: her overall hypothesis is that aspect in Cz operates on the lexical level; yet she goes to considerable trouble in order to demonstrate that the Cz CCIP is not limited to certain lexical classes of verbs (a point already made in Ivančev 1961). While it is certainly true that meanings of *in medias*

*res*, etc. are compatible with verbs which have some sort of internal consistency, i.e. activities and accomplishments, I would argue that this is not the most significant factor motivating the CCIP: Ivančev points out that the CCIP is possible even with achievements (“momentary verbs”), and in such cases he suggests that the effect is similar to a slow-motion film:

(28) Potom do něho kousl<sup>p</sup>, odporem zkřivil<sup>p</sup> tvář a **vracel<sup>i</sup>** jej rychle Matějovi.

‘Then he bit him, made an expression of disgust and turned [it] to Matěj quickly.’ [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 83; Drda]

Galton’s idea of the seamless continuity of actions is important here, especially because in this example we find *rychle* ‘quickly’, which seems to contradict the idea of slow-motion. However, speed does not preclude the perception of a smooth transition between events. In addition, the object of the act of turning *vracel<sup>i</sup>* is the expression/face, which is also the object of the previous action of distortion *zkřivil<sup>p</sup>*, and these two actions are performed by the same subject, so that the interpretation of seamless continuity makes quite a bit of sense.<sup>10</sup>

Rather than simply being an option for the expression of predicates with some amount of duration (activities), I suggest that the key elements of the CCIP are its narrative aspects—the presentation of sequential (or overlapping) actions without clearly defined contours (Ivančev) and the seamless continuity of actions (Galton). In other words, the CCIP is a special device that expresses these specific nuances in a narrative, either as a reflection of the speaker’s perception of events or as an element of style, or both. Inasmuch as this is true, in the case of the CCIP, Cz aspectual usage is not primarily a function of lexico-semantic verb types, but a device operating on the “discourse level” of a narrative. Although it is clear that the CCIP is used with verbs other than motion verbs, one might still consider use with determinate verbs of motion and other activity verbs to be the central, prototypical cases, whereas use with other verbs is an extension, highlighting the nuances described above.

The theory of aspect advocated here allows for a straightforward explanation of the phenomenon in the different Slavic languages. If the

<sup>10</sup> Recall that Ivančev’s definition given in 1.1 specifies that the preceding pv form and the CCIP have the same subject. This is also considerable circumstantial support for Galton’s view: sequential actions performed by the same agent are much more likely to be perceived as exhibiting smooth, seamless transitions than actions performed by different agents.



western ipf has a meaning of the “assignability of the situation to more than one point in time” (quantitative temporal indefiniteness), then the view of activity situations as *in media res* easily sanctions the ipf aspect, as the process meaning is a major instantiation of quantitative temporal indefiniteness (see Dickey 1997 for details). Moreover, this quantitative nature of the meaning of the western ipf does not negate the unique location of a predicate relative to other situations in the fact structure of a discourse. Thus, no immediate contradiction results from employing the ipf to denote situations that are arguably temporally definite (i.e., occurring in sequences of events). In other words, the temporal indefiniteness of the west (defined as the assignability of a situation to more than one point in time) allows situations with internal consistency, which follow and precede other situations, to be viewed from within as temporally indefinite, occupying several points in time between and/or overlapping with prior and subsequent actions. This is why the phenomenon is so widespread in Cz, and so much less so in the languages to the east. The more the meaning of the ipf includes non-uniqueness, i.e. the inability of a situation to be assigned to a definite point in time, then the less a situation in a sequential relationship with other situations can be coded in the ipf.

Thus, the main issue is how much uniqueness there is in the meaning of the pf in a given language, and correspondingly how much non-uniqueness there is in the meaning of the ipf. The concept of “assignability to more than one point in time”, as has been pointed out, is not incompatible with ultimately locating a situation uniquely relative to other situations in time. As far as examples with achievement verbs are concerned, e.g., Cz (28), the meaning of smooth transitions may be viewed as an independent, yet related sub-type of the Cz version of temporal indefiniteness, for which activities (predicates with internal consistency) are central cases, but which extends to achievements (momentary predicates) as peripheral cases, in which case the latter are lent the nuances specific to the schema of the CCIP.

The lack of the CCIP in the eastern languages is straightforwardly explained by the hypothesis that eastern aspect expresses a distinction in definiteness. The meaning of the eastern ipf (qualitative temporal indefiniteness—the inability to be assigned to a single, unique point in time relative to other situations) is incompatible with the contextual environment of the CCIP, i.e. sequences of events. The situations expressed by the ipf in Cz and the western languages are arguably temporally definite, as they are viewed as one event in a sequence of events; they may be assigned to a single conceptual point in time relative

to other events in the fact structure of a narrative. It would therefore be difficult for them to be coded as ipf in the eastern languages, inasmuch as the ipf denies the locatability of an action at a unique point in time.

If the actions denoted by the CCIP often overlap slightly with other events, as was suggested above, the eastern languages do not perceive this overlap in reality as crucial for the coding of aspect—for one is not dealing with anything approaching canonical simultaneity in these cases. In the east, any overlap is either lost in the structuring of narratives, or it is often expressed by special lexical verbs of the pf aspect, the meaning of which appears to be precisely this kind of fuzziness. They are the topic of the following sections.

### 3. *Stat'* as an Ingressive Phase Verb in Slavic

I consider the above analysis of the distribution of the CCIP and its relation to aspectual semantics in the Slavic languages, which draws largely on the analysis contained in Dickey 1997, to be fairly unproblematic. The CCIP may be analyzed in this way as an independent phenomenon, but there is reason to believe that it is also connected with other Slavic aspectual phenomena. Over half the Cz ipf forms in Ivančev's examples are rendered in Russian with the phase verb *stat'* plus a main verb (to be precise, 63%). Of Stunová's (1993) examples categorized as ingressive, 75% include *stat'*, whereas only 25% include *načat'*. Representative examples are (20–22) and the following:

- (29) a. "Lže," řekl<sup>p</sup> Švejk a čekal<sup>i</sup>.  
           "He's lying," Švejk said and waited. [Cz; Stunová 1993: 149]  
       b. — Vret! — skazal<sup>p</sup> Švejk i stal<sup>p</sup> ždat<sup>i</sup>. [Ru]
- (30) a. Posle ètogo ona kinulas<sup>p</sup> k masteru, obxvatila<sup>p</sup> ego šejku i stala<sup>p</sup>  
           ego celovat<sup>i</sup> v guby, v nos, v ščeki.  
           After that she rushed toward the master, threw her arms around  
           his neck and started kissing him on the lips, nose and cheeks.  
                                                                   [Ru; Stunová 1993: 153]  
       b. Po těch slovech se mu pověsila<sup>p</sup> na šíji a líbala<sup>i</sup> ho na try, na nos i  
           na tváře. [Cz]

- (31) a. Zůstal<sup>p</sup> jen průvodčí vlaku se Švejkem a železničním zřízencem. Průvodčí vlaku vytáhl<sup>p</sup> zápisní knížku a **sestavoval**<sup>i</sup> relaci o celém případě.  
 ‘Only the train conductor remained with Švejk and the railroad servant. The train conductor pulled out his notebook and started compiling a record of the whole affair.’ [Cz; Stunová 1993: 150]
- b. Švejk, železnodorožnyj služáčij i konduktor ostalis<sup>p</sup> odni. Konduktor vynul<sup>p</sup> zapisuju knížku i **stal**<sup>p</sup> **sostavljat**<sup>’</sup> protokol o proisšestvii. [Ru]

Such a correspondence between the forms leaves one wondering whether *stat*<sup>’</sup> has some semantic element that corresponds to the meaning of the CCIP. Little has been said on the differences between Ru *stat*<sup>’</sup> and *načat*<sup>’</sup>, both ‘begin’, with the exception of the treatment given in Flank 1987. She observes that *stat*<sup>’</sup>, as opposed to *načat*<sup>’</sup>, often refers not to the beginning of the nucleus of the action itself, but to a preparatory stage of the action which she calls the **onset** (see Flank 1987: 310–11 and the references cited there). This is why *stat*<sup>’</sup> is appropriate in contexts in which an action is interrupted before it is properly begun:

- (32) On **stal**/**\*načal** kričat<sup>’</sup>, no peredumal i ne kričal.  
 ‘He started to yell, but changed his mind and did not yell.’  
 [Ru; Flank 1987: 313]

Flank links the fact that *stat*<sup>’</sup> often refers to sudden or unplanned actions (as in the previous example) with its denotation of the onset and not the beginning of the nucleus of an action: sudden and unplanned actions are more subject to the kind of reversal portrayed in (32) than are planned actions.

However, there is another, related feature of *stat*<sup>’</sup>: according to informants, *stat*<sup>’</sup> is preferred to *načat*<sup>’</sup> as an ingressive phase verb whenever the precise beginning of the action is not clearly focused upon as an independent entity. For instance, perfect contexts in conversational discourse, in which the precise moment of the beginning of an action is not foregrounded, prefer *stat*<sup>’</sup>, as shown in (33):

- (33) Vse amerikanki **stali**/**?načali** nosit<sup>’</sup> mini-jubki.  
 ‘All American girls have started wearing mini-skirts.’ [Ru]

In contrast, informants observe that adverbials indicating a specific moment in time (e.g., *v pjat' časov* 'at five o'clock') render *stat'* inappropriate.

Another context in which *stat'* is appropriate is when the beginning of the action is not foregrounded as an independent event in narrative contexts; that is, when there is a smooth, seamless flow from one event into the beginning of the next, possibly involving a small overlap of the actions. According to informants, this nuance is expressed by *stat'* in Ru ex. (22, 29–31).<sup>11</sup> This parallels the same nuance frequently expressed in the CCIP (cf. e.g., informant comments on (6)). In a brief discussion in Dickey 1997, I suggested that Russian makes use of a separate lexical phase verb to express the same kinds of nuances that are expressed grammatically in languages with the CCIP. However, I did not investigate the equivalents of *stat'* in other languages.

An investigation shows that the languages that attest *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb are those languages that exhibit the lowest frequency of the CCIP—that is, Ru, Uk, Bg and SC (and Br?). Representative examples are given in (34):

- (34) a. Davu vdrug prosijal pri izvestii, soobščennom ad"jutantom, i **stal**<sup>p</sup> zastegivat'sja.  
 'Davout suddenly beamed upon [hearing] the news that the adjutant had reported, and started buttoning up his coat.'  
 [Ru; Tolstoy, *Vojna i mir*]
- b. Do večora Semen zovsim oxljav i **stav**<sup>p</sup> kašljaty ta stohnaty vholos.  
 'By evening Semen had grown quite weak, and had started coughing and moaning loudly.'  
 [Uk; Bilodid et al. 1970 vol. IX: 628]

---

<sup>11</sup> This characterization is not necessarily contradictory to Flank's analysis; she notes that there are other dimensions to the contrast between *stat'* and *načat'* besides the onset/nucleus distinction (Flank 1987: 315). I think that the denotation of sudden or unexpected actions is related to the idea of seamless continuity, in the sense that if an action occurs suddenly or unexpectedly, it is "emerging" against the background of a prior action/situation without the latter concluding beforehand. Given the fact that most, if not all, of the Ru examples containing *stat'* given in this paper indicate the beginning of the nucleus of an action as well, I suggest that *stat'* often refers to both the onset and the beginning of the nucleus. It is important to point out that the inclusion of the onset of an action in the denotation of *stat'* can account for the nuance of seamless continuity or partial overlap: the very initial preparatory stage of an action—its onset—is often simultaneous to one phase of a prior action, especially inasmuch as the onset involves the mental preparation of an agent which can easily coincide with other ongoing physical activities.

- (34) c. Mikolka **staw**<sup>p</sup> narazac' xleb na stol.  
 'Mikolka started cutting the bread onto the table.'  
 [Br; Atraxovič, et al. 1983 vol. V: 319]
- d. Trjabva da ì e dosadilo da me čaka i e **stanala**<sup>p</sup> da me târsi.  
 'She must have grown tired of waiting for me, and started  
 looking for me.'  
 [Bg; Romanski 1954 vol. III: 293]
- e. Po edno vreme, gledam: nema dobičeto! More, târsim ja, tuk  
 magare, tam magare—nema magare! **Stanem**<sup>p</sup> da go târsim čak  
 po seloto.  
 'At one moment, I look: the beast isn't there! Well, I look, here  
 and there for the donkey—there's no donkey! I even start  
 looking for it in the village.'  
 [Bg; Maslov 1959: 242]
- f. A kad je sneg **stao**<sup>p</sup> da se topi...  
 'But when the snow started melting...'  
 [SC; Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*]

In SC and especially Bg, *stat'* clearly does not occupy the prominent position as an ingressive phase verb that it does in East Slavic. My Bg informant knew of this use of Bg *stana*, but considered it dialectal and perhaps archaic; educated speakers of Bg do not employ *stana* as an ingressive. But Romanski 1954 vol. III: 293 gives the following as the tenth definition of *stana*: *predpriemam nešto, zaemam se da izvârša nešto*—'to take on a task, to undertake to do something'. SC informants consider *stati* to be archaic, and ascribe no particular nuance to it (although the examples I have found, such as (34f), happen to involve contexts where there is no precise moment of inception as a foregrounded action). Again, it is nevertheless significant that ingressive meanings are given for *stat'* in the dictionaries of those languages.

In contrast, dictionaries of the languages of the western group, as well as Pol, give *no* ingressive definition whatsoever for their respective cognates of *stat'*. The distribution of *stat'* in Slavic is shown in Figure 2. A comparison with Figure 1 in section 1.2 shows clearly that the CCIP and *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb are, in a sort of geographic "complementary distribution". This lends considerable support to the suggestion made in Dickey 1997 that these two phenomena have similar functions in the different languages.

Figure 2. "Geography" of phasal *stat'* in Slavic

West –	Transitional (+)	East +
Polish		<b>RUSSIAN</b>
Sorbian		<b>BELARUSIAN</b>
Czech		<b>UKRAINIAN</b>
Slovak		
Slovene	BULGARIAN	
	SERBO-CROATIAN	

#### 4. Ingressive Procedural *za-* in the Slavic Languages

A very similar situation exists with respect to the distribution of *za-* as a formant for **ingressive** procedural verbs (i.e. verbs which lexically express the beginning of an action). It is important to pinpoint their exact distribution across Slavic. In Ru, Uk, Br and Bg, prefixation with *za-* is a highly productive manner, and indeed the chief manner, of deriving ingressive verbs. In Russian, verbs of sound phenomena, indeterminate motion and emotional experiences are particularly prone to forming ingressive verbs with *za-*, although according to Avilova (1976: 278) *any* intransitive activity verb can derive an ingressive verb in this manner. Text examples of ingressive verbs in *za-* from each of these languages are given in (35–38).

- (35) a. —Čto? Načalos'? Pora?—**zagovoril**<sup>p</sup> P'jer, prosnuvšis'.  
 '—What? Has it begun? Is it time?—Pierre started to speak,  
 having woken up.' [Ru; Tolstoj, *Vojna i mir*]
- b. Gde-to sleva zlobno **zastrekotali**<sup>p</sup> stankovye pulemety.  
 'Somewhere to the left, heavy machine guns started chattering  
 wickedly.' [Ru; Gorbačevič 1994 vol. V–VI: 635]
- (36) a. Na druhyj že den' troxy ne vse misto **zahovorylo**<sup>p</sup> pro Parasčynu  
 bolist',—čoho vona i vid čoho.  
 'On the very next day almost the whole village started talking  
 about Paraska's illness,—what did she have and how did she get  
 it?' [Uk; Bilodid et al. 1970 vol. III: 82]

- (36) b. **Zastrekotily**<sup>p</sup> voroži kulemetry, prorizujučy temravku civkamy trasujučyx kul'.  
 'Enemy machine guns started chattering, cutting the darkness with the streaks of their tracer bullets.'  
 [Uk; Bilodid et al. 1970 vol. III: 333]
- (37) a. Cjahnula padysci da jae, **zahavaryc**<sup>np</sup>, ale ën ne znaxodziw pryčyny.  
 'He felt like going up to her and striking up a conversation, but he couldn't find a reason.' [Br; Atraxovič, et al. 1983 vol. II: 294]
- b. Nedze za lesam **zasakatala**<sup>p</sup> nekal'ki kulemëtaw i znow usë scixla.  
 'Somewhere beyond the forest, several machine guns started chattering and then everything quieted down again.'  
 [Br; Atraxovič, et al. 1983 vol. II: 380]
- (38) a. Doktorât radostno se usmihva i **zagovarja**<sup>i</sup> s bavnija si glas.  
 'The doctor smiles and begins to speak in his slow voice.'  
 [Bg; Čolakova 1987 vol. V: 236]
- b. Izvednâž tankovete izskočiha ot padinkata i otnovo **zabâlvaha**<sup>p</sup> ogân.  
 'Suddenly the tanks rushed out of the ravine and started belching fire again.'  
 [Bg; Romanski 1955 vol. I: 357]

As Sokolov (1978: 67–71) points out, prefixation with *za-* to form ingressive verbs is even more productive in Bg than in Ru, due in large part to the ability of transitive verbs to derive ingressives in *za-*, e.g., *začeta*<sup>p</sup> 'begin to read' (Ru *začitat*' has no ingressive meaning):

- (39) Sedna i **začete**<sup>p</sup> vestnik.  
 'He sat down and started reading the newspaper.'  
 [Bg; Sokolov 1978: 70]

It is very important to note, although it is rarely pointed out in the literature, that *za-* does not convey a "neutral" expression of ingressivity in the eastern languages; rather, perfective verbs in *za-* express certain nuances of ingressivity, such as the unexpectedness or involuntary nature of an action. Another noteworthy aspectual peculiarity of ingressive verbs in *za-* is that they are much less prone to expressing the strict sequentiality characteristic of the pf in Ru (this has been pointed out in Švedova and

Trofimova 1987: 20–21). This can be seen in (40), where the pf verbs in *za-* all denote actions beginning simultaneously:

- (40) Fljagin vyšel. Čto tut načalos'! **Zagudeli<sup>p</sup>, zavorčali<sup>p</sup>, zakričali<sup>p</sup>.**  
 'Fljagin went out. And what began then! They began to hoot, began to grumble, began to shout.' [Ru; Švedova and Trofimova 1983: 22]

Some of the eastern examples in (35–38) also show sequences of actions that obviously exhibit the same kind of smooth, seamless continuity that is expressed by the CCIP: in (35a), Pierre's waking leads directly into his speech without interruption; in (37a), what is expressed is a natural and "smooth" beginning of a conversation following the approach. Notice also that in (36a) the whole village does not begin talking about Paraska's illness at a single, particular moment—the temporal contours of the action are unclear; rather, on the next day we find ourselves, as it were, *in medias res*. It is worth pointing out that the perfectivity of ingressive verbs in *za-* refers to the initial phase of the action, which is completed, leaving us in the middle phase of a continuing action.

Thus, ingressive verbs in *za-* seem to be expressing nuances that correspond at least in part to the kinds of nuances expressed by the CCIP. It is significant that this is also true for Bg. Sokolov (1978) does not address the issue of nuances involved with Bg ingressive verbs in *za-*. However, my Bg informant, when presented with (38a–b) alongside parallel examples containing paraphrases with phase verbs (i.e. *započva da govori* 'begins to talk', *započnaha da bâlvat ogân* 'began to belch fire'), immediately characterized the original variants with ingressive verbs in *za-* as "more continuous", i.e. as expressing the lack of clear boundaries between the actions: with *zagovarja<sup>p</sup>* the doctor starts talking while still smiling, and with *zabâlva<sup>p</sup>* the tanks start firing while they are still charging out of the ravine. This makes it easier to understand Ivančev's (1961: 34) observation that Bg translations of the Cz CCIP often employ ingressive verbs in *za-*. It is also noteworthy that several Ru translations of Cz originals which he provides employ ingressive verbs in *za-*. An example of this is (23), repeated here as (41); in the Cz sentence we have the CCIP, in the Ru translation an ingressive *za-* verb (note also that in (24) the Pol translation contains an ingressive *za-* verb, this is expected inasmuch as Pol often patterns more like the eastern languages).



- (41) a. Jednou vzal<sup>p</sup> jsem klarinet a **pískal**<sup>i</sup>; učitel to slyšel...  
 ‘Once I picked up the clarinet and started playing; my teacher  
 listened...’ [Cz; Ivančev 1961: 38; Němcová]
- b. Raz kak-to vzjal<sup>p</sup> klarnet i **zaigral**<sup>p</sup>... [Ru]

In contrast, the linguistic literature discussing ingressive procedural verbs in the western languages almost unanimously expresses the opinion that *za-* is not productive as an ingressive prefix in these languages. Křížková (1963: 287) points out that in Cz “*za-* only exceptionally occurs with a purely ingressive meaning, [and] has as a rule a **resultative meaning**” [emphasis mine—SMD], e.g., *zahrát<sup>p</sup>* ‘play’, which does not correspond to Ru ingressive *zaigrat<sup>p</sup>*, but rather to the resultative *sygrat<sup>p</sup>* ‘play’. Kopečný (1962: 125) connects the ingressive meaning of Cz *za-* to “the sense of a small amount of the action [*pocit malé míry*]”, e.g., *zacvrlikat<sup>p</sup>* ‘chirp’. Isačenko (1960: 228–37) stresses that, in contrast to Ru, the Sk (and Cz) prefix *za-* does not express ingressivity: for instance, Ru *zaplakat<sup>p</sup>* means ‘start crying’, whereas Sk *zaplakat<sup>p</sup>* denotes an “undefined amount of the action”, and is more equivalent to Ru *vsplaknut<sup>p</sup>* ‘have a little cry’ or *poplakat<sup>p</sup>* ‘cry a while’. In fact, he includes prefixation with *za-* along with prefixation with *po-* as the means of forming Cz and Sk **delimitative** procedural verbs (i.e., verbs which delimit the duration of an activity in time). Sekaninová 1981: 4 emphasizes that, unlike Ru, Sk does not employ the prefix *za-* in an ingressive meaning. Thus, Cz example (42) from the *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* (Bělič 1971), which bears a formal resemblance to (38b, 39b, 40b), actually does not refer to the start of a continuing action, but to the totality of a brief action, i.e. from start to finish (the *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* defines *zarachotit<sup>p</sup>* as *výdat krátký rachot* ‘emit a brief racket’; my translation of the following example is rather free):

- (42) **Zarachotily<sup>p</sup>** kulemety.  
 ‘The machine guns fired off a noisy burst.’  
 [Cz; Bělič 1971: vol. IV, 592]

The situation in Sor is similar to that in Cz and Sk: verbs in *za-* do exist, e.g., *zahrač<sup>p</sup>* ‘start playing’, but there is no unequivocal opinion that *za-* is productive primarily as an ingressive prefix. Fasske and Michalk 1985: 110–11 discusses *za-* as the formant for ingressive procedural verbs, but notes that “the inchoative [ingressive—SMD] Aktionsart crosses over easily into the delimitative Aktionsart [which they note is also formed by

*za-*; cf. Isačenko's characterization of Cz and Sk above—SMD]. The boundary between these two Aktionsarten is therefore not sharp and not always clear-cut, one must reckon with a fluid transition [between them]". In their subsequent discussion of the Sor delimitative Aktionsart, Fasske and Michalk 1985: 115 characterize verbs in *za-* as expressing the momentary nature of an action as well as its sudden and unexpected inception, e.g., *zaplakać*<sup>p</sup> 'cry'. This also indicates the lack of a clear distinction between delimitatives and ingressesives in Sor verbs prefixed with *za-*: they express momentary actions (delimitativity) as well as the sudden or unexpected beginning of the action (ingressivity). For Lower Sor, Janaš 1976: 299 says only that such verbs denote a "short, intense action", e.g., *zašumiš*<sup>p</sup> 'rustle', *zaspěwaš*<sup>p</sup> 'sing'.

Thus, in Cz, Sk and Sor, sublexical *za-* is not primarily productive as an ingressive prefix, unlike its counterpart in the eastern languages. In these languages, *za-* can have an ingressive function with some verbs, but it is not always or even ever separable from what appears to be a related function of denoting the totality, delimitation or momentary nature of an action.<sup>12</sup> It is important to keep in mind that, in the eastern languages, the derivation of delimitative or momentary verbs by prefixation with *za-* does not occur at all.

Pol seems to have some ingressive verbs in *za-*. However, Agrell (1908: 95) considers the ingressive meaning of Pol *za-* to be a variation of its chief meaning of a momentary action (the latter of which occurs chiefly with verbs of sound and light phenomena, e.g., *zakrzyć*<sup>p</sup> 'shout', *zabłyśkać*<sup>p</sup> 'flash'). Piernikarski 1969: 122–24 points out that *za-* does not express ingressivity in Pol nearly to the degree that it does in Ru. Example (43) parallels the eastern examples (35b, 36b, 37b), but my informant noted that the example is in fact ambiguous: it may be interpreted as either the beginning of continuing action, or a short burst.

(43) Gdzieś pod lasem **zaterkotały**<sup>p</sup> karabiny maszynowe.

'Somewhere near the forest, machine guns started chattering/  
chattered.'

[Pol]

<sup>12</sup> It is interesting that we see the same two kinds of functions with another Slavic verbal morpheme. The suffix *-nu-* has two distinct meanings: that of the change to a new state (inchoativity) which is comparable in a general sense to the ingressive meaning of *za-*, and that of a momentary action which is likewise comparable to the delimitative meaning of *za-* in the west. Bybee 1985: 87 has noted a connection between inceptives (inchoatives) and punctuality on a more universal level.

Totality or resultativity is also important in Pol; for instance, the first definition of *zaśpiewać*<sup>p</sup> is ‘sing’, as in Russian *spet*<sup>p</sup>.

For South Slavic, Dejanova (1976: 461) has counted ingressive verbs in *za-* in both Bulgarian and Serb-Croatian, and found that there are 720 in Bulgarian and only around 200 in Serbo-Croatian. My own count in the *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (Bajec, et al. 1972) found that in Sn there are only around 155 verbs prefixed with *za-* marked specifically as ingressive. Merše 1995: 288, discussing 16th-century Sn, notes that “it is impossible to find examples which would clearly indicate the ingressive meaning of the prefix [...] The difficulties in distinguishing ingressive meaning from momentary meanings and semelfactivity arise especially whenever the context provides no distinction”. Although her remarks are not concerned with the contemporary language, it is interesting that they essentially replicate the picture for Cz-Sk-Sor-Pol given above. In any case, South Slavic evidences a clear transition from east to west: 720 ingressive *za-* verbs in Bg, 200 in SC and only 155 in Sn. My search in the *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* continues the western end of the picture: I could not find any systematic designation of *za-* verbs as ingressive.

**Figure 3.** “Geography” of ingressive *za-* in Slavic

West –	Transitional (+)	East +
	POLISH	<b>RUSSIAN</b>
Sorbian		<b>BELARUSIAN</b>
Czech		<b>UKRAINIAN</b>
Slovak		
SLOVENE		<b>BULGARIAN</b> <sup>13</sup>
	SERBO-CROATIAN	

Let us now consider *raz-* (and its cognates) as an ingressive prefix. In any discussion of Slavic ingressive procedural verbs, prefixation with *raz-* must be taken into account. Townsend 1981: 227 notes the existence of

<sup>13</sup> It is interesting that Bg exhibits a rather large inventory of productive prefixes with ingressive meaning, including *do-* (e.g., *dospiva mi se* ‘I begin to feel like sleeping’), *pri-* (e.g., *pripukoam* ‘begin to pop’), *pro-* (e.g., *proplača* ‘begin to cry’) and *pod-* (e.g., *podkarvam* ‘start driving’). Ingressives are also formed by suffixation with *-n-*, e.g., *svetna* ‘begin to shine’. For details, see Sokolov 1978 and Ivanova 1974. None of these other Bg ingressive formations are directly relevant to this discussion, however.

some ingressive verbs in Cz which are affixed with *roz-* (*se*), e.g., motion verbs such as *rozběhnout se*<sup>p</sup> ‘start running/get a running start’.<sup>14</sup>

In the eastern languages, e.g., Ru, verbs in *raz-* (*sja*) do not function as ingressives but as evolutives, which, according to Isačenko 1961: 233, express “the attainment of maximum intensity” of the action. He points out that the inception itself lies outside the scope of such verbs. Thus, Ru *raskričat’sja*<sup>p</sup> means ‘reach the maximum intensity of screaming after an interval of increased intensity’. It is easy to see how Ru *razbežat’sja*<sup>p</sup> corresponds to English ‘get a running start’. In Cz (and Sk), however, the evolutive meaning of such verbs is weaker, so that they sometimes function as “ingressives”. Thus, Cz *rozjet*<sup>p</sup> *se* can mean anything from ‘get going/moving’ or ‘set into motion’ to ‘start to go’, depending on the context. However, most Cz linguists are of the opinion that the connection to ingressivity is secondary. For instance, Křížková 1963: 287 points out that although “*roz-* (*se*) [...] is considered to be ingressive, [it] is as a rule connected with a change in the intensity of an action”. Kopečný 1962: 118 characterizes verbs in *roz-* (*se*) as usually expressing the attainment of the appropriate or characteristic degree (*dosazení náležitě míry*) of the action. Thus, a good English translation of such verbs is perhaps ‘get started...’, e.g., *rozepsat*<sup>p</sup> *se* ‘get started writing’.

Schuster-Šewc 1996: 189 notes that Upper Sor verbs in *roz-* (*so*) denote the “internal development or unfolding of an action, which increases in intensity”, e.g., *rozplakač*<sup>p</sup> *so* ‘burst into tears’. According to Fasske and Michalk 1985: 115, these verbs denote an action “increasing to maximum intensity”. For Lower Sor, Janaš 1976: 299 defines the meaning of *roz-* (*se*) as the occurrence of an action “with great intensity”, e.g., *rozwjaselis*<sup>p</sup> *se* ‘rejoice’. None mention a specifically ingressive use of verbs with these affixes.

It is possible that these verbs might differ slightly in the different languages. Affixation with *raz-* (*sja*) is connected with the intensity of an action in all Slavic languages. In the east, *raz-* (*sja*) appears to focus on an increase to **high** or **maximum** intensity. In the west, however, *roz-* (*se*) appears more to express an increase in intensity, not necessarily to maximum intensity, but rather to the **characteristic** intensity of an action (cf. Kopečný’s remarks above; only the descriptions of Sor stress maximum or high intensity). If some kinds of verbs occur commonly in an

<sup>14</sup> There is a non-reflexive type of verb prefixed with *roz-*, which is connected with ingressivity, e.g., *rozepsat*<sup>p</sup> ‘begin to write’. However, such verbs do not appear to be great in number. Moreover, as Townsend 1981 observes, they carry a very specific nuance of ‘begin but leave unfinished’, as in *rozepsaný dopis* ‘an unfinished letter’. Note that non-reflexive *rozepsat*<sup>p</sup> is distinct from the reflexive *rozepsat*<sup>p</sup> *se* ‘get started writing’.

ingressive function, e.g., motion verbs in Cz (cf. Townsend 1981: 227), this represents more a conventionalization than a widespread, productive pattern of usage, especially since many of these verbs denote actions which necessarily involve an increase of intensity in their beginning stages. Thus, western affixation with *roz-* (*se*) does not create ingressives which are equivalent to those produced with *za-* in the east.

## 5. Discussion

The description given in section 4 indicates that in Slavic there is an east-west aspectual parameter involving *za-* as an ingressive prefix, and the division here is perhaps even more clear than that involving *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb. Taken by themselves, these two parameters are hard to interpret, but if one considers them with respect to Ivančev's parameter of the CCIP, they become much more interesting: languages with the CCIP do not employ *stat'* and *za-* as special markers of ingressivity, and vice versa. This is shown by the comparison of the patterning of the individual languages for the parameters in Figure 4:

**Figure 4.** The Parameters Taken Together

	Ru	Uk	Br	Bg	SC	Pol	Sn	Sk	Cz	Sor
CCIP:	-	-	?	-	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	+	+
<i>stat'</i> as ingressive:	+	+	+	(+)	(+)	-	-	-	-	-
<i>za-</i> as ingressive:	+	+	+	+	(+)	(+)	(+)	-	-	(+)

Thus, I think it is clear that these phenomena are related and indeed mutually exclusive to a considerable degree. Ivančev 1961: 102–103 notes the lack of *za-* as an ingressive prefix in Cz as opposed to the proliferation of the CCIP, as well as the reverse situation in Bg and Ru. However, he does not put the connection in a full cross-Slavic context by including other languages, nor does he consider the cross-Slavic situation regarding the phase verb *stat'*.

The question naturally arises as to why this situation should now exist in Slavic. As shown in section 2, the aspect theory developed in Dickey 1997 accounts for the parameter of the CCIP: in the west, where aspect is concerned solely with the totality of an action, imperfective verbs may denote foregrounded actions in narrative sequences to express certain nuances, presenting the actions as in an exploded view, without emphasizing their temporal contours, and with the accompanying implicature of the beginning of an action or of a seamless flow between

actions. In the east, however, aspect is crucially concerned with sequencing actions, and the imperfective aspect is prohibited in a narrative sequence of foregrounded events, since its prototypical function is precisely to lift an action out of any kind of articulated sequence.

This brings us to the additional means of expressing ingressivity in the eastern languages, *stat'* and *za-*. In both the eastern and the western languages, the Slavic perfective, by virtue of its totalizing force, gives narratives what Galton (1976: 71) has called a “staccato” feel. Apparently all Slavic languages feel the need to attenuate this effect and to lend a smoother feel to some episodes within a narrative. The western languages achieve this with a grammatical means, i. e. imperfective past-tense forms. However, this option is not open to the eastern languages, due to the semantics of aspect in those languages. In this respect, one is reminded of the structuralist adage that languages do not differ so much in what they **can** express, but what they **must** express: in the eastern languages, the temporal definiteness/indefiniteness distinction must be expressed. I suggest that the eastern languages must resort to these special lexical items to express certain nuances of ingressivity which are otherwise inexpressible given the strong sequencing force of aspect in those languages: *stat'* and *za-* function precisely to circumvent the normal effect of the eastern perfective aspect in narratives. In other words, narrative structure in the east is tightly organized around the distinction between background events and sequenced foreground events, the latter of which are always coded in the pf aspect. The pf procedural verbs in *za-* and the pf phase verb *stat'* satisfy by virtue of their aspect the requirement that all sequenced actions be coded in the pf; yet their additional lexical meanings in fact express a fuzziness and partial overlap in the initial phase of an action.

So what these isoglosses reveal are alternate strategies for expressing the same kinds of nuances of ingressivity, one grammatical (the CCIP) opposed to two lexical strategies (*stat'* and *za-*). Here we can see an interesting difference between ingressive verbs in *za-* and the CCIP: ingressive *za-* explicitly asserts the completion of the initial phase of an action, and the continuation of its middle phase is an implication; with the CCIP the middle phase is explicitly asserted and it is the beginning phase that is implicit. In this respect the two strategies are almost mirror images of each other. Another question is why meanings of smooth transitions and continuity of action are so important as to warrant the development of differing strategies according to differences in aspectual semantics in Slavic. But perhaps it is a universal tendency to express various nuances of ingressivity—cf. for example English *begin* and *start*, the latter of which

according to my Sprachgefühl expresses nuances which often correspond to *za-* and *stat'*.

## 6. Conclusion

This article has attempted to draw a connection between the widespread use of imperfective forms with ingressive meaning in a group of western Slavic languages (Cz, Sk, Sor, Sn), and the use of *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb as well as the widespread derivation of ingressive procedural verbs with *za-* in a group of eastern languages (Ru, Uk, Br, Bg).<sup>15</sup> SC and Pol represent clearly transitional zones: Pol allows the ingressive use of ipf forms and also derives a number of ingressive verbs with *za-*, and SC tends not to make use of any of these special means of expressing ingressivity, relying much more on the neutral phase verb *početi'* 'begin'.

It has been argued that the most significant cause of this complementary geographic distribution in modes of expressing ingressivity is a difference in the semantic meaning of aspect in the two groups of languages. Event sequencing is a central element of the function of aspect in the eastern languages, and in the east the pf is required in the denotation of sequential events. Aspect in the western languages is not so crucially concerned with event sequencing, but merely the totality of an event (as opposed to its extension in time as a repeated event or an action in process), and therefore in these languages the ipf aspect can occur in sequences of events with an ingressive meaning, accompanied by nuances such as a smooth transition between events or the presentation of the event from within its midst (*in medias res*). The use of *stat'* as an ingressive phase verb and also the highly productive derivation of ingressive verbs in *za-* have been argued to be means of providing for the expression of the same kinds of nuances in the eastern languages.

Although the semantic meanings of aspect in the respective language groups might not be the only factor conditioning such a geographical division in the expression of ingressivity in Slavic, the hypothesis presented here allows for a straightforward, general explanation of what appears at first glance to be a rather peculiar set of aspectual isoglosses, utilizing a theory of Slavic aspect which has already been independently motivated in Dickey 1995, 1996, 1997. In any case, these aspectual divisions must be accounted for by an adequate theory of Slavic aspect. The treatment of procedural *za-* here raises the almost untouched issue of differences between the individual Slavic languages in the domain of

---

<sup>15</sup> As noted in section 3, the ingressive use of *stana* in Bg is an archaic and/or dialect phenomenon.

procedural verbs (Aktionsarten). Just as Slavic verbal aspect is not the monolithic phenomenon we have occasionally assumed it to be, it turns out that the Slavic ingressive Aktionsart is not, either; there are most likely other differences in procedural verbs that, when subjected to close examination, will greatly enhance our understanding of Slavic aspect.

## References

- Agrell, Sigurd. (1908) *Aspektänderung und Aktionsartbildung beim polnischen Zeitwort*. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Buchdruckerei. (*Lunds universitets årsskrift* N. F. AFD. 1 Bd. 4 nr. 2)
- Atraxovič, K. K. et al., eds. (1983) *Tlumačal'ny slovník belaruskaj movy*. Minsk: Vydavectva "Belaruskaja saveckaja encyklopedyja" imja Petrusja Browki.
- Avilova, Natal'ja Sergeevna. (1976) *Vid glagola i semantika glagol'nogo slova*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".
- Bajec, Antonin et al., eds. (1970) *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.
- Bajec, Anton et al. (1971) *Slovenska slovnica*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Bělič, Jaromír, ed. (1965) *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*. Prague: Československa akademie věd.
- Bilodid I. K. et al., eds. (1970). *Slovník ukrajins'koji movi*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Bondarko, V. V. (1961) "K voprosu o glagolax dviženija v češskom jazyke". *Slavia* 30: 527–47.
- Brecht, Richard D. (1985) "The form and function of aspect in Russian". Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht, eds. *Issues in Russian morphosyntax*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 9–34.
- Bybee, Joan L. (1985) *Morphology: A study in the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Čolakova, Kristalina, ed. (1987) *Rečnik na bâlgarskija ezik*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bâlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Dejanova, Marija. (1976) "Iz sârbohrvatsko-bâlgarskata sâpostavitelna aspektologija". *Bâlgarski ezik*, 26(6): 459–67.
- Dickey, Stephen M. (1995) "Aspect and verbal nouns in Slavic". *Zbornik Matice srpske* 38(2): 19–41.
- . (1996) "A comparative analysis of the Slavic imperfective general-factual". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 3(2): 288–307.



- Dickey, Stephen M. (1997) *Parameters of Slavic aspect*. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- Fasske, Helmut and Siegfried Michalk. (1980) *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Bautzen: VEB Domowina Verlag.
- Flank, Sharon. (1987) "Phase subdivisions and Russian inceptives". *Die Welt der Slaven* 32(2): 310–16.
- Galton, Herbert. (1976) *The main functions of the Slavic verbal aspect*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Gorbačevič, K. S., ed. (1994) *Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.
- Isačenko, A. V. (1960) *Grammatičeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s slovackim. Čast' vtoraja: morfologija*. Bratislava: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk.
- Ivančev, Svetomir. (1961) "Kontekstovo obuslovena ingresivna upotreba na glagolite ot nesvâršen vid v češkija ezik". *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet* 54(3): 1–152.
- Ivanova, Kalina. (1974) *Načini na glagolnoto dejstvie v sâvremennija bâlgarski ezik*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bâlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Janaš, Pětr. (1976) *Niedersorbische Grammatik*. Bautzen: VEB Domowina Verlag.
- Kopečný, František. (1961) "Ještě o nedokonavosti futura typu 'ponesu, povezu...' a o časovém významu typu 'dovede to, ujde to...'". *Slovo a slovesnost* 21: 187–92.
- . (1962) *Slovesný vid v češtině*. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd. (*Rozpravy Československé akademie věd* 72(2))
- Koschmieder, Erwin (1979) "Das türkische Verbum und der slavische Verbalaspekt". *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Phonetik, Phonologie, und Morphologie der slavischen Sprachen*. Neuried: Hieronymus Verlag, 313–28.
- Křížková, Helena. (1962) "Über den Ausdruck verschiedener Handlungsphasen im Russischen und Tschechischen". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 7(1): 113–124.
- . (1963) "K ingresívnosti v češtině". *Slovo a slovesnost* 24: 286–91.
- Langacker, Ronald. (1987) *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume 1*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Maslov, Ju. S. (1959) "Glagol'nyj vid v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke". S. B. Bernštejn, ed. *Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Merše, Majda. (1995) *Vid in vrstnost glagola v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja*. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

- Piernikarski, Cezar. (1969) *Typy opozycji aspektowych czasownika polskiego na tle słowiańskim*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk.
- Romanski, Stojan, ed. (1954) *Rečnik na sâvremennija bâlgarski knižoven ezik*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bâlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Schuster-Šewc, H. (1996) *Grammar of the Upper Sorbian language: Phonology and morphology*. Munich: Lincom Europa. (Translated by Gary Toops.)
- Sekaninová, Ella. (1981) "Vyjadrenie inchoatívnosti a ingresívnosti deja v ruštine a slovenčine". *Československá rusistika* 26(1): 1–5.
- Sokolov, O. M. (1978) "K charakteristike sposobov dejstvija (na materiale russkogo i bolgarskogo jazykov)". Maslov, Ju. S., Ed. *Voprosy sopostavitel'noj aspektologii*. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 56–75.
- Stunová, Anna. (1993) *A contrastive analysis of Russian and Czech aspect: Invariance vs. discourse*. Amsterdam.
- Švedova, L. N. and T. G. Trofimova. (1987) *Posobie po upotrebleniju vidov glagola dlja raboty s filologami-rusistami*. Moscow: "Russkij jazyk".
- Taylor, John R. (1990) "Schemas, prototypes, and models: In search of the unity of the sign". S. L. Tsohatzidis, ed., *Meanings and prototypes*. London: Routledge, 521–34.
- Thelin, Nils B. (1990) "Verbal aspect in discourse: On the state of the art". Nils Thelin, ed. *Verbal aspect in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3–88.
- Townsend, Charles. (1981) *Czech through Russian*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Vendler, Zeno. (1957) "Verbs and times". *The philosophical review* 66: 143–60.

Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures  
University of Virginia  
Cabell Hall 109D  
Charlottesville, VA 22903  
smd6n@virginia.edu

Received: 23 April 1998  
Revised: 5 December 1999