Nicholas LeBlanc
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

ITERATIVITY: Revisiting and re-thinking secondary homogeneity in Russian delimitatives

Abstract

Delimitative verbs in Russian place an arbitrary temporal bound on the activity they encode. They are usually formed by adding the prefix по- to the verb in an activity predicate (Vendler 1957). Such actions are internally homogeneous and atelic. The verb сидеть 'sit' is an example: By adding the prefix по- we obtain the delimitative verb посидеть 'sit for a while'.

Some accomplishment and achievement predicates do allow delimitative formation, however. This usually involves a re-construal of the accomplishment/ achievement predicate as an activity (a process known as secondary homogenization). This paper examines the explanations for the formation of this sort of delimitative as set forth by Mehlig (2001) and Kisseleva & Tatevosov (2004). Within the framework of cognitive linguistics, the present investigation builds on these authors' works and posits the condition ITERATIVITY as a more concise explanation of the delimitatives in question. Data collected from the Russian internet are used extensively to support all conclusions drawn.

Introduction

Delimitative verbs in Russian have received a fair share of attention in the scholarly literature devoted to the Russian verbal system. Isačenko (1960) and Zaliznjak & Šmelev (2000) list the delimitative as one of the several Aktionsarten[1] formed with the prefix по-. Instead of delineating contexts where delimitative formation is not permitted,

---

[1] I use Isačenko's (1960: 218) definition of Aktionsart throughout this paper: "Under [the category] *совершаемость* [=Aktionsart] we include those general meanings of verbs which, being expressed by formal means (prefixes, suffixes), modify the meaning of the unprefixed or prefixed base verb in relation to phases, multiplicity or quantity of action, and which are semantically related to it. Verbs expressing one or another *совершаемость* [=Aktionsart] are always represented by only one aspectual form" (tranlation mine).

Flier (1985) offers a treatment of delimitative verbs that "seek[s] the positive basis of delimitative formation" (Flier 1985:43), emphasizing that delimitative verbs do no result in a change of state. Petruxina (2000), after surveying the native Russian scholarship on delimitatives, posits three layers of meaning for the delimitative ((Petruxina 2000: 145), which include 1) aspectual, 2) quantitative evaluative, and 3) pragmatic evaluative meanings. Mehlig (2001) also explicates the meaning of the delimitative and the contexts in which it is permitted. For the purposes of this paper, a few, nearly universally accepted ideas about the delimitative are necessary to keep in mind. As Petruxina (2000: 151) notes, delimitative verbs are usually formed from "homogeneous, dynamic, intransitive verbs with the meaning of a concrete activity localized in time, and also a physical and psychological state conceptualized in language as a process" (such as поработать 'work a while'). Verbs that do not allow partial completion of the action (по/ставить 'put, place', по/дарить 'give as gift') do not form the delimitative; the prefix по- only signals the perfective form of the verb (Petruxina 2000: 154). This echoes Isačenko's earlier definition stating that the delimitative Aktionsart «сосредоточивает внимание на ограниченном отрезке (фазисе) действия, представляемого как целостное, сомкнутое событие» (focuses attention on a bounded segment (phase) of the action, represented as a whole, close-ended event) (1960: 234). As examples he gives the simple sentences Он **поработал** 'He **worked a while**' and Я **посижу** 'I **will sit a while**,' both of which focus attention on demarcated stretches of time in which the subject worked or sat. It is important to note that delimitatives are usually formed from verbal predicates that can be labeled activities in Vendler's (1957) system of classifying events—that is, only those actions that do not have distinct beginning, middle, or end phases (and are thus homogeneous) can form the delimitative. Actions that do have distinct beginning, middle, or end phases are telic and are generally incompatible with the meaning of the delimitative. Such predicates (called achievements and accomplishments in Vendler's system) generally do not permit delimitative formation, except in the conditions outlined below.

Secondary Homogenization and the Delimitative

Mehlig (2001) addresses the use of the delimitative in accomplishment and achievement predicates and identifies three sets of conditions in which delimitative use is permitted in these predicates—despite the usual stricture that delimitatives cannot be formed from accomplishments and achievements. The three conditions can be distilled into the following:

1) Distributivity: the predicate involves an unbounded number of objects

2) Iterativity: the predicate involves an unbounded number of repetitions

3) Frequentativity: the predicate involves an unbounded number of repetitions, each having an internal bound

Mehlig calls these conditions "secondary homogenizations", as each condition allows the speaker to conceptualize what would ordinarily be an accomplishment/achievement as an activity predicate—that is, predicates that would usually be considered heterogeneous (and telic) are re-construed as homogeneous (and atelic). Some examples will illustrate this point.

Distributive[2] predicates involve an unspecified number of objects. Take the following predicate, for instance:

(1)   На "Скорой помощи" Артема, к примеру, задолженность по зарплате колоссальная. Два-три месяца медикам **деньги повыплачивают**, и опять затишье.

The Artema Emergency Service, for instance, has gone hugely in debt paying wages. For two or three months they **will pay out wages** to the medics, and again all is quiet.

Here there is no explicit bound on the object деньги 'wages'. Thus the speaker is able to re-conceptualize the predicate выплатить деньги 'pay out wages'—normally a goal-oriented process—as an activity, выплачивать деньги 'pay out wages' that has no inherent beginning, middle, or end phase. Such a situation is thus homogeneous and admits delimitative formation through the prefix по-, yielding повыплачивать деньги 'pay out wages (for a while)'.

---

[2] The term distributive here is not to be confused with the distributive Aktionsart in Russian. Mehlig refers to the latter as the resultative-distributive in his article, and reserves the term *distributive* for predicates such as those I describe here.

Iterative predicates differ from distributive predicates in that they do have bounded objects. However, iterative predicates represent homogeneous situations because the number of repetitions of the action is unbounded. For example:

(2)   В раннем детстве я страдала крайней неопределённостью -меня кидало в разные начинания:училась игре на фортепиано(кстати 7 лет мучений не прошли даром),занималась танцами,рисованием,большим теннисом(кстати иногда и сейчас не прочь **поперебрасывать мячик**),плаванием...в позднем детстве стала менее энергичной и более постоянной.

In my early childhood I suffered from extreme uncertainty—I was thrown into various undertakings: I learned to play the piano (by the way 7 years of torture weren't in vain), I did dancing, drawing, tennis (incidentally sometimes even now I'm not against **batting the ball a while**), swimming…in later childhood I became less energetic and more steady.

Here the direct object is bounded: there is only one ball to be tossed. The number of ball-tossings, however, is not: The speaker could theoretically toss the ball until she becomes exhausted. Because there is no bound on the number of ball-tossings, this predicate has no inherent beginning, middle, or end—all phases of the predicate перебрасывать мячик are identical. The predicate thus represents a homogeneous event, which permits the use of the delimitative поперебрасывать мячик 'toss the ball around (a while)'. Delimitative use here is permitted despite the fact that this event is usually conceived of as an accomplishment перебросить мячик 'toss the ball'.

Frequentative predicates are like iterative predicates in that they involve a bounded object but an unbounded number of repetitions of the action. Unlike iterative predicates, in frequentative predicates each repetition has an internal bound (making frequentative predicates a subtype of iterative predicate). The following example will illustrate this type of predicate:

(3)   **Попринимайте гомеопатический препарат Arnica 6 пару раз на дню** подальше от еды.

'**Take the homeopathic preparation Arnica 6 a couple times a day** a little while after eating.'

The bolded predicate contains a bounded argument: the medicine Arnica 6 (as opposed to an unspecified number of medicines). The length of time the patient should use the medication is not specified—it could be anywhere from several days to several months.

Without a bounded duration of medicine-taking, this predicate involves an unspecified (and hence unbounded) number of repetitions of the action, rendering it homogeneous. Every day that the patient takes Arnica 6, however, he is instructed to take it twice—so there is a repetition-internal bound in this scenario. In the hierarchy that Mehlig posits, frequentative predicates can be viewed as a subtype of iterative predicate.

Secondary Homogenizations: Replaced by Iterativity?

Kisseleva & Tatevosov (2004) discussed delimitative use in a variety of contexts in their presentation at the Slavistics conference in Leuven. In the course of this broader discussion, Kisseleva & Tatevosov mention that Mehlig's three-tier hierarchy is unnecessary and that a single condition, iterativity, can replace all three of the secondary homogenizations. They define iterativity as such: "A predicate is iterative iff[3] every part of the event involves the whole participant of that event" (2004:5). Kisseleva & Tatevosov give the following example that embodies this idea (2004:5):

(4)   Вася пооткрывал дверь пять минут и бросил.

       'Vasja tried opening the door for five minutes and then gave up.'

Here, every part of the action пооткрывал 'tried opening' involves the object дверь 'door'. Thus this is an iterative predicate and delimitative formation is permitted. Example (4) differs from the next example, in which every part of the action does not relate to the whole patient (according to Kisseleva & Tatevosov 2004:3):

(5)   *Он порасстреливал пленного.

       'He spent some time shooting the captive.'

Kisseleva & Tatevosov assert that there are several sub-parts of the action порасстреливал 'shoot' that do not involve the пленного 'captive' as the patient: checking the gun, loading it, taking aim, etc. Because these subparts do not involve the captive as patient, this predicate does not fit the definition of iterativity that Kisseleva & Tatevosov propose; hence delimitative formation is excluded in this predicate.

Unfortunately, the same can be said of the earlier example (4) involving struggling Vasja and the door that will not open. By using logic analogous to that used to

---

[3] Here "iff" is shorthand for "if and only if".

examine predicate (5), we can easily identify subparts of the action пооткрывал дверь 'tried to open the door (a while)' that do not involve the object дверь 'door' as patient: Vasja could quite plausibly roll up his sleeves, bare his teeth, and even grunt as he strains to open the door. These sub-actions—rolling up sleeves, baring teeth, and grunting—are just as much a part of the event пооткрывал дверь 'tried to open the door (a while)' as the sub-actions of loading the gun and aiming are part of the event *порасстреливал пленного 'shoot the captive (a while)'. And yet delimitative formation is excluded in (5) but permitted in (4). This raises a logical question: Does Kisseleva & Tatevosov's definition of iterativity capture the conditions that could predict delimitative formation or exclusion in accomplishment/achievement predicates?

Data Collection and Analysis

In order to have a better idea of the explanatory power of both Mehlig's and Kisseleva & Tatevosov's theories, I gathered a data set of 50 predicates containing verbs of the type по- + derived imperfective. Data were gathered using www.yandex.ru, which was selected as a collection tool for several reasons: Many of verbs of the type по- + derived imperfective are highly colloquial and unlikely to appear in standard literary contexts; a preliminary search on the Russian National Corpus (www.ruscorpora.ru) revealed only a few scattered examples. Yandex, however, allows users to search the entire body of Russian web pages, including discussion boards, personal web pages, and forums, where the language is highly colloquial and uncensored. A preliminary search of Yandex with several test-verbs revealed that a much larger data set could be produced using this method. Finally, Yandex automatically lemmatizes the search term(s), so that one can search using the infinitive to find past, non-past, imperatives, gerunds, etc. (compare this to Google, which yields only exact-spelling matches).

I selected the following ten verbs as search terms because they appeared frequently on the Russian web during test searches (each verb is followed by the number of web pages it occurred on in the search results):

повыметать 'sweep out'	1,474
повыплачивать 'pay out'	287
повысылать 'send out/away'	1,219

позадерживать 'withhold'	351
поотщипывать 'nip off'	280
поперебрасывать 'throw over, shift; toss'	225
попересаживать 'transplant; make change seats; relocate'	739
поподписывать 'sign'	1,106
попридумывать 'think up'	8,063
поразыскивать 'find; dig, search; hound out'	201

On average, a given verb occurred on 1,394.5 web pages. These numbers, however, must be interpreted with care: There is no way of telling exactly how many of these occurrences are originals and not quoted texts (i.e., duplicates of one and the same predicate), although many of them assuredly are not. The mechanics of the search engine Yandex falsely pairs these verbs with "perfective partners", such as поподписать for поподписывать 'sign' and includes these supposed "partner" verbs in the body of search results. In addition, Yandex makes no distinction between morphologically identical Aktionsarten, meaning that many of the predicates in the body of search results are not delimitative (many are of the distributive Aktionsarten, which is morphologically identical to the delimitative; see below for discussion). Thus the above figures do **not** establish the frequency of delimitative predicates of the type по- + derived imperfective on the Russian Internet. Rather, they are intended to verify that these verbs do exist and are used by native speakers of Russian, even though many of them are absent from the standard dictionaries.

In treating the final data set, two caveats must be addressed. Not all of the occurrences found in a given search were generated by native speakers; non-native data may not accurately reflect the true constraints on delimitative formation in Russian. This challenge inherent in Internet data was dealt with according to the guidelines set forth by the Linguists for the Responsible Use of Internet Data (http://www.unc.edu/~lajanda/responsible.html). Web pages containing a noticeable amount of Ukrainian mixed with Russian were avoided (as the possibility that the author's Russian was influenced by his/her Ukrainian fluency could not be ruled out), and most of the predicates used in this study were gathered only from sites with .ru and .ua

domains. The final data set was double-checked by a native Russian speaker—any example that struck the native speaker as questionable was removed.

Furthermore, delimitative predicates of the type по- + derived imperfective are morphologically identical to what Isačenko calls distributive predicates of the type по- + derived imperfective. The final data set was thus carefully screened so as to include no predicates of the distributive Aktionsart. Distributive predicates (Isačenko 1960; Zaliznjak & Šmelev 2000; called resultative-distributive in Mehlig 2001), though morphologically identical to delimitatives, do not indicate that the action in question was performed over a delimited time span. Rather, such predicates emphasize that the action involved either all the objects in question, or a certain subset of them (Isačenko 1960: 278), without reference to the time frame over which the action occurred. The following is a typical distributive Aktionsart predicate:

(6)   Не пора ли вам прошерстить ваши ряды и "поганой метлой" **повыметать всех сотрудников**, что имели (а может до сих пор имеют) отношение к разным черным делишкам?

Isn't it time for you to purge the ranks and with a "foul broom" **sweep out all the colleagues** who had (and maybe up until now still have) relations with various under-handed affairs?

Here the predicate повыметать всех сотрудников 'sweep out all the colleagues' does not indicate that the action occurred over a delimited period of time. Rather, it indicates that *all* colleagues who had gotten their hands dirty in shady business would experience the action of being swept out. The additional details of the distributive Aktionsart do not concern us here. Predicates of this Aktionsart were not included in the final data set.

The 50 predicates in the final data set were classified in a two-step process. First, all predicates were classified according to Mehlig's system: Predicates containing an unbounded object were labeled distributive; predicates in which there was a bounded object but an unbounded number of repetitions were labeled iterative; and predicates containing a bounded object, an unbounded number of repetitions, and an internal bound in every repetition were labeled frequentative. All predicates were then classified according to Kisseleva & Tatevosov's system, as either iterative or non-iterative. To minimize the possible subjectivity in classifying predicates according to Kisseleva &

Tatevosov's stipulations, I strived to use logic analogous to that Kisseleva & Tatevosov

used to classify their own data.

An example will illustrate how this two-fold classification works:

(7)   Я частично смотрела «За стеклом» и «Фабрику - 2» (потому что по ней
        просто обмирала моя сестра). Мне было достаточно посмотреть «За
        стеклом», чтобы понять всю схему таких шоу. Смотреть на чужую жизнь
        мне жалко времени, т.к. у меня есть моя, которую хочу прожить
        плодовороно [sic], чтобы в старости не жалеть. Сейчас идёт «Голод», но его
        ни разу не смотрела (просто так получается, хотя разок бы глянула на суть
        этого действия). В рекламе говориься [sic], что победитель будет получать
        1000 баксов ежемесячно...У меня появилась мысль, что с победителем
        может неожиданно произойти через некоторое время после победы
        «несчастный случай» или **повыплачивают деньги** какое-то время, а потом
        вдруг кто-то обанкротится...Что-то в этом роде. Слишком большие деньги
        для пожизненного выигрыша (если я правильно вникла в это шоу).

        'I halfway watched "Behind the Glass" and "The Factory—2" (because my sister
        was just crazy about it). It was enough for me to see "Behind the Glass" in order
        to understand the whole scheme of such shows. I don't want to waste time
        watching someone else's life, since I have my own that I want to live fruitfully, so
        that I won't regret it in my old age. Now "Hunger" is playing, but I haven't seen
        it a single time (that's just how it turns out, although I would have glanced once at
        its main point). In the advertisement it's said that the winner will receive 1,000
        bucks a month…The thought crossed my mind that after some time the winner
        could unexpectedly experience an "accident" or they'**ll pay out money for some
        time**, and then suddenly someone will go bankrupt…Something of that sort. Too
        much money for a lifetime win (if I've correctly understood this show).'

        Mehlig: distributive; unbounded money
        Kissleva & Tatevosov: NI; deciding on payment method, any requisite
                                     paperwork

Here the predicate повыплачивали деньги 'pay out money for a while' is labeled

distributive in Mehlig's system. The reason for this classification is that the verbal object

деньги 'money' is unbounded. This same predicate is labeled non-iterative (NI)

according to Kisseleva & Tatevosov's criterion "A predicate is iterative iff every part of

the event involves the whole participant of that event" (Kisseleva & Tatevosov 2004: 5).

To help the reader understand why this is a non-iterative predicate in their system, I list

several parts of the event повыплачивать деньги 'pay out money for while' that do not

involve the whole participant деньги 'money' as patient, namely, the paperwork and general processing that occurs every time a sum is paid out.

If both Mehlig's and Kisseleva & Tatevosov's systems explained the data equally well, then it would follow that every predicate in the data set would satisfy the conditions for delimitative formation presented by both models. This, however, was not the case. The results of the classification are summed up in this Table 1:

Table 1

Mehlig (2001): 3 types of secondary homogenizations	Kisseleva & Tatevosov (2004): Iterativity
36 distributive predicates	0 iterative predicates
14 iterative predicates	50 non-iterative predicates
0 frequentative predicates	

In Mehlig's system, 36 predicates were distributive, and the remaining 14 were iterative. No frequentative predicates turned up in the data set. This does not indicate that such predicates do not exist, but confirms that they are uncommon (Mehlig 2005: personal communication). None of the predicates satisfied the conditions of iterativity under Kisseleva & Tatevosov's system—that is, it was possible (without stretching the imagination) to posit subparts of the action in any given predicate that do not involve the object as patient, as was illustrated in example (7). This does not mean that Kisseleva & Tatevosov's condition of iterativity applies to no delimitative predicates at all, but that such predicates did not occur in this data set. However, as no special effort to avoid such predicates was made, it is safe to say that there are likely many other delimitative predicates that cannot be explained by Kisseleva & Tatevosov's condition of iterativity. Thus, on the basis of the data examined, there is reason to believe that delimitative formation is better explained by a construal-based approach, such as Mehlig's (2001), than by an approach that relies heavily on the logical, real-world details of the action, such as that presented by Kisseleva & Tatevosov (2004).

The New ITERATIVITY

However, after a second look at the data, Kisseleva & Tatevosov's (2004:5) original assumption that there is one quality unifying all three of Mehlig's secondary homogenizations seems to be accurate. To borrow their term, this unifying quality can be named ITERATIVITY and can be given a revised definition: the property of an action construed as occurring in identical (or nearly identical) sub-segments. This new definition of ITERATIVITY highlights the importance of the speaker's construal of the action. Although construal is in some respects constrained by the logical reality of a situation, a construer is free to overlook some of the situational details in his construal. Thus the logical details of the action are no longer the sole factor determining the exclusion or admission of delimitative formation in a given predicate. What is central is the speakers *ability to conceptualize* the action as occurring in identical, or nearly identical, sub-segments. The (conceptually) identical nature of the sub-segments permits a homogeneous interpretation of the situation, which, as Mehlig emphasizes, is the primary precondition for delimitative formation. All predicates encoding actions that can be construed according to this definition should—in theory, at least—permit delimitative formation. Table 2 compares Mehlig's, Kisseleva & Tatevosov's, and my own systems for predicting delimitative formation in accomplishment/achievement predicates:

Table 2

Mehlig (2001) 3 Secondary Homogenizations	Kisseleva & Tatevosov (2004): Delimitative Use	LeBlanc (2005): ITERATIVITY
Distributives: unbounded number of actors	**Incrementality**: Every part of the event involves some part of the patient.[4]	**ITERATIVITY**: the property of an action that is construed as occurring in discrete, identical (or nearly identical) sub-segments.
Iteratives: bounded number of actors, unbounded repetitions	**Iterativity**: Every part of the action involves the whole patient.	
Frequentatives: bounded number of actors, unbounded number of repetitions (each with an internal bound)		

---

[4] This part of Kisseleva & Tatevosov's theory does not pertain to the present investigation and as such is not discussed in this article.

Do all the predicates in the data set exhibit this property of ITERATIVITY? After a re-examination of the data, I believe that the answer to that question is yes. Space does not permit an exposition of every single predicate in the data, but a look at some of the more typical cases will suffice:

(8)   Очевидно, чтобы избежать подобного прокола на Новый Год, US Airways приглашает всех не состоящих в профсоюзах работников и просто волонтеров заняться интереснейшим и полезнейшим для талии и печени делом - **поперебрасывать чемоданы** вместо веселых посиделок за праздничным столом.

It is evident that in order to avoid a similar blow-out on New Year's, US Airways is inviting all non-union employees and simply volunteers to engage in an interesting activity that's useful for the waistline and the liver—**spending time tossing suitcases** instead of at merry gatherings at the holiday table.

Here the predicate поперебрасывать чемоданы 'spending time tossing suitcases' encodes the action of tossing an unspecified quantity of suitcases. Each act of suitcase-tossing is construed as identical to all other acts of suitcase-tossing. Although in reality the suitcases may be of varying shapes and sizes, tossing some may require more effort than others, and the workers might even drop a few from time to time, all of these real-world differences between sub-acts are ignored. What matters here is the speaker's *construal* of the situation as homogeneous: Whether consciously or not, the speaker does not have in mind all the real-world differences between each sub-segment of suitcase-tossing; to him/her all the sub-segments are identical. As a result, this predicate possesses the property of ITERATIVITY and delimitative use is thus permitted.

(9)   Подумала, что раз уж скоро Новый Год, но надо бабушкам **поподписывать открытки** и отправить. И первое, что пришло на ум, это необходимость их ПОДПИСЫВАТЬ на русском языке... от руки. Самый последний печальный опыт в этом нелегком деле был совсем недавно.

I thought that New Year's is almost here, but I need **to do some card-signing** for the grandmas and send them off. And the first thing that came to mind was the necessity of SIGNING them in Russian…by hand. My latest sad experience in this difficult matter occurred quite recently.

In this scenario there were more than likely many differences between individual acts of card-signing: Perhaps the speaker knew some of the women better than she knew others, resulting in some cards containing more personal notes than others. Though there may

have been some duplicates, there were likely a number of different sorts of cards signed.
Maybe the signer even used different colors of ink to sign some cards. All of these real-
world differences are irrelevant, however, to the speaker's construal of the situation. She
conceptualizes every act of card-signing as identical to all the others, regardless of actual
differences between them. The situation is thus interpreted as homogeneous (that is, as
an activity, as opposed to an accomplishment/achievement, which the predicate
подписать открытку 'sign a card' would usually indicate), and delimitative formation is
permitted.

(10)   Вскоре все оказались в столовой, где народу представили очередного
именинника - мистера Тыкву, отчаянного коллекционера монет. Поэтому
духи решили собрать и подарить ему много разных монет. Призраки
поделились на команды и отправились поиски подарков. Им удалось
побывать в кунсткамере, порассказывать и **попридумывать разные
истории**, поозвучивать мелодии.

Before long everyone ended up in the dining room, where they were presented
with today's nameday celebrant—Mister Tykva, the desperate coin collector.
Therefore the spirits decided to pitch in and give him many different coins as a
gift. The ghosts divided themselves into teams and search parties for gifts were
sent off. They managed to visit the Kunstkamera, tell and **think up various
stories**, make a little music.

In this final example, each act of story-thinking-up is obviously different from the other
acts of story-thinking-up—if they were all identical, the listeners would surely have tired
of hearing the same story repeated over and over again. But despite differences in story
length, creativity, and narrative structure, the speaker *construes* them all as identical. A
homogeneous interpretation of the action results, and delimitative formation is permitted.

Conclusion

In sum, ITERATIVITY is a plausible explanation of the delimitative use in the
predicates examined in this paper. More specifically, the definition of ITERATIVITY as the
property of an action that is construed as occurring in discrete, identical (or nearly
identical) sub-segments explained delimitative use in the data set more effectively than
the original definition Kisseleva & Tatevosov (2004) posit (that is, that every part of the
event must involve the whole patient as its object). The revised ITERATIVITY also
provides a satisfactory confirmation of Kisseleva & Tatevosov's notion that there is one

property underlying Mehlig's three-tier hierarchy of secondary homogenizations. However, this does not mean that ITERATIVITY replaces that hierarchy. Mehlig's system of distributive, iterative, and frequentative predicates still captures important differences between ITERATIVE predicates and thus should not be discarded. ITERATIVITY provides a simple means of predicting and explaining delimitative formation in the type of predicates we have examined here; Mehlig's system then goes on to categorize these ITERATIVE predicates into three sub-groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Binnick, Robert I. 1991. *Time and the verb: A guide to tense and aspect*. New York/Oxford: Oxford U Press.

Čertkova, Marina. 1996. *Grammaticheskaja kategorija vida v sovremennom russkom jazyke*. Moscow State University: Moscow.

Dickey, Stephen M. and Julie Hutcheson. 2003. "Delimitative Verbs in Russian, Czech, and Slavic," *American Contributions to the 13th International Congress of Slavists*, vol. 1. Bloomington: Slavica, 23-36.

Dickey, Stephen M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect. A Cognitive Approach*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Dmitrieva, Olga. 2000. "Formirovanie sistemy russkix delimitativnyx glagolov," *Predloženie i slovo: paradigmatičeskij, tekstovyj i kommunikativnyj aspekty*. Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta, 28-33.

Flier, Michael S. 1985. "The Scope of Prefixal Delimitation in Russian" in Michael S. Flier and Alan Timberlake, eds. *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 41-58.

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

Holden, Kyril T. 1981. "The role of metaphor in defining Russian aspect," *Canadian Slavonic Papers (Revue Canadienne des Slavistes)*. 31, 25-43.

Isačenko, A. V. 1960. *Grammatičeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s slovackim – Čast' vtoraja: morfologija*. Bratislava: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk.

Janda, Laura A. 2002. "The conceptualization of events and their relationship to time in Russian." *Glossos 2*. http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/.

Janda, Laura A. 2004. "A metaphor in a search of a domain: the categories of Slavic aspect," *Cognitive Linguistics*, vol. 15, no. 4, 471-527.

Janda, Laura A. (forthcoming) "Aspectual clusters of Russian verbs." Submitted to *Studies in Language*, 68 pgs.

Kisseleva, Xenia and Sergei Tatevosov. 2004. "Incrementality and the Delimitative." Presentation at *Perspectives on Slavistics* conference. K. U. Leuven, Belgium. 18 September 2004.

Krifka, M. (1998). "The origins of telicity." in S. Rothstein, ed. *Events and Grammar.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. 197-235.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* Chicago: U of Chicago.

Ludwig, Jonathan Zachary. 1995. *Multiply-Prefixed Verbs in Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian*. Doctoral dissertation. Indiana University.

Maslov, Ju. S. 1959. "Glagol'nyj vid v sovremmenom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke," in S. B. Bernštejn, ed. *Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literurnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR. 157-378.

Mehlig, Hans Robert. 1996. "Some analogies between the morphology of nouns and the morphology of aspect in Russian," *Folia Linguistica*. 30, 87-109.

Mehlig, Hans Robert. 2001. "Glagol'nyj vid i vtoričnaja gomogenizacija oboznačaemoj situacii posredstvom kvantifikacii: K upotrebleniju delimitativnogo sposoba dejstvija v russkom jazyke," *Slavjanskij vid i leksografija*. Christian-Albrechts-Universität. Preprint No. 57
(To be published in Semantika i Struktura slavjanskogo vida. Sbornik materialov konferencii "Slavjanskij vid i leksikografija. Hamburg, July 2001. *Slavolinguistica 5*. München, Sagner 2005.)

Petruxina, E. V. 2000. *Aspektual'nye kategorii glagola v russkom jazyke: v sopostovlenii s češskim, slovackim, pol'skim i bolgarskim jazykami.* Moscow: Izdatel'stov Moskovskogo Universiteta.

Timberlake, Alan. 1984. "The Temporal Schemata of Russian Predicates," in Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht, eds. *Issues in Russian Morphosyntax* Columbus, Ohio: UCLA Slavic Studies, vol. 10. 35-57.

Vendler, Zeno. 1957. "Verbs and times." *The philosophical review*. 66, 143-160.

Veyrenc, Jacques. 1980. "Pour une Grammaire Syntagmatique des Préverbes," *Etudes sur le Verbe Russe*. Paris: Institut pour d'Etudes Slaves.

Zaliznjak, Anna A. and Aleksej D. Šmelev. 2000. *Vvedenie v russkuju aspektologiju*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.