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The Scope of “Secondary” Imperfectivization
in Bulgarian, Russian, and Upper Sorbian

Gary H. Toops

This paper has two purposes. The first is to seek the elimination of one particularly recurrent terminological ambiguity in studies of Slavic verbal aspect by defining what is vs. what should be meant by the term “secondary imperfectivization.” Obviously, if scholars who use the term “secondary imperfectivization” (or its apparent synonym “re-imperfectivization”) fail to explain how the morphosemantic operation designated by this term differs from that denoted by the simple term “imperfectivization,” then the former term is pleonastic at best; at worst, the term implies the existence of some “primary” imperfectivizing process that is distinct from that imperfectivizing process referred to as “secondary.” Fortunately, a critical examination of the relevant linguistic literature reveals that scholars generally use the term not to designate some secondary derivation of imperfective verbs, but rather to refer to the derivation of so-called secondary imperfectives that stand in contrast to “primary,” or basic, imperfectives, i.e., imperfective verbs whose stems do not include a verbal prefix. Even so, it remains pointless to speak of the derivation of “secondary” imperfectives, since all such imperfective verbs are derived (specifically, through stem suffixation), while all other imperfectives, being basic, are by definition non-derivative.

The second purpose of this paper is to demonstrate—by reviewing certain semantic properties of aspectually imperfective verbs derived by stem suffixation in contemporary Bulgarian, Russian, and Upper Sorbian—that the term “secondary imperfectivization” does have a place in aspectological studies nonetheless. However, if we are to maintain conceptual clarity in linguistic discussions, the term must denote a morphosemantic operation in contemporary Slavic languages that is, if not always formally, then at least semantically distinct from the process of imperfectivization pure and simple.

Example sets (1) and (2), below, suffice to illustrate for the time being what I intend to convey by the term “secondary imperfective” as opposed to both basic and derived imperfectives generally:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>BASIC IMPERFECTIVE</th>
<th>PREFIXAL PERFECTIVE</th>
<th>“SECONDARY” IMPERFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>че́та</td>
<td>→ процедурь</td>
<td>→ прочита́м</td>
<td>‘to read’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>я́м</td>
<td>→ изъя́м</td>
<td>→ изъядам</td>
<td>‘to eat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ка́рам</td>
<td>→ нака́рам</td>
<td>→ нака́рвам</td>
<td>‘to force’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>мия́ (се)</td>
<td>→ изми́я́ (се)</td>
<td>→ измивам́ (се)</td>
<td>‘to wash’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>печатам</td>
<td>→ отпечатам</td>
<td>→ отпечатвам</td>
<td>‘to print’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пи́ша</td>
<td>→ напи́ша</td>
<td>→ написвам</td>
<td>‘to write’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>правъ</td>
<td>→ направъ</td>
<td>→ направвам</td>
<td>‘to do/make’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the results of secondary imperfectivization in Upper Sorbian (hereafter, USo) are semantically comparable to those in Bulgarian and Russian, aspectual considerations motivating the formation of secondary imperfectives in USo differ and are better illustrated by example set (3).¹

In this paper I maintain that the imperfective verbs listed above in the left-hand column together with the perfective verbs listed in the middle column of example sets (1)–(3) constitute “true” aspectual pairs, to the extent that such verb pairs are defined as being characterized by a subordinative opposition of the features [±P] vs. [+P], where [P] stands for [perfective]. I consider this to apply to imperfective/perfective (hereafter, “I/P”) verb pairs regardless of the “direction” of the derivation, i.e., be it I → P (as in example set [1]) or I ← P (as in example set [2]). The verbs labelled “secondary imperfective” in the right-hand column of example sets (1) and (3) accordingly do not enter into the subordinative opposition [±P] vs. [+P] by which I/P aspect pairs are normally defined in the grammars of contemporary Slavic languages.

¹ The results of secondary imperfectivization in Lower Sorbian (LSo), on the other hand, will be discussed in a forthcoming paper.
Owing either to a persistent adherence to lexicographic tradition or to a strictly formalistic approach to the postulation of aspe­ctual pairs, various linguists in the past fifty years have denied, and to this day continue to deny, the existence of aspectual pairs that consist of a basic imperfective and a prefixally derived perfective verb. Such linguists regard as aspectually paired only perfective verbs and those imperfectives derived from them through stem suffixation. The reasons cited for adopting this standpoint typically include the formal and lexical identity of the base of the two verbs in question and the formal regularity (i.e., stem suffixation) that characterizes the derivation of prefixed imperfective verbs from prefixed perfective ones (see inter alios Aronson 1977:10–11). Another reason that is sometimes cited is simply that this is the way verb entries generally appear in dictionaries of Slavic languages (cf. Fielder 1993:23). Since basic imperfective verbs usually have separate dictionary entries, this last reason inevitably results in an illusory inflation of the number of imperfectiva tantum in the individual Slavic languages. Semantic considerations of tense, including the potential for continuous (eventive) and conative readings normally exhibited by imperfective verbs (specifically, telic verbs according to Vendler 1967) as well as their temporal coordinability, are either ignored or subordinated to considerations of the identity of lexical and/or sublexical morphemes and the regularity of formal derivation.

Even linguists who maintain that only those verbs listed in the right-hand column of example set (1) constitute “true” imperfective-aspect partners of the prefixal perfectives from which they are derived, often acknowledge the “special status” of these secondary imperfectives in contrast to basic and other derived imperfectives (e.g., Hult 1981, following Maslov 1963:6, speaks of their being “temporally defective,” while the Bulgarian Academy Grammar [1983:267] refers to their being “syntactically restricted”). In the Bulgarian linguistic literature in recent years they have been labelled “написвам-type” verbs (Thelin 1981; Lindstedt 1985:131–33). Since the semantics of secondary imperfectivization as I use the term here are comparable in Slavic languages other than Bulgarian—essentially, the only Slavic language (if we discount Macedonian) in which the term “написвам-type verb” can be meaningfully employed—, it behooves us to speak of secondary imperfectives instead. In so doing, we find ourselves following in essence the practice of Ivančev 1971 and 1976, who distinguishes between (basic or derived) “imperfective-1” and (derived) “imperfective-2” verbs ($NSV_1$ or $NS_1$ vs. $NSV_2$ or $NS_2$, where $NSV$ or $NS$ stands for несъвършен [вид] ‘imperfective [aspect]’).

The more frequent attention accorded to secondary imperfectives in Bulgarian, relative to Russian and Sorbian, linguistics is no doubt due to the fact, stated by Maslov (1963:5), “that in Bulgarian such forms exist for almost all verbs formed with ‘empty prefixes’ or with the ‘perfectivizing suffix’ –н–” and that “only in a few cases does the formation of a secondary imperfective stem prove here to be impossible due to reasons of a formal-technical nature.” Indeed, according to the Bulgarian Academy Grammar (1983:267), secondary imperfectives as defined here (i.e., “написвам-type” verbs) number approximately 200, or about 3.25% of the overall number of prefixed verbs in the Bulgarian language today.
Some of the confusion surrounding the postulation of I/P aspect pairs can be traced at least to the early 1940s, when Mazon, in his *Grammaire de la langue russe* (1943:216ff.), adduced the notions of *préverbes pleins* and *préverbes vides* with respect to Russian prefixed verbs. Two decades later, Maslov, in his work on the morphology of verbal aspect in Bulgarian, would invoke the term *préverbe vide* (i.e., '[lexically] empty verbal prefix') as a synonym of the Russian *чисто видовая приставка* ('purely aspectual prefix'—1963:5). Although the term *préverbe vide* subsequently became synonymous with "purely aspectual prefix," Mazon himself had used the term inconsistently: for him, "empty prefixes" might in some instances be instrumental in the formation of lexically synonymous perfective-aspect partners to basic imperfective verbs, while in others, the prefixes, although devoid of any discernible lexical meaning (at least from a synchronic viewpoint), might nevertheless play a rôle in lexical derivation. Example set (4), below, illustrates Mazon's conceptualization of *préverbes vides*:

(4) Mazon's *préverbes vides* (1943:217–22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Превербе ви́де</th>
<th>Изначальный сте́м</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>идёт 'il va'</td>
<td>по-идёт 'il ira'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>несёт 'il porte'</td>
<td>с-несёт 'il portera'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(родился?)</td>
<td>на-родился 'il est né'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*имет?)</td>
<td>по-имет 'il comprendra'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*щелет?)</td>
<td>с-щелет 'il trouvera'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inconsistency of Mazon's approach to verbal prefixes is even more obvious in the light of the fact that he classified the prefix of *no-бежит* 'il commencer à courir' as a *préverbe plein* (1943:220), while, as we have seen above ([4]), the prefix of *no-идет* 'il ira' constituted for Mazon a *préverbe vide* used to form a perfective aspectual partner to *идет* 'il va' (1943:217).

Reacting perhaps at least in part to such notions of empty, or purely aspectual, prefixes and their rôle in the derivation of perfective aspectual partners to basic imperfective verbs, Maslov rejected, as did Isachenko, the notion that the perfective member of any I/P aspect pair could ever be derived as such by means of prefixation. Thus, for Maslov, *читать*| *прочитать* ‘to read’, *писать*| *писать* ‘to write’, *слабеть*| *ослабеть* ‘to weaken, grow weak’, *неметь*| *онеметь* ‘to become dumb, speechless’, etc., did not constitute aspectual pairs, while *прочитывать*| *прочитать*, *ослабевать*| *ослабеть*, *онемевать*| *онеметь*, etc., did. In setting forth this position, however, Maslov (1963:5–6) made two significant concessions: (a) "... in isolated instances (Russian *делать*| *делать* and a few others) the relations between the prefixed and non-prefixed stem do approach absolute lexical identity"; and (b) "the verb ... with the simpler morphological structure (неметь, etc.) is used significantly more often than the derived imperfective-aspect forms (онемевать), especially in certain syntactic functions (e.g., in a concrete progressive sense [в конкретно-процессном значении], etc.)."

Thus, we again note a "special status" being accorded to the secondary imperfective relative to the basic imperfective verb form. Moreover, in explaining why a
speaker of Bulgarian or Russian might select the secondary imperfective in lieu of the basic imperfective verb—why one would choose, say, Bulgarian написавам in place of писа, Maslov created a conceptual dilemma when he stated (1963:127): “Obviously ... there exists a need for imperfective verb forms that retain the prefix [of the perfective verb], and this means that so-called ‘empty’ prefixes prove in fact not to be ‘empty’ at all. They carry a nuance of limitedness [пределности] of one sort or another, a nuance which a speaker or writer may not at all be inclined to forego even when s/he needs to use an imperfective verb form.” As Forsyth explained in his annotated translation of Maslov 1985, the term пределный ‘limited’ (or, more accurately, ‘bounded’6) derives from “the noun ‘limit’ (предел) which has long been a basic concept in Russian in defining the perfective (cf. for instance the Academy of Sciences’ Грамматика русского языка, Moscow, 1960, vol. 1, p. 424)” (Maslov 1985:7). In sum, Maslov 1963 had arrived at the self-contradicting conclusion that the prefix of verbs like Bulgarian написа is not lexically “empty,” i.e., that the prefix is not “purely aspectual” precisely because it expresses a meaning that is aspectual (viz., “limit- edness,” a semantic property of the perfective aspect!)

Isačenko 1968 contributed to this conceptual dilemma by subsuming the perfective members of such Russian verb pairs as делать/делать ‘to do’, писать/писать ‘to write’, варить/сварить ‘to cook’, and строить/построить ‘to build’ under the rubric of a “resultative Aktionsart” (1968:393) after maintaining that “under no circumstances do the basic verb and the Aktionsart formed from it constitute an aspectual pair, inasmuch as the Aktionsart expresses an additional shade of meaning that is absent in the basic verb” (1968:386). Some two decades earlier, however, Vinogradov (1947:487) had noted that “the basic exponent of the perfective aspect is the indication of an action limit.... Result is a particular manifestation of an action’s limit.... The designation of result is one of the basic meanings of the perfective aspect...” (thus cited in Toops 1979:9).

Among American linguists, Aronson 1977 maintained that only derived imperfectives enter into grammatical oppositions with perfective verbs, while basic imperfectives enter into no such oppositions. Aronson 1985 further maintained that basic imperfectives in Bulgarian (and also Russian) are “aspectless,” while constituting at the same time the unmarked members of a privative opposition “[−P]/[+P],” where [−P] was understood to be an aspectual property (Aktionsart) of all prefixally derived perfective verbs and their suffixally derived counterparts. Setting store only by the formal identity of the prefix of each verb form, Aronson denied any “special status” to secondary imperfectives like Bulgarian написавам (see above) and on that basis alone considered them equivalent, in terms of aspectual semantics, to derived imperfectives like приспевам ‘to ascribe’ and приспевам ‘to rewrite’. Consequently, Lindstedt (1985:44) later imputed to Aronson “an extreme form of ... confusion.”

Maslov (1963:24–25) established four “paradigmatic criteria” and three “syntactic criteria” for identifying a given verb as aspectually imperfective in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian. He regarded these criteria, enumerated below in example sets (5) and (6), as being “absolute”:

---

5. **Paradigmatic Criteria**

- **Criterion 1:** The imperfective verb form must have a prefix.
- **Criterion 2:** The perfective verb form must have a prefix.
- **Criterion 3:** The imperfective verb form must have a suffix.
- **Criterion 4:** The perfective verb form must have a suffix.

6. **Syntactic Criteria**

- **Criterion 5:** The imperfective verb form must be able to occur in all syntactic positions where the perfective verb form can occur.
- **Criterion 6:** The imperfective verb form must have the same aspectual properties as the perfective verb form.
- **Criterion 7:** The imperfective verb form must have the same tense properties as the perfective verb form.
Paradigmatic criteria for imperfective verbs [Maslov 1963]

Imperfective verbs admit the formation of...

a. negative imperatives of the types не + imperative, не ведей + “infinitive,” стига (доста) + perfect;

b. present participles;

c. verbal adverbs;

d. deverbal nouns with progressive meaning.

Syntactic criteria for imperfective verbs [Maslov 1963]

a. The verb can occur with the complementizer да after phasal verbs or be modified by adverbs like непрекъсан но ‘constantly’, всичко + comparative (всичко по-често ‘more and more often’), etc.

b. The verb can be used in the praesens actualis (hereafter, “continuous” or “eventive” present, past, and future).

c. The verb cannot be modified by adverbs like веднага ‘immediately’, изведнъж ‘suddenly’, etc.

If secondary imperfectives in Bulgarian are in fact equivalent to other suffixally derived imperfectives, as some have suggested (see above), then such verbs as написвам and накарвам should meet all of Maslov’s paradigmatic and syntactic criteria in the same way as приписвам and подкарвам do (see example sets [1] and [2] above). As information elicited from native speakers of Bulgarian reveals, however, secondary (i.e., “написвам-type”) imperfectives fail to meet the first two of Maslov’s paradigmatic criteria ([5a] and [5b] above) as well as the second of Maslov’s three syntactic criteria ([6b] above). At the same time, Bulgarian secondary imperfectives, like basic and other suffixally derived imperfectives, do admit the (sometimes marginal) formation of both verbal adverbs (cf. Написвайки тези писма, той включи телевизора ‘While getting [or] Having gotten these letters written, he turned on the television’ — Накарвайки ме да изляза, той искаше да остане сам ‘In forcing [or] Having forced me to leave, he wished to be left alone’) and deverbal nouns (albeit not necessarily with progressive meaning, cf: Написването на тази книга до края на месеца беше трудно ‘Getting this book written by the end of the month was difficult’ — Накарването ни да направим ров беше излишно ‘Forcing us to dig a ditch was uncalled for’). Bulgarian secondary imperfectives can also be governed by adverbials of the type mentioned in the first and third of Maslov’s syntactic criteria ([6a] and [6c], above), cf.: Почти всеки ден те веднага написваха писмата ‘Almost every day they would immediately get the letters written’ — Той ме по-често накарваше да ходя с него на кино ‘He forced me more and more often to go to the movies with him’.

The relative abundance of Bulgarian secondary imperfectives—which, as we have just seen, share the aspectual semantics of perfective verbs while retaining some of the syntactic and paradigmatic properties of “ordinary” imperfectives—is no doubt connected with a broader grammatical phenomenon in Bulgarian, viz., a taxis-related constraint on the occurrence of perfective verbs in the imperfect tense. (Much of what follows applies to perfective verbs in the “present tense,”
i.e., without the auxiliary uje, as well. Imperfect-tense forms of perfective verbs in Bulgarian are confined to (mostly temporal) subordinate clauses (see Maslov 1954:104ff., especially p. 107) and to the protasis of unreal conditional sentences (cf. Ако отидех в магазина, щях да ти купя нещо ‘If I went [or, were to go] to the store, I would buy you something’). When perfective verbs in the imperfect tense do occur elsewhere, they are stylistically marked and express what some have labelled “vividly exemplary/concretely typical meaning” (нагледно-примерно/конкретно-типично значение—cf. Stankov 1976:8). In the latter case, their functional/stylistic equivalent in Russian is the use of perfective verbs with бывало. In Bulgarian they can always be replaced in such contexts by imperfective imperfects, just as in Russian imperfective past-tense verbs can replace perfective non-past verbs in бывало constructions. (In iterative/habitual contexts, Upper Sorbian admits preterite-tense forms, as well as marked iterative pret­erites, of either or both aspects.10) These are illustrated in Bulgarian examples (7) and (8) and Russian example (9) below:

(7) Той излизаше сутрин рано, нахранявахме зайците и тогава тръгвахме на работа. [Stankov 1976:7]  
‘He went out early [each] morning, fed the rabbits, and then left for work’.

(8) Той излизаше сутрин рано, нахранявахме зайците и тогава тръгнахме на работа. [Stankov 1976:7]  
‘He would go out early in the morning, feed the rabbits, and then leave for work’.

(9) Сядете/Садился, бывало, и начните/начинал рассказывать. [after Ожегов 1982:60]  
‘He would (used to) sit down and start narrating’.

Because of the tactic constraint on imperfect-tense forms of Bulgarian perfective verbs, secondary imperfectives often occur in independent clauses instead; their instantiation is prompted by considerations of what Lindstedt (1985) has called “aspectual nesting” and what Maslov (1985) considers a combination of different markings for qualitative and quantitative aspectuality. According to Maslov (1985:17), “[t]here are cases where the meanings of quantitative aspectuality combine with qualitative aspectual meanings, modifying them in certain ways. Thus an iterative action which is limited and even attains its limit in each separate act of repetition, may, when seen as a whole, as a series of repetitions, be non-limited.” Accordingly, in the previously cited Bulgarian sentence Почти всеки ден те веднага напишаха писмата ‘Almost every day they immediately got the letters written’, the secondary imperfective напишаха occurs because the perfective imperfect напишеше is precluded from expressing iterative completions of the action in main (independent or matrix) clauses.

The principal distinguishing feature of Bulgarian secondary imperfectives, however—and the one which links them morphosemantically to secondary imperfectives in Russian and Upper Sorbian—is their inability to occur in “continuous” (eventive, praeens actualis) time frames (which, according to Lindstedt [1985:126] includes stative ones as well). Considerations of continuous vs. non-continuous
action can be found, moreover, to affect more than the instantiation of secondary imperfectives in the three languages examined here. In Upper Sorbian, for example, imperfective-aspect forms are indispensable only for conveying actions in continuous time frames; telic, achievement-type verbs (Vendler 1967) like namakać ‘to find’ and zadžeržeć ‘to stop (an object)’, whose lexical semantics are incompatible with the notion of continuous action, occur only as aspectually unpaired perfectiva tantum (see Faške 1981:191).

In Bulgarian, the feature [-continuous] is responsible, then, for the ungrammaticality (according to the Bulgarian Academy Grammar [1983:267]) of the following sentences:

(10) *Аз написвам писмо на Милка.
    'I am writing a letter to Milka'.

(11) *Аз щях да написвам писмо на Милка.
    'I was going (about) to write a letter to Milka'.

Note, however, that the derived (not “secondary”!) imperfectives дописвам ‘to finish writing’ and преписвам ‘to rewrite’, which, unlike написвам, have no lexical synonym in any basic imperfective verb form (e.g., пиша ‘to write’) and are therefore not marked [-continuous], can and do occur in continuous time frames like those in examples (10) and (11), above. Because of the feature [-continuous], secondary imperfectives in Bulgarian are also “relegated” to extended uses of the present tense, e.g., in non-continuous time frames like the historical present of (12a), which contrasts with the past tense (perfective aorists) of (12b):

(12) a. В 1824 г. П. Берон съставя и отпечатва първия български буквар.
    'In 1824 P. Beron compiles and prints the first Bulgarian primer'.

b. В 1824 г. П. Берон съставя и отпечатва първия български буквар.
    'In 1824 P. Beron compiled and printed the first Bulgarian primer'.
    [Hubenova and Dzhumadanova 1983:191]

The imperfective съставя ‘compiles’ is not a secondary imperfective, but rather the imperfective member of the I/P aspect pair съставям (-съставля­вам)/съставя (representing I ← P). This pair therefore exhibits no secondary imperfective, unlike the I/P pair печатам/отпечатам ‘to print’ (representing I → P), which does exhibit a secondary imperfective, отпечатвам, that must be used for the expression of non-continuous (including non-habitual) action specifically in such contexts as the historical present.11

Although Russian exhibits far fewer secondary imperfectives than Bulgarian,12 they, too, are marked [-continuous] and naturally occur together with basic and other derived imperfectives in iterative contexts. Example (13), below, illustrates such a Russian context:

'Today I get up the way I normally do... I peel potatoes..., stir the porridge, brew the coffee, warm up the milk, wake Dima, and go get the kids out of bed... The kids have milk and bread; Dima eats, but I can't—I just have (drink) a cup of coffee'.

Where Russian in the above-cited context exhibits the secondary imperfectives помешивать 'I stir' and выпивать 'I drink', Bulgarian will likewise exhibit secondary imperfectives (разбърква̀м and изпива̀м, resp. [vs. basic imperfectives бъ̀ркам, пѝя]), while USo has no secondary imperfectives *змё̀шжу, *купѝвам (for which USo, because of its aspectual system, has no need in any case—see above and below).

The feature [-continuous] is further underscored by the modal semantics arising from the iterative reading of the secondary imperfective in the following Russian and Bulgarian sentences; a continuous-present reading is excluded (which explains why USo exhibits here a perfective verb):

(14) [R] Она прочитывает роман за два часа.
    'She reads (can read) a novel in two hours'. [Nakhimovsky and Leed 1981:91]
    [B] Тя прочита ромъ̀н за два часа.

As the following examples (15) and (16) demonstrate, both Russian and Bulgarian can instantiate either a basic imperfective or the corresponding secondary imperfective (if one exists) in iterative contexts, although that same secondary imperfective is inadmissible in continuous time frames. Nevertheless, both languages may admit ironic uses of secondary imperfectives in continuous time frames, as we see in example sets (17) and (18), below:

(15) [R] Я каждый день ем — съ̀даю яблоко.
    'I eat an apple every day'.

(16) [R] (Что это ты делаешь?) — Я (сейчас) ем [*съ̀даю] яблоко.
    [B] (Какво правиш сега?) — Аз (сега) ям [*изъя̀дам] ѐдна я̀бъ̀лка.
    '(What's that you're doing?) — (Right now) I am eating an apple'.

(17) [R] (Что это ты делаешь?) — Я «съ̀даю» секретные документы!
    [B] (Какво правиш сега?) — «Изъя̀дам» (сега) секретни документи!
    '(What's that you're doing?) — I am «eating» secret documents!

(18) [R] Начальник попросил меня прочитать этот доклад, так вот я его (сейчас) и «прочитываю»!
    [B] Началникъ̀т ме помули да прочета този доклад, тъ̀й че го (сега) и «прочитам»!
    'The boss asked me to read this report, so (that's what I'm now doing:) I'm «reading» it!'

Despite their similarities, Russian and Bulgarian differ in the instantiation of secondary imperfectives in temporal subordinate clauses. As stated above, such clauses provide the proper environment (taxis) for present- and imperfect-tense
forms of Bulgarian perfective verbs, which accordingly express the successful completion of a given action on multiple occasions. For this purpose Russian, in contrast, has recourse to secondary imperfectives. As already noted, USo can instantiate perfective verb forms in any iterative context regardless of taxis. Continuous time frames in examples (19)–(21) are contrasted with iterative ones denoted by the temporal subordinate clauses in (22)–(24), below:

(19) [R] Он (сейчас) путает\textsuperscript{11} [*перепутывает\textsuperscript{12}] факты. ‘He is (now) getting his facts mixed up’.

(20) [R] Я (сейчас) мою\textsuperscript{11} [*вымываю\textsuperscript{12}] окна. [B] Мия\textsuperscript{11} [*Измивам\textsuperscript{12}] (сега) прозорчите ‘I am (now) washing the windows’.

(21) [R] Врач (сейчас) моет\textsuperscript{11} [*вымывает\textsuperscript{12}] руки. [Bg] Лекарят си мие\textsuperscript{11} [*измива\textsuperscript{12}] (сега) ръцете. [Us] Lëkar sej (nëtko) ruce myje\textsuperscript{11} [*wumyje\textsuperscript{p}]. ‘The doctor is (now) washing his hands’.

(22) [R] Каждый раз, когда он перепутывает\textsuperscript{12} [*путает\textsuperscript{11}] факты, он смущается. ‘Every time he gets his facts mixed up, he gets embarrassed’.

(23) [R] Каждую весну, когда я вымываю\textsuperscript{12} [*мою\textsuperscript{11}] окна, я с удовольствием ложусь на диван и смотрю на голубое небо. [B] Всяка пролет, когато измия\textsuperscript{p} [*мия\textsuperscript{11}/измивам\textsuperscript{12}] прозорчите, с удовольствие лягам на дивана и гледам синьото небе. ‘Every spring, after I wash [have washed] the windows, I gladly lie down on the sofa and look up at the blue sky’.

(24) [R] Врачи приступают к операциям только после того, как они вымывают\textsuperscript{12} [*моют\textsuperscript{11}] руки. [B] Лекарите започват операции само след като си измият\textsuperscript{p} [*мият\textsuperscript{11}/измиват\textsuperscript{12}] ръцете. [Us] Lëkarjo operacije zapocnu hakle, po tym zo sej ruce wumyja\textsuperscript{p} [*myja\textsuperscript{1}]. (∼ po tym zo su sej ruce wumyli\textsuperscript{p}). ‘Doctors begin operations only after they wash [have washed] their hands’.

If, alternately, the same Russian or Bulgarian verbal prefix expresses a distinct or concrete lexical meaning (rather than an aspectual meaning or Aktionsart), then the prefixed imperfective verb form does not constitute a secondary imperfective and thus can occur in continuous time frames. This is illustrated in examples (25) and (26), below:

(25) [R] Он (сейчас) перепутывает\textsuperscript{1} верёвки. ‘He is (now) getting the ropes tangled up’.

(26) [R] Я (сейчас) вымываю\textsuperscript{1} грязь из ванны. [B] Измивам\textsuperscript{1} (сега) мръсотията от вана. [Us] Njerjad (nëtko) z wanje wumywam\textsuperscript{1}. ‘I am (now) washing the grime out of the bathtub’.
As we see in example (26), above, Upper Sorbian exhibits a prefixed imperfective \textit{wumywac}, but only as an aspectual partner to \textit{wumyc} in its meaning 'to wash out', not as a secondary imperfective in a "verbal triangle" (Townsend 1970:55) \textit{myc}---\textit{wumyc}---\textit{wumywac} like that exhibited in this particular instance by Russian and Bulgarian. In general, Upper Sorbian has no secondary imperfectives of this formal type. Until recently, however, a number of Upper Sorbian dictionaries did cite artificial forms like those in (27) below, if only because they are conceivable from the standpoint of other, better codified Slavic languages (see Toops 1992–93:17, 22):

\begin{center}
(27) \hspace{1cm} jěšć \rightarrow zjěść \quad (\rightarrow *zjědować) \quad \text{‘to eat’}

\hspace{1cm} pisać \rightarrow napişać \quad (\rightarrow *napisować) \quad \text{‘to write’}

\hspace{1cm} pić \rightarrow wupić \quad (\rightarrow *wupiwać) \quad \text{‘to drink’}

\hspace{1cm} šić \rightarrow ześcić \quad (\rightarrow *ześliwać) \quad \text{‘to sew’}
\end{center}

Whereas Bulgarian and Russian exhibit only a handful of synonymous, derived imperfective doublets (cf. Bulgarian \textit{cьставляю/съставляю} \textit{←} \textit{съставляю} ‘to compose’, Russian \textit{подготавливаю/подготавливать} \textit{←} \textit{подготовить} ‘to prepare’, \textit{постоянно/постоянным} \textit{←} \textit{постоянство} ‘to catch cold’), Upper Sorbian exhibits numerous such doublets, derived with the stem suffixes -\textit{owa}- and -\textit{a}- (\textit{e}- between soft consonants). From the standpoint of the Upper Sorbian literary language, the two types of derived imperfective are synonymous. For a good number of Upper Sorbian speakers, however, the derived imperfectives in -\textit{owa}- are distinguished from those in -\textit{a}- by the feature \textit{[−continuous]} and denote only iterative and/or distributive performances of an action. Distributivity appears to be the overriding grammatical meaning expressed by verbs derived with the suffix -\textit{owa}- in the popular language (i.e., assuming the existence of either a contrasting biaspectual verb or a contrasting imperfective -\textit{a}-suffixed verb stem), while iterative readings seem to be prompted mostly by the occurrence of some non-plural (i.e., singular or collective) subject or object of a given "-\textit{owac}-verb." Where distributive meaning is expressed, (discontinuous) progressive readings are not inconceivable.\textsuperscript{15} In the case of a number of prefixed verbs of motion (which have become biaspectual), however, the derived imperfective forms may be marked for iterativity/distributivity irrespective of whether the stem suffix is -\textit{owa}- or -\textit{a}-, cf. examples (28)–(30), below (the corresponding infinitive verb forms are cited in brackets).\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{center}
(28) \hspace{1cm}
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{Wón mi swoje wobrazy pokaza}^{1P}. \text{[pokazać]} \\
& \text{‘He is showing me his [set, collection of] pictures’}.
\end{array}

\begin{array}{ll}
\text{b.} & \text{Wón mi swoje wobrazy pokazuje}^{\text{ITER/DIST}}. \text{[pokazować]} \\
& \text{‘He shows me his pictures (over a period of time).}
\end{array}
\hspace{1cm}
\sim \text{He is showing me his pictures (one after the other’).}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
(29) \hspace{1cm}
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{Wón je přeco ke mni přišol}^{1P}. \text{[přišći]} \\
& \text{‘He always came to [see] me’}.
\end{array}

\begin{array}{ll}
\text{b.} & \text{Hošćo nětko přiňđeja}^{1P}. \text{[přińć]} \\
& \text{‘The guests are now coming, arriving’}.
\end{array}
\end{center}
In sum, secondary imperfectives, as I have defined and discussed them above, are prefixed, suffixally derived imperfective verbs in Slavic languages like Bulgarian, Russian, and Upper Sorbian, which are semantically marked for the feature [-continuous]. This feature is not a concomitant of their formal derivation, but rather arises from the existence of lexically synonymous imperfective (or, in the case of Upper Sorbian, biaspectual) verbs sharing the same basic stems in the static lexicon of each given language. If we accept Maslov's (1985) dichotomy of qualitative and quantitative aspectuality, then we may conclude that secondary imperfectives, like imperfective and perfective verbs generally, are also characterized by two aspectual properties. With respect to qualitative aspectuality, they are marked [+P] in Bulgarian and Russian, but in Upper Sorbian, because of the possibility of progressive distributive readings, they are unmarked ([±P]) relative to qualitative aspectuality. With respect to quantitative aspectuality, in contrast, they are characterized in Russian and Upper Sorbian by the feature [-P] and thus are the unmarked members of a privative quantitative aspectual opposition [-P]/[+P]; whereas in Bulgarian, because of their instantiation in the historical present, they are the unmarked members of a subordinative quantitative aspectual opposition [±P]/[+P]. This is summarized in illustration (31), below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspectual Property</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Secondary Imperfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>[±P]</td>
<td>[+P]</td>
<td>[±P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>[±P]</td>
<td>[+P]</td>
<td>[-P]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

1 The Upper Sorbian data presented here do not necessarily conform to the prescriptive ("Slavicizing") norms of the literary language. They derive rather from my interviews of speakers of the western (so-called Catholic) and Bautzen dialects.

Wherever it is relevant to do so, perfective verbs will be marked here with the superscript "P," imperfective verbs with the superscript "I," and biaspectual or aspectually neu-
tral verbs with the superscript “I/P.” Secondary imperfectives may be marked “I2” (in contrast to basic imperfectives: “I1”), and obsolete or archaic forms are indicated by a preceding “†.” The superscript “ITER/DIST” denotes iterative and/or distributive meaning.

2 Cf. Maslov 1963:5: “В последнее время становится ясно, что в любом славянском юзке количество дефектных глаголов, представленных формами одного какогонибудь вида, совершенного либо несовершенного, довольно велико.”

3 Cf. Macedonian измие/измивало “to wash”, испие/испивало “to drink up”, corresponding to Bulgarian измивало/измивам, испивало/испивам, resp.

4 We should note that as early as 1915, Ščerba, in similar fashion, had distinguished between “empty prefixes” (пустые префиксы) and those “with [lexical] content” (содержательные) in reference to the semantics of verbal aspect in the Eastern Lower Sorbian (specifically Mužakow [Bad Muskau] dialect (1915:121).

5 These views were set forth by Mazon in the section of his Grammaire titled “Valeur des préverbes” and remained unchanged for 35 years, i.e., as late as the year 1978, which saw the second printing of the fourth edition of his book (cf. Mazon 1978:262-71).

6 Although in Maslov 1985 the term предельность is translated into English as ‘limitedness’, the term is better translated as ‘boundedness’, with ‘limitedness’ better reserved as the translation of Russian ограниченность. See Toops 1995 for details.

7 According to Lyubomira Parpulova-Gribble (personal communication), the secondary imperfective накарваm, when used as a causative auxiliary, may in fact occur with a phasal verb, cf.: Той престана да ме накарва да правям това ‘He stopped forcing me to do that’. As mentioned in Toops 1988a and 1988b, the same sentence formulated with the corresponding basic imperfective карам—Той престана да ме карам да правям това—admits a “conative” interpretation and is therefore ambiguous: ‘He stopped forcing [or rather:] trying to force me to do that’.

8 I am grateful to Wichita State University student Radoslav V. Stoichev of Plovdiv, Bulgaria, for acting as my native informant and formulating these and other Bulgarian sentences contained in this paper.

9 As Lindstedt (1985:122–23) correctly points out, the imperfect tense is essentially a “present in the past,” which explains why both the present and imperfect tenses of Bulgarian perfective verbs are subject to similar tactic constraints.

10 I am indebted to H. Schuster-Šewc for reviewing and verifying the Upper Sorbian data contained in this paper. The Upper Sorbian equivalents of Bulgarian examples (7) and (8) are as follow: Wön rano zahe won джеёл, нукле picowaёl a potom na dželo wotjёдёe (iterative preterite: Wön by rano zahe won шокё, нукле napicowaё a potom na dželo wotjёdёe) — Wön rano zahe wuńđёe, нукле napicowaё a potom na dželo wotjёdёe (iterative preterite: Wön by rano zahe woteшокё, нукле napicowaё a potom na dželo wotjёdёe). Russian example (9) can be formulated in one of two ways in USo: Wön so sydnyё a započаё powедац (potentially ambiguous with respect to one-time vs. habitual action), Wön by so sydnyё a započаё powедац (unambiguous iterative preterite).

11 The basic imperfective newest is possible in the cited example (12) but yields either a continuous (eventive) or an habitual reading: ‘In 1824 P. Beron is compiling and printing the first Bulgarian primer’ or ‘In 1824 P. Beron (regularly) compiles and prints the first Bulgarian primer’.

12 One factor contributing to the smaller number of secondary imperfectives in Russian (relative to Bulgarian) may be the tendency of the Russian language over time to reanalyze secondary imperfectives as “ordinary” derived imperfectives. The original basic imperfective is thereby relegated to obsolescence, and the original derivational direction
"I → P" is recast as "I ← P". Consider ([сказать]₁ → [послать]₀ → [посылать]₁ 'to send' (but: Шлю привет 'I send greetings') ([предложить]₁ → [пояснить]₀ → [пояснять]₁ 'to force (someone to do something)'; ([править]₁ [ошибки] → [исправить]₀ → [исправлять]₁ 'to correct (mistakes)', etc.

13 The passage in Rosengrant and Lifschitz is from N. Baranskaja, Nedelja kak nedelja.
14 I thank Ludmila S. Yevsukov for helping me formulate these and subsequent Russian sentences.

Note that Upper Sorbian does not imitate Russian and Bulgarian in these examples. To the non-continuous sentence *I eat an apple every day* Upper Sorbian responds with either a basic imperfective or a prefixal perfective, but not with a secondary imperfective: *Kóždy džen jabluko jem' → zjém* [zfěduj]. Ironic instantiations of Upper Sorbian perfective verbs in continuous time frames are infelicitous, cf. *Načolnik je mje prosyl, zo bych tón referat přečital, potajkim ja jón tež (nětko) čitam* [*přečitam*] 'The boss asked me to read this report, so I am (now) reading it'.
15 Although the terms *continuous* and *eventive* are often used as synonyms of *progressive* or as terms that subsume *progressive*, we see here the need to avoid conflating the terms. Distributive occurrences/performances of an action are by definition discontinuous, so that the distributive meaning expressed by a particular verb form follows from its being marked [−continuous], irrespective of the admissibility of progressive readings.
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