



Wichita State University Libraries
SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository

Gary H. Toops

Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures

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

Gary H. Toops
Wichita State University

Recommended citation

Toops, Gary H. 1998. The Scope of “Secondary” Imperfectivization in Bulgarian, Russian, and Upper Sorbian. American Contributions to the Twelfth International Congress of Slavists. Cracow, August-September 1998. Edited by Robert A. Maguire & Alan Timberlake. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 1998, pp.515-529.

Copyright 1998 Gary H. Toops

This paper is posted in Shocker Open Access Repository

<http://soar.wichita.edu/dspace/handle/10057/3641>

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:

(1)	BASIC IMPERFECTIVE	→	PREFIXAL PERFECTIVE	→	“SECONDARY” IMPERFECTIVE	
[B]	чета	→	прочета	→	прочитам	‘to read’
	ям	→	изям	→	изяждам	‘to eat’
	карам	→	накарам	→	накарвам	‘to force’
	мия (се)	→	измия (се)	→	измивам (се)	‘to wash’
	печатам	→	отпечатам	→	отпечатвам	‘to print’
	пиша	→	напиша	→	написвам	‘to write’
	правя	→	направя	→	направлям	‘to do/make’

[R]	читать	→ прочитать	→ прочитывать	'to read'
	есть	→ съесть	→ съедать	'to eat'
	мешать	→ помешать	→ помешивать	'to stir'
	мыть	→ вымыть	→ вымывать	'to wash'
	пить	→ выпить	→ выпивать	'to drink'
[USo]	twarić	→ natwarić	→ natwarjeć	'to build'
	(dele) padać	→ spadnyć, -ać	→ spadować	'to fall (down)'
(2)	PREFIXAL IMPERFECTIVE	PREFIXAL PERFECTIVE		
[B]	изчитам	← изчета		'to read out'
	подкарвам	← подкарам		'to spur on'
	поправам	← поправа		'to repair'
	преждам	← преям		'to overeat'
	приписвам	← припиша		'to ascribe'
	разпечатвам	← распечатам		'to unseal'
	смивам	← смия		'to wash away'
[R]	объедать	← объесть		'to eat around'
	перечитывать	← перечитать		'to re-read'
	примешивать	← примешать		'to stir, mix in'
	пропивать	← пропить		'to drink away'
	смывать	← смыть		'to wash off'
[USo]	wutwarjeć	← wutwarić		'to build on'
	nadpadować	← nadpadnyć		'to attack'

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

(3)	[USo]	PREFIXAL IMPERFECTIVE	PREFIXAL VERB	"SECONDARY" IMPERFECTIVE	
			pokazać ^{I/P}	→ pokazować	'to show'
			přińć ^{I/P}	→ přichadžeć	'to come'
		zasadžeć ←	zasadzić ^{I/P}	→ zasadźować	'to install'
		~	zasadzić ^{I/P}	→ zasadźować	'to install'

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 [\pm 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 \rightarrow P (as in example set [1]) or I \leftarrow 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 [\pm P] vs. [+P] by which I/P aspect pairs are normally defined in the grammars of contemporary Slavic languages.

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.² 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 Macedonian³) 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 *несвършен [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' *-n-*" 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).⁴ 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)

<i>идѣт</i> 'il va'	→	<i>по-идѣт</i> 'il ira'
<i>несѣт</i> 'il porte'	→	<i>с-несѣт</i> 'il portera'
(<i>родѣлся?</i>)	→	<i>на-родѣлся</i> 'il est né'
(* <i>имѣт</i> ?)	→	<i>по-имѣт</i> 'il comprendra'
(<i>ищѣт</i> ?)	→	<i>с-ищѣт</i> 'il trouvera'

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 *по-бежѣт* 'il commença à courir' as a *préverbe plein* (1943:220), while, as we have seen above ([4]), the prefix of *по-идѣт* 'il ira' constituted for Mazon a *préverbe vide* used to form a perfective aspectual partner to *идѣт* 'il va' (1943:217).⁵

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 Isačenko, 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/написать* '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/сделать* 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 *написвам* in place of *пиша*, 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 [предельности] 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 *предельный* ‘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 *напиша* is not lexically “empty,” i.e., that the prefix is *not* “purely aspectual” precisely because it expresses a meaning that *is* aspectual (viz., “limitedness,” 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/сделать* ‘to do’, *писать/написать* ‘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 *написвам* (see above) and on that basis alone considered them equivalent, in terms of aspectuo-temporal semantics, to derived imperfectives like *приписвам* ‘to ascribe’ and *переписвам* ‘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 for imperfective verbs [Maslov 1963]
Imperfective verbs admit the formation of ...
- a. negative imperatives of the types *не* + imperative, *недей* + “infinitive,” *стига (доста)* + perfect;
 - b. present participles;
 - c. verbal adverbs;
 - d. deverbal nouns with progressive meaning.
- (6) 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 *непрестанно* ‘constantly’, *все* + comparative (*все 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).⁷ 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’).⁸ 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 все 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 *ще*, as well.⁹) 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^I сутрин рано, нахранваше^I зайците и тогава тръгваше^I на работа. [Stankov 1976:7]
‘He went out early [each] morning, fed the rabbits, and then left for work’.
- (8) Той излезеше^P сутрин рано, нахранеше^P зайците и тогава тръгнаше^P на работа. [Stankov 1976:7]
‘He would go out early in the morning, feed the rabbits, and then leave for work’.
- (9) Сядет^P/Садился^I, бывало, и начнёт^P/начинал^I рассказывать. [after Ožegov 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 написваха писмата* ‘Almost every day they immediately got the letters written’, the secondary imperfective *написваха* occurs because the perfective imperfect *напишеха* 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, *praesens 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 *zadržet'* 'to stop (an object)', whose lexical semantics are incompatible with the notion of continuous action, occur only as aspectually unpaired *perfectiva tantum* (see Faßke 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 съставя¹¹ и отпечатва¹² първия български буквар.
'In 1824 P. Veron compiles and prints the first Bulgarian primer'.
- b. В 1824 г. П. Берон състави^P и отпечата^P първия български буквар.
'In 1824 P. Veron 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:

- (13) Сегодня я встаю нормально.... Я чищу картошку..., помешиваю кашу, завариваю кофе, подогреваю молоко, бужу Диму, иду поднимать ребят.... Ребята пьют молоко с хлебом, Дима ест, а я не могу, выпиваю только чашку кофе. [Rosengrant and Lifschitz 1992:125–26]¹³

‘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 *помешиваю* ‘I stir’ and *выпиваю* ‘I drink’, Bulgarian will likewise exhibit secondary imperfectives (*разбърквам* and *изпивам*, resp. [vs. basic imperfectives *бъркам*, *пия*]), while USo has no secondary imperfectives **změšuju*, **wupiwam* (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**¹² роман за два часа.
 ‘She reads (can read) a novel in two hours’. [Nakhimovsky and Leed 1981:91]
 [B] Тя **прочита**¹² роман за два часа.
 [USo] Wona za dvě hodžinje roman přečita^P.

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:¹⁴

- (15) [R] Я каждый день ем ~ **съедаю** яблоко.
 [B] Всеки ден ям ~ **изяждам** една ябълка.
 ‘I eat an apple every day’.
- (16) [R] (Что это ты делаешь?) —Я (сейчас) ем [***съедаю**] яблоко.
 [B] (Какво правиш сега?) —Аз (сега) ям [***изяждам**] една ябълка.
 ‘(What’s that you’re doing?) —(Right now) I am eating an apple’.
- (17) [R] (Что это ты делаешь?) —Я «**съедаю**» секретные документы!
 [B] (Какво правиш сега?) —«**Изяждам**» (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] Началникът ме помоли да прочета този доклад, тъй 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 (taxi) 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^{I1} [*перепутывает^{I2}] факты.
'He is (now) getting his facts mixed up'.
- (20) [R] Я (сейчас) мою^{I1} [*вымываю^{I2}] окна.
[B] Мия^{I1} [*Измивам^{I2}] (сега) прозорците
'I am (now) washing the windows'.
- (21) [R] Врач (сейчас) моет^{I1} [*вымывает^{I2}] руки.
[Bg] Лекарят си мие^{I1} [*измива^{I2}] (сега) ръцете.
[USo] Lëkar sej (nětko) ruce myje^{I1} [*wumyje^P].
'The doctor is (now) washing his hands'.
- (22) [R] Каждый раз, когда он **перепутывает**^{I2} [*путает^{I1}] факты, он смущается.
'Every time he gets his facts mixed up, he gets embarrassed'.
- (23) [R] Каждую весну, когда я **вымываю**^{I2} [*мою^{I1}] окна, я с удовольствием ложусь на диван и смотрю на голубое небо.
[B] Всека пролет, когато измия^P [*мия^{I1}/*измивам^{I2}] прозорците, с удоволствие 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**^{I2} [*моют^{I1}] руки.
[B] Лекарите започват операции само след като си измият^P [*мият^{I1}/*измиват^{I2}] ръцете.
[USo] Lëkarjo operacije započnu hakle, po tym zo sej ruce wumuja^P [*myja^{I1}] (~ po tym zo su sej ruce wumyli^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**^I верёвки.
'He is (now) getting the ropes tangled up'.
- (26) [R] Я (сейчас) **вымываю**^I грязь из ванны.
[B] **Измивам**^I (сега) мръсотията от ваната.
[USo] Njerjad (nětko) z wanje **wumywam**^I.
'I am (now) washing the grime out of the bathtub'.

As we see in example (26), above, Upper Sorbian exhibits a prefixed imperfective *wumywać*, but only as an aspectual partner to *wumyc^P* in its meaning ‘to wash out’, not as a secondary imperfective in a “verbal triangle” (Townsend 1970:55) *myc^L—wumyc^P—wumywać^L* 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):

(27)	<i>jěsć</i>	→	<i>zjěsć</i>	(→ * <i>zjědować</i>)	‘to eat’
	<i>pisać</i>	→	<i>napisać</i>	(→ * <i>napisować</i>)	‘to write’
	<i>pić</i>	→	<i>wupić</i>	(→ * <i>wupiwać</i>)	‘to drink’
	<i>šić</i>	→	<i>zešić</i>	(→ * <i>zešiwać</i>)	‘to sew’

Whereas Bulgarian and Russian exhibit only a handful of synonymous, derived imperfective doublets (cf. Bulgarian *съставям/съставлявам* ← *съставя* ‘to compose’, Russian *подготовлять/подготавливать* ← *подготовить* ‘to prepare’, *простужаться/простуживаться* ← *простудиться* ‘to catch cold’), Upper Sorbian exhibits numerous such doublets, derived with the stem suffixes *-owa-* and *-a-* (*-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 *-owa-* are distinguished from those in *-a-* by the feature [–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 *-owa-* in the popular language (i.e., assuming the existence of either a contrasting biaspectual verb or a contrasting imperfective *-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 “*-ować*-verb.” Where distributive meaning is expressed, (discontinuous) progressive readings are not inconceivable.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 *-owa-* or *-a-*, cf. examples (28)–(30), below (the corresponding infinitive verb forms are cited in brackets):¹⁶

- (28) a. *Wón mi swoje wobrazy pokaza^{IP}*. [*pokazać*]
 ‘He is showing me his [set, collection of] pictures’.
- b. *Wón mi swoje wobrazy pokazuje^{ITER/DIST}*. [*pokazować*]
 ‘He shows me his pictures (over a period of time).
 ~ He is showing me his pictures (one after the other)’.
- (29) a. *Wón je přeco ke mni přišo^{IP}*[*přińć*]
 ‘He always came to [see] me’.
- b. *Hosćo nětko přińdžeja^{IP}*. [*přińć*]
 ‘The guests are now coming, arriving’.

- c. Hosćo nětko přichadžeja^{ITER/DIST}. [přichadžeć]
 ‘Guests are now arriving (one after the other).
 ~ Guests now come (regularly, all the time)’.
- (30) a. Wokno nětko zasadžu^{I/P}. [zasadzić]
 ‘I shall now install [or] I am now installing a window’.
- b. Wokno nětko zasadžam^I. [zasadžeć]
 ‘I am now installing a window’.
- c. Wokna nětko zasadžuju^{ITER/DIST}. [zasadžować]
 ‘I now install windows (regularly).
 ~ I am now installing (the) windows (one after the other)’.

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:

(31)			<i>Aspect Form</i>		
	<i>Imperfective</i>	<i>Perfective</i>	<i>Secondary Imperfective</i>		
<i>Aspectuality</i>			Bg	R	USo
<i>Qualitative:</i>	[±P]	[+P]	[+P]	[+P]	[±P]
<i>Quantitative:</i>	[±P]	[+P]	[±P]	[–P]	[–P]

Wichita State University

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 языке количество дефективных глаголов, представленных формами одного какого-нибудь вида, совершенного либо несовершенного, довольно велико.”

³ Cf. Macedonian *измие^P/измива^I* ‘to wash’, *испије^P/испија^I* ‘to drink up’, corresponding to Bulgarian *измия^P/измивам^I*, *изпия^P/изпивам^I*, 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 *накарвам*, 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 кара 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: *Wón rano zahe won džěše^I, nukle picowaše^I a potom na džěto wotjě-dže^{I/P}* (iterative preterite: *Wón by rano zahe won šo^I, nukle napicowa^P a potom na džěto wotjě^{I/P}*) — *Wón rano zahe wuńdže^{I/P}, nukle napicowa^P a potom na džěto wotjědže^{I/P}* (iterative preterite: *Wón by rano zahe wotešo^P, nukle napicowa^P a potom na džěto wotjě^{I/P}*). Russian example (9) can be formulated in one of two ways in USo: *Wón so sydney^P a započā^P powědać* (potentially ambiguous with respect to one-time vs. habitual action), *Wón by so sydney^P a započā^P powědać* (unambiguous iterative preterite).

¹¹ The basic imperfective *нечата* 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 re-analyze 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 (†*слать*^I →) *послать*^P → *посылать*^I ‘to send’ (but: *Шлю привет* ‘I send greetings’); (†*нудить*^I →) *понудить*^P → *понуждать*^I ‘to force (someone to do something)’; (†*править*^I [*ошибки*] →) *исправить*^P → *исправлять*^I ‘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 dzeń jabuko jěm^I ~ zjěm^P [*zjěduju^{I2}]*. 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^I [*přečitam^P]* ‘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.

¹⁶ See Toops 1992 and 1992–93 for details of these lexical and grammatical phenomena in Upper Sorbian.

REFERENCES

- Aronson, Howard I. 1977. “The Interrelationships Between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian,” *Folia Slavica* 1:9–32.
- . 1985. “Form, Function, and the ‘Perfective’ in Bulgarian,” *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*, ed. Michael Flier and Alan Timberlake, 274–85. Columbus, Oh.
- Bulgarian Academy Grammar = Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite. Institut za bălgarski ezik. 1983. *Gramatika na săvremennija bălgarski knižoven ezik, 2: Morfologija*. Sofia.
- Faßke, Helmut. 1981. *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Morphologie / Gramatika hornjoserbskeje spisowneje rěče pŕitomnosće. Morfologija*. Bautzen.
- Fielder, Grace E. 1993. *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Verbal Categories in Bulgarian*. Lewiston, N.Y..
- Hubenova, Milka, and Ana Dzhumadanova. 1983. *A Course in Modern Bulgarian, 2*. 2nd, corrected ed. Columbus, Oh.
- Hult [Xult], Arne. 1981. “Za edin vid temporalno defektivni glagoli v săvremennija bălgarski ezik,” *Bălgaristični izsledvanija. Părvi bălgaro-skandinavski simpozium, 24–30 septemvri 1979 g.*, 145–60. Sofia.
- Isačenko, Alexander V. 1968. *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart, 1: Formenlehre*. Halle.
- Ivančev, Svetomir. 1971. *Problemi na aspektualnostta v slavjanskite ezici*. Sofia.
- . 1976. “Morfo-semantiko-funkcionalnata teorija na glagolnija vid v slavjanskite ezici i specifikata na bălgarskija ezik,” *Pomagalo po bălgarska morfologija. Glagol*, ed. Petăr Pašov and Ruselina Nicolova, 134–65. Sofia.
- Lindstedt, Jouko. 1985. *On the Semantics of Tense and Aspect in Bulgarian*. Slavica Helsingiensia, 4. Helsinki.
- Maslov, Ju. S. 1954. “Imperfekt glagolov soveršennogo vida v slavjanskix jazykax,” *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 1:68–138.

- . 1963. *Morfologija glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke*. Moscow-Leningrad.
- . 1985. "An Outline of Contrastive Aspectology," *Contrastive Studies in Verbal Aspect in Russian, English, French and German*, ed. Yu. S. Maslov and trans. James Forsyth, 1–44. *Studies in Descriptive Linguistics*, 14. Heidelberg.
- Mazon, André. 1943. *Grammaire de la langue russe*. Paris.
- . 1978. *Grammaire de la langue russe*. 4th ed., 2nd printing. Paris.
- Nakhimovsky, Alexander D., and Richard L. Leed. 1980. *Advanced Russian*. Columbus, Oh.
- Ožegov, S. I., comp. 1982. *Slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Ed. N. Ju. Švedova. Moscow.
- Rosengrant, Sandra F., and Elena D. Lifschitz. 1991. *Focus on Russian*. New York.
- Ščerba, L. V. 1915. *Vostočnolužickoe narěčie*. Petrograd. Photomechanic reprint 1973. *Der ostniedersorbische Dialekt*. Bautzen.
- Stankov, Valentin. 1976. *Konkurencija na glagolnite vidove v bälgarskija knižoven ezik*. Sofia.
- Thelin [Telin], Nils B. 1982. "Universalni funkcii temporalnost i aspektualnost i bälgarskite t.n. «defektivni» glagoli ot tipa napisvam," *Die slawischen Sprachen. Referate des I. Salzburger Slawistengesprächs «Probleme der Bulgaristik»*, 108–18. Salzburg.
- Toops, Gary H. 1979. *An Analysis of Prefixal Perfectivization in Contemporary Standard Russian*. M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.
- . 1988a. "Bulgarian Causatives: Remarks on Tense, Aspect, and Entailment," 24 March, Sixth Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore. Chicago.
- . 1988b. "Secondary Imperfectivization and the Morphosemantics of Bulgarian Causative Verbs," 12 May, The Ohio State University. Columbus, Oh.
- . 1992. "Upper Sorbian Prefixal Derivatives and the Question of German Loan Translations," *Slavic and East European Journal* 36:17–35.
- . 1992–93. "Lexicalization of Upper Sorbian Preverbs: Temporal-Aspectual Ramifications and the Delimitation of German Influence," *Germano-Slavica* 7(2)–8(1):3–22.
- . 1995. "Review of: A. V. Bondarko, *Die Semantik des Verbalaspekts im Russischen / Semantika glagol'nogo vida v russkom jazyke*," *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue canadienne des slavistes* 37:267–70.
- Townsend, Charles E. 1970. *Continuing with Russian*. New York.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Vinogradov, V. V. 1947. *Russkij jazyk. Grammatičeskoe učenie o slove*. Moscow-Leningrad.