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ARTICLES

Vendlerian Classes and the Russian Aspectual System*

Pavel Braginsky and Susan Rothstein

Abstract. This paper considers the relevance of the Vendlerian lexical aspectual classification of verbs in Russian. We focus on the lexical classes of accomplishments and activities and argue that the classification of verbs into activities and accomplishments cuts across the classification into perfective and imperfective verbs. Accomplishments display incremental structure and occur as perfectives and imperfectives. Activities do not display incremental structure and also occur in the perfective and imperfective aspect. The distinction between activities and accomplishments is expressed through their interactions with what we call incremental modifiers: modifiers which are sensitive to the incremental structure of the verb meaning. These modifiers include postepenno ‘gradually’, and ‘X by X’ modifiers such as stranica za stranicu ‘page by page’ and etaža za etažom ‘floor by floor’. Imperfective activities do not occur with either postepenno or the ‘X by X’ modifiers, and neither do the verb forms which Padučeva 1996 calls “delimited activities” (delimitatio). Accomplishments in both the imperfective and the perfective aspects occur with postepenno and the ‘X by X’ modifiers (although some Russian speakers find some examples of perfective accomplishments with ‘X by X’ modifiers unnatural owing to what we consider to be pragmatic reasons). We show that the behavior of these modifiers generally follows if we assign accomplishments the incremental structure posited in Rothstein 2004 and treat the modifiers as directly modifying the incremental structure.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to shed some light on the interaction between grammatical and lexical aspect in Russian, in particular, the interaction

* We would like to thank those who provided intuitions and/or commented on earlier drafts of this paper, including Boris and Irena Braginsky, Hana Filip, Armenuhi Grigorian, Mark Korabelnikov, Hans Robert Mehlig, Elena Paducheva, Elena Poptsov, and two anonymous reviewers whose comments were extremely helpful in making revisions. Research for this paper was supported by Israel Science Foundation Research Grant #951-03 to Susan Rothstein and a Presidential Ph.D. Fellowship to Pavel Braginsky. We thank them for their support.

between perfective and imperfective aspectual categories and the Vendlerian classes of lexical verbs (Vendler, 1967). The central question is whether the Vendlerian classification of verbs into states, activities, achievements, and accomplishments has any grammatical relevance in Russian, or whether it is made redundant by the grammatical distinction between perfective and imperfective verbs. We begin with some background about the Vendlerian classes in general and then address how these have been treated in the discussion of Russian aspect.

1.1. Vendlerian Classes in English-Oriented Linguistic Studies

The Vendlerian classification is a four-way classification of verbs into states, activities, achievements, and accomplishments, depending on the properties of the events in their denotation, for example, dynamic vs. static, telic vs. atelic (see, e.g., Vendler 1967, Dowty 1979, Smith 1991, and Rothstein 2004). It has proved relevant in many languages, in particular English, because grammatical operations such as adverbial modification and the progressive operator are sensitive to the distinctions made by this classification. For example, in English, modifiers of the form in X time naturally occur with accomplishment and achievement verbs but not with activities or states, while for X time naturally modifies a state or an activity but not an achievement or an accomplishment, as in (1).

(1) a. John grew up in a short time/*for a short time. (accomplishment)
   b. John arrived in a short time/*for a short time. (achievement)
   c. John ran *in a short time/for a short time. (activity)
   d. John lived *in a short time/for a short time. (state)

However, there has been some confusion and disagreement in the literature as to what exactly the Vendlerian classification is supposed to be classifying. On the one hand, it seems to apply to verbs, so that love is classified as a state, arrive as an achievement, run as an activity, and build as an accomplishment. Since verbs are taken to denote events (either entities as in the (neo)-Davidsonian framework, or as relations of certain kind as Dowty has argued) and Vendlerian classes classify
according to properties of events, this is very plausible. On the other hand, as Dowty (1979) pointed out, we might take the classification to apply at the VP level since choice of verbal complement affects the linguistic behavior of the VP as a whole. The data in (1) do not support either position, since in these examples the VP and the V contain exactly the same material. But with a transitive accomplishment like build the effects of the direct object become clear: build the house seems to have accomplishment properties since it appears with in X time, but build houses looks more like an activity. Similarly, run a mile or ran to the store behave like accomplishments, although run has activity properties:

(2)  
   a. John built the house in a day/*for a day.
   b. John built houses *in some years/*for some years.
   c. John ran a mile in an hour/*for an hour.
   d. John ran to the store in an hour/*for an hour.

Although some linguists have taken the data in (2) as evidence that Vendlerian classes apply to VPs, a more insightful analysis has emerged, especially from the work of Krifka (1989, 1992, and 1998). Krifka gave an analysis of verb phrase meanings which shows how the verb meaning relates to the VP meaning. He argued that the in a time/for a time adverbials distinguish between two kinds of VPs, telic and atelic. A telic VP, according to Krifka (1998), is essentially a VP denoting an event holding at a specified temporal interval. So build the house in (2a) is telic since the determined NP in direct-object position allows one to specify an interval at which the event took place: an interval which is big enough to build the house in question. Build houses in (2b) is not telic, since the bare plural does not allow one to pick out a specific interval. Krifka went on to argue that verbs differ in how they contribute to determining the telicity of the VP which they head. Build is a verb with an incremental theme argument, and this is why the direct object, expressing the theme, contributes to the determination of the telicity of the VP. By contrast, push does not have an incremental theme argument, and thus the properties of the arguments do not determine the telicity of the VP.
(3)  a. John pushed the cart for an hour/*in an hour.
    b. John pushed carts for an hour/*in an hour.

Krifka’s work made it possible to clarify what the Vendlerian classification of event structures applies to. VPs are telic or atelic depending on whether they denote events holding true at a specifiable time interval or not. Verbs belong to different Vendlerian classes since they contribute to determining the telicity of the VPs they head in different ways. An accomplishment denotes an inherently incremental event type, with a theme incrementally related to the event, and thus the properties of the theme determine whether or not the VP it heads is telic. An activity is not incremental, and thus the theme cannot determine the length of an event, and a VP headed by a non-modified activity is atelic. But activities naturally allow themselves to be measured by a variety of modifiers, and thus the examples in (2c–d) contain telic VPs. Achievements denote instantaneous changes and thus normally head telic VPs, since the dimensions of the change determine the interval at which the event holds (Rothstein 2004). States are not inherently measurable and thus do not head telic VPs (unless they have undergone shifts in meaning).

This approach has led to the conclusion that the Vendlerian classification is best seen as part of the study of lexical aspect, that part of aspect which is determined by the property of verbal heads. The classification of verbs into states, activities, achievements, and accomplishments reflects the properties of the events in the denotations of the verbs, and the VP properties demonstrated in (2) follow from the fact that verbs belonging to different lexical classes and denoting different kinds of event types interact with direct objects and modifiers in different ways (see also the discussion in Rothstein 2004). This approach is proving fruitful because it makes it possible to ask in what kinds of ways VPs may be telic. Verbs of different kinds will allow the time intervals at which they hold to be specified differently and may thus be telic for different reasons.

Almost all the discussion of Vendlerian classes has focused on English, but an obvious question is how the Vendlerian classification is relevant in languages with very different verbal systems, such as the Slavic family. If Vendlers classes are universal constraints on what kind of meanings verbs can have and what kind of events they can denote, then one might expect them to be prima facie relevant in all languages.
However, the question as we have just phrased it is a philosophical one. The empirical issue, which is relevant for linguists, is different. The Vendlerian classification is linguistically relevant in a particular language if and only if certain linguistic operations in that language are sensitive to the distinctions that the Vendlerian classification makes.

In Russian and other Slavic languages, unlike in English and other Germanic languages, verbs are classified into the perfective and imperfective aspect. The obvious question is whether the Vendlerian classification has any relevance in languages with this kind of verbal system, or whether it is made redundant by the grammatical aspectual system. There are three possible answers. One possibility is that mapping verbs in Slavic into the Vendlerian lexical classes is not relevant, since linguistic operations make reference only to the perfective/imperfective distinction. As far as we know, this position has not been explicitly argued by anyone. A second possibility is that the Vendlerian classification in Russian is subsumed under the perfective/imperfective distinction, in which case the Vendler distinctions are relevant only to the degree to which they subdivide the perfective/imperfective distinction. This is a traditional approach to the issue of lexical aspect in Russian, manifested by Brecht (1985), who, among many others, argues that the perfective aspect is reserved for the lexical classes of accomplishments and achievements, while the imperfective aspect coincides with the lexical classes of activities and states. Brecht’s account is reviewed in more detail in the next section.

The third possibility is that the semantics of the lexical classes is fully exploited in Russian and that lexical classes cut across the perfective/imperfective distinction. This is the approach taken in Kučera 1983, Eckert 1985, Filip 1999, and Padućeva 1996. Padućeva (1996), for instance, makes explicit use of the Vendlerian classification as a part of her own analysis of the lexical classes of verbs in Russian. If this approach is the correct one, then there should be some linguistic operation which is sensitive to the distinction in lexical class and which provides empirical evidence that lexical classes cut across the perfective/imperfective distinction.

In this paper, we will argue against the first and the second possibilities and defend the third position. We will provide empirical evidence that accomplishment verbs can be realized in both perfective and imperfective aspects in Russian, thus supporting the position of
Padučeva (1996), and provide a lexical categorization of verb classes which builds on Padučeva’s analysis. We will also suggest that activities have perfective and imperfective realizations. This means that on our interpretation of what Vendlerian classes are, the class of activities, as well as that of accomplishments, cuts across the imperfective/perfective distinction.

2. Vendlerian Classes in Russian – Some Background

The issue of lexical aspect in Russian and its interaction with the grammatical aspects of perfectivity and imperfectivity has been a subject of intense debate in the linguistic literature (e.g., Bulygina 1982, Forsyth 1970, Mehlig 1985, and Filip 1999). Here we focus on two accounts: Brecht 1985 and Padučeva 1996. Both works discuss the compatibility of the Vendlerian classification with the Russian verbal system and represent two different views on this topic. We summarize the relevant parts of their approaches below before proceeding to our analysis of incremental modifiers.

2.1. Brecht’s 1985 Account

In his discussion of the interaction between grammatical aspect and the Vendlerian lexical classes of verbs in Russian, Brecht (1985) argues that perfective verbs denote the telic lexical classes of accomplishments and achievements, while imperfective verbs coincide with the atelic lexical classes of activities and states. He explains this correlation by the assumption that the semantics of perfective aspect is associated with telic situations, while the semantics of imperfective aspect is compatible with incomplete ones. Brecht claims that some unprefixed imperfective verbs belonging to the lexical classes of activities and states can be shifted into accomplishments and achievements by verbal prefixes. Following this shift, the aspectual status of an imperfective verb is automatically changed into a perfective one. Thus, verbal prefixes in Russian serve as lexical operators that transform atelic activities and states into telic accomplishments and achievements. Under such an account, the unprefixed imperfective verb *stroit’IMPF* ‘to build’

---

1 Brecht uses the term “culminations” instead of accomplishments. We, however, retain the original Vendlerian terminology throughout this paper.
is an atelic activity (example (4a)) that is shifted into the telic accomplishment \textit{postroil}^{\text{PERF}} by the addition of the perfectivizing prefix \textit{po-}, as shown in (4b).

(4) a. Ivan \textit{stroil}^{\text{IMPF}} dom. \hspace{1cm} [Activity]
Ivan built house
‘Ivan built a/the house.’

b. Ivan \textit{postroil}^{\text{PERF}} dom. \hspace{1cm} [Accomplishment]
Ivan built house
‘Ivan built the house.’

The opposite process of shifting unprefixed perfective accomplishments and achievements into imperfective activities and states is achieved by the perfectivizing suffix \textit{-(i)i}. While perfectivization is a lexical process (see also Filip 2000, which claims that perfectivizing prefixes are derivational affixes), the imperfectivizing suffix is a grammatical operator (inflectional affix) that changes the aspectual status of a verb without changing the meaning of the lexical head. The process of turning a perfective accomplishment verb into an imperfective activity is illustrated in the following example:

(5) a. Ivan \textit{obezvredil}^{\text{PERF}} minnoe pole. \hspace{1cm} [Accomplishment]
Ivan defused minefield
‘Ivan defused the minefield.’

b. Ivan \textit{obezvrežival}^{\text{IMPF}} minnoe pole. \hspace{1cm} [Activity]
Ivan defused minefield
‘Ivan defused a/the minefield.’

It follows from Brecht’s account that there is a homomorphism from lexical to grammatical aspects in Russian: activities and states will be realized as imperfectives, and accomplishments and achievements as perfectives. Hence, examples (6a–b) are activities, while (7a–b) are accomplishments.

(6) a. Ivan \textit{čital}^{\text{IMPF}} knigu. \hspace{1cm} [Activity]
Ivan read book
‘Ivan read a/the book.’
(6) b. Ivan gulja\textsubscript{IMPF}.  
Ivan walked  
‘Ivan walked.’

(7) a. Ivan pročita\textsubscript{PERF} knigu.  
Ivan read book  
‘Ivan read the book.’

b. Ivan pogulja\textsubscript{PERF}.  
Ivan walked  
‘Ivan walked for a while.’

2.2. Padučeva’s 1996 Account

Padučeva (1996) incorporates the four Vendlerian classes in her analysis of the lexical classes of verbs in Russian. Similarly to Brecht, she states that the Vendlerian lexical categories of activities and states are manifested by imperfective verbs, while achievements are expressed by perfective ones. Contrary to Brecht, however, Padučeva argues that the lexical class of accomplishments is realized by both perfective and imperfective verbs. These accomplishments form aspectual pairs which she calls “bounded pairs” (predel’\‘nye pary) (Padučeva 1996: 91–94). A perfective member of the bounded pair denotes a process that pursued a certain goal and was completed after reaching its inherent limit, resulting in a change in the direct object. An imperfective member describes an ongoing process that aims towards reaching its inherent limit but has not reached it yet. In Padučeva’s terminology, agentive perfective accomplishments are “regular actions” (dejstvi\‘ja obyčne\‘ye) and agentive imperfective accomplishments are “actions in progress” (dejstvi\‘ja v razvitii)\textsuperscript{2}. Having classified both dejstvi\‘ja obyčne\‘ye and dejstvi\‘ja v razvitii as accomplishments, Padučeva points out that

\textsuperscript{2}In her work Padučeva also discusses non-agentive perfective and imperfective accomplishments (“bounded processes” (predel’\‘nye processy) and “processes in progress” (processy v razvitii)). An example of a non-agentive perfective accomplishment is \textit{Sneg rastaja\textsubscript{PERF}} ‘The snow melted’. Its imperfective correlate is \textit{Sneg taja\textsubscript{IMPF}} ‘The snow was melting’. While we focus mainly on agentive accomplishments in our discussion, we will show that both agentive and non-agentive accomplishments behave in the same way with respect to the incremental modification that we employ, so that the agentive/non-agentive distinction is irrelevant for our purposes.
the original Vendlerian classification, being based on the English data, does not have a lexical class analogous to the imperfective accomplishments (деиствija в развитii) in Russian. Furthermore, the Vendlerian classification fails to account for the cases of attenuative procedurals (Forsyth, 1970: 21), perfective verbs which are derived from unprefix imperfective activities by the delimitative prefix po- and which assign to these activities a meaning of duration for some time (after which an activity process stopped). These perfective verbs fall under the lexical category of “delimited activities” (delimitativ) which constitute a new lexical class, absent from the Vendlerian system. It is important to mention that for Padučeva perfective delimited activities do not form asperrual pairs with the imperfective verbs they are derived from, due to the fact that they denote a different lexical meaning from the original imperfective verbs. An example of delimited activity is the verb poguljat’PERF ‘to walk for some time’ in example (7b).

Applying Padučeva’s classification to our initial examples in (6–7), we get the following taxonomy, with the names of the lexical classes given in both Padučeva’s and Vendler’s terms. Note that the delimited activity in example (9b) does not have a correlate in the Vendlerian classification.

(8) a. Ivan čitalIMPF knigu. [Dejstvie v razvitii / Accomplishment]
    Ivan read    book
    ‘Ivan read a book.’

b. Ivan guljlIMPF. [Dejatel’nost’ / Activity ]
    Ivan walked
    ‘Ivan walked.’

(9) a. Ivan pročitalPERF knigu. [Dejstvie obyčnoe / Accomplishment]
    Ivan read    book
    ‘Ivan read a book.’

b. Ivan poguljalPERF. [Delimitativ]
    Ivan walked for a while
    ‘Ivan walked for a while.’

Padučeva’s analysis leads to the following conclusions. First, the lexical class of accomplishments is expressed in both perfective and
imperfective aspects by pairs of verbs that stand in the aspectual pair relation with each other. Padučeva suggests that imperfective accomplishments in Russian are similar to progressive accomplishments in English (Padučeva 1996: 106). This means that that there must be something to the semantics of accomplishments which cuts across the imperfective/perfective divide. The second point is that the imperfective aspect is not limited to verbs denoting activities and states but can include the lexical class of accomplishments as well.

The question is, what exactly is the relation between the Vendlerian classification and the Russian data, or in other words, what is an imperfective accomplishment—or a delimited activity. We concentrate here on the lexical semantics of accomplishments and suggest that accomplishments denote inherently incremental events, both in English and in Russian, and that it is this semantic feature which crosses the perfective/imperfective divide. We show that the modifier postepenno ‘gradually’ and modifiers of the form X za X, ‘X by X’ modify only accomplishment verbs and that this is because they are inherently incremental and make reference in their semantics to the incrementality of the accomplishment verb.

In what follows we will present evidence to support this claim about the distribution of incremental modifiers and will suggest a semantics which explains this distribution (section 3). In section 4, we will make some more general observations about the Vendlerian classification and the perfective/imperfective classification and suggest that the interaction between grammatical and lexical aspect in Slavic predicts exactly such strange beasts as imperfective accomplishments and delimited activities.

3. Distribution of Incremental Modifiers

If čitat’ and pročitat’ ‘to read’ are both accomplishments, despite the difference in grammatical aspect, then we expect them to pattern together with respect to some linguistic operation and to contrast with activities, whether perfective or imperfective. These patterns occur with what we call incremental modifiers. We will examine the distribution of these modifiers with aspectual pairs like čitat’ and pročitat’, as well as with verbs like guljav’ an activity, and poguljav’, the delimited activity which is the nearest thing to its perfective counterpart.
We will examine two kinds of incremental modifiers, *postepenno*, corresponding more or less to the English *gradually*, and modifiers of the form *X za X*, ‘*X by X*’. Example (10) shows the distribution of *postepenno*, and example (11) shows the distribution of the *X za X* modifier.³

(10) a. Ivan *postepenno* čítaIMPf knígu. 
   Ivan gradually read book
   ‘Ivan gradually read *a/the book*.’

b. Ivan *postepenno* pročítaPERf knígu. 
   Ivan gradually read book
   ‘Ivan gradually read the book.’

c. *Ivan* *postepenno* *guljaiMPf.* 
   Ivan gradually walked
   ‘Ivan gradually walked.’

d. *Ivan* *postepenno* poguljaiPERF. 
   Ivan gradually walked for a while
   ‘Ivan gradually walked for a while.’

(11) a. Ivan čítaIMPf knígu stranica za stranicí. 
   Ivan read book page by page
   ‘Ivan read *a/the book page by page*.’

b. Ivan pročítaPERf knígu stranica za stranicí. 
   Ivan read book page by page
   ‘Ivan read the book page by page.’

c. *Ivan* guljaiIMPf šag za šagom. 
   Ivan walked step by step
   ‘Ivan walked step by step.’

³ For some speakers, including the first author of this paper and some of his informants, the *X za X* modifiers are somewhat degraded in the perfective. We will discuss this fact later on.
(11) d. *Ivan poguljal_{PERF} šag za šagom.
Ivan walked for a while step by step
‘Ivan walked for a while step by step.’

The examples in (10) show that postepенно can modify both čitat’ and pročitat’, which both superficially correspond to the English accomplishment read, but does not occur with either imperfective or perfective forms which correspond to the English activity walk. This means that it occurs with the verbs which Padučeva takes to be accomplishments but not with those that she takes to be activities or delimited activities. Example (11) shows that the X by X modifiers too occur with the hypothesized accomplishment but not with the imperfective activity guljet’ or the delimited activity poguljet’.

This ability to be modified by incremental modifiers generalizes to all verbs classified by Padučeva as accomplishments, while activities cannot be so modified. (An exception is directed motion activities such as bežat’_{IMPF} ‘to run’ and plyt’_{IMPF} ‘to swim’, which behave as a class by themselves; see the discussion later in the paper.) Thus, we have further examples of accomplishments that are acceptable with incremental modifiers: postepенно pisat’_{IMPF}/napisat’_{PERF} knigu ‘to write a book gradually’ and pisat’_{IMPF}/napisat’_{PERF} knigu stranica za stranicaj ‘to write a book page by page’; postepенно risovat’_{IMPF}/narisovat’_{PERF} kartinu ‘to paint a painting gradually’ and risovat’_{IMPF}/narisovat’_{PERF} kartinu mazok za mazkom ‘to paint a painting brushstroke by brushstroke’.

Conversely, we have further examples of activities which cannot be so modified: *postepенно prygat’_{IMPF} ‘to jump gradually’/*postepенно poprygat’_{PERF} ‘to jump for a while gradually’ and *prygat’_{IMPF} kamen’ za kamnem ‘to jump stone by stone’/*poprygat’_{PERF} kamen’ za kamnem ‘to jump for a while stone by stone’ and *postepенно smejet’sja_{IMPF} ‘to laugh gradually’/*postepенно posmejet’sja_{PERF} ‘to laugh for a while gradually’;

*smejet’sja_{IMPF} smešok za smeškom ‘to laugh laughter by laughter’ and *posmejet’sja_{PERF} smešok za smeškom ‘to laugh for a while laughter by laughter’.

Note also that most perfective procedurals which are derived from accomplishments can also be modified by these incremental modifiers, as can the secondary imperfectives derived from them, although not, of course, the delimited procedurals derived via po- prefixation and meaning ‘V for a while’, or procedurals that un-
dergo a shift from accomplishments into achievements.\textsuperscript{4} For instance, imperfective accomplishments \textit{stroit'}\textsubscript{IMPF} ‘to build’ and \textit{čitat'}\textsubscript{IMPF} ‘to read’ can have a wide number of perfective proceduralis derived from them (some of which can undergo a secondary imperfectivization). Some examples are \textit{nadrostit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{nadstraivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} ‘to build on top/add construction’, \textit{zastroit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{zaskastrivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} ‘to fill a site with buildings’, \textit{perestrokit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{perestraivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} ‘to rebuild’, \textit{perečitat’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{perečityvat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} ‘to reread’ and \textit{dočitat’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{dočityvat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} ‘to finish reading’. All these proceduralis are compatible with the incremental modifiers, thus: \textit{postepenno nadstroit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{nadstraivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} \vetaž ‘to gradually add a floor’ and \textit{nadstroit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{nadstraivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} \vetaž komnata za komnatoj ‘to add a floor room by room’, \textit{postepenno zastroit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{zaskastrivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} \učastok ‘to gradually build up a site’ and \textit{zastroit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{zaskastrivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} \učastok domami dom za domom ‘to fill a site with houses house by house’, \textit{postepenno perestrokit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{perestraivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} dom ‘to gradually rebuild a house’ and \textit{perestrokit’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{perestraivat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} dom komnata za komnatoj ‘to rebuild a house room by room’; \textit{postepenno perečitat’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{perečityvat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} knigu ‘to gradually reread a book’ and \textit{perečitat’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{perečityvat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} knigu stranica za stranicej ‘to reread a book page by page’, \textit{postepenno dočitat’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{dočityvat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} knigu ‘to gradually finish reading a book’ and \textit{dočitat’}\textsubscript{PERF}/\textit{dočityvat’}\textsubscript{IMPF} knigu stroka za strokoj ‘to finish reading a book line by line’.

On the assumption that incremental modifiers modify incremental verbs, these data indicate (i) that the class of incremental verbs (= accomplishments) has both perfective and imperfective instantiations and (ii) that non-stative imperfective verbs denoting events with duration can be divided into those which are incremental (by hypothesis, accomplishments) and those which are not (uncontroversially, activities). The data in (10–11) thus provide support for Padučeva’s position rather than Brecht’s. One might suggest that the Brecht’s analysis could still be defended by claiming that (8a) and (9a) are transitive activities and (8b) and (9b) are intransitive ones and that what the incremental modifiers react to is the transitive versus intransitive status of activity verbs. However, the examples in (12–15) show that the dis-

\textsuperscript{4} For example, \textit{nedočitat’} ‘not to complete reading’ and the inchoative \textit{začitat’} ‘to begin reading’ cannot be modified by incremental modifiers, \textit{nor can počitat’} ‘to read for a while’. Mehlig (2008) argues that \textit{počitat’} is derived from a non-incremental use of the verb \textit{čitat’}. 
tinction between activities and accomplishments with respect to incremental modification is maintained even when accomplishments are intransitive and the activities are transitive.

(12) a. Cvetok postepenno ros_{IMPF}.
   flower gradually grew
   ‘A flower gradually grew.’

b. Cvetok postepenno vyros_{PERF}.
   flower gradually grew up
   ‘A flower gradually reached full bloom.’

c. *Ivan postepenno iskal_{IMPF} knigu.
   Ivan gradually looked for book
   ‘Ivan gradually looked for a/the book.’

d. *Ivan postepenno poiskal_{PERF} knigu.
   Ivan gradually looked for a while for book
   ‘Ivan gradually looked for a while for a/the book.’

(13) a. Cvetok ros_{IMPF} meter za metrom.
   flower grew meter by meter
   ‘A flower grew meter by meter.’

b. Cvetok vyros_{PERF} meter za metrom.
   flower grew up meter by meter
   ‘A flower reached full bloom meter by meter.’

c. *Ivan iskal_{IMPF} knigu komnata za komnatoj.
   Ivan looked for book room by room
   ‘Ivan looked for a/the book room by room.’

d. *Ivan poiskal_{PERF} knigu komnata za komnatoj.
   Ivan looked for a while for book room by room
   ‘Ivan looked for a while for a/the book room by room.’

(14) a. Dinozavry postepenno isčezali_{IMPF} s lica zemli.
   dinosaurs gradually disappeared from face earth
   ‘Dinosaurs gradually disappeared from the face of the earth.’
(14) b. Dinozavry postepnno isčezli\textsuperscript{PERF} \textsubscript{IMPF} s lica zemli.
dinosaurs gradually disappeared from face earth
‘Dinosaurs gradually disappeared from the face of the
earth.’
c. *Deti postepnno maxali\textsuperscript{IMPF} rukami.
children gradually waved hands
‘The children gradually waved their hands.’
d. *Deti postepnno pomaxali\textsuperscript{PERF} rukami.
children gradually waved for a while hands
‘The children gradually waved their hands for a while.’

(15) a. Dinozavry isčezli\textsuperscript{PERF} \textsubscript{IMPF} s lica zemli vid za vidom.
dinosaurs disappeared from face earth species by species
‘Dinosaurs disappeared from the face of the earth species by
species.’
b. Dinozavry isčezli\textsuperscript{PERF} \textsubscript{IMPF} s lica zemli vid za vidom.
dinosaurs disappeared from face earth species by species
‘Dinosaurs disappeared from the face of the earth species by
species.’
c. *Deti maxali\textsuperscript{IMPF} rukami dviženie za dviženiem.
children waved hands movement by movement
‘The children waved their hands movement by movement.’
d. *Deti pomaxali\textsuperscript{PERF} rukami dviženie za dviženiem.
children waved hands movement by movement
‘The children waved their hands movement by movement.’

Other examples which support this are postepenno \textit{tajat’IMPF/rastajat’PERF}
‘to melt gradually’ and \textit{tajat’IMPF/rastajat’PERF sloj za slojem ‘to melt layer
by layer’}, and \textit{postepenno ostyvat’IMPF/ostyt’PERF ‘to cool gradually’ and
ostyt’IMPF/ostyt’PERF gradus za gradusom ‘to cool degree by degree’}. All
of these are acceptable, as opposed to *\textit{postepenno tancevat’IMPF tango ‘to
gradually dance a tango’/postepenno potancevat’PERF tango ‘to gradually
dance a tango for a while’, *\textit{tancevat’IMPF tango šag za šagom ‘to dance
a tango step by step’/potancevat’PERF tango šag za šagom ‘to dance a tango
for a while step by step’, *\textit{postepenno xlopat’IMPF kryl’jami ‘to gradually

flap wings’/*postepenny poslopat’_{PERF} kryl’jami ‘to gradually flap wings for a while’, and *xlopat’_{IMPF} kryl’jami ryvok za ryvkom ‘to flap wings swing by swing’/*poxlopat’_{PERF} kryl’jami ryvok za ryvkom ‘to flap wings for a while swing by swing’.

An important question is whether all imperfective accomplishments can be modified by these modifiers independent of their interpretation.\(^5\) In the examples given above, the most natural interpretation of the imperfective accomplishments is that they denote partially completed events or events in progress. However, imperfective verbs in Russian can be interpreted in four different ways: progressive, durative, iterative or habitual, and perfect. As we show below, incremental modifiers occur in all four readings, indicating that the incrementality of the verbal element is a lexical property of the verbal head and not derived from the particular choice of imperfective reading imposed on it.

The four interpretations are illustrated in (16). A progressive focalized-processual interpretation describes a situation occurring at the moment of observation, as in (16a). A durative-processual interpretation denotes a situation that holds at a time interval but is located before some point of reference, as in (16b). This is the most natural reading for the examples which have been used up to now. The iterative reading in (16c), also referred to as the habitual, denotes an iteration of a certain situation. Finally, a perfect reading in (16d) denotes a completed situation with some relevance for the present.

(16) a. V 12:00, Ivan čital_{IMPF} knigu.
    at 12:00 Ivan read book
    ‘Ivan was reading a/the book at 12:00.’

b. Ivan dva časa čital_{IMPF} knigu pered tem kak ja prišel_{PERF}.
    Ivan two hours read book before I arrived
    ‘Ivan was reading a/the book for two hours before I arrived.’

c. Ivan čital_{IMPF} žurnal Time po subbotam.
    Ivan read magazine Time on Saturdays
    ‘Ivan used to read Time magazine on Saturdays’.

\(^5\) We thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing out to us the importance of this question.
(16) d. Ivan užel čitalIMPFO Vojnu i mir za dve nedel.
Ivan already read War and Peace in two weeks
‘Ivan has already read War and Peace in two weeks.’

As we see in the following examples, incremental modifiers are compatible with all four interpretations, though some readings require contextual support. Note also that these readings are available with both singular and plural direct objects, interpreted as definites or indefinites, which indicates that the incrementality is inherent in the verb meaning and not derived from a structure imposed on a plurality or from a completive reading dependent on the definiteness of the direct object.

(17) a. ?Kogda ja vošel, Ivan čitalIMPFO knigu/ knigi stranica za when I came in Ivan read book books page by page
‘When I came in, Ivan was reading a/the book / (the) books page by page.’

b. ?Kogda ja vošel, Ivan postepenno čitalIMPFO knigu/ knigi.
when I came in Ivan gradually read book books
‘When I came in, Ivan was gradually reading a/the book / (the) books.’

by page
‘Sitting in the library, Ivan read a/the book / books page by page.’

b. Sidja v biblioteke, Ivan postepenno čitalIMPFO knigu/ knigi. sitting in library Ivan gradually read book books
‘Sitting in the library, Ivan gradually read a/the book / (the) books.’
(18) c. Ivan dva časa čital knigu/ knigi stranica za stranicej
Ivan two hours read book books page by page
pered eksamenom.
before exam
‘Ivan read a/the book / (the) books page by page for two
hours before exam.’

(19) a. Po voskresen’jam, Ivan čital gazety stranica za
on Sundays Ivan read newspapers page by
stranicej.
page
‘On Sundays, Ivan read (the) newspapers page by page.’
b. Po voskresen’jam, Ivan postepenno čital gazety.
on Sundays Ivan gradually read newspapers
‘On Sundays, Ivan gradually read (the) newspapers.’

(20) a. Ivan uže čital Vojnu i mir stranica za stranicej.
Ivan already read War and Peace page by page
‘Ivan has already read War and Peace page by page.’
b. Ivan uže postepenno čital Vojnu i mir.
Ivan already gradually read War and Peace
‘Ivan has already gradually read War and Peace.’

The durative-processual reading in (18), the habitual/iterative
reading in (19), and the perfect reading in (20) are compatible with the
incremental modifiers postepenno and ‘bit by bit’. At first sight, the
incremental modifiers seem to be incompatible with the progressive
focalised-processual interpretation of imperfective čital in (17). However,
this incompatibility is explained by pragmatic considerations: a
speaker is unable to ascertain that the reading process was gradual or
proceeded bit by bit at the point of observation. Since the sentences in
(17) are narrowed down to a single moment or a very short time inter-
val, the speaker cannot judge whether the reading process is gradual
or page by page from what he observes at this short moment. A proper
contextual support seems to resolve this problem, as we can see in (21).
(21) Ivan načal_{\textsc{perf}} čitat$'$_{\textsc{imperf}} knigu s utra. Kogda ja Ivan began to read book since morning when I uxođil_{\textsc{imperf}}, Ivan postepeno/ stranica za stranicej čital_{\textsc{imperf}} left Ivan gradually page by page read knigu. Kogda ja vernulsja_{\textsc{perf}} v 12:00, on prodolžal book when I came back at 12:00 he continued postepenno/ stranica za stranicej čitat$'$ etu že knigu. gradually page by page to read this very book 'Ivan began reading a book in the morning morning. When I was leaving, Ivan was reading the book gradually/page by page. When I came back at 12:00, he continued to read the same book gradually/page by page.'

Incremental modifiers may still sound a little strange with bounded plural objects in the progressive, but as Mehlig (2008) shows this has to do with the general incompatibility of bounded objects with imperfective accomplishments (except under simultaneous interpretation). Mehlig shows that when a possessive pronoun accompanies the direct object the relevant sentences sound better. In these cases, incremental modifiers are perfectly acceptable and imply that the drinking happened in an ordered fashion, cup after cup.

(22) a. Ivan postepeno pil_{\textsc{imperf}} svoi tri čaški kofe. Ivan gradually drank his three cups coffee

‘Ivan was gradually drinking his three cups of coffee.’

b. Ivan pil_{\textsc{imperf}} svoi tri čaški kofe glotok za glotkom. Ivan drank his three cups coffee gulp by gulp

‘Ivan was drinking his three cups of coffee gulp by gulp.’

Notice that while the non-bounded direct objects of the examples using imperfectives can be interpreted as indefinite or definite (as shown in examples (17–19)), the bare plural direct object in the paired perfective sentence must be interpreted as definite.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{6} As Mehlig points out (p.c.), in some special contexts direct objects of perfective verbs acquire an indefinite reading. One such case is contrastive negation: \textit{On pročital_{\textsc{perf}} ne knigu, a gazetu ‘He read a newspaper, not a book’}. 

(23) Ivan pročital_{PERF} gazety stranica za stranicej/postepенно.
Ivan read newspapers page by page gradually

‘Ivan read the newspapers page by page / gradually.’

This contrast is further evidence that the incrementally modified imperfective is an independent construction and not just the progressive correlate of the perfective form.

More support comes from the use of temporal modifiers. While temporal za modifiers, the equivalent of in X time, are canonically found as modifiers of perfective verbs and for X time modifiers are canonically found with imperfective verbs, the za modifiers can occur with perfect or completive uses of the imperfective. An example was given in (16d). If incrementality, and thus incremental modification, is dependent on the lexical properties of the head and independent of the particular interpretation given, then incremental modifiers should co-occur with both za čas ‘in an hour’ and čas ‘for an hour’. This prediction is borne out, as the data in (24) show. Here we see that stranica za stranicej can modify both atelic and telic readings of the imperfective, where use of užè ‘already’ and the definite direct object in (24b) makes the telic reading natural.

(24) a. Ivan čas čital_{IMPF} knigu/ knigi stranica za stranicej.
Ivan hour read book books page by page

‘Ivan read a/the book / (the) books page by page for an hour.’

b. Ivan užè čital_{IMPF} ètu knigu/ eti knigi stranica za
Ivan already read this book these books page by page
stranicej za čas.
in hour

‘Ivan has already read this book / these books page by page
in an hour.’

Note further that incremental modifiers appear with intransitives of verbs like čitat’ only if the content of the direct object is recoverable from context. Thus (25) is acceptable only in the context of a situation where, for example, I have given Ivan an enormous pile of papers or exams to grade and I say:

Note further that incremental modifiers appear with intransitives of verbs like čitat’ only if the content of the direct object is recoverable from context.

Thus (25) is acceptable only in the context of a situation where, for example, I have given Ivan an enormous pile of papers or exams to grade and I say:
(25) Ivan čital IMPF postepenno/ stranica za stranice.
Ivan read gradually page by page
'Ivan was reading gradually / page by page.'

But this result is expected, since the presence of an incremental theme (either explicit or understood from context) is essential to get an incremental reading of a verb. In English too, standard accomplishment verbs such as write get a non-incremental activity reading when intransitivized, as in the acceptable he wrote for some hours. It thus looks as if incremental modifiers will provide a means for distinguishing between accomplishment verbs and activity verbs in Russian exactly along the lines that Padučeva's theory requires. We now need to explain why these modifiers behave the way they do and show that their distribution hinges on the difference in structures between accomplishments and activities. We turn to this in the following sections.

4. The Interpretation of Incremental Modifiers

4.1. Postepenno

If incremental modifiers are indeed a test for accomplishments, we may assume that the distribution of these modifiers follows from their interpretation. We thus need an account of the semantics of postepenno and X za X which will show how they interact with the denotations of the verbs they modify and why they have the distribution they do. We begin with postepenno, the Russian equivalent of gradually.

The only serious study of the semantics of gradually that we know of is Piñón’s 2000 study of gradually in English. Piñón is the first to point out that the distribution of gradually in English allows us to make aspeсtual distinctions among verbs. Gradually in English can occur sentence initially, preverbally, or post-verbally. In sentence initial position and also in preverbal position, it arguably scopes over tense and can modify the stages leading up to an event, but as a verbal modifier it applies directly to the verb itself and only with verbs denoting events of change along some kind of scale. Thus, as a verbal modifier gradually occurs in English with degree achievements such as cool and expand, with almost all accomplishments (with the exception of rescue, which is arguably an achievement anyway), but with activities and states only if some kind of scale of measurement is added explicitly.
As in English, postepenny in Russian can occur either sentence-initially, preverbally, or post-verbally, as shown in (26).

(26) a. Postepenny, led rastajal\textsubscript{PERF} gradually ice melted
    b. Led postepenno rastajal\textsubscript{PERF} ice gradually melted
    c. Led rastajal\textsubscript{PERF} postepenno. ice melted gradually.
    
    ‘The ice gradually melted.’

Preverbal position seems to be the most natural in Russian (as well as in English). As we saw in the previous section, postepenno naturally occurs with what we pretheoretically would consider accomplishment types and not with activities.

A further look at the data indicates some more fine-grained distinctions and indicates also that the facts about the distribution of postepenno in Russian do not carry over directly from the facts about gradually. Unlike the English data, postepenno never modifies states and activities, even when these have been already modified by a scalar or degree modifier. In English, as Piñón (2000) has shown, gradually can modify activities and states after the addition of more and more modification, as in (27).

(27) a. *Children gradually ran.
    b. Children gradually ran more and more quickly.
    c. *Peter gradually loved Mary
    d. Peter gradually loved Mary more and more.

In Russian, however, the addition of the more and more modifier does not affect the incompatibility of postepenno with activity and state verbs, as we can see in (28). Note that there is no problem in adding a degree modifier, as in (28a, d), but crucially these degree modifiers do not license X za X modification.
(28) a. Deti \textit{bežali}^{\text{IMPF}} vse bystree i bystree.
    children ran all faster and faster
    ‘The children ran more and more quickly.’
b. *Deti \textit{postepenno bežali}^{\text{IMPF}}.
    children gradually ran
    ‘The children gradually ran.’
c. *Deti \textit{postepenno bežali}^{\text{IMPF}} vse bystree i bystree.
    children gradually ran all faster and faster
    ‘The children gradually ran more and more quickly.’
d. Ivan \textit{ljubil}^{\text{IMPF}} Mašu vse bol’še i bol’še.
    Ivan loved Masha all more and more
    ‘Ivan loved Masha more and more.’
e. *Ivan \textit{postepenno ljubil}^{\text{IMPF}} Mašu.
    Ivan gradually loved Masha
    ‘Ivan gradually loved Masha.’
f. *Ivan \textit{postepenno ljubil}^{\text{IMPF}} Mašu vse bol’še i bol’še.
    Ivan gradually loved Masha all more and more
    ‘Ivan gradually loved Masha more and more.’

In order to express the meanings in (28c, f) Russian uses the accomplishment verb \textit{ubystrijat'}^{\text{IMPF}} ‘to quicken’ and the inchoative achievement \textit{vlubljat'sja}^{\text{IMPF}} ‘to come to love/to fall in love’ respectively:

(29) a. Deti \textit{postepenno ubystrijali}^{\text{IMPF}} svoj beg.
    children gradually quickened their run
    ‘The children gradually quickened their pace’.
b. Ivan \textit{postepenno vse bol’še i bol’še vlubljalsja}^{\text{IMPF}}
    Ivan gradually all more and more fell in love
    v Mašu.
    in Masha.
    ‘Ivan gradually fell more and more in love with Masha.’

Predictably, achievements denoting singular events cannot be modified by \textit{postepenno} in initial, pre-, or post-verbal positions:
(30) a. *Postepenno vozdušnyj šarik lopnul_{PERF-gradually} balloon popped
b. *Vozdušnyj šarik postepenno lopnul_{PERF-gradually} balloon gradually popped
c. *Vozdušnyj šarik lopnul_{PERF-postepenno} balloon popped gradually
   ‘The balloon gradually popped.’
d. *Postepenno Igor’ umer_{PERF-gradually} Igor’ died
e. *Igor’ postepenno umer_{PERF-gradually} Igor’ died
f. *Igor’ umer_{PERF-postepenno} Igor’ died gradually
   ‘Ivan gradually died.’

However, they can appear sentence-initially, pre-, and post-verbally with achievements, on condition that the verb phrase can denote a plurality. In the following examples postepenno modifies the plurality of events in the VP and is true if the plurality of instantaneous events is spaced out gradually over an extended time period. The plural achievements are also acceptable with one specific X za X type modifier, ‘one by one’.

(31) a. Postepenno, vozdušnye šariki lopnuli_{PERF-gradually} balloons popped one by another
   ‘Gradually, the balloons popped one by one’.
b. Vozdušnye šariki postepenno lopnuli_{PERF-gradually} balloons popped one by another
   ‘The balloons gradually popped one by one’.
c. Vozdušnye šariki lopnuli_{PERF-postepenno, odin za drugim} balloons popped gradually one by another
   ‘The balloons popped gradually, one by one’.
d. Postepenno, okna v dome tresnuli_{PERF-gradually} windows in house cracked one by another
   ‘Gradually, the windows in the house cracked one by one.’
(31) e. Okna v dome postepennol tresnuliperf odno za drugim.
    windows in house gradually cracked one by another
    ‘The windows in the house gradually cracked one by one.’

f. Okna v dome tresnuliperf postepeno, odno za drugim.
    windows in house cracked gradually one by another
    ‘The windows in the house cracked gradually, one by one.’

g. *Okna v dome tresnuliperf postepeno, oskolok za
    windowsin house cracked gradually fragment by
    oskolkom.
    fragment
    ‘The windows in the house cracked gradually, fragment by
    fragment.’

Interestingly, pluralities of activities and states cannot be modified
by postepeno. Thus (32a–b) are unacceptable, while (32c–d) are accept-
able, because the activity stem in (32a) and the state stem in (32b) have
been prefixed by the prefix za-, plausibly shifting them into achieve-
ments in (32c–d), respectively.

    gradually guests smoked cigarettes
    ‘The guests gradually smoked cigarettes.’

b. *Postepeno, deti drenaliimf.
    gradually children slept
    ‘The children gradually slept.’

c. Postepeno, gosti zakuriliiperf sigarety.
    gradually guests began to smoke cigarettes
    ‘Gradually, the guests lit up cigarettes.’

d. Postepeno, deti zadrenaliiperf.
    gradually children fell asleep
    ‘Gradually, the children fell asleep.’

The position of postepeno in (32) can also be pre- or post-verbal in all
the examples without affecting the judgments. The initial position is
nonetheless the most natural one for postepeno when it modifies the
plural achievement events, as in (31a–d). We conclude from this that postepenno behaves as a sentential modifier when it modifies plural achievement events. We will, however, ignore this use of postepenno in the rest of the paper.

One other important difference between postepenno and gradually concerns direct objects. While in English gradually is incompatible with mass or bare plural objects, as in (33a), postepenno does not create such a problem in Russian:

(33) a. *Ivan gradually ate cheese.
   b. *Ivan gradually ate cakes.

(34) a. Ivan postepenno eIMP syr.
     Ivan gradually ate cheese
     ‘Ivan gradually used to eat cheese / was eating the cheese.’
   b. Ivan postepenno s’elPERF syr.
     Ivan gradually ate cheese
     ‘Ivan gradually ate the cheese.’

(35) a. Ivan postepenno eIMP pirogi.
     Ivan gradually ate cakes
     ‘Ivan gradually ate (the) cakes.’
   b. Ivan postepenno s’elPERF pirogi.
     Ivan gradually ate cakes
     ‘Ivan gradually ate the cakes.’
   c. Ivan elIMP pirogi kusok za kuskom.
     Ivan ate cakes bit by bit
     ‘Ivan ate (the) cakes bit by bit.’
   d. Ivan s’elPERF pirogi kusok za kuskom.
     Ivan ate cakes bit by bit
     ‘Ivan ate the cakes bit by bit.’

Note that while the English examples are ungrammatical except on the habitual reading ‘Ivan gradually came to eat cheese/cakes’, Russian allows non-habitual readings. The example (34a) has a habitual interpretation, meaning that in general Ivan used to eat (an unknown
amount of) cheese gradually, and a durative interpretation, in which the denotation of cheese will be restricted to the concrete, contextually defined piece of cheese. The perfective example (34b) has only a completed interpretation in which the contextually defined piece of cheese was eaten. The Russian examples in (35) have two possible non-habitual interpretations. First, Ivan ate the cakes (in perfective sentences—all available cakes) gradually and simultaneously, biting a piece of each cake in turn. Second, Ivan gradually ate the cakes, completely finishing one cake and then starting another. In both cases, each individual cake was eaten gradually (or bit by bit).

The semantics which Piñón proposes for *gradually* in English make it a modifier of relations R between events and degrees, and “asserts that as an event e unfolds, the degree of e as determined by R steadily increases.” Piñón’s semantics require that *gradually* only modifies verbs that have a degree argument, and this naturally constrains its distribution. Degree achievements such as *cool* can naturally be modified by *gradually*, as in *The soup cooled gradually*, and Piñón’s semantics give this the meaning that the soup cooled and the degree of its coolness steadily increases as the event continues. Verbs which can be modified by *gradually*, but do not have an explicit degree argument require a degree argument to be introduced by a degree function. A crucial element of Piñón’s analysis is that the degree function can only be added directly to a verbal meaning if the verb has an incremental argument which incrementally reflects the development of the event. Accomplishments are incremental and have an incremental theme (the direct object of a transitive verb and subject of an intransitive, usually unaccusative, verb). This means that an implicit degree function can be added to the accomplishment verb meaning and the resulting output can be modified by *gradually*. Activities and states can be modified by *gradually* only if an explicit scalar modifier is added to the VP as in *love Mary more and more* and *run more and more quickly*, as illustrated above.

The analysis we present in this paper shares with Piñón’s account the assumption that the semantics of graduality is inherently tied up with incrementality. However, we present a simpler analysis of *postepenno*, in which the modifier directly modifies an incremental event instead of assuming a relation between the event and the degree argument and modifying that relation. Our reasons for taking this approach are based on the data above. The crucial examples are (28c, f), repeated here, which show that, unlike the corresponding English ex-
amples, *postepennno* cannot modify an activity or a state, even if it includes an explicit expression of degree.

(28) c. *Deti* postepennno bežali_{IMP} vse bystree i bystree.
    children gradually ran all faster and faster
    ‘The children gradually ran faster and faster.’

f. *Ivan* postepennno ljubil_{IMP} Mašu vse bol’še i bol’še.
    Ivan gradually loved Masha all more and more
    ‘Ivan gradually loved Masha more and more.’

The data in (28) show that *postepennno* modifies only an inherently incremental verb, and this implies that in Russian it is the incremental structure of the verb itself which is modified, not a degree argument which has been added to the verbal meaning. We take this as support for the claim that it is lexical incrementality which is essential to the semantics of *postepennno*, rather than degrees,\(^7\) and we give an analysis which builds on this.

Intuitively, *postepennno* applies to verbs of incremental change, and adds the information that the change was not brought about in a rush but in small steps. The meaning of adding *postepennno* to “X V-ed” is not that the degree assigned to the incremental stages is constantly increasing but that the incremental steps are small or, put differently, that there are sufficient incremental stages for the changes between each stage to be small. We show that the interpretation of the adverb

\(^7\) It is true that the examples in (31) indicate that an incremental structure can be constructed on a plural set of achievements. This clearly requires an explanation (which we are not going to attempt here), but since the phenomenon is restricted to achievements and not dependent on an explicit expression of degree, it does not affect our basic claim. Mehlig (2008) presents evidence based on temporal modification which shows that plural achievement predicates can be interpreted as incremental. The fact that achievement predicates in Russian can be modified by *odin za drugim* ‘one after another’ but not by other *X za X* modifiers suggests that it is a derived incrementality (rather than a lexical incrementality), derived from imposing incremental structure on a plurality of instantaneous events. Crucially, this cannot be done generally, but only with achievements, and presumably is connected to the temporal and/or lexical properties of achievements. This raises many interesting questions about achievements and plurality which we will not discuss further here. Note that the data in (31) provide evidence for characterizing the lexical class of achievements. Unlike accomplishments, singular achievements cannot be modified by *postepennno*, but unlike activities and states plural achievements can be so modified.
presupposes that the event denoted by the V has an incremental structure and that this adverb distinguishes between accomplishments and activities, no matter what grammatical aspect the verb appears in, precisely because an accomplishment has an incremental structure in both aspects.

In order to show how the semantics of postepenno works, we first need some background on a formal representation of Vendler classes and a theory of incrementality. We illustrate this using the semantics for accomplishments introduced in Rothstein 2004. Although our semantics for incremental modifiers could no doubt be instantiated in other theories of incrementality, such as Krifka 1992 and 1998, Rothstein’s account is particularly suited to our analysis since it presupposes that incrementality proceeds in discrete stages. We will claim that it is the set of stages, or the incremental structure determined by this set of stages that both postepenno and X za X modify. We will say more about this below.

Rothstein’s (2004) account is based on a reworking of the Vendlerian classification system in a neo-Davidsonian framework (see Parsons 1990 and Landman 2000). In this framework, verbs denote sets of events or event types, and thematic roles denote functions from events to their participants. Lexical classes are distinguished by the different properties that the events in their denotations have, and the set of lexical classes may be seen as a disjunction of constraints on the possible event types that can be denotations of verbal heads. Rothstein argues that the diagnostic tests indicate that Vendler’s four classes can be seen as instantiations of two features: whether a verb denotes an event which can be analyzed as having distinguishable stages and whether it denotes an event of change. The notion of event stages was introduced in Landman 1992 and discussed further in Landman 2008. An event e’ is a “stage” of e if the following hold:

(36) e’ is a stage of e iff:
   (i) e’ ⊆ e; i.e., e’ is a temporal part of e;
   (ii) e and e’ have the same temporal starting point;
   (iii) e is a development of e’; i.e., e and e’ are qualitatively distinguishable, having different properties.

Activities and accomplishments have stages (which is why they naturally occur with the progressive), while states and achievements
do not. States do not have stages because they are entirely static, and any subevent of a state ε is indistinguishable from any other subevent in the relevant respects. Achievements do not have stages because they are too short. They are analyzed as essentially instantaneous changes from ¬φ to φ, which therefore hold at two consecutive instants, the last moment that ¬φ is true and the first moment that φ is true (see Dowty 1979).

With respect to change, achievements and accomplishments are analyzed as events of change, while states and activities are not. Since a change has a natural culmination or end point, the point when the change has “happened”, this explains the fact that achievements and accomplishments naturally head telic VPs. In English, the activity-headed VP in John ran is atelic because we do not know when the process of running was over, while the accomplishment headed VP in John drew a picture is telic because the given event was over when the painting of the picture was completed. Rothstein (2004, chapter 8) shows that the analysis of the four verb classes in terms of these two features can be summed up in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Class</th>
<th>[± stages]</th>
<th>[± event of change]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 1, accomplishments are the most complex of these verb classes because they have both stages, and denote events of change. Event stages are ordered temporally. However, in an accomplishment event the stages can be ordered not only according to the temporal size but according to how close they bring you along the process of change to a predefined culmination point.

Rothstein 2004 thus differs from Krifka 1989, 1992, 1998, and similar proposals, as Krifka argues that accomplishments are incremental because there is a homomorphism between the part structure of the theme argument and the part structure of the event. Rothstein pro-
poses instead that the incrementality of accomplishments is determined by the inherent ordering of event stages. She analyses accomplishment events as complex events consisting of an activity subevent and an event of change and argues that the process of change is used to “measure” or plot the progress of the activity event. The process of change has contextually defined stages, and the structure of this chain of stages is imposed on the event as a whole. The culmination point of the change, i.e., the point at which the change is achieved, determines the culmination or end point of the whole event.

More precisely, an accomplishment event is a singular event formed out of the sum of an activity event and a temporally extended BECOME event. These are linked by an incremental relation, which works as follows. It assumes a contextually determined incremental chain, C(e₂), imposed on the event of change via the stage of relation holding between its subevents (where stage is defined as in (36) above). This incremental chain assigns the BECOME event a break down into its contextually relevant parts. A function, call it μ, maps the elements of the incremental chain onto the activity event in such a way that each element of C(e₂) is mapped onto that part of e₁ which shares its running time. Thus, the structure captures the generally accepted intuition (Dowty 1991, Krifka 1992, Tenny 1994, and others) that the change of state “measures out” or marks the progress of the activity and thus of the event as a whole.

An incremental chain is defined as in (37).

(37) Incremental Chain

Let e be a BECOME event:

An incremental chain C(e) is a set of stages of e such that:

(i) the smallest event in C(e) is the initial bound of e;
(ii) for every e₁, e₂ in C(e), e₁ ⊆ e₂ or e₂ ⊆ e₁;
(iii) e ∈ C(e).

So an incremental chain breaks a BECOME event down into a set of temporally ordered stages, which start with its beginning and plot its growth into the complete event. This is represented graphically in (38), where the initial bound of e is the starting point of e, and the upper bound of an event e is its final point or culmination.
(38) An incremental chain $C(e)$

In an accomplishment event the incremental chain, or division into ordered stages, is mapped by a one-to-one function $\mu$ onto the activity event via the incremental relation in (39) (where $\tau(e)$ maps an event onto its running time):

(39) Incremental relations:

Let $e_1$ be an activity, $e_2$ be a BECOME event, and $C(e_2)$ be an incremental chain defined on $e_2$.

$\text{INCR}(e_1, e_2, C(e_2))$ ($e_1$ is incrementally related to $e_2$ with respect to the chain $C(e_2)$) iff:

there is a one-to-one function $\mu$ from $C(e_2)$ into $\text{PART}(e_1)$ (the set of parts of $e_1$) such that:

for every $e \in C(e_2)$: $\tau(e) = \tau(\mu(e))$.

So the incremental relation maps the salient incremental parts of $e_2$, the BECOME event, onto those parts of $e_1$, the activity event, that have the same running time. Note that “identity” here is identity up to bounds, since the point of the $\mu$ function is that it enables the bounded intervals in $e_2$ to impose a right-bound on the intervals in $e_1$, which are inherently only left-bounded. So, while the incremental chain $C(e_2)$ imposes an incremental structure on the BECOME event, the incremental relation imposes this structure onto the event as a whole. This is illustrated graphically in (40), where $e_1$ is the activity event, whose temporal trace is a right-open interval, and $e_2$ is the BECOME event, which is a right-closed interval that imposes its temporal trace on the structure of the event as a whole.
(40) **Accomplishment event structure**

---

The template for accomplishment verbs given in (41) shows how the meaning of a lexical item “unpacks” to express this structure. The sum operation used is the composition of the standard sum operation based on the part of relation and an operation which takes plural entities into a singular entity. Thus \( s(e_1 \uplus e_2) \) gives the singular event which is formed from the sum of \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \). For justification of this operation see Rothstein 2004:

(41) **Accomplishment Template**

\[
\lambda \lambda \lambda \epsilon \exists e_1 \exists e_2 \exists e =^s(e_1 \uplus e_2) \wedge P_{\text{ACTIVITY}}(e_1) \wedge \text{Th}(e_1) = x \\
\wedge \text{BECOME-P-ed}(e_2) \wedge \text{Arg}(e_2) = \text{Th}(e_1) \wedge \text{INCR}(e_1, e_2, C(e_2))
\]

An accomplishment verb thus denotes a complex event with an activity subevent \( e_1 \) and a BECOME subevent \( e_2 \) in which the theme undergoes the activity expressed by \( P \). The accomplishment READ thus denotes a set of events, each of which is the sum of an event \( e_1 \) in the denotation of \( \text{READ}_{\text{ACTIVITY}} \) and an event \( e_2 \) in which the theme of

---

8 Note that in (41) the content of the activity and of the BECOME event are lexically related, while the definition in (39) leaves open the possibility that they are independent. This is because (41) is the template for a basic lexical accomplishment verb, while the definition in (39) covers also derived accomplishments formed via lexical type shifting operations in, for example, resultative constructions. See Rothstein 2004 for details.
READ<sub>ACTIVITY</sub> gets read. In the interests of brevity we will use λxλe. P*(e) ∧ Th(e) = x as a short form for (41), so that λxλe. READ*(e) ∧ Th(e) = x is the short form of the denotation of the accomplishment read whose long form would use the template in (41).<sup>9</sup> Arg is a general function from events to their participants, and Arg(e<sub>2</sub>) = Th(e<sub>1</sub>) specifies that the thematic argument of e<sub>2</sub> or participant of e<sub>2</sub> is the same entity as the theme argument of e<sub>1</sub>. The value of this function is thus the incremental theme. An INCR(e<sub>1</sub>, e<sub>2</sub>, C(e<sub>2</sub>)) relation holds between e<sub>1</sub> and e<sub>2</sub>, requiring e<sub>1</sub> and e<sub>2</sub> to be incrementally related by means of an incremental chain C(e<sub>2</sub>) built on e<sub>2</sub>.

The crucial point is that there are obviously many incremental chains which can be constructed on the BECOME event because there are many possible ways of picking out salient sets of stages for the event of change. For example, the relevant stages of a book-reading event will depend on how long the book is, how fast the reader, what purpose the book is being read for, what kind of book it is, and so on. Thus the incremental relation is contextually determined, depending on the contextually determined choice of what the salient stages of the event of change which determines the incremental chain are.

We assume that it is this choice which is constrained by postepenno. We look again at the data showing the distribution of postepenno:

(42) a. Ivan postepenno čital<sub>IMP</sub> knigu.
    Ivan gradually read book
    ‘Ivan read a/the book gradually.’

b. Ivan postepenno pročital<sub>PERF</sub> knigu.
    Ivan gradually read book
    ‘Ivan read the book gradually.’

<sup>9</sup> Read also has an activity reading as in I read the story to the child for hours. Rothstein (2004) argues that this reading is derived from the accomplishment reading. The lexical accomplishment read denotes λxλe.∃e<sub>1</sub>e<sub>2</sub>[ e=λ(e<sub>1</sub> e<sub>2</sub>) ∧ READ<sub>ACTIVITY</sub>(e<sub>1</sub>) ∧ Th(e<sub>1</sub>)= x ∧ BECOME-READ (e<sub>2</sub>) ∧ Arg(e<sub>2</sub>) = Th(e<sub>1</sub>) ∧ INCR(e<sub>1</sub>, e<sub>2</sub>, C(e<sub>2</sub>))], but read as an activity denotes λxλe.λe.BECOME-READ(e) ∧ Th(e)= x. As far as we can tell, the subevent λe.BECOME-READ(e) does not have an independent usage outside the accomplishment reading, but maybe it is the basis of the middle usage as in This book reads easily.
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(42)  

c.  *Ivan guljal_{IMPF} postepenno.  
   Ivan walked gradually  
   ‘Ivan walked gradually.’

d.  *Ivan poguljal_{PERF} postepenno.  
   Ivan walked for a while gradually  
   ‘Ivan walked for a while gradually.’

Let us assume that if an event is gradual, then the change brought about is brought about in small stages and not in a rush. If (42a) is true, then Ivan read the book in small stages and not in one sitting. We assume this can be captured by the constraint that the event is analyzed as having salient, identifiable stages, which guarantees that it does not happen “in one go” or “in a rush”. If Ivan read the book gradually, we should be able to identify stages in the event of reading that book at each of which a different quantity of book had been read. These parts do not have to be homogeneous. I can read a book gradually over a period of time, reading more and more of the book at different rates (several chapters on one sitting, another chapter over a period of weeks, and so on). Similarly, I can build a house gradually over a period of time, digging the basement and then pausing for a while, and then continuing with work stages and pause stages of different and unpredictable durations and types. But in order to ensure that the event is gradual it has to be assigned an incremental structure consisting of a large enough number of salient subevents. We can call such an incremental structure “dense.” The fact that gradual events tend to be slow follows from the fact that in order to have a large enough set of salient subevents a gradual event needs to last long enough for the subevents to be noticed.

We treat postepenno as a VP modifier, applying to VP meanings and returning VP meanings, i.e., an expression of type $<<e,t>,<e,t>>$ denoting a function from sets of events to sets of events. (Note we use ‘e’ here as denoting the type of event entities.) It applies to VPs headed by accomplishments and returns the set of events whose incremental subevent is analyzed as having a sufficiently large number of relevant stages. Thus, while postepenno applies to a VP structurally, its effect cannot be seen without unpacking the meaning of the accomplishment verb so that the structure given in (41) is visible. It is important to see that the unpacking itself is not an effect of adding the modifier: this
structure is always there but is not usually represented explicitly unless it is necessary. With incremental modifiers, it is necessary.

An accomplishment-headed VP modified by postepenno will have the structure \( \lambda e. \text{VP}(e) \land \text{postepenno}(e) \) that will be interpreted as in (43).

\[
(43) \quad \lambda e \exists e_1, e_2 \left[ e = s(e_1 \cup e_2) \land \text{P}_{\text{ACTIVITY}}(e_1) \land \text{BECOME-P-ed}(e_2) \\
\land \text{INCR}(e_1, e_2, C(e_2)) \\
\land |C(e_2)| = \text{BIG} \right]
\]

The meaning given is that a gradual event is one in which the cardinality of the chain which is the domain for the incremental relation is in BIG. A cardinality is in BIG if it is sufficiently above the norm, where of course the norm, and thus the denotation of BIG, is context dependent. Thus we have a contextually defined incremental chain which consists of more stages than expected relative to some standard of interpretation. So postepenno can modify a VP whose meaning contains reference to an incremental chain, i.e., a VP headed by an accomplishment, and it adds the information that this incremental chain has many stages. This ensures that events in the denotation of the modified VP have incremental structures with enough subevents to be considered gradual. Examples (42a) and (42b) will both have the interpretation in (44), abstracting away from the differences due to the semantic expression of perfectivity.

\[
(44) \quad \exists e, e_1, e_2 \left[ e = s(e_1 \cup e_2) \land \text{READ}(e_1) \land \text{Ag}(e_1) = \text{IVAN} \\
\land \text{Th}(e_1) = \text{THE BOOK} \\
\land \text{BECOME READ}(e_2) \land \text{Arg}(e_2) = \text{Th}(e_1) \\
\land \text{INCR}(e_1, e_2, C(e_2)) \\
\land |C(e_2)| = \text{BIG} \right]
\]

‘There was an event of Ivan reading the book in which the book became read which had many incremental stages (and was therefore gradual).’

The semantics of degree achievements is beyond the scope of this paper, but it seems clear that they have a naturally incremental structure (as argued in Hay, Kennedy, and Levin 1999) and are therefore predicted to occur with postepenno.
(45) a. Temperatura postepenno podnimalas’IMPF-
temperature gradually rose
‘The temperature gradually rose.’
b. (Nebo) Postepenno temneloIMPF-
sky gradually darkened
‘(The sky) gradually darkened.’

To sum up this section, we have analyzed postepenno as an incremental modifier which modifies inherently incremental verbs. We have proposed treating postepenno as a modifier which constrains the incremental structure of the verb to have enough distinguishable incremental stages, where “enough” is contextually determined, and we have suggested that the intuitive understanding of what gradually/ postepenno means follows from this. We have instantiated this analysis in Rothstein’s (2004) theory of the structure of accomplishments.

It should now be clear why we chose Rothstein’s theory over more conventional ones. We analyze postepenno as modifying the incremental structure of the event. Rothstein’s account differs from more standard accounts such as Krifka 1992 and 1998 in arguing that an accomplishment event has incremental structure consisting of a chain of contextually determined incremental stages. Since in this theory an event has an explicit incremental structure, the event structure is modifiable and can be constrained by incremental modifiers. In a Krifka-style account of incrementality, incrementality is the result of a gradual relation between the incremental argument and the event, such that for any two event stages e and e’, if e is a proper part of e’, the theme of e will be a proper part of the theme of e’. This makes incrementality a property of the relation between event and theme and does not require an explicit choice of stages which are incrementally related or an explicit context-dependent incremental structure. In such a theory it would not be possible to treat incremental modifiers as modifiers of incremental structure. In the next section, we give the semantics for X by X modifiers, providing further support for a theory of accomplishments which requires accomplishment events to be assigned an explicit incremental structure expressed by an incremental chain.
4.2. *X za X* Modifiers

The semantics of *X za X* modifiers is naturally more complicated, in part because unlike with *postepenno* there are a few exceptions to the general pattern of distribution. Nonetheless, the overwhelming pattern is that *X za X* modifiers appear only with accomplishments. A very natural semantics builds on the relation between the modifier and the incremental structure of the verb, and this provides further support for the claim that accomplishments, defined by their inherently incremental structure, appear in the imperfective as well as the perfective aspect.

Against the background of our analysis of *postepenno*, the function of modifiers such as *page by page*, *step by step*, and so on can very naturally be analyzed as constraints on the elements of the incremental chain as well, i.e., on the domain of the μ function and thus as constraints on the incremental structure of the event. *X za X* modifiers determine what are the contextually relevant stages which chart the progress of the event or, more formally, what is the domain of the “stage-of” relation that determines the incremental chain. Consider the examples in (46):

(46)  a. On stroilIMPf dom ètaž za ètažom.
   he built   house floor by floor
   ‘He was building a/the house floor by floor.’

   b. Ivan elIMPf kornfleks ložka za ložkoj.
      Ivan ate cornflakes spoon by spoon
      ‘Ivan ate cornflakes spoon by spoon.’

Example (46a) is true if there was an event of building the house and the relevant stages which marked the progress of the building event are stages that are measured in terms of the building of floors. Example (46b) is true if there was an event of eating cornflakes whose salient parts are the (sub)events of eating spoonfuls. Contrast example (46b) with (47):

(47)  On elIMPf kornfleks xlopinka za xlopinkoj.
      he ate cornflakes cornflake by cornflake
      ‘He ate cornflakes cornflake by cornflake.’
Sentence (47) asserts that the contextually relevant stages of the eating cornflakes event were stages which grew by the eating of just one cornflake. We can imagine a situation in which (47) is appropriate. It would be a situation in which the eating of each separate cornflake was perceptually salient and the event progressed at what was probably a snail’s pace. Note crucially that (46b) and (47) are mutually incompatible, as an event of eating cornflakes spoon by spoon cannot at the same time be an event of eating cornflakes flake by flake. Furthermore, not only are the salient stages of the event, i.e., the events in the incremental chain, measured in terms of X, but all events which can be measured in terms of X must be in the incremental chain. So if Ivan built a house floor by floor, then each and every event of accomplishing another floor is relevant, and if Ivan ate his cornflakes spoonful by spoonful, then each miniaccomplishment of eating another spoonful is relevant and must appear in the incremental chain.

We thus want an analysis of X za X modifiers which will capture these intuitions: X by X modifiers specify the properties of the incremental stages of an event, proposing a scale in terms of which the stages in the event are measured. In the theory we are using, accomplishment meanings include an incremental chain which determines the salient incremental stages of the event. X za X modifiers are naturally analyzed as VP modifiers which constrain this incremental chain by determining the scale in terms of which stages in the incremental chain are measures. Roughly speaking, the modifier imposes the constraint that the incremental chain includes a new stage for every unit of measurement specified by the modifier.

We define X za X modifiers in the following way:

First, we assume a generally available measure function MEAS_S (relevant for any grading operation) which assigns to an entity (individual or event) a pair consisting of cardinality and a standard of measure relative to a particular scale S (see, e.g., Landman 2004). If Ivan is six feet tall, then MEAS_{height}(i) has the value <6, FOOT> and if he is six feet wide, then MEAS_{width}(i) = <6, FOOT>. MEAS_S can apply to events: if an event e takes two hours, then MEAS_{duration}(e) = <2, HOUR>. We call the set of ordered pairs which are the values of MEAS_S for some scale S, R_S. Since we are concerned only with measuring the duration of events, we will leave out the subscript on MEAS (and on R).

The MEAS function is generally available in the grammar (since it is used by comparative constructions), and X za X modifiers make use
of it too. X za X modifiers constrain the members of the incremental chain C(e₂) to be all and only those events, which are part of e₂, which can be measured in terms of numbers of Xs, where X is floors, spoonfuls, and so on. In other words, if a verb V is modified by X by X, then the salient stages of V becoming the case will be the event of V-ing one X, the event of V-ing two Xs, the event of V-ing three Xs, and so on. Stroiľ IMPF dom étaz za étazom ‘built a/the house floor by floor’ constrains the salient incremental stages of the event of building the house to be the event of building one floor, the event of building two floors and so on. El IMPF kornfleks ložka za ložkoj ‘ate cornflakes spoon by spoon’ determines that the perceptually salient stages of the event of eating the cornflakes are the event of eating one spoonful, the event of eating two spoonfuls, and so on. This means that the stages of the maximal event of eating the cornflakes are eating stages in which each subsequent stage grows by the extent of eating another spoonful.

The meaning for X za X is given formally in (48) (where N is the set of natural numbers). Like postepenno, X za X is a VP modifier of type <<e₁,t>,<e₂,t>>. However, it does not specify the properties of the incremental subevent e₂, but rather of the incremental chain mapping from e₂ to the activity event:

\[ \lambda e. \exists e_1, e_2 [ e = \sigma(e_1 \cup e_2) \land P_{\text{ACTIVITY}}(e_1) \land \text{BECOME-P-ed } (e_2) \land \text{INCR}(e_1, e_2, C(e_2)) \land \forall e' \in C(e_2): e' \in P_{\text{ACTIVITY}} \land \text{MEAS}(e') \in R_X \land \text{MEAS}(e_2) = \langle n, X \rangle \rightarrow \forall n' < n: \exists e'' \in C(e_2): \text{MEAS}(e'') = \langle n', X \rangle ] \]

\[ \lambda e. P^*(e) \land X \text{ za } X(e) \text{ denotes a set of events in } P \text{ which consist of an activity } e_1 \text{ and a BECOME-P-ed event } e_2, \text{ where } e_2 \text{ is incrementally related to } e_1 \text{ via an incremental chain. The incremental chain is a linearly ordered set of events which are stages of } e_2, \text{ and which themselves are activity parts in the denotation of } P, \text{ whose duration can be measured in terms of the measure determined by } X, \text{ and which includes an event marking each X-stage of the development of } e_2. \text{ Example } (46b), \text{ Ivan el IMPF kornfleks ložka za ložkoj is interpreted in } (49): \]
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(49) \[ \exists e_1,e_2 \in [e \in (e_1 \text{ \text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{EAT(e_1) \land Ag(e_1) = IVAN}}}}}}}}) \land Th(e_1) = \text{THE CORNFLAKES}} \land \text{BECOME EATEN (e_2)} \land \text{Arg(e_2) = Th(e_1)} \land \text{INCR(e_1, e_2, C(e_2))} \land \forall e' \in C(e_2): e' \in \text{EAT,ACTIVITY} \land \text{MEAS(e')} \in R_{\text{SPOONFUL}} \land \text{MEAS(e_2) = }<n, \text{SPOON}> \rightarrow \forall n' < n: \exists e'' \in C(e_2): \text{MEAS(e'')}=<n', \text{SPOON}>] \]

‘There is an event which has an activity subevent of eating cornflakes with Ivan as agent and a change subevent in which the cornflakes become eaten, and these two events are incrementally related by an incremental chain on the event of change, and the stages of the event of change are eating events, and the measure of each of these eating events is in terms of eating n spoons of cornflakes, and if the event of change is an event of eating n spoonfuls, then for every n’ smaller than n, the incremental chain includes an event on eating n’ spoons of cornflakes.’

So the incremental chain picks out as contextually salient the event of eating one spoon of cornflakes, the event of eating two spoons of cornflakes, the event of eating three spoons of cornflakes, and so on up to the maximal event. Line 5 of the meaning gives us the sortal restriction on the stages, that they all have the activity property, in this case that they are all eating stages, and that each event in the incremental chain (i.e., each relevant stage) has a measure in terms of spoonfuls. This means that once we have chosen our measurement by means of the X za X modifier, stages which are measured in terms of some other scale are excluded from the incremental chain. Line 6 gives us the statement that the BECOME event has a measure of n spoonfuls, and that for all numbers n’ less than n, the event of eating n’ spoonfuls is in the incremental chain. This guarantees that the stages of eating each and every number of spoonfuls are in the incremental chain.

The modifier, which determines what the salient parts of the BECOME event are, interacting with pragmatic considerations and the semantic restrictions on incremental chains, influences our perception of the rate at which the event took place. Compare (46b) with (47). In On el_{slp} korinfines xlopinda za xlopnokoj, ‘He ate cornflakes cornflakes by cornflake’ the modifier picks out as salient events in which one cornflake is eaten. This of course imposes an incremental chain which is
very much more fine-grained than the chain used in the interpretation of (46b), where the events involve spoonfuls. Since the semantic constraints on incremental chains require the stage-of relation to impose a linear order on the set and every natural number smaller than the maximal measure has to be represented in the chain, there will be many more elements in the chain if the measure of event stages is how many cornflakes have been eaten than if it is how many spoonfuls of cornflakes have been eaten.

We can now see why X za X modifiers, like postepenno, can only modify accomplishments. Since these modifiers constrain the incremental relation, they can only occur with verbs whose meaning includes reference to an incremental relation.

Note that we constrain all events in the incremental chain to be of the same type as the activity part of the verbs meaning. This constrains the meaning in two ways. First, the relevant salient incremental stages of the event are not pause stages. This corresponds with our intuition that all the salient event stages of the eating-cornflakes event are themselves eating events. Second, this explains the unnaturalness of the example in (50a), despite the fact that činilIMPF is clearly incremental, since it can be modified by postepenno, as in (50b):

(50) a. #Ivan činilIMPF komp’juter, (proverjaja) detal’ za detal’ju.
    Ivan repaired computer checking part by part
    ‘Ivan repaired the computer (by checking) part by part.’

    b. Ivan postepenno činilIMPF komp’juter.
    Ivan gradually repaired computer
    ‘Ivan repaired the computer gradually.’

The infelicity of (50a) is predicted by the clause in line 4 of (48b), which provides that all event stages of the incremental chain be events which have characteristics of the activity itself. The events in the incremental chain of el cornflakes ložka za ložkoj ‘ate cornflakes spoon by spoon’ are themselves in ‘eat’ and the events in the incremental chain of stroil dom ëtaž za ëtažom ‘built a house floor by floor’ are themselves events in ‘build’. However, if Ivan repairs a computer by checking part by part, the stages which make up the incremental chain are not in themselves repair stages, since the repairing only happens at the final stage when Ivan finds what the problem is. They are events which can be parts of
the repairing activity, but they do not share enough properties of the characteristic activity of the verb itself. We can see that this is a pragmatic matter and not a property of činit’IMPF because the verb is compatible with an X za X modifier in a context in which the condition in line 5 of (48) is met straightforwardly, as it is in (51), which entails that each stage of the event of repairing the clock mechanism is an event of repairing a cogwheel.

(51) Ivan čnilIMPF časovoj mehanizm šesterenka za šesterenkoj.
   Ivan repaired clock mechanism cogwheel by cogwheel
   ‘Ivan repaired a/the clock mechanism cogwheel by cogwheel.’

Sentence (50) is better if asserted in a situation where the computer has a number of things wrong with it, and each stage of the process of repairing the computer is itself an event of repairing a part until finally all parts are repaired and the computer is thus repaired. In such a context (50a) is unproblematic.

As mentioned above, for some speakers, the X za X modifiers do not occur easily with perfective verbs. For them (52) is acceptable only in some contexts, for example, if Ivan usually builds the houses block by block but in this one case he built it floor by floor.

(52) Ivan postroilPERF dom ètaž za ètažom.
   Ivan built house floor by floor
   ‘Ivan built the house floor by floor.’

The fact that (52) is perfectly acceptable in the appropriate contexts indicates that the issue is a pragmatic one. A possible direction of explanation is the following. Assume that perfectivity is associated with boundedness or totality (see for example Filip 2000 and Filip and Rothstein 2005), with the perfective verb denoting a set of total or maximal or bounded events. Since the choice of perfective verb indicates that the event is being related to as a complete and maximal whole, some speakers may find it inappropriate to predicate properties of the parts or stages of the event unless a specific context is set up to do so.
The only non-accomplishments which allow \( X \ za X \) modification seem to be imperfective verbs of motion as in (53).\(^{10}\)

(53) a. Ivan bežal_{IMPF, DET} kilometr za kilometrom.
    b. Ivan begal_{IMPF, INDET} kilometr za kilometrom.

    ‘Ivan ran kilometer by kilometer.’

We assume that these verbs are lexically associated with a path, or measure of distance incrementally covered. They can thus be modified by \( X \ za X \) modifiers, but only as long as the unit of measure is a measure of distance. They thus differ from accomplishments where the unit of measure can be any contextually relevant measure. There is some leeway, since apparently some lexical items can be metaphorically interpreted as measures of distance, but this is quite limited. So (54a) is acceptable but (54b) absolutely is not, presumably because stones are not reinterpretable as measures of distance. No such constraint occurs with accomplishments:

(54) a. Ivan bežal_{IMPF, DET} ulica za ulicej.

    Ivan begal_{IMPF, INDET} ulica za ulicej.

    ‘Ivan ran street by street.’

    b. *Ivan bežal_{IMPF, DET} kamen’ za kammem.

    *Ivan begal_{IMPF, INDET} kamen’ za kammem.

    ‘Ivan ran stone by stone.’

The motion verbs constitute a separate subclass of activity verbs within the Russian aspectual system. They are divided into determinate and indeterminate motion verbs, both of which are imperfective.

---

\(^{10}\) More properly, motion verbs seem to be the only class of exceptions. There seem to be a couple of rogue examples with activity verbs which allow \( X \ za X \) modification:

(i) Ptica xlopala kryľjami xlopok za xlopkom.
   bird flapped wings flap by flap
   ‘The bird flapped its wings flap by flap.’

(ii) Ivan smotrel televizor fil’m za fil’mom.
    Ivan watched television movie by movie
    ‘Ivan watched television movie by movie.’
Determined motion verbs denote a motion in one direction, while indeterminate ones define a motion type in general or motion in different directions, excluding a reference to specific motion at a specific point in time. Lexical representations of both types of verbs plausibly involve reference to a path. In contrast, *guljat* ‘to walk’, which we used as an example of an activity above, is not a part of the motion verb class since it is neutral with respect to the directionality. Thus, the Russian sentence *Ivan guljal po parku* is best compared to the English *John took a walk in the park*, meaning that John did not have a specific destination or direction in mind but was simply engaged in a walking process without any restrictions on directionality or specific time frame. Being a verb outside the motion verbs class, *guljat* is incompatible with the measures of distance, presumably since its meaning involves no reference to a path. Thus we get a minimal contrast between (53) and the completely unacceptable (55).

(55) a. *Ivan guljal_{IMP} po parku kilometr za kilometrom.
   Ivan walked on park kilometer by kilometer
   ‘Ivan walked in the park kilometer by kilometer.’

b. *Ivan guljal_{IMP} ulica za ulicej.
   Ivan walked street by street
   ‘Ivan walked street by street.’

This supports our original claim that incremental modifiers modify verbs which are inherently incremental.

We have one final point. For reasons which we do not as yet understand, *X by X* modifiers with accomplishments are less acceptable when the standard of measure is a canonical measure, such as *hour by hour* or *meter by meter*. The construction clearly prefers standards of measures determined by the lexical content of the V. So (56) is less natural than the other examples but still grammatical.

(56) On čital_{IMP} knigu čas za časom.
   he read book hour by hour
   ‘He read a/the book hour by hour.’
5. Delimited Activities

The account that we proposed so far allows us to make some interesting general points about the aspectual system in Russian and the comparison between the Russian and English systems.

We have identified a class of incremental modifiers which apply to verbs with incremental structure in both perfective and imperfective aspects. We showed that incremental modifiers apply to these verbs independently of their aspect and independently of whether they are understood to denote bounded or unbounded, completed or uncompleted events, even in the imperfective. Such incremental modifiers do not modify activities (except, in a restricted way, the verbs of directed motion), states, or achievements. The verbs which can be modified by these incremental modifiers lexically correlate with those argued to be accomplishments in English. We conclude therefore that incremental modification picks out a class of verbs with incremental structure which can be characterized as accomplishments occurring in both imperfective and perfective aspects. This supports Padučeva’s (1996) claim that accomplishments are not restricted to a single aspect but occur in both aspects, and it further provides a test for whether a particular verb is indeed classifiable as an accomplishment. It opens the way for a study of how the semantics of the perfective/imperfective distinction interacts with the semantics of accomplishments to obtain the differences in meaning that we see in pairs, such as stroit’IMP/ postroit’PERF.

More generally, the implications of this study are that the Vendlerian classification is indeed a characterization of kinds of events. Being an accomplishment is being an extended event whose parts have an inherent temporal ordering according to a template laid down by an incremental structure dictated by the meaning of the verb. A temporal ordering of a non-accomplishment event is extensional, mapping the stages of some event onto their temporal location in the world and ordering the results. A temporal ordering of an accomplishment can be seen as intentional, mapping an event onto its incremental structure and assigning the inherently ordered stages of this structure their temporal locations. Incremental modifiers constrain the properties of this incremental structure.

Understanding the Vendlerian classification as a characterization of the inherent properties of events in this way is precisely the con-
ceptual position underlying the hypothesis that the Vendlerian classification is a potential linguistic universal and thus constitute a set of cross-linguistic constraints on properties of verbal meaning. Crucially, this set of constraints interacts with the grammatical properties of a particular language, and consequently imperfective and perfective accomplishments will have different properties in Russian because of the interaction between the semantics of the aspects and the properties of the accomplishments. Thus we can see that the two classes of verbs that Padućeva identifies as *dejstvija obyčnye* (regular actions) and *dejstvija v razvitii* (actions in progress) show up as the result of the interaction of the system of lexical aspect described by Vendler with the grammatical system of perfectivity and imperfectivity which is part of Russian grammar. This results in Russian in a more flexible exploitation of lexical aspect, in particular of accomplishments, than is possible in English.

We hypothesize that the same approach can explain the presence in Russian of what has often been called a non-Vendler class, namely, the class of bounded activities, or perfective activities which Padućeva (1996) calls *delimitativ* and Piñón (1993) calls “poffectives.” Padućeva and Piñón both argue that these verbs are derived from activities and have the meaning of “do the activity for some time/for less time than contextually expected” (after which the activity stopped). Characteristic examples are *pogulat’IMPF* ‘to walk for a while’ and *porabotat’IMPF* ‘to work for a while’.\(^{11}\) Piñón 1993 shows that these po+verbs are a puzzle, since on the one hand they clearly have properties of perfective verbs and on the other seem also to have properties of imperfective verbs. What indicates that they are perfective is: (i) that they cannot have present-tense interpretation in non-past forms (*Ivan guljaetIMPF* ‘Ivan is taking a walk’, *Ivan poguljaetPERF* ‘Ivan will take a walk’); (ii) they do not admit a progressive reading in the past tense (*Ivan guljaetIMPF, kogda ja ego uvidelPERF* ‘Ivan was walking when I saw him’ vs. *Ivan poguljalPERF, kogda ja ego uvidelPERF* ‘Ivan walked for a while, when I saw him’); and (iii) an assertion that a po- event occurred in the past is not compatible with an assertion that this event unexpectedly continued (*Ivan poguljalPERF i do six por guljaetIMPF* ‘Ivan walked for a while and is

---

\(^{11}\) Mehlig (2006) argues that po- can be prefixed onto accomplishments if they are associated with a homogeneous activity, in which case the resulting verb is treated as non-incremental as in *čitat’IMPF/počitat’PERF* ‘to read/to read for a while’.
still walking’). On the other hand, they have properties which we associate with the unprefixied imperfective forms; in particular, they are compatible with durative adverbs such as for an hour, and the modifier a little can have a temporal and not a nominal interpretation:

(57) a. Ivan poguljal_{PERF} čas.
   Ivan walked hour
   ‘Ivan walked for an hour.’

b. *Ivan pročital_{PERF} knigu čas
   Ivan read book hour
   ‘Ivan read a book for an hour.’

c. Ivan nemnogo poguljal_{PERF}.
   Ivan a little walked for a while
   ‘Ivan walked for a little while.’

d. *Ivan nemnogo pročital_{PERF} knigu.
   Ivan a little read book
   ‘Ivan read a/the book a little.’

We are not going to propose an analysis of the po- prefix here. Piñón proposes a very plausible account in which the imperfective root denotes a process, while the po- prefix is a derived measure function, mapping the imperfective stem denotation onto a quantized denotation. In his account imperfectives denote normally non-quantized processes (or states), while perfectives denote quantized events. “Pofectives” are a hybrid, because they are essentially quantized processes. Without going into the details of his analysis (which would require a detailed discussion of how the event/process/state distinction relates to the Vendlerian classification), we want to suggest a way of analyzing pofectives which explains his conclusions and solves Padučeva’s question of what kind of lexical class these verbs belong to.

We assume that the semantics of perfective aspect is essentially the semantics of boundedness. This can be expressed in terms of quantized reference as in Piñón’s paper, in terms of totality as in Filip 2004, or in terms of a maximality operation as suggested in Filip and Rothstein 2005. In all these cases the perfective aspect is interpreted as denoting some kind of operator which is applied to a verb meaning (a measure operation, a totality operation, or a maximalization opera-
tion), imposing a bounded structure on the event. We continue to assume that the semantic properties of Vendlerian classes classify the inherent properties of the event type itself, a classification of the kind of event it is. In one case (achievements), the event type is naturally bounded, but in the other cases this is not so. We thus have a framework for classifying verb behavior: a verb may have some distributional properties because of its Vendlerian class, and it may have other properties because of its aspect. As we have seen, incremental modification is a property which is (mostly) determined by Vendlerian class, while the possibility of a progressive reading is determined by aspect. From this point of view, the conflicting properties of pofectives are explained in the following way. Pofectives such as poguljat’ are indeed perfective, since the po- prefix is quantizing operator (Piñón 1993, Filip 2005) and the resulting verb is quantized/total/maximal/bounded. However, denoting a process verb (in Piñón’s terms) is a reflection of lexical class or of the intensional properties of the event type itself, and the po- quantizer does not affect this. This explains Padučeva’s intuition that these verbs are best classified as delimitativ or delimited activities. However, delimited activities are not a new Vendlerian class, but a class of verb which results from the interaction of the lexical semantics of activities, the semantics of the prefix, and the semantics of perfective aspect. In terms of the table of verb features in Table 1 (section 4), we see that guljat’IMP and poguljat’PERF should both be classified as activities, since they both denote sets of events which are dynamic and do not involve change. However, the perfective aspect imposes a boundedness on the perfective predicate poguljat’PERF. This correctly predicates that poguljat’PERF does not behave as an accomplishment, since it does not acquire incremental structure, and indeed it cannot be modified by postepenno.12

12 Note that the accumulative prefix na- with an activity bezat’IMP ‘to run’ forms a perfective accomplishment: Ivan postepenno nabegalPERF 100 kilometrov ‘Ivan gradually accumulated 100 kilometers by running’. We can explain this data either by assuming that na- is a shift operator from activity into accomplishment, or by suggesting that the motion verbs in some cases exhibit accomplishmentlike behavior because they have their own incremental structure, albeit different from the incremental structure of accomplishments.
(58) *Ivan postepenno poguljal_{PERF}.
    Ivan gradually walked for a while
    ‘Ivan gradually walked for a while.’

A consequence of this analysis and the analysis of accomplishments in
the previous section is that prefixation in Russian does not necessarily
change lexical class. Prefixing po- to an activity verb does not neces-
sarily affect the lexical class of the event type it is attached to. For ex-
ample, in lubit’_{IMPF}/polubit’_{PERF} (to love/to come to love) the prefix at-
taches to a state and results in an achievement.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that the basic division of lexical class-
es into states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements is rele-
vant both in English and in Russian and that it cuts across the perfec-
tive/imperfective distinction. The Vendlerian classification reflects the
basic characterizing features of event predicates: whether they denote
inherently extended events, (i.e., can be analyzed as having stages) and
whether they are events of change. While both activities and accom-
plishments are extended and thus have stages, the interaction between
the part structure and the [+change] features is such that accomplish-
ments have an incremental structure, to which incremental modifiers
are sensitive, while activities do not. There are apparently more verb
classes in Russian than in English, since we can distinguish between
activities and delimited activities, and between dejstvija obyčnye and
dejstvija v razvitii, but this is an epiphenomenon, resulting from the in-
teraction of lexical aspect with the semantics of the perfective/imper-
fective distinction.
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