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Abstract

In this thesis, I show that there is an alternative method of syntactic analysis for aspect in Russian, where aspect is analysed as a null aspectual head that selects for a verb with a matching aspectual feature. First, I examine the structure of Russian verbs and how various types of verbs are broken down not only morphologically, but overall in relation to aspect. Then, I consider several pieces of literature from the field of Russian linguistics and related subjects, and evaluate not only the content of the writings, but also the effectiveness of the arguments made therein. In what follows, I discuss the methodology surrounding how I chose the data I am working with in this thesis. I then begin to discuss individual data sentences in the context of the analysis I have conceived. Finally, I discuss the limitations of my work and avenues for further research consideration, culminating in a conclusion of the work presented here and the implications thereof.
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1 Introduction

One of the main features Slavic languages are known for is their use of grammatical aspect in relation to verbs, and Russian is no exception. There is, however, discussion in the field of linguistics about how aspect should be analysed in terms of syntax and semantics. This conversation draws on various arguments in support of or in opposition to the current standard beliefs on the matter. However, the ideas currently discussed or supported in the field do not seem to be an adequate description of the issue.

For example, often aspect in Russian is considered in terms of aspectual pairs of verbs, in which one form of the verb has the imperfective aspect and the other is the perfective form. Despite of the popularity of this explanation of this element of analysis of Russian verbs, even it has its critics among linguists. For example, in Laura Janda’s 2007 article,\(^2\) “Aspectual clusters of Russian verbs”,\(^3\) she highlights the issue of verbs that have multiple forms under one aspect, which seems to be a critical flaw in the current analysis. The concerns that Janda (2007) raises (among other problems) is still relevant to the discussion and must be included for a more complete understanding. The main topic that will be addressed in the following thesis, however, is the explanation of aspect through prefixation and suffixation of a stem, and how that analysis is inadequate. This thesis will elaborate on current thought about elements of aspect, as well as suggest and support a different analysis of the syntax of aspect in Russian, wherein aspect is a feature of a whole verb which can be present (marked) or not present (unmarked), and the

\(^2\) Laura Janda is a professor of Russian Linguistics at Universitetet i Tromsø, part of the Arctic University of Norway. Her work focuses on case and aspect and their study through the use of corpus data.

subject of a broader AspP which selects for a matching aspectual feature. While the full scope of
the new analysis will not be covered in this thesis, the ultimate goal is for the examples and
framework provided herein will serve as the basis for the implementation of this interpretation of
aspect in the field, while beginning to address the issues with the current method.

2 Overview of Russian Verbs

In Russian, verb structure is somewhat complex. In order to properly conjugate a verb,
one must first understand all its moving parts. The primary issues come from the verb endings. But before verb endings can even be discussed, the parts of a Russian verb must be described. The following list comprises the morphological sections of a verb, using pisat’, ‘to write’, as an example:

- (Optional) prefix: pod- (‘under-’, if one were to form podpisat’, literally ‘to underwrite’ → ‘to sign’)
- Stem: (-)pis-
- Suffix: -a-
- Infinitival ending: -t

---

This page discusses the difference of "ending" vs. "suffix" in Russian linguistics. Though "ending" is often seen as a pedagogical term, here it is appropriately applied linguistically. In the case of Russian linguistics, " endings" are morphemes that code for word form, number, gender, etc., while "suffixes" are root-final affixes, which can be followed by an "ending"—similar to the concept of an infix, though only able to be applied root-finally or directly after another "suffix".


6 We will shortly get into the structure of an infinitival ending, but it is important to note now that the ’ at the end is, in fact, part of the verb. It represents a soft sign, or miyagki znak (ь), and not part of any following gloss.
Of course, this is only one verb of thousands in the language—and there are several other suffixes that are used in conjunction with the infinitival ending, such as -ovat’ (the most common productive ending for modern verb formation) or -it’—this breakdown of pisat’ is roughly generalisable to most regularly formed verbs.

Now that the general segmentation of Russian verbs has been outlined it is possible to look at the manner of conjugation of a Russian verb. Common pedagogical practice is to teach verbs as falling into two forms: first conjugation and second conjugation. First conjugation is generally noted by the presence of an -a- or -ja- used in conjunction with the infinitival ending, whereas second conjugation verbs are usually seen to have an -i- or -e- in that location. This conjugation system also holds up under a linguistic lens. Using this system, the following charts then outline the endings for person and number when conjugating Russian verbs of each form in the present:

---

7 As for which is used, verbs are not given using stems, only with their associated suffix. I would assume that which ending was attached to which verb has to do with their entrance to the language—for example -ovat’ is how most new verbs are created—and their evolution within the language, along with the phonological structure of the verb.
9 Other examples that follow this same pattern include (vy-)igr-a-t’ (to win) to play’—where the parenthetical gloss is the gloss including the optional prefix in the data—and (pere-)jver-i-t’ (to recheck) to believe’. Exceptions will be discussed as needed throughout this work, if necessary and applicable.
10 This system is used in a variety of respected Russian textbooks like the Live From Russia! textbook series (which is affiliated with the American Councils for Teachers of Russian) and Terrence Wade’s A Comprehensive Russian Grammar, 3rd edition, as well as educational websites such as a few online course publications from universities such as Auburn and Cornell, and masterrussian.com, russianlessons.net.
11 The prevalence of these suffixes is due to the productivity of 1st conjugation -aj- stems and 2nd conjugation -i- stems. In the case of verbs with an -ova- suffix, they generally follow the rules of first conjugation verbs, only adding an u to the stem prior to the conjugated ending presented in Table 1. Other (non-)suffixed forms are supported by both conjugations as well.
Table 1. First conjugation (based on *pisat*, ‘to write’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>ending</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>-em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>-esh(^{12})</td>
<td>2pl(/1sg formal)</td>
<td>-ete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>-et</td>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-ut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Second conjugation (based on *zvonit*, ‘to call’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>ending</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>-ju</td>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>-im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>-ish</td>
<td>2pl(/1sg formal)</td>
<td>-ite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-jat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though conjugation is not directly related to the aspeutual classification of a verb in Russian, it does play a role in the morphological structure of the verb. Additionally, it is accomplished differently depending on aspect, as a result of which changes are made to the verb structure in order to obtain the desired aspeutual classification. It is also important to note that Russian has three tenses: past, present, and future. To some extent, the difference in aspect is used to give the nuance provided by tenses that might exist in other languages, such as, say, the preterit tense in Spanish.\(^{13}\) However, not all verbs in Russian can be conjugated in all of the

\(^{12}\) In this thesis, approximate transcriptions into English orthography have been done by me based on the pronunciation, not letter equivalents of the words in question. Therefore, this ending and others with e in them being written in Cyrillic lettering with e, which, depending on if it has an umlaut represents [ɛ], [ě], or [ə], is represented in the English transcription as being the pronunciation equivalent, je (technically the unumlauted and unumlauted e are different letters in the alphabet, but standard practice in current writing is to omit the umlaut in all cases). It is important to note that in any case where -je is present, it is also possible to have -jo, just as -u in 1sg in first conjugation could be -ju depending on the stem it is attached to, due to fortition and lenition rules. For the purposes of this proposal however, the rules governing which vowel appears are not relevant to the argument and therefore will not be discussed beyond what has been said here. I have chosen in these tables to use the vowels that are not “soft”, so je instead of jo, u instead of ju, etc. unless the more common form of the ending is with the “soft” vowel.

\(^{13}\) The preterit tense in Spanish is used to denote that the action being discussed was completed in the past, and was not continuous. The perfective aspect in Russian accomplishes something similar depending on the context in which a perfective form verb is used.
tenses. For example, one cannot use or conjugate a perfective verb in present tense because of the added forms of emphasis placed on them (as will be discussed shortly in §2.2). Instead, perfective verbs, when conjugated following the same rules as present tense conjugation for imperfective verbs like in Tables 1 and 2, are actually conjugated for future tense. In order to conjugate an imperfective verb for future tense, one must use the construction *ja budu _____*,14 which is roughly equivalent to ‘I will _____’, where the blank is filled by an infinitival imperfective verb. Past tense conjugation for regular verbs is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>ending</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>-l(a)</td>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>-l(a)</td>
<td>2pl(/1sg formal)</td>
<td>-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>-l(a)(o)</td>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1 Prefixes and their meanings

After seeing how the basic parts of Russian verbs work, the idea of prefixes comes into play. Each prefix available for a Russian verb modifies the meaning of the verb by adding a slight nuance to the verb’s base meaning. This change in meaning, in turn, impacts the aspect of the verb, a concept which will be discussed. The following chart16 gives the meaning of the majority of the prefixes themselves (though one might extrapolate how these meanings would change the definitions of the verbs they attach to):

---

14 *Budu* is conjugated for 1st person singular here, but can be conjugated for any other person.
15 Certain non-suffixed stems do not have the -l ending in the masculine form.
16 Azamatova Arya, “Глаголы движения с приставками” (class handout received in Intermediate Russian with Professor Arya Azamatova, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, July 2017).
Table 4. Verbal prefixes and their most basic meanings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v(o)¹⁷⁻</td>
<td>in, into</td>
<td>po⁻</td>
<td>start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vui⁻</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>pod⁻/podo⁻</td>
<td>approach, under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do⁻</td>
<td>reach, up to</td>
<td>pri⁻</td>
<td>arrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za⁻</td>
<td>behind, briefly, begin</td>
<td>pro⁻</td>
<td>through, go past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o(/ob/obo)⁻</td>
<td>around</td>
<td>raz⁻/razo/ras⁻</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s⁻</td>
<td>completative</td>
<td>u⁻</td>
<td>away from, leave (long distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pere⁻</td>
<td>cross</td>
<td>na⁻</td>
<td>over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, when pod⁻ is applied to pisat’, it then means ‘to sign’ (technically ‘under-write’). However, some prefixes, in some contexts, do not maintain their meaning as listed in this chart. Rather, they mark an aspectual difference from the base form of the verb.

2.2 Aspect and the Russian verb

Now, let us turn to aspect. Russian has two aspects: imperfective and perfective. Primarily, discussion in Russian education covers the imperfective and perfective aspects of verbs, but does not cover the aspectual subsets¹⁸ as aspects in and of themselves: delimitative (emphasis on the amount of time an action occurs), completative (emphasis on completion of an action), and inceptive (emphasis on the start if an action). Instead, they consider the imperfective and perfective aspects as umbrella terms that encompass these aspectual subsets. For example, one definition of the imperfective aspect is that the it is said to show the continuation and repetition of an action, while perfective verbs emphasize the completion of the action or the

¹⁷ Parenthetical items are alternatives or additions to the base form listed outside the parentheses, with differences being due to rules concerning consonant clusters.
¹⁸ These are not considered subsets in their own right per say, but rather concepts that the imperfective and perfective aspects can emphasise. However, I have chosen to call them subsets here in order for clearer explanation and understanding for readers.
The specific context in which a perfective or imperfective verb is used may place even more nuance on the intended impact of using one aspect or the other, like indicating the continuous state of doing an action. An example of this is the verb *ponimat’*, the imperfective form of ‘to understand’, which in this context would be thought of as being in a state of understanding something with no stopping point.

Because of the aspectual differences of Russian verbs, and, along with the fact that there are some prefixes that do not hold meaning when applied to a verb other than to impart aspectual information, verbs in Russian are generally considered to have aspectual pairs, where one is imperfective and the other is perfective. For example, consider the verbs that are matched as aspectual pairs in the following table:

**Table 5.** Some aspectual pairs (‘-’ indicates prefix boundary, parenthetical gloss information is the added meaning for the perfective form).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>chitat’</em></td>
<td><em>pro-chitat’</em></td>
<td>‘to read (through)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>delat’</em></td>
<td><em>s-delat’</em></td>
<td>‘to do (to completion)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smotret’</em></td>
<td><em>po-smotret’</em></td>
<td>‘(to begin) to watch’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pisat’</em></td>
<td><em>na-pisat’</em></td>
<td>‘to write (completative)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ponimat’</em></td>
<td><em>ponjat’</em></td>
<td>‘to understand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>govorit’</em></td>
<td>‘skazat’</td>
<td>‘to say’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

masterrussian.com provides educational resources for Russian learners. Though formatted for pedagogical purposes, the information present aligns closely with current linguistic discussion and knowledge of the topics they are presenting. This page is a table noting the different ways aspect can be used in terms of grammar and semantics.  
20 It is important to note however, that the reason perfective verbs are used is related to the importance of the emphasis to the speaker. For example, though I may have completed reading a book, if it is not relevant to the information I am imparting, then I do not need to, nor should I necessarily, use a perfective verb. This idea is often somewhat difficult for non-native speakers to internalise, so L2 speakers tend to overuse the perfective aspect.  
21 However, some of the aspectual pairs have prefixed verbs where the prefix maintains its prefix meaning. When the meaning is not maintained, it generally takes on a meaning influenced by the meaning of the verb to which it is attached.
Likely, two of these pairs will stand out due to their glaring disconnect from the other verb pairs: the aspectual pairs *ponimat’/ponjat’* ‘to understand’ and *govorit’/skazakt’* ‘to say’.

The structural difference of aspectual pairs is more often than not created by adding a prefix to the imperfective form of the verb. However, it is also possible, as in *ponimat’/ponjat’*,22 ‘to understand’ in Table 4, to create perfective verbs by changing the suffix used with the infinitival ending (here it is ‘-imat’ vs ‘-jat’). This is a rarer form of perfective indication, but nonetheless just as valid. Even more rare however, are aspectual pairs with two different stems completely, such as ‘to say’. These words have effectively nothing structurally in common, other than the practically ubiquitous (excluding some irregular verbs) verbal ending—not even a vowel. Despite this, they still form an aspectual pair.23

2.2.1 Verbs of motion: structure and aspect24

Verbs of motion in Russian are somewhat more complex in terms of their lexical meanings and nuances, and have different processes for aspectual shift in relation to this. For a basic example of this, consider the two most common sets of verbs of motion: the set which indicates movement via one’s own power and the set that indicates motion via the power of something else: *idti/hodit’* and *ehat’/ezdit’. It is important to note, however, that despite the presence of pairing and the same notation as for aspectual pairs, the

---

22 Henceforth, when discussed together, aspectual pairs will be written as [imperfective form]/[perfective form] unless otherwise noted.

23 However, as I am not an expert in proto-Slavic, I cannot say for sure that it is not plausible that these verbs were part of separate aspectual pairs of similar meaning to begin with (say, ‘govorit’ – *sgovorit’* and ‘*kazat’ – *skazat’* or something along those lines) that then converged, taking the imperfective from one and the perfective from the other as their counterparts fell out of use. For the purposes of this thesis, however, it falls outside of the scope and therefore will not be discussed. However, this is an interesting idea and may merit further discussion outside of this analysis (and, if proven, might potentially discredit the criticisms presented herein).

pairing here is not related to aspect, but rather directionality, which will be explained in the following section (as well as the relationship between this and aspect).

Perhaps the easiest way to consider the differences between the verbs in each set is through directionality, which has some overlap in explanation with aspect. *Idti* and *ehat’* are unidirectional verbs, which means that they are not grammatical in any context beyond that with a singular destination or the act of starting to go or of setting out, and completing that action once. On the other hand, *hodit’* and *ezdit’* are multidirectional verbs. This means that they are used in contexts where there are multiple destinations, multiple return trips, and movement without a particular destination. The same distinctions are also true for other verbs of motion, like *letat’/letit’* (‘to fly’), or *begat’/bezhat’* (‘to run’). Though there is no official or explicit connection between directionality and aspect, there is some inferable similarity. For example, unidirectional verbs seem to align with some of the qualities of perfective verbs in the sense of specificity about the way the action happened, and, conversely, multidirectional verbs coordinate with the ideas of imperfective verbs due to the lack of specificity. Officially, nonetheless, both verbs in these sets are considered imperfective.25

However, directionality is not aspect, and, indeed, verbs of motion can show both aspects. There are, however, more restrictions on how aspect associates with these verbs, specifically in relation to the presence of prefixation.26 Perhaps the simplest way to explain the structure of verbs of motion in relation to aspect is the following:

---


26 These restrictions lend further credence to the idea that prefixation is not solely, if at all, responsible for aspectual shift, which will be discussed in further herein.
• Unidirectional verb of motion + prefix = perfective, with the additional meaning associated with the prefix
  - Ex. idti + po- = pojti ‘to (begin) walking (in one direction)’
• Multidirectional verb of motion + prefix = imperfective, but with the additional meaning associated with the prefix
  - Ex. hodit’ + po- = poxodit’ ‘to (begin) walking (in a variety of instances or multiple directions)’

Thus, it is possible to conjecture that there is a link between directionality and aspect and that prefixation does not necessarily cause a shift in aspect. It is then necessary as a result to examine this phenomenon and attempt to account for it using a different model than that of the current prefixation model.

2.2.2 Reflexive verbs: structure and aspect

In Russian, reflexives are marked with -sj a which is attached word finally to the infinitival verb form. These reflexives are used in the traditional sense of an entity doing an action to itself, and also in reciprocal relationships expressed in a sentence. Examples of these verbs can be seen below:

• odevat’sya ‘to dress oneself’
• nachinat’sja ‘to start’
• vstertit’sja ‘to meet (each other)’

27 When the verb is conjugated, the -sj a remains in its original form, unless preceded by a vowel, at which point it becomes -s’.
28 Specifically, in these reciprocal situations, it must be done by both actors in the same manner. For example, if I met a friend at a café without arranging it beforehand, I would not use a reflexive because the other person was not involved in the action of meeting, they were met. But, if we both agreed to meet each other, then the reflexive would be used.
• nahodit’sja ‘to locate oneself at’

The vast majority of reflexives are reflexive in both the imperfective and perfective aspects. However, there are four atypical verb sets where the imperfective reflexive has a non-reflexive perfective counterpart:29

• sadit’sja/seat ‘to sit’
• lozhit’sja/lech ‘to lie down’
• stanovit’sja/stat ‘to become’
• lopat’sja/lopmut ‘to burst’

The atypical comparisons above, can, for the most part, be explained through meaning. For example, it is impossible to be in the process of bursting without being the same thing that is doing the bursting, just as one cannot be in the process of becoming without being oneself the thing becoming. On the other hand, it is possible for something to cause something else to burst, and for one to become something without being the one who caused the action of becoming—in essence, there has to be an emphasis on completion.

3 Literature Review

This section will discuss some contemporary thought on aspect and related topics in Russian. The literature presented here is by no means a comprehensive review of the topic of aspect in Russian, nor does it address every thought about it within the linguistic community. However, the following works point out foundational problems with the current analysis of

aspect in Russian, providing a basis for needed change. They cover a range of topics, some of which may seem irrelevant, but in fact provide crucial background and description of current thought regarding what is incorporated to the model presented in this thesis. The individuals who wrote the following articles are all academics in the field of Russian or Slavic linguistics who focus on various subfields, mostly in the scope of morphology, semantics, and syntax.

3.1 Svenonius (2004):30 “Russian prefixes are phrasal”

This paper discusses the potential to read Russian prefixes as phrasal in syntactic discussion. Svenonius bases his assignment of phrasal status on the idea that prefixes occupy a specifier position and maintain their independence from the verb to some extent, as they “are not incorporated into the verb under a nonmaximal projection”.31 Though it is indisputably logical to conclude that prefixes can indicate a change in the aspect of a verb, it is not logical to conclude that the extra meaning carried in a prefix—even those that mark the change of the verbal aspect—is a satisfactory reason to classify them as phrasal. The basis of his argument, however, seems to stem from the idea that prefixes are themselves aspect.

However, evidence exists to contradict that notion, primarily for verbs whose aspectual pairs are noted by non-prefixed verbs with differences in structure (such as ponimat’/ponyat’ ‘to understand), or those which have a seemingly entirely unrelated pairing (such as govorit’/skazat’ ‘to say’). Though Svenonius does not explicitly argue for or against the concept of aspect being part of the prefix, he bases his argument on this idea. Therefore, assuming that idea is incorrect, Svenonius fails to appropriately support this claim. Taking the view of the analysis presented in

---

31 Svenonius, “Russian Prefixes are Phrasal”, 1.
this thesis (assuming it is shown to be broadly applicable after further work), this is a common failure in much academic writing about Russian aspect.

3.2 Janda (2007): “Aspectual clusters of Russian verbs”

This article discusses an issue previously mentioned in this thesis: that multiple forms of a verb often fall under one of the aspects. Usually this is accomplished through the prefixation of a verb, and these altered verbs almost exclusively end up being perfective. As in English and other languages, many verbs in Russian are not limited to one prefix. For example, one might consider again the verb pisat’, ‘to write’. As previously mentioned, it is possible to have not only pisat’, but also podpisat’, ‘to sign’, and also the perfective form listed as the aspectual pair, napisat’, ‘to write (perf.)’. It is also possible to create other forms of pisat’ with some of the prefixes listed in Table 3. In most cases, the majority of the prefixed forms of a verb would be considered perfective.

Because of the issues raised by the existence of multiple perfective forms per imperfective form, Janda argues for replacing the aspectual pairs model with aspectual clusters, allowing for all the variations of perfective and imperfective forms to be considered together. She pursues this angle from a semantic standpoint, creating a semantic map to show the interactions of the various forms of a verb, and ultimately creates a hierarchy that predicts the cluster types observed in Russian.

While this paper provides a striking analysis of the way aspect is presented in Russian (the language and linguistics), more notable for the purposes of this thesis is the way Janda strongly displays a new way of looking at aspect in Russian. Among other conclusions that can

32 Janda, "Aspectual Clusters of Russian Verbs".
be drawn from her paper, the fact that Janda proposes a different way of thinking about asceptual pairs shows that there may be faults within the current methods of analysis of aspect in Russian, and that a new way to look at aspect is being sought. Although Janda covers only one issue in the discussion of aspect in Russian, her proposal further widens a door to rethink the current model of asceptual analysis.

3.3 Gladney (1982):“Biaspectual verbs and the syntax of aspect in Russian”

Despite being less modern than the other writings discussed in this section, Gladney (1982) still displays many of the central themes of asceptual analysis present in current discussion. Importantly for the interpretation of the syntactic structure being pursued in this thesis, Gladney also discusses the syntax of aspect in Russian.

Gladney spends much of his article promoting the idea that asceptual pairs are, in fact, only one verb. However, his argument is confused by him espousing a controversial idea that, in fact, prefixation does not occur in Russian. This idea appears to be based on the fact that not all prefixes mean exactly the same thing when applied to every verb, and that certain verbs are restricted in terms of which prefixes they can take. This muddles his argument in that Gladney spends a large portion of his article discussing the book Russkaja grammatika and seems to agree with many of the concepts presented therein. Despite his agreement, and the fact that many of the arguments from Russkaja grammatika are based on the idea of prefixation on a


Gladney’s article reads as somewhat of a review of Russkaja grammatika and an evaluation of some of the arguments it presents. The ideas presented within appear to be the basis of much of his discussion on the matter of aspect and syntax in Russian.
morphological level, Gladney rejects the presence of a prefixation process, not addressing the impact of this denial on all the features of his broader argument.

His rejection of prefixation, among other things, raises a few important points in relation to the formation and analysis of aspect in Russian. For example, there are some verbs that do not have a perfective counterpart, but that can be used as perfective given the right context or modification. This is primarily visible in his discussion of atakovat’ (‘to attack’) throughout the article. With this example, Gladney—even as a somewhat secondary consequence of his overarching argument—brings up the idea that some verbs are restricted in how they can display perfective aspect. The atakovat’ example also highlights the issue of whether aspectual pairs truly exist, or if they are instead simply one verb with different modifications done to show each aspect—an idea with which native Russian grammarians of the time agreed.35

Gladney also presents discussion on the relationship between tense, stem changes, and pre-/suffixation and their relationships to aspect. In his discussion of tense, Gladney touches on the major issue of how tense and aspect interact, especially in relation to future tense formation. In particular, he examines the idea of imperfective future tense, which is accomplished by turning a lexical item into a phrase by adding an auxiliary verb into the equation. This is important to note due to the effect this form of aspectual presentation has on the syntactic breakdown of a sentence: it implies that aspect has a relationship to syntax in Russian. Gladney also presents the concept—which he states is somewhat supported in Russkaja grammatika—that syntax is more important than morphology when it comes to analysing aspect in Russian.36

---

35 See: Maslov’s “Glagol'nyj vid v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke (znatenie i upotreblenie)” and Bondarko and Bulanin’s “Russkij glagol: Posobie dlja studentov i uchitelej”.

In this article, Lenore Grenoble, a linguist who focuses in part on Slavic languages, discusses the idea of an imperfective periphrastic future tense38 in Russian, and that it should in fact be considered a tense, rather than a mood or an analytic verbal construction. The main argument she makes for it to be a tense is that the imperfective periphrastic future (henceforth IPF) does not allow double negation, which is common in Russian, and freely allowed with the analytic constructions “that include modal verbs and adverbs that take a dependent infinitive such as the verbs moč’ ‘to be able', umet’ ‘to know how' and the modal adverbs možno ‘[it is] possible', nužno ‘[it is] necessary', nado '[it is] needed' and so on”.39 Despite the fact that IPF relies on the auxiliary byt’ ‘to be’, showing a similarity to how the analytic constructions are formed, the fact that the dependent infinitive in the IPF construction cannot be negated40 establishes a basis for consideration as a full tense rather than an analytical construction or mood.

This argument is particularly relevant in the scope of this thesis in that aspect is directly related to the overall tense of a sentence and its syntactic make up. In particular, the negation marker being restricted in movement and location in the sentence impacts larger phrase structure, and it is possible that aspect could have scope over that structure and further explain the restrictions syntactically. The existence of IPF as a tense is also important, as it shows that the future tense in Russian is not limited to only the perfective aspect, and that there is a difference

---

38 In order to form the future tense using a verb with imperfective aspect, one must use the auxiliary byt’ ‘to be’, making it a periphrastic construction. The presence of byt’ with a perfective verb is ungrammatical, and thus does not qualify as periphrastic.
40 Grenoble does bring up the ability to negate infinitive in IPF when serial commas are used. However, she notes that “the ellipsis leaving the marker of negation directly before the infinitive, is somewhat artificial” (189).
in the syntax of a perfective verb and an imperfective verb when used in the same context (e.g. when forming a future tense utterance).

3.5 Jakobson (1984): “Relationship between Russian stem suffixes and verbal aspects”

This chapter of Jakobson’s *Russian and Slavic Grammar: Studies 1931-1981* provides important background information necessary to fully understand arguments made in this thesis, and discusses ideas about how aspect is structured in relation to a verb. In §2, the idea of two conjugation forms was discussed, along with various suffixes that verbs might have. Jakobson discusses the stem suffixes as being divided in a similar manner to those conjugation rules, where there is a strong opposition between low and high vowels like /a/ and /i/ (signs for first and second conjugation forms respectively). He also points out that certain suffixes (e.g. -iva-) are directly associated with the imperfective aspect in the large majority of verbs, particularly if the suffix is more than one vowel or includes an intervocalic consonant. To summarise, Jakobson concludes that the suffix of the verb is a morphological and phonological representation of the aspect of that verb.

In this chapter, Jakobson also includes his thoughts on the idea of prefixation and its relationship to aspect. He points out that there are verbs that use the same prefix but fall under different aspects even with the same lexical meaning, using the following example, which contains the prefix za-:

(1) a. *Zamorozit* ‘to (complete) freeze(ing) (perf.)’

    b. *Zamorazhivat* ‘to freeze (impf.)’

---

Zamorazhivat', as noted in the definition, is imperfective, despite the same structure—other than the suffix—of its counterpart, zamorozit'. This is significant because it shows that somehow, there is an emphasis on the completion of the action with the perfective form, and also because it supports the idea that prefixation is not the main focus when it comes to how aspect is indicated morphologically, which may also affect the syntax of a sentence depending on the aspect of the verb. The idea of prefixation not being the main constituent of aspectual structure runs counter to current and traditional thought in the Russian linguistics community, which is interesting in that more people have not adopted the idea of suffixation as a main aspectual marker.

However, there are still flaws in this analysis, with the main issue being the existence of verbs which do not have a counterpart with the same base stem. If there is not the same base stem, one could argue that the verbal suffixes are not fully in opposition to each other as there may be confounding phonological variables that require the presence of one vowel or another in the specific environment.

The assertion that it is the suffix that is fully responsible for aspect marking is also unsound, however, as there exist many verbs that do not abide by the system Jakobson describes. Perhaps the most direct way to show the failure of the argument is the following example:

(2) a. Delat’ ‘to do (impf.)’
   b. Sdelat’ ‘to do (to completion) (perf.)’

Here it is clear that the suffix of the two aspectual forms is no different—both have -a-. It would seem that the aspectual marker in this instance is the prefix on the perfective form, s-. However, given Jakobson’s assertion about aspectual meaning not being fully associated with prefixes and
the example he gives in (1) supporting this idea, one must then conclude that aspect is marked in some other way than prefixes and suffixes, since there are counter examples for both.


In her dissertation, Abdelrahim-Soboleva discusses the contexts in which the imperfective or perfective aspect is required in the larger context of a sentence. Of course, as previously mentioned in §2.2, both aspects have different emphases they can place on the meaning of the sentence. Abdelrahim-Soboleva lists them as the following categories in her work:

- For perfective verbs:
  1. Delimitative
  2. Completative
  3. Inceptive

- For imperfective verbs:
  1. Habituality
  2. Continuity
  3. General validity

These categories can have certain specific lexical markers that indicate the desired effect of the emphasis. For imperfective verbs, these markers come in the form of “adverbial modifiers, prepositional phrases, specific conjugations, or some other syntactic means, such as the plural form of the subject and/or the direct object.”

Perfective contexts, on the other hand, are mostly

---


43 Abderahim-Soboleva defines general validity as “a lexical means of indicating that the situation, expressed by an imperfective verb, took place at some time in the past, and thus was anterior to another situation”.

indicated by adverbs which also lexically carry some requirement for a specific emphasis from the list above. For example, *srazu* ‘immediately’ and *vdrug* ‘suddenly’ indicate emphasis on the starting of an action, or *pochti* ‘almost’ and *sovsem* ‘entirely’, which “stress that a situation designated by a perfective verb has been almost completed, or has been completed entirely”, or rather, require a completative emphasis. There are also some situations in which a prepositional phrase can indicate the need for a perfective verb; usually the presence of these prepositional phrases are related to indicating specific points in time (which falls under the completative and delimitative categories), among other limitations that do not allow imperfective verbs.

Though much of this is further support for the current analysis of the meanings of aspect discussed in §2.2, it also makes a crucial point about aspect in terms of sentence structure: the presence of words other than the verb itself are associated with aspect. In fact, the ideas presented in Abdelrahim-Soboleva’s dissertation also seems to suggest that in order for there to be a clear need for an aspect and to have only one of the aspects be acceptable, there often needs to be a contextual marker outside the verb. While aspect may be directly associated with the verb, this brings about the possibility that aspect has a broader syntactic scope than recent analysis gives it credit for.

These conclusions provide me with evidence that the idea of aspect having a higher place in a syntactic analysis has been neglected, given that I have not found other instances of scholars, discussing aspect in terms of the broader sentence formation.46

---

46 This is not to say they do not exist, rather that the focus of the research done on the topic of aspect has not directly focused on this idea in this format. Even for this dissertation, the focus is not specifically on which contextual markers are required where and when, but rather why speakers support or reject aspectual substitutions, for which these contextual markers are potentially important, but not required, to be the basis of a rejection/approval of an aspectual substitution.
4 Data Collection and Methodology

In order to appropriately discuss the data that I will be using in the following sections of this thesis, it is vital to understand how the data was selected and how it will be considered. Therefore, in this section I will discuss how the data was collected, my methodology, as well as the validity of that methodology and the limitations encountered, and, finally, the structure of the forthcoming analysis.

4.1 Data Collection

4.1.1 Data source

For this thesis, all data was collected from the Национальный корпус русского языка (‘National Corpus of Russian Language’). This corpus, henceforth called the RNC, was started primarily by the Institute of Russian Language which is part of the Russian Academy of Sciences. However, the corpus is maintained and updated by a large number of linguists located across Russia, such as in Moscow, Kazan, and other academic centres. The RNC includes data from a large variety of sources that span many centuries in origin, from the 1200s to modern day. The subcorpora include corpora of poetry, newspapers, historical and modern texts, speech, and dialect categorised data, as well as corpora of teaching materials, stress marking over time, and syntactic breakdowns.

---

48 Directly translated: National Corpus of the Russian Language. However, the official translation is the “Russian National Corpus”, which is how it will be referred to in this thesis (initialized to RNC).
For the purposes of this thesis, I have chosen to work primarily with the main corpus, which includes modern and historical texts.\(^{49,50}\) I chose to work with text-based data because there are higher levels of consistency in grammaticality, as well as often more straightforward, less complicated sentences, which have a more simple structure. The use of oral data is a non-starter for me, as it is difficult to work with due to the often inconsistent and unclear nature of speech, as non-verbal context clues may be missing, sentences might trail off, and the use of pauses and interjections make syntactic analysis more complicated. Additionally, dialect potentially has a much stronger influence on speech patterns and sentence structure than the more formal writing found in the majority of texts.

4.1.2 Data selection categories and reasoning

The data I will be drawing from the RNC covers a selection of major categories that verbs fall under in Russian, as well as standard suffixes and prefixes. More specifically, these categories are the following:

- Verbs for each subset of the perfective aspect
  - inceptive, completative, delimitative
- Verbs with “imperfectivising” suffixes (alternatively, back formed imperfectives)
- Verbs with different stems in their aspectual “pairs”
- Verbs of motion
- Reflexives
- Verbs conjugated in the present tense

---


\(^{50}\) These texts include birch bark letters from the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) century, religious texts, literature, poetry, newspapers, etc.
Because I am rejecting the idea that aspectual shift is attached to the prefixes and suffixes themselves, it is vital to break down sentences in which the verb that is present has one or both. It is also important to look into prefixes, as current research (as discussed in §3) considers prefixes to commonly carry aspect, and prefixation to cause aspectual shift. Additionally, these prefixes carry the meaning associated with the aspectual subsets, which is a main reason for the existence of these perfective verbs in the first place. Though suffixes are also thought to play a similar role as prefixes in terms of aspectual shift processes, they are considered to create aspectual changes less commonly by the literature. Therefore, I will be limiting my data selection and analysis to only the most commonly mentioned suffixes involved with aspect—particularly those involved in the backformation of imperfective verbs, such as -ivaj-.

Inconsistencies in the conceptualisation of the prefixation/suffixation model in terms of acknowledging aspectual groupings with different stems demands their inclusion in the selected data as well. These forms in particular are one of the most crucial groups to include, as they provide blatant contradiction to the current model due to the lack of prefix/suffix addition or change, but rather an entirely different stem and/or suffix being the main difference between the aspects.

I am also choosing to include verbs of motion in my data set as a result of their particular requirements relating to the presence of aspect in relation to the directionality of the verb.51 While verbs of motion show aspect in much the same way as other verbs,

---

51 See §2.2.1 for an explanation of verbs of motion and directionality.
the structure of the verb for a given aspect differs slightly in terms of which requirements are needed for the verb to be one aspect or the other.

As for the decision to include reflexive verbs, this is because the large majority of—if not almost all—reflexive verbs in Russian have aspectual counterparts that are also reflexive.\textsuperscript{52} The value of this fact is that it will show not only how the -sja reflexive marker fits in structurally, but also how that structure is related to aspect. Because there are many reflexive verbs in Russian,\textsuperscript{53} it would be remiss to not consider this construction and the role it might play in relation to aspect. This is especially true since there are, in fact, a small handful of cases where the perfective form of a verb is not reflexive (and therefore does not have the -sja suffix), while the imperfective is. It will be important for this analysis to look at data of an aspectual “pair” of verbs in which one verb is not reflexive to evaluate the implications of reflexivity on the syntactic structure of aspect.

Finally, it is crucial to evaluate data in which the verb is conjugated in the present tense because perfective verbs cannot be conjugated in the present tense. Therefore, this will show a verb in a context in which no change could be made to make it perfective; in effect, this data will clarify the base aspectual structure for an entire tense, and how that structure might differ (or not) from verbs in their infinitive forms or conjugated in the past or future tenses.

Beyond the reasoning for choosing the categories of verbs I have listed in this section, I am also compelled to discuss my reasoning for using such minimal data. For

\textsuperscript{52} Alexieva, Petia. n.d. "Teaching Russian Reflexive Verbs to Speakers of English". Presentation, Chicago, IL.
each of these categories, I am using sentences based around one or two aspectually different items at most. This is, indeed, a small sample size, and may yield results that are not fully generalisable; however, it is not possible expand my data set to the extent necessary to cover all verbs and every possible implication of aspect—even in these categories—due to time consuming nature of this work. Because the analysis done in this thesis aims to, in some ways, lessen the morphological association of aspect with the verb, it is my understanding that the results of the analysis will be, on the syntactic level, generalisable to all Russian verbs, with few exceptions.

My reasoning for choosing the verbs I will be analysing is also important to qualify the results of this thesis and research. I will be using verbs that are strongly represented in the corpus and are of high frequency overall in Russian. These verb choices have been made in order to ensure the availability of data that fits the specific parameters of the category under which they are evaluated, as well as potential for somewhat less complex sentences that still effectively illustrate the analysis.

4.1.3 Benefits and limitations of the use of a corpus and decisions surrounding data choice

Though the data selection criteria have been carefully considered, there are, of course, limitations to these selections. The clearest of these constraints is the limited data volume; however, working with a low volume of data was necessary due to the time involved in doing this analysis. Of course, further steps for research on any topic that is not completely addressed based on the limited data set will be suggested where necessary. However, it is my ultimate goal that the final proposed syntactic structure for aspect will be broadly applicable to almost any verb (though there will always be
exceptions). Beyond a data set that is limited in quantity, one might also think the data set lacking in breadth as well. This is for similar reasons, along with the fact that these categories of verbs should satisfy the requirements of any other form because they cover the vast majority of structural contexts by the nature of their semantic meanings and also given the non-specific nature of the new syntactic model suggested herein.

However, despite these potential concerns about the data, it is also important to note the benefit of using a corpus in this situation. The main advantage is that the data from a corpus is not constructed specifically to be analysed for this work, nor has it been cherry-picked from specific sources. Instead, the data all have different authors and contexts, and therefore less biased toward this change than anything recorded or devised by someone attempting to resolve the issue of the syntax of aspect in Russian.

Admittedly, there are further drawbacks to the specifications I have put forth for the data beyond quantity and breadth. Particularly, my choice to constrain the sources I am willing to use to texts from the mid-20th century onwards, limits me in several ways. During the late 19th and early 20th century, Russian was in a state of change based around the cultural and political shifting of the period, and specifically underwent major changes in orthography leading up to and after the 1917 revolution.54 These changes were well documented, but of course, all language evolves over time. Therefore, it might be beneficial to explore the changes to the way aspect has been denoted over time in order to see where any changes might have occurred that would have led modern speakers to the current structure, and how the current prefix/suffix model has come about. Again, due to

---

time constraints, this is not possible to accomplish in this thesis, but consideration of these implications might be beneficial for someone to explore in future research to consider. Instead, I will be looking at more modern, post revolution texts in order to appropriately compare and analyse the structure between similar time-frame texts, which ought to have more consistent structure across the board.

4.2 Methodology

Though the quantity of data in this set is limited, it is still essential to discuss the exact process of the data selection in order for the analysis to be entirely understood, from the inception to the final breakdown, as well as the form of the analysis itself.

4.2.1 How the corpus is set up

The RNC is a searchable corpus, and there are a number of ways a search can be filtered to yield the most relevant results. On the original search page, there are two options for searching: using an exact term or phrase, or inputting a variety of filters to indicate the results desired. These filters cover everything from parts of speech to the specific context in which a word is used, such as specifying the surrounding punctuation marks or its physical location in the sentence. These extensive grammatical filters are broken down under several categories, listed as grammatical signs, semantic signs, additional signs, and word formation.

---

55 See §6.2 for additional and more in-depth suggestions for future research paths.
56 This grouping includes, according to the additional information provided near the filter area, desired morphological characteristics of the lexeme or word form.
57 This grouping includes filters for the desired semantic and derivational characteristics of the search item.
58 Additional parameters include the location of a word in a sentence related to punctuation, beginning and end, etc.
59 This category includes morphemic searches (specifically it allows for one to search a suffix, root, or stem, as well as flexion (derivational forms).
When one searches for a particular word or phrase or uses the filters to find results, they appear on a new page, which lists not only results, but also the number of results in the corpus, with information about the quantity of items in the full corpus. The page also provides links to the statistics and distribution of the query items or parameters by the years of the entries of the corpus (for example, *govorit* ‘to speak’ appears 539 times in texts from 2010 that are present in the corpus). The results also include the source type, author, and date, assuming all of those are available for each entry.

4.2.2 Parameters and search process

Though ideally one would be able to search the corpus for any niche results, it is difficult to shape this corpus to one’s will when it comes to the specific format of data I wanted to consider under this analysis. For example, though every word in each entry is tagged with all possible grammatical information that may be searched for in the corpus, it is not possible to discover a set of sentences that are for the most part structurally identical, but where one uses a perfective form and the other an imperfective form of the same verb through the use of the available search parameters. Nor can one create a search for commonality of verbs that have a specific marker or prefix, so searches tend to result in a massive amount of data, or do not provide any results. Thus, for the purposes of the research in this thesis, the onus falls, to some extent on the researcher(s) to narrow down the data and pick the most relevant and workable examples out of the search results.

---

60 This function is not available with all searches that I have tried, however, making it impossible to use consistently as a time period limiter for the data set I am using. Therefore, exclusion of historical texts will be done by hand during data selection.
As a result of the inability to appropriately narrow the search to the full specifications desired for the purposes of this thesis, my process is to search not for categories of verbs, but rather for specific verbs in those categories listed in §4.1.2, and limiting the results further using the parameter options. In order to do this, the verbs are decided before the search is conducted. Because of the large variety of entries in the corpus that do not necessarily meet my data specifications, the choice of verbs to get the largest number of results is important to consider. For this reason, I will be using the more common verbs in the language, or the more commonly used verbs that fall under certain categories. As a result the variety of verbs is limited; however, generally this results in the data available being more consistent, and thus comparisons and analyses that are clearer.

In order to further narrow the data and in an attempt to find data sentences that have similar structure, the use of some parameter filters is also necessary, depending on the verb category being discussed. For example, some parameters that may be set are the presence of certain suffixes or prefixes, as well location in a sentence in relation to other elements, and specification of which aspect the verb that is being searched falls under. Though some of this is covered simply by searching the verb itself (e.g. it is not possible to have a verb that is both perfective and imperfective with the exact same composition), it does not detract from the search to include the parameters, and may result in the corpus providing results that might not have been considered when those parameters were not

---

61 For example, the age of the source, the sentence type, sentence complexity, etc.
specifically mentioned as search terms. It could potentially also remove results that do not meet the requirements for the data I select.

4.2.3 Legitimacy of methodology

As mentioned in the previous subsections, there are surely limitations and drawbacks to the methodology I am following for this thesis. However, considering the sheer quantity of verbs in Russian (or any language for that matter), it would be unwieldy to analyse every possible subset of verbs, or even more than just a handful of verbs for each subtype; thus, it is important to limit the scope of the data only to that which is most relevant and generalisable, as I have done here. Of course, the verbs I have chosen are not necessarily a representative sample, but again, the method and analysis ought to be applicable to the large majority of verbs, regardless of the subsets and categories they are part of. The purpose of this thesis is not to fully describe the entirety of the verbal lexicon in relations to aspect, but rather to show that this is a viable analysis for several broad categories of verbs (of course with minor modifications as necessary, given their specific structural attributes). Therefore, the data set is sufficient, and the process of choosing that data allows for the presence of enough relevant information to perform the analysis, despite the seemingly small quantity. For any further work based on this idea, however, it would be beneficial to identify more verb groupings, and to use more data (perhaps with slight differences) that fall within the current groupings analysed here in order to find exceptions and show further applicability of this analysis within those groupings.
4.2.4 Structure of analysis

In order to fully consider the data I have selected, I will be looking at it from a morphological and syntactic perspective. To do this, I will provide a morpheme by morpheme gloss, as well as individual tree diagrams for all relevant sentences.

The purpose of examining the data in this way is to not only consider how the current understanding of aspect might be shown through the morphemic gloss, but particularly to show how the analysis presented herein functions in that context. However, as I aim to move away from the morphemic analysis of aspect to a more completely syntactic evaluation, it also then important to include a visual breakdown of the syntax of any relevant segments of these sentences that have been taken from the corpus. The inclusion of the tree diagrams allows the syntactic structure of each sentence to be seen in a manner that shows the dependencies of each constituent of the sentence, and provides for a clearer understanding of this analysis.

5 Analysis and Discussion

Based on the information I have so far discussed, it is now possible to begin to consider the implications in a more concrete manner. In the following section, I will provide examples that demonstrate the structure and applicability of the new syntactic analysis I am proposing—that aspect is not tied to prefixes or suffixes, but rather to a null aspectual head which selects for a verb with a matching aspect—across a variety of verb types.

---

63 However, I do not directly show this. Rather, I focus on the analysis I am presenting, but it is possible for readers to infer how the other interpretation might be structured from my glosses.
5.1 Aspectual subsets (emphases)

As discussed in §2.2, the perfective aspect has several aspectual subsets, which indicate different emphases on the action noted by the verb in a sentence. In (3a), the completative subset is shown through the presence of dochitat’ ‘(finish) reading’, wherein the prefix do- places the completative meaning on the verb chitat’ ‘to read’:

(3a) Daj-te mne Ø do-chita-t'-Ø sur-u.  
give-IMP 1SG.DAT [+perf] finish-read-INF-PF surah-ACC  
'Let me finish reading the surah.'

In this morphological breakdown, the change in the structure of aspect is first seen. Here and in all other data, I have chosen to indicate aspect via null aspect head with feature agreement, in order to show the coordination between the verb and the larger aspectual projection. This relationship is visualised in the following tree diagram of (3a):

(3b)

Though the entire sentence is not broken down here, one can see that aspect has a larger scope over the sentence. Not only does aspect appear as its own phrase, but also has purview over the direct object, suru ‘surah’.

---

64 Surah is part or chapter of the holy scripture in Islam, which ranges from several words to several pages and describe the revelations from Allah which were received by Muhammad.
choice must be designated by the aspect of the sentence or clause for grammaticality, it is possible for the AspP to have scope over all the items it affects in a sentence. However, this idea is not evidenced in this tree, as this particular sentence does not require these restrictions, but will be discussed in relation to other data.

The next example, (4a), shows the inceptive subset at play:

(4a) Chtoby Ø za-plaka-t'Ø, Ø sled-uju-Ø sovet-u,
 in.order.to [+perf] begin-cry-INF-PF [-perf] follow-1SG.PRS-IPF advice-ACC

vy-chitan-nomu v Internet-e.
fully-read.ADJ-PASSPSTPT on Internet-PREP
'In order to start crying, I follow the advice I read on the Internet.'

The first clause of this sentence, chtoby zaplakat’ ‘in order to start crying’, clearly displays the inceptive emphasis, with the presence of za-, which here means ‘begin’. Though the structure surrounding zaplakat’ does not show anything unexpected or novel in when compared to the analogous section of (3a), it does show that the same explanation of aspect is applicable to more than one of the aspeectual subsets of the perfective aspect in Russian. This allows one to conclude that this analysis holds true across aspectual subsets.
The following tree, (4b), is a breakdown of the first clause of (4a):

(4b)

Though in the gloss of (4a) one can, to some extent, see the syntactic (and morphological) structure, through (4b) it is possible to see much more clearly how these elements are related to each other in the sentence syntactically. In this sentence, one can see that, unlike (3b), the AspP does not have any children beyond the VP. If one were to continue breaking down the rest of (4a) in this tree, there would be other phrasal projections higher up for the remaining sections. One can thus conclude that, while aspect may have scope over the VP and its daughters as in (3a) and exhibited in (3b), it does not necessarily have scope over the entire rest of the sentence after the VP.

In the following sentence, (5a), one can see the delimitative aspectual subset:

(5a) Ob etom mozhno Ø po-govori-t'-Ø.
    about that.PREP possible [+perf] DLM-talk-INF-PF
    'It is possible to talk about that (for a short while).'
Here, though often *po-* has an inceptive meaning, like *za-* in (4a), it rather carries a delimitative aspect in relation to time: *pogovorit’* means ‘to talk (for a short time)’. Similarly to (4a), this sentence shows that this analysis of aspect is capable of being applied to different aspectual subsets, with the following tree, (5b), as additional evidence to support this:

(5b)

Further, this tree also shows aspect in relation to a different part of the sentence: the end. In (3b) the VP takes a daughter NP, and in (4b) an NP is found at the end of a clause, but in (5b), the subject VP is the conclusion of the sentence. So, not only does this example show that it is possible for the AspP and coordinating [+perf] feature to be applied on verbs that fall under the delimitative subset, but also that the AspP and subsequent phrases can be used anywhere in the sentence, without locational limitations.

### 5.2 Imperfectivising suffixes and multi aspect sentences

With (3), (4), and (5), the verbs involved all have prefixes, which is, in these cases, what marks them visually as perfective verbs, though the presence of a prefix does not structurally cause perfectivisation, under this analysis—and neither does a suffix. Both a prefix and suffix are present on the same verb in the following, (6a):
(6a) Mozg predpriimchv-ogo yan'ki Ø privyk-Ø
    brain enterprising-GEN  yankee [+perf] used.to.3SG.M.PST-PF

Ø s-rabat-yvat'-Ø molnienosn-o.
    [-perf] CPL-work-INF-IPF  lightning.speed-ADV

'The brain of the enterprising Yankee is used to working at lightning speed.'

Interestingly, one might notice that the prefix, $s$-, is one that, under the current standard model, causes the verb to be perfective, but due to the presence of $-ivat'$, the verb is imperfective. This would make sense under a backformation model, where the imperfective is formed off of the perfective. However, I would argue that, in fact, these morphemes have nothing to do with aspect other than to serve as visual markers, as aspect is a feature associated with the entire verb, rather than just specific parts of the verb. I would also say that an “imperfectivising” suffix does not exist, but can be a consistent feature of imperfective verbs that have other markers that might indicate they are perfective.

(6a) is also a worthwhile sentence to consider due to the fact that there are verbs with different aspects right next to each other, with no separation. The syntactic breakdown for that situation under this analysis is as follows:
Based on this analysis, it shows that there can be more than one AspP in a sentence, it simply needs to be accounted for, so that any subsequent constituents of the following verb phrase can have aspect appropriately applied to them, if necessary. In this example specifically, the reason for this change in aspect is due to the meaning—one cannot become accustomed to something that has not occurred many times, and repetition is a hallmark of the imperfective aspect. Therefore, though privyk ‘used to’ is perfective and has an AspP which supports the presence of that perfective aspect, there can also be different aspect if required, even under the original AspP—it is just secondary, only controlling the aspect of part of the sentence. Though it is theoretically possible for there to be a sentence such as (7),\(^6\) contextual makers in the sentence

\(^6\) This sentence was not pulled from the corpus, but rather manufactured as a “counterexample” for (5).
indicate repetition which removes the basis for the perfective aspect in the first place which makes the sentence ungrammatical.\textsuperscript{66}

\[(7) \text{Ja } \emptyset \text{ privyk-Ø } \emptyset \text{ do-chitat'} \text{ knigu} \]

\begin{tabular}{l}
1SG [+perf] used.to.3SG.M.PST-PF [+perf] finish-read-INF-PF book.ACC.SG \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
kazhdij den'. \\
each day \\
‘I am used to finishing a book every day.’
\end{tabular}

However, had aspect been directly connected to the prefix of the verb, with no connection to anything other than the VP of the sentence, a sentence such as (7) would require some way to create agreement between a verb which had a perfective feature attached to it and the habitual (and therefore imperfective associated) NP of knigu kazhdij den’ ‘a book every day’. That connection would, however, inevitably deny the aspectual association between the verb and other elements of the sentence that are associated with it. As it stands here, this would also pose a problem with this analysis, wherein the NP following dochitat’ would require a different AspP in order to show the contrast. Despite the potential solution of having an AspP without a coordinating verb to account for the habituality of the NP, the manner of showing the aspectual association of the NP is much clearer and easier to define, which shows the ungrammaticality of the sentence much more easily than a different attempt which has aspect under the prefix might.

5.3 Verbs with different stems

Having now considered both the idea of prefixes and aspectual subsets, as well as the concept of “imperfectivising” suffixes and multi-aspect sentences, and having concluded that the

\textsuperscript{66} Some might consider this sentence ungrammatical, though some might find it acceptable, though very highly marked and unusual. Theoretically, (7) is possible, but because the consensus is that it is a strange sentence either way, my feeling is that it is best to consider it ungrammatical.
analysis of aspect as AspP with scope over the VP and its dependents is functional in those contexts, it is now necessary to discuss the validity of this analysis on verbs that have no specific differences between aspects, other than having an entirely different form. While these verb pairs are generally uncommon, they are often used—particularly говірін’/сказат’ ‘to talk’, as discussed in §2.2. With this pair of verbs there are no overt markers of aspectual difference and have entirely different stems, but are still the base aspectual counterparts.

First, let us consider говірін’ ‘to talk (impf.)’ through the following example:

(8a) Pozhaluj, tak Ø говірін’-Ø nel’zja.
    Perhaps like that. ADV [-perf] speak-INF-IPF forbidden
    'Speaking like that is probably not allowed.'

Because говірін’ lacks any particular prefix or suffix other than the basic verbal ending for second conjugation verbs67 it is unclear where the aspect would attach under the system currently used in the field. Therefore, it is not possible to use that analysis, meaning that something different must account for the way aspect fits into the sentence in relation to the verb.

Consider then the following tree:

(8b)

---

67 See §2 for an explanation of the 1st and 2nd conjugation system.
With this analysis of aspect as a feature of the whole verb, rather than simply associated with a prefix or suffix, it becomes apparent that this analysis can appropriately account for the imperfective aspect of a verb that does not also have any kind of overt aspectual marker, visibly or morphologically.

Given that current literature considers aspect to be changed through a shift associated with the prefixation or suffixation, the question then becomes about how we handle the perfective aspect when a verb has the same basic structure (stem + infinitival ending) as an imperfective verb—rather, when there is no prefix or suffix to mark it. Thus, we begin to consider the verb *skazat’* ‘to talk (perf.)’, as in sentence (9a):

(9a) Nel’zja Ø skaza-t’-Ø, chto Vanga Ø rabota-la-Ø na cannot [+perf] say-INF-PF that.CONJ Vanga [-perf] work-2SG.F.PST-IPF for KGB.

KGB.ACC

'This is not to say that Vanga worked for the KGB.'

Just as how *govorit’* was analysed in (8), *skazat’* can also have aspect—albeit perfective instead of imperfective—accounted for through the presence of a null aspect head in conjunction with an aspectual feature associated with the whole verb which coordinates with that head, as shown in the tree of (9a) that follows:
Therefore, if aspect is made a feature of the whole verb that coordinates with a higher AspP, then the problem of where to locate aspect in the structure of the verb when there is no prefix or suffix, and, as in this case, the imperfective and perfective forms have no discernible connection, is resolved. This also allows for a similar structure, as well as the influence of aspect on further dependents until a new AspP is introduced, in the event that the next VP in the sentence does not have a verb of the same aspect (which can again be seen in (9b) above).
5.4 Reflexives

Reflexive verbs are also common in the Russian lexicon. They are incredibly important for a variety of constructions, as there are many actions one cannot express without using a reflexive verb. While the vast majority of reflexives are so in both aspects, there are, as previously mentioned in §2.2.2, four sets that are reflexive in only the imperfect aspect, and it is one of those pairs that will be considered here. This comparison is being done in order to properly consider any contrast that might exist between a reflexive and non-reflexive in terms of structure in close proximity. Specifically, this section will examine the verb *stanovit'sja/stat' ‘to become’*.

First, let us analyse the imperfective form, *stanovit'sja ‘to become (process)’*:

\[(10a) \text{Prezident-om nado O stanoi-t'-sja-O v sam-om}\]

\[\text{President-INST must [-perf] become-INF-REFL-IPF at.PREP very.PRO-PREP}\]

\[kontse kar'er-u.\]

\[\text{end.PREP career-ACC}\]

'One must become president at the very end of one's career.'

Based on the morphology of the verb, we can see that there is indeed a reflexive morpheme in the verb, through which *stanovit'sja* associates with an impersonal subject.\(^69\) In the current syntactic analysis of aspect that is accepted in the scholarly community, this reflexive morpheme plays a role in the marking of aspect in a sentence, as aspect is considered to be associated with certain individual morphemes in the verb. However, under this analysis, the reflexive morpheme has no effect on aspect. In this interpretation the aspect encompasses the whole verb, and therefore the reflexive morpheme is not singled out in any way, which makes the reflexive

\(^{68}\) Only the thing becoming something else can do the action of becoming, thus requiring it to be reflexive.

\(^{69}\) There is no overt subject in (9).
morpheme unremarkable in this context. This can be seen in the following tree breakdown of (10a):

(10b)

Thus, it can be concluded that there is no difference in the syntactic structure of aspect in relation to the reflexive morpheme under this analysis. This conclusion mitigates the issues that would be present under the current model where these verbs would have to be addressed exceptions to show how the reflexive morpheme would select for only the imperfective aspect of these verbs.

Additionally, as the reflexive morpheme is considered a suffix, it is appropriate now to more completely address the idea of verbs that not only have suffixes, but also have a prefix. In a situation such as this one, there would be difficulty deciding which affix would carry the aspect of the verb. However, under the model outlined herein, this would not be an issue, as aspect is considered an overall feature of the verb which coordinates with the feature of the aspectual projection, rather than competing elements of a verb. For the same reason, this model allays the
concern related to verbs that have different stems or stem changes, and how to account for that in conjunction with aspect through morphology.

Consider then the verb *stat’* ‘to become (completative)’, the counterpart of *stanovit’sja*. An example of *stat’* can be seen in (11a):

\[
\begin{align*}
(11a) \quad \text{No, } & \emptyset \hspace{1em} \text{sta-t’-Ø} \hspace{1em} \text{nov-ym prezident-om} \hspace{1em} \text{Hitler ne} \\
\text{but } & \text{[+perf] become-INF-PF new-INST president-INST Hitler NEG} \\
\text{zhela-l-Ø.} & \\
\text{wish-2SG.PST-PF} & \\
\text{'But Hitler did not wish to become the new president.'}
\end{align*}
\]

Due to *stat’* not being reflexive (note the absence of *-sja*), the verb structure reads like a standard basic perfective, with only two morphemes—the (truncated) stem and the infinitival marker—much like *skazakt’* in (9a). Additionally, the tree analysis of (11a) shows the same general structure as the reflexive form of the verb, despite the lack of the reflexive marker and the difference in aspect:

\[
(11b)
\]

Therefore, it can be concluded with even more certainty that the reflexive marker has no bearing on aspect in the sentence—despite being considered as a potential factor in modern
literature—because there is no difference in syntactic structure between members of an aspectual set such as stanovit’sja/stat’ under this analysis.

5.5 Verbs of motion

Because of the slightly different process of indicating aspect with verbs of motion, it is important to examine them in relation to the functionality of this analysis. There are two sets of general verbs of motion with a power distinction, hodit’/idti ‘to go (by one’s own power)’ and ezdit’/ehat’ ‘to go (by the power of something else)’. They are, however, not grouped by aspect, but rather by directionality, which plays a role in the imperfective and perfective classifications, and so it is important to consider these verbs when it comes to evaluating this analysis of aspect.

5.5.1 Imperfective verbs of motion

In order to appropriately compare these verbs, they will be grouped first by aspect and then by directional association. First to be analysed will be the unidirectional imperfective verbs idti and ehat’, and within this grouping they will be further examined in terms of the power distinction. To begin, consider idti ‘to go (by one’s own power)’ in (12a), following:

(12a) Nam Ø pri-hodi-t'-sja-Ø idti-Ø domoj.
     1SG.DAT [-perf] arrive-go-INF-REFL-IPF go.INF-IPF homeward
     'We have to go home.'

---

70 See §2.2.1 for an explanation of directionality.
71 Recall that no matter the directionality of the verb, if it is un-prefixed, it is imperfective.
In this example, it can be seen that, through this analysis, *idti* morphologically breaks down in the same manner as any other imperfective verb discussed thus far. Similarly, the following tree shows that with this interpretation of the syntactic structure of aspect, *idti* follows the same structure as the other imperfective verbs:

(12b)

![Diagram]

Having shown that this analysis is plausible for *idti*, the next step is to consider the verb *ehat’*, in order to show that no issue is raised through this analysis related to the power distinction. Consider then as an example (13a), which contains the unidirectional imperfective verb *ehat’* ‘to go (by the power of something else)’:

(13a) *Papa dolzhen Ø byl-Ø eha-t'-Ø vmeste s nami.*

father must [-perf] be.2SG.M-INF go-INF-IPF together with 1PL.INST

‘Papa was supposed to go together with us.’

In the morphemic glossing of the sentence presented here, there is no morphological indication of power distinction, meaning that this must be done in a manner other than morphologically and syntactically, as there is also no coordinating syntactic or lexical
A sentence is a representation of the power distinction. Because of this, it can be concluded that the power distinction is not relevant to the discussion of the syntax of aspect in Russian, which can be further seen in the tree diagram of (13a) that follows. The tree, (13b), does not differ in any way from the other imperfective verbs that have been evaluated to this point in relation to how aspect must be handled under this proposed analysis.

Moving on to multidirectional verbs of motion, in (12) it is possible to see that multidirectional verbs of motion also experience no difference in structure, morphologically or syntactically. This is evidenced by the presence of prihodit ’sja, which contains the verb hodit’ ‘to go (by one’s own power in a variety of instances or multiple
directions)’. Noting that the presence of *pri-* does not make the verb perfective, does not only contradict the current interpretation of aspectual shift, but also shows that the presence of a prefix on a verb does not merit special consideration under this new syntactic model. However, it is possible that verbs of motion are exceptions to the current view of aspectual shift, but because the same issue is seen across different types of verb, this seems unlikely.

5.5.2 Perfective verbs of motion

Verbs of motion are only noted as perfective if there is a modification to the base form of a unidirectional verb. If a modification is present on a multidirectional verb, the verb only acquires the added meaning of that modification and does not change aspect, which further disproves the theory that prefixation is the cause of aspectual shift. Beyond that, however, there is no change under this analysis in terms of the morphological structure of aspect in relation to perfective verbs of motion, which can be seen in (14a) and (15a):

(14a) On Ø soglasi-l-sja-Ø po-jti-Ø so mnoj v
2SG.M [+perf] agree-PST-REFL-PF begin-go.INF-PF with 1SG.INST to

tajn-u.
secret-ACC
'He agreed to share a secret with me.'

(15a) No, za to, chtoby Ø po-eha-t'-Ø v Rossi-ju, Ø
But for that in.order.to [+perf] begin-go-INF-PF to.PREP Russia-ACC [-perf]

vsegda plati-li-Ø bol'she.
always pay-3PL.PST-IPF more
‘But, in order to go to Russia, they always paid more.’
The fact that there is no difference for the structure of perfective verbs of motion in this interpretation, whereas further differences would be necessary to differentiate between imperfective and perfective verbs of motion under the previous analysis, is further illustrated in the trees of both (14a) and (15a):
5.6 Present tense

Finally, it is time to turn to present tense conjugated verbs. Because perfective verbs do not have a present tense form, it is useful to look at verbs that cannot have a change made to them to make them perfective and maintain the same tense (as discussed in §4.2.1) to continue evaluating the validity of the current analysis versus the analysis proposed herein.

In order to examine this, consider one verb that is very commonly used in Russian: chitat’ ‘to read’. Chitat’ can take practically any prefix, and therefore makes a good example to use for this analysis because it can easily be perfective as well as imperfective, given the right circumstances. However, the markers considered to cause a specific aspect cannot appear in present tense. An example of a non-prefixed form of chitat’ is seen in (16a), following:
(16a) Kstati, ja ne Ø chita-ju-Ø sovietsk-ixh
by.the.way, 1SG NEG [-perf] read-1SG.PRES-IPF soviet.ADJ-ACC.AN.PL
gazet.
newspapers.GEN.PL
'By the way, I don't read the newspapers of Soviets.'

Again, when the aspect of a sentence or phrase is analysed as a null aspectual feature that coordinates between the verb and a higher AspP, the structure of aspect remains the same. There is no need to place further restrictions on the verb to stop it from being able to become perfective, because it is dependent upon other elements in the sentence, which can be seen in the tree below:

(16b)

The syntactic representation of the structure of aspect remains the same, no matter the tense: it is always dependent on coordination between Asp and V.
5.7 Summarised model

Based on the functionality of this method of analysis in the previous examples, certain generalisations can be made in order to provide a basic framework for any future application of this interpretation. First of all, under this analysis aspect is considered a feature, either [-perf] or [+perf], of the whole verb, with no distinct marker or morpheme. This feature must coordinate with an aspectual phrase (AspP) that has scope over the VP and its daughters, which allows for any contextual markers that require a certain aspect to be considered part of the equation as well. In the event that there are clauses of a sentence that require a different aspect than the first clause, there is also a way to handle that through the ability of AspP to take a TP or another AspP under its scope. In the event that this occurs, the aspect of that clause is related to the AspP that comes after the closest TP to the area of the sentence, such as in (9b) in §5.3. If another AspP is used as a daughter of the original AspP without a TP present, it simply means that each constituent is subject only to the closest AspP. To aid in the visualisation of this summary of the analysis, one can consider the following section of a tree as a template:
6 Limitations and Further Research

Although one always hopes that what one does will be the right answer and make a broad impact, this is rarely the case. Like the vast majority of thoughts put out into the world, this work has limitations, and much room for further development and exploration.

6.1 Limitations

Based on my currently held knowledge of Russian, as well as the analysis presented here, I have come up with a way to consider aspect in Russian that I feel addresses many of the issues I have encountered as a learner of the language and in scholarly writing. However, because of the limited time during which the work of this thesis was undertaken, the scope of the research herein is lacking. Though I have provided examples for the most common verbs under specific categories, there remain thousands and thousands of verbs in the Russian lexicon to analyse. As a result, it is highly possible there are exceptions, where this new analysis is not possible, or is in some way deficient. At no point would I ever assert that the information presented here is in any way comprehensive; rather, it is meant as a starting point, which resolves many issues, but does not cover every detail.

The fact that this thesis focuses solely on linguistics, rather than pedagogy is also a limitation. Current pedagogy and, generally, Russian education in the English speaking world works off of the currently accepted model of morphological breakdown of aspect; which, to be fair, is much more clear to non-linguists than what I have suggested here, as a result of having visual markers one can rely on to recognise the aspect of a verb, rather than having to explain linguistic theory to beginning students. Therefore, although this framework may be a more
accurate representation of the syntax of aspect in Russian, it may not have a broad impact outside the field of linguistics.

6.2 Suggestions for future work

Having fully acknowledged that what I have presented may not resolve all the problems with current analysis and may raise some new issues of its own, it is necessary to provide direction that may be beneficial to the further exploration of this idea, along with concepts that I see as necessary for any derivational work to consider.

Perhaps the most obvious matter that needs to be addressed in relation to the work presented in this thesis is to apply this analysis to more data. It is possible that there may well be exceptions to the framework outlined herein. While the examples used show broad applicability across a variety of verb types, there may be verbs that require specific contexts for use that do not function with this syntactic breakdown, or perhaps simply contexts which directly contradict this model. Given the successes of the analysis I have presented here, however, I remain confident that there will not be significant evidence of this type. Nonetheless, if it does exist, it ought to be considered and accounted for. In essence, further refinement of this proposed structure is needed, whether it be somehow expanding the scope of aspect even further, or perhaps finding that this is a good base model that needs to be more specific in some manner to account for exceptions, which is something that future researchers might look to explore.

In considering further data, it would also be informative to consider the relationship between tense and aspect. Because there is some connection between tense and aspect, as is seen through the limitations placed on either aspect as to how tense is formed and which tenses can be formed, it logically follows that this relationship should be explored and the form of the
linguistic relationships between these two concepts be concretely defined. In so doing, further work might discover a link that needs to be addressed in future iterations of this analysis, or further confirm the analysis presented here.

Another suggestion I would make for continued research in this area is to consider broader implications on Slavic languages that also include aspect distinctions in their verbal systems. While it is possible to say that this new analysis has potential in Russian, it is as of yet unclear whether it can be expanded to include other Slavic languages, and, if so, to what extent and with what modifications this may be done. This would also be a convenient way to consider historical data and contemplate the changes that have happened in aspectual structure and marking as these languages split off from each other, in addition to the more recent historical changes of aspectual structure in Slavic languages, including further analysis of Russian.

7 Conclusion

The goal of this thesis is to have successfully provided an alternative model to popular understandings of aspect formation and structure in the linguistic and pedagogical communities. Current perceptions and generalisations promoted in these communities inadequately describe the issue, and require many different ways of interpreting aspect in order to account for the numerous exceptions to the idea that changing aspect is achieved merely through verbal modification. In order to simplify and standardise a model of syntactic analysis of aspect, in the model presented here aspect has been analysed instead as a feature of the entire verb, with no morphological marker for aspect. By interpreting aspect in this way, there are theoretically no exceptions that need to be accounted for, allowing for one analysis to cover all verbs. Another major issue is that many modern works on aspect insufficiently address the aspectual
implications of other words in a sentence—a problem that is also remedied under the analysis laid out in this thesis. By evaluating aspect as a feature of a verb that must coordinate with a higher AspP, the context that indicates which aspect must be used is accounted for under the broader scope of that AspP.

Given the limited data presented herein, this is only an initial probe into a potentially more viable model of the syntax of aspect than what is currently understood to be the syntactic structure. In order for this model to be verified as applicable to the vast majority of, if not all, Russian verbs and sentences that contain verbs, it is clear that more work needs to be done. However, based on this initial examination of a variety of verbs falling under many of the major categories, considering aspect as structurally denoted by a null aspectual head which selects for a verb with a matching aspectual feature has strong potential to be an appealing method for addressing the issues in current research and also resolving the problem of exceptions to the current rules.

Additionally, in the event that this model is shown to be viable after further analysis is done, it would not only create a more definitive structure for analysing aspect, but also clarify future work on the subject and inform a great amount of later research, not only on this topic, but on topics requiring an understanding of the syntax of aspect as background for research beyond the scope of the syntax of aspect.

This thesis provides evidence in support of a new model and a basis for a fresh analysis of the syntactic structure of aspect. Though the ideas presented here require further evidence to be analysed to better support and refine the model, it has clarified and synthesised a foundation for future work.