Volkmar Lehmann

ON THE GRAMMATICAL STATUS OF
ANALYTICAL PARADIGMS IN RUSSIAN

> Статическому „морфологизму" (…) я
> считаю своевременным противопоставить
> процессуальное рассмотрение явлений
> языка, которое позволяет говорить о
> большей или меньшей граммa-
> тизации тех или иных аналитических
> конструкций, о разных ступенях их
> трансформации из словосочетания в
> аналитическую форму слова.
> В. М. Жирмунский, 1965

1. Problem, Goal, Approach

Which grammatical or lexical status applies to analytical units with phasal verbs (*načal plakat'*), with modal auxiliaries (*mogu / možno zakryt'*), and with prepositions (*v institute*)? What about the "aktionsarten" such as the ingressive (*zaplakat'*)?

An example for the problem of assigning a status to analytical forms is the way analytical comparatives such as *bolee interesnyj, menee interesnyj* are dealt with in the Academy Grammar of 1980 (AG 1980, 562). Since *bolee* and *menee* allegedly maintain their lexical meaning, they could not be seen as analytical forms of the comparative. Other grammars generally convey a different opinion here.

The goal is to adequately integrate analytical forms into the grammar, in the present case into Russian grammar. To reach this aim, differentiating between central and peripheral (morpho-)grammatical categories is suggested, that is, a gradation within the category system of morphology according to grammatical status. The most central categories are those which are today considered morphological in Russian grammatography, e.g., case, mode, or aspect. In addition to lexico-grammatical categories (e.g., animacy, homogenity, transitivity, see Lehmann 2001) and transpositional categories (e.g., adjectival and adverbial participles, ibid.), neither of which are addressed here, the peripheral categories include the *expansionary categories* (case expansions such as *v institute*, modal expansions such as *mogu zakryt'*, aspect expansion such as *načal plakat'*),

which are almost always analytical categories. The entire category system with the central and peripheral categories is outlined by Lehmann (in print, see also Lehmann 2003). The analytical paradigms up for debate here belong either – being expansionary categories – to the peripheral categories, or else they belong to several central categories such as to tenses, e.g., ipf. (imperfective) future, or to grammatical voice.

This gradation has always been common in grammatography, since categories such as case or tense are classified as "morphological" categories or – in the narrow sense – as grammatical ones, while others such as participles or transitivity do not have any particular status. The grammatical status of a whole array of categories is up for debate. These include animacy, analytic paradigms of comparison, derived adverbs and relative adjectives, etc.

The integration of peripheral categories demands the category which is considered (morpho-)grammatical to be defined accordingly. This question about grammatical status has been dealt with by Lehmann (2003). According to the definition there, a category is grammatical when it can behave as a formal-functional, opposition-building paradigm combining in principle with any semantically appropriate lexeme[1] of a word class. Participle affixes, for example, combine within the word form with verbal lexemes, while prepositions do so with nouns. Modal auxiliaries are function words that only appear in combination with verbs. The German aspect marker *dabei sein zu Verb-en* is (morpho-) grammatical (*ich bin dabei, sein Buch zu lesen*), because it combines with any semantically appropriate German verb, but the construction *am Verb-en sein* is not, since a syntactic context such as **ich war das Buch am Lesen* is not acceptable according to the norms of standard language use. In this case, connectivity with verbs is shown to be syntactically limited.

Our definition of grammatical units as elements of grammatical categories corresponds largely to the gram proposed by Bybee and Dahl (e.g., Bybee, Dahl 1989).

Defining grammatical status has two limitations. The first limitation, "in principle" (being able to appear together with any lexeme), shows already that this criterion of distribution is not an absolute characteristic, but more of a graded one. Describing the distribution of grammatical units is a very extensive task and will not be done here; it would certainly be helpful for the purpose at hand but is not necessary. Hence we are left with distinguishing (morpho-)grammatical units on the one hand and lexical or syntactic units on the other hand; this dividing line is to be interpreted as a strong default.

The second limitation "with any semantically appropriate lexeme" applies, e.g., to the compatibility of plural and homogenous noun lexemes such as *voda*

---

[1] Lexeme as understood by the Moscow semantic school, meaning a word with exactly one lexical meaning ("lexical-semantic variant").

(other lexemes of *voda* allow for the plural), of the pf. aspect and stative verb lexemes like *sootvetstvovat'*, of the comparative and relative adjectives such as *gorodskoj*.

The definition of (morpho-)grammatical category implies a term not only clearly broader than that of morphological category (see AG 1980), but also broader than the traditional, narrow term of grammatical category (see e.g., Leh-feldt, Kempgen 1999). As mentioned, the central (morpho-)grammatical categories agree in principal with the so-called morphological categories. There are however important differences between these morphological categories and the central (morpho-)grammatical categories on the one hand and the traditional grammatical categories in the narrow sense on the other hand. First of all, the former categories apply to word classes, while grammatical categories in the narrow sense are independent from word classes. In addition, the former have form-function units, whereas the traditional ones are function categories. The characteristics of word class binding and form-function combinations include all (morpho-)grammatical categories, even the peripheral ones.

Furthermore, we will simply say "grammatical" instead of "morpho-grammatical" when dealing with categories and their status.

One way to detect if and to what extent a category is grammatical is by determining its relationship to categories beyond morphology. If morphology is a separate component of the language system, then obviously the further away its categories and their characteristics are from the categories of other sub-systems (from lexicon and syntax), the more "morphological" – or even more grammatical in the sense used here – its categories are. Thus, the levels of morpho-grammatical grammaticality are determined on the basis of what is specific to morphology in contrast to adjacent language levels. The fewer typical characteristics of syntactic categories on the one hand or lexical categories on the other hand a morpho-grammatical category has in formal or in functional terms, the higher its degree of grammaticality is.

These circumstances are sometimes described with the expression autonomy. Morphological autonomy is then a central feature of grammaticality. In the following we will consider this characteristic first from a formal standpoint, and then from a functional one.

2. Central and expansionary categories' formal proximity to syntax

2.1. Analytical Paradigms

One explanation for why the expansionary categories, which consist almost exclusively of analytical paradigms, are not among the central grammatical categories is found in their proximity to the syntax of phrases. On the other

hand, the analytical Slavic future, for example, is a tense. Nevertheless, tense is almost always included among the central grammatical categories in the strictest sense. Hence, excluding all categories with analytical paradigms from grammatical categories is not possible.

Let us consider more closely how the grammaticality of analytic forms in Slavic languages is graded. Weiss has already pointed out that describing analytical constructions without the perspective of grammaticalization would be incomplete. He looks at these in terms of moving from lexical to grammatical status, hence concluding that they represent "not a final stage but only a transitional one". Ever since Kuryłowicz's "inflectional categories" it has been held: "For the element that is to be grammaticalized, the prescribed sequence is clitisizing – agglutination – fusion." (Weiss 2004, 266)

For the question at hand, we grade the analytical paradigms as follows, based on the function words they include: Clitics are the most strongly grammatical function words (they are the most strongly grammaticalized). For function words that are stressed, non-inflected ones are closer to morphology than inflected ones, since inflection is typical for content words (words with lexical meaning), while function words (words without lexical meaning) do not usually display inflection.

	CLITIC	ACCENTUATED NON-INFLECTED	ACCENTUATED INFLECTED
CENTRAL CATEGORIES	–	*bolee sil'nyj* comparative	*budu zakryvat'* *samye sil'nye* Future superlative (elative)
EXPANSIONARY CATEGORIES	*v gorod* case expansion	*nado zakryt'* *možno zakryt'* *ввиду* modal expansion case expansion	*možet zakryt'* *načali zakryvat'* modal expansion aspect expansion

Formal grammaticality of analytical word forms (with examples) increases to the left

Word stress and inflection are typical for the analytical paradigms of central categories as well as for those of peripheral ones. Case expansion with clitics – characteristic for the more common prepositions – are grammaticalized even more strongly than the analytical forms of the central categories. Hence, considering formal types of analytical paradigms does not result in excluding the expansionary categories from the grammatical categories based on the former's analytical structure.

2.2. Synthetic Paradigms

Having looked at the analytical paradigms, let us now turn to the synthetic ones. Of course, these hardly play a role for expansionary categories. However, they are interesting in the present context since two of the three synthetic paradigm types are the same for central and peripheral categories. This is a further formal argument for expanding the system of grammatical categories to include peripheral categories.

Grammaticality is graded for the synthetic paradigms as well. If we assume that affixes are typically the carriers of central morphological functions, then the lexical stems are less grammatical than affixes as function carriers (nositel' funkcii). Every lexical meaning requires a lexical stem to be function carrier, while this is not the case for grammatical functions.

What are the function carriers for synthetic paradigms? They can be affixes only, affixes and lexical stems, or lexical stems only. This differentiation corresponds to the type of grammatical operation upon which a synthetic paradigm is based, whether inflection, derivation, or classification (see, e.g., Lehmann 2003). The role of the stem and the affixes in the synthetic paradigms determine to which type synthetic paradigms are to be assigned:

Inflectional Paradigms: The carriers of grammatical functions are affixes. Although affixes are also used for lexical word formation, in contrast to these, inflective affixes can be combined with any lexical stem of the word class and form paradigms with morphemes that are interchangeable with each other, such as, for example, case endings (grammatical operation of inflection).

Derivational Paradigms: The carriers of grammatical functions are stems and affixes. A carrier-affix is added to a lexical stem in order to form the grammatical opposition with the stem; it is not interchangeable with other affixes within the paradigm (grammatical operation of derivation). With grammatical derivation a larger lexical affinity emerges, because the lexical stem or a stem that contains it is used to make up the grammatical opposition, and this stem carries the lexical meaning. This is, for example, the case for aspect, with the stem as function carrier in *zakry(-t')* or *stroi(-t')* and with the suffix in *(zakry-)va(-t')* or the prefix in *po(-stroit')*.

Classificational Paradigms: The carrier of grammatical function is the lexical stem. Since only the lexical stem is available as a carrier, a change in the grammatical function of the lexeme by the means of affixes is excluded. The grammatical opposition is between lexical stems. The grammatical function is shown by syntagmatic distribution, predominantly internal to the word form, and the lexeme is classified accordingly (operation of classification). For example, verbs are classified into personal and impersonal verbs according to whether or not they can be used in the first or second person. Nouns are classi-

fied into heterogenous and homogenous nouns according to whether or not they can be used with the plural, etc.

Thus, in the case of central categories such as noun gender, or of peripheral categories such as animacy, homogeneity, transitivity, or telicity the lexical stem is the sole carrier or one of the carriers of grammatical function. This is a remarkable lexical proximity to the lexicon which shows that full (morpho-) grammatical autonomy is restricted to inflectional categories.

The following combination of central ("morphological") categories according to the type of their synthetic paradigms (see the table columns) is complemented by a line with the peripheral categories. This should show that with regard to the formal-functional structure only the inflected categories, due to their high degree of grammaticality, do not correspond to any peripheral ones.

As affixes are more common as carriers of grammatical functions than stems are, the degree of grammaticality increases from the right side to the left. The parenthetical note concerning the analytical structure points once again to the fact that analytical paradigms can be counted among the central categories and among the other peripheral categories as well.

	PRIMARILY OR EXCLUSIVELY SYNTHETIC CATEGORY TYPES			ANALYTIC CATEGORY TYPE
TYPE: (CARRIERS:)	INFLECTED (AFFIX)	DERIVATIONAL (STEM OR AFFIX)	CLASSIFI-CATORY (STEM)	
(STATUS) CENTRAL CATEGORIES:	case and number of noun and adjective; gender of adjectives, mood and tense (both also analyt.), grammat. person, etc.[2]	aspect, voice (also analyt.), comparison of adj./adv. (also analyt.)	noun gender	–
(STATUS) PERIPHERAL CATEGORIES:	–	transposition categories[3]	lexico-grammatical categories[4]	**expansionary categories[5]**

Formal grammaticality of grammatical categories increases to the left

It becomes clear that central and peripheral categories do not necessarily differ from each other in the structure of their word form (if one overlooks the

---

[2] For complete lists see Lehmann (in print), ch. XII: 2.1.1.
[3] Participial category of the adjective and of the adverb, relational adjective, deverbal adverb.
[4] Nouns: animacy, homogeneity, appellatives and proper nouns; adjectives and adverbs: scaled adj./adv.; verbs: telicity, transitivity, lexico-grammatical personality.
[5] Case expansion, modal expansion, aspect expansion (also synthetic).

innermost, inflected core of the center). However, for the expansionary categories, unlike the other categories, analytical word forms dominate, so that they are to be considered the outermost periphery of the category system.

3. The criterion of obligatoriness

From a structuralist viewpoint, obligatoriness is generally considered to be the main criterion for central categories ("morphological" categories, i.e., grammatical in the narrow, traditional sense). However, since we are concerned with integrating all morphologically relevant categories into the grammatical system, thus forming a greater and a graded system, we apply a criterion that is more encompassing than obligatoriness. We not only call those categories grammatical for which every semantically appropriate word of a word class always *has to* be specified, but also those for which it *can* be specified.

The term obligatoriness can be interpreted in different ways. Concerning forms, for example, it means that categories have to be morphologically marked if they are supposed to be considered grammatical categories. This would exclude classificatory paradigms including the gender of the nouns from being grammatical categories as well as, e.g., pf. or ipf. verbs without aspect affix.

According to the most widespread understanding of obligatoriness (cf. Ch. Lehmann 1995, 12; or Plungian 2000, 106), a category is grammatical if it has to be specified when a word of a word class is used. Case, gender of nouns or adjectives, or aspects are obligatory categories, but even an inflected category such as the gender of the verb *(zakryla)* is not grammatical if it is not specified for verbs in the present or in plural forms, while grammatical person in turn is only specified for certain tenses. A further example is tense, which is not realized in the infinitive or the imperative. Categories such as adjectival or adverbial participles are not obligatorily defined along these lines and therefore are not counted among grammatical categories in the narrow sense anyway.

With our broad definition of grammatical categories requiring that they can always – but do not need to – be combined with every semantically suitable word, all categories mentioned are covered. Obligatoriness can be applied as a grading criterion. This means that obligatory categories are definitely central ("morphological"). However, obligatoriness itself is a graded characteristic. For tense, person, the inflected gender of the verb, and the infinitive, additional conditions would have to be formulated for a conditional obligatoriness. They are only obligatory when certain other categories are specified. When, for example, the present or the future imperfect is specified, a grammatical person has to be specified as well.

In any case it can be recognized that the classical trait of full obligatoriness is not only missing in the expansionary categories. On the other hand, all

classificational categories, even lexico-grammatical ones such as transitivity, telicity, animacy, and homogeneity, are obligatory per se because they – being carried by the stem – are inherent to the word form.

4. Semantic lexical proximity for central and expansionary categories

The proximity of the stem to lexical semantics is a measure for the degree of grammaticality. With lexical proximity the degree of grammaticality decreases. The greater the lexical amount in the functions of a grammatical category, the lower the level of grammaticality is. There are extensive zones of semantic lexical proximity, both in the peripheral and in the central categories. However, the proximity is of various kinds: Units of central categories can be lexically *founded*, (a), units of peripheral categories can be lexically *motivated*, (c), units of both kinds of categories can *alternate* with lexical units, (b).

(a) A grammatical function is lexically founded if implied by the lexical meaning (see Lehmann 2001 and in print). The extent of being founded varies. Lexico-grammatical categories are always fully lexically founded, and are hence peripheral. In contrast, central categories are either not founded at all, specifically the inflected categories such as case, number, tense, or they are only partially lexically founded. Hence, in contrast to the lexico-grammatical category of animacy, for the central category of noun gender only one subset of nouns, animate ones (*babuška, djadja*), is lexically founded, since the lexical meaning implies gender. The allegedly greater group of inanimate nouns (*stena*) is not founded, their gender being independent from the lexical meaning.

Derivational categories with a synthetic form have another kind of partial founding in common. Specifically, the function of the verb form or adjective form without a grammatical affix is lexically founded (*zakryt', sil'nyj*), whereas the grammatical affix (*-va-, -ejš-*) is not. Hence for the verbs, the telic lexical meanings imply the pf. aspect. For example, the meaning of *zakryt'* implies that an internal limit has been reached – if the door is closed, it cannot be closed any more. Nearly all verbs that imply reaching an internal limit, i.e., nearly all telic verbs, are by default pf. verbs without an aspectual affix and can only be made into ipf. verbs through an aspectual affix. Thus we can say that the lexical meaning implies the pf. aspect's function. Since with an aspectual affix – see *zakry<u>va</u>t'* – an ipf. verb emerges, the affix has the oppositive function. It is not lexically founded.

The telic lexemes are only one part of the verbal lexicon. Another part is composed of the atelic process verbs, for which the situation is the other way around. For example, the lexical meaning of *plakat'* is atelic (an internal limit is not included in the meaning). It implies the ipf. aspect and can also be made into a pf. aspect by affixation (*za-, poplakat'*). The lexically founded grammatical

function carried by the stem is replaced with the oppositive, derivationally produced function. As for aspect the partner without an aspectual affix is hence usually lexically founded (the meaning of the lexical stem implies the particular grammatical aspect). The affix that forms opposition is, however, only grammatical, not being lexically founded.

Hence, in larger areas of central grammatical categories we can determine a close relation of foundedness between lexical meaning of the stem and grammatical function. For analytical word forms proximity to the lexicon manifests itself as lexical motivation, for central as well as for expansionary categories.

(b) There can be functional alternation between a lexical unit and a central or peripheral function word. (Foundedness is not a relation between two units, but the relation between a meaning or function, which entails another meaning or function.) The Academy Grammar of 1980 excludes analytical forms of the type *bolee sil'nyj* from the central category of the comparative because there is no difference in meaning from the corresponding content word *bolee* (see AG 1980, 256). But it seems reasonable to say that the adjective *bolee* 1 and the auxiliary *bolee* 2 have the same meaning, but are different units, one being a content word and the other one being a function word.

Many auxiliaries show this type of alternation. For many auxiliaries there are content words, i.e., words with lexical meaning, that sound the same (cf. *nužno zakryt'* and *nužnye den'gi, končit' plakat'* and *končit' urok*). Historically, function words distinguished themselves from these in the process of grammaticalization and are recognizable in that they only appear with the infinitive. Hansen (2001) defined the Slavic modal auxiliaries as a category and described their synchronic and diachronic characteristics. "Among the auxiliaries that have the central characteristics, but untypically display non-modal meanings as well, are *dolžen, nado* and *sleduet*" (ibid., 213). He classifies them to the outer center of the category, labeling *nužnyj* and *prichoditsja* as semi-auxiliaries (ibid.). The non-motivated modal auxiliaries are *moč', možno, nel'zja, nadležit*. It becomes apparant that the modal auxiliaries are graded several times with regard to lexical motivation itself.

There is no functional alternation concerning the phasal auxiliaries *stat'* ('to begin') and *perestat'* ('to finish'). But most phasal auxiliaries alternate with full verbs; the lexical meaning becomes clear when they are directly used with noun objects cf. *načat' urok*; the other auxiliaries are *prinjat'sja; prodolžat'; končit', prekratit', brosit'*[6].

---

[6] Since the phasal verbs *pustit'sja, kinut'sja, brosit'sja, ostat'sja* express further specifications beyond phase, they are not auxiliaries, but full verbs. Cf. for example from MAS to *brosit'sja*: Быстро, резким движением устремляться куда-л.; кидаться. То *ostat'sja*: Про-

(c) Motivatedness is a paradigmatic relation between a base, the motivating unit (lexeme or functional word), and another, the motivated unit, which shares nontrivial formal and/or functional components with the base. If the shared components are formal and functional, the motivatedness is a relation of word-formation, e.g., *vvidu < v, vid*; *nesmotrja na < ne, smotret', na*. Many of the more recent or even very new prepositions, which are also less common, are lexically motivated: *vblizi, v zavisimosti ot, po povodu, v tečenie, nesmotrja na* etc. But it is precisely the most common prepositions that are typically not lexically motivated, thus not demonstrating any lexical proximity (*v, s, k, na, nad, iz, ot, pered,…*). Looked at synchronically, they are neither morphologically nor semantically derived. Though most of them also serve as prefixes, they do not necessarily do so for lexical word formation. Several are also grammaticalized as central or peripheral aspectual prefixes (*s-, na-, pro-, raz-, u-, za-* et al.).

The examples show that the expansionary categories exhibit various degrees of lexical proximity. However, on the one hand, for the expansionary categories there are also sufficient areas of lexical distance and indicators of being grammaticalized (cf. in particular Hansen's (2001) studies on modal auxiliaries). In addition, with lexical foundedness there are cases of closer semantic proximity for the central derivational categories and for noun gender as well. We can conclude that this parameter of the lexical relationship is not a reason to keep the expansionary categories from being part of the system of grammatical categories.

5. Functional proximity of central and expansionary categories

Absence of functional proximity to lexical units is a sign of grammaticity, and so is functional proximity to central categories. The expansionary categories are part of the inner grammatical space of their respective functional category in the sense employed by Bondarko (1987). They belong to the functional category centered around case, to modality centered around mood, and to aspectuality centered around aspect. The expansionary category forms together with the central category what could be called a grammatical *hypercategory*. A hypercategory's existence is justified not only by the functional commonality of a central and an expansionary category (by both belonging to a Bondarko category), but also by the fact that the expansionary category functionally complements, differentiates and parallels the corresponding central category, i.e., by their functional proximity.

должить свое пребывание в каком-л. положении, состоянии. *[…] Петр отрицательно покачал головой и остался сидеть.* В. Попов, «Сталь и шлак».

It is clear that the evidence here can only be given with a few examples, especially as very much has already been written about individual cases of these phenomena. I will concentrate on the parallelism and differentiation of aspectual functions, since here the claim of transitional phenomena, unlike the handling, e.g., of case expansion, was demonized for a long time. This is not least due to the consequences of Isačenko's, among others, fatal elimination of any grammatical prefixation from aspect, but also because of the structuralist exclusion of "aktionsarten" from aspect.

That case expansion parallels and differentiates the cases without a preposition is a known fact that has been described in most detail by Bartels (2005) on the Russian *dlja* (in addition to the German *für* and Polish *dla*). Bergmann (2003) shows how this has developed over a long time. That also currently there is a tendency to replace the simple case and how the functions overlap, is shown with the help of a lot of material by Glovinskaja (1996; concerning the differentiation function of prepositions opposed to the simple case, p. 243-7). The fact that the prepositive case is no longer used without a preposition is also significant.

The overlapping of functions in the modal hypercategory is, as it seems, quantitatively lower and less dynamic than for pure cases and case expansion. Overlapping and especially differentiation emerge in deontic modality, e.g., the imperative *zakroj* – modal expansion *tebe nado / pridetsja / sleduet zakryt'*. In alethic and epistemological modality the auxiliaries are best seen as complementing mood.

Let us now turn to functional overlapping in the aspectual hypercategory. This concerns the synonymy of the pf. (perfective) aspect's functions without phasal affixes (*zakryt'*), of analytical aspect expansions with phasal auxiliaries (*načali zakryvat'*) and of pf. aspects with phasal affixes (*zaplakat'*).

I have already pointed out a few times that the *ending* can be profiled not only by phasal auxiliaries such as *končit'* or, even if rarely, by the prefixation of progressive verbs with *ot-*, but also contextually by pf. verbs when limits are reached:

– Ты одеваешься уже полчаса. – Я сейчас <u>оденусь</u>.

Let us now look somewhat more extensively at the profiling of the *beginning* for verbs used in a narrative. This can be realized through affixes or auxiliaries, but also without these, in a purely contextual manner. Being found across languages, it is presumably a universal phenomenon, and apparently reflects a general conceptual need. Hence, even though German lacks grammatical aspect, the Bible passage from the gospel of John *Und Jesus weinte* can be paraphrased by *Und Jesus begann zu weinen*.

In English, which clearly has grammatical aspect, contextual profiling of the beginning with the simple form, i.e., without morphologically marking the

beginning, can be demonstrated with translation variants. First of all, let us consider how the decursive lexeme (the activity verb) *weep* is used in *Jesus wept* (John 11:35) in a delimitative role (in Russian it is the standard function of this verb type's aspectual derivate):

> *Jesus wept at a time when Mary and others were weeping.*[7]

The biblical context from an earlier translation[8] of the passage "*Jesus wept*" cited here is:

> When Jesus saw her weeping, and the Jews who had come along with her also weeping, he was deeply moved in spirit and troubled. "Where have you laid him?" he asked. "Come and see, Lord," they replied. Jesus wept.

Here the decursive lexeme with delimitative function is used as well, but a paraphrase with "*began to weep*" is clearly possible as well. It is more reasonable when it reads more explicitly in the narrative *And Jesus wept* (the "New American Bible"; similar *Now Jesus wept* in the Bible version "The Message"). The "New Revised Standard Version" brings out the phasal verb expressly:

> *Jesus began to weep.*

Ivančev (1971) and Dickey (2000, 203ff) have dealt extensively with the ingressive function of ipf. verbs in the western aspect area of the Slavia. For Czech, Ivančev postulated the ingressive function of the imperfect in the sequence pf.verb–*a*–ipf.verb. The discussion that follows (extensively documented by Berger, in print) led in particular to the initial meaning's general validity being rejected. However, the diverse translation equivalents with ingressive verbs such as *pojti* permit the claim that a verb without a prefix and auxiliary *can* have an ingressive function in Slavic as well.

Marking through a pf. verb with the prefix *za-* stands in contrast to this function. In Russian the synthetic form is clearly preferred (unlike in Polish, see Krumbholz, in progress):

> *Zaplakal* (NK[9]: 2704 hits) – *stal plakat'* (NK: 46 hits) *načal plakat'* (NK: 27 hits)

The marking in Russian being obligatory, is the synthetic form *zaplakat'* grammatical at all? The profiling of the initial phase through *za-* is considered by Dickey (2000, 222) to be lexical (who in any case advocates a grammatical

---

[7]   http://lavistachurchofchrist.org/LVSermons/WhyDoesJohnMentionThatJesusWept.htm (9/1/2012).

[8]   See the synopsis of versions of this sentence including both of the following versions in Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesus_wept) from 9/1/2012.

[9]   Search from 9/1/2012.

delimitative *po-*). Furthermore, he finds support in the literature for several functional elements (unexpectedness, involuntary nature), which in his opinion speak against a "neutral" meaning of the ingressive *za-* (ibid., 224).

To show the grammatical character of the ingressive marking, I have checked the usage of *plakat', poplakat'* and *zaplakat'* as well as *stal / načal plakat'* in combination with *i* ,and' in the Russian national corpus (NK; 9/2/2011). In the context of the preceding *i* the preterite verb is by default narrative. As is well known, in narrativity the multiple pf. aspect in Russian and other Slavic languages produces a sequence by default and the multiple ipf. aspect produces a temporal parallelism by default as well. Here are examples of each of these phenomena with the number of hits (the search was conducted in the NK according to the underlined word forms):

Он упал и заплакал. (with 575 hits; practically all cases checked[10], form sequences).

Дальше он ничего не мог сказать, закрылся занавеской от окна и стал плакать. (with 7 hits, apart from one[11] for sequences)

— Ах, нет! — крикнул мальчик и начал плакать. (also with 7 hits for sequences).

вымолил у нее, как мальчишка, прощение и поплакал (of the 4 hits, this example maintains the strongest sequential character)

после падения в финале бега на 1500 м Хишам лежал на дорожке и плакал (with 552 hits, almost exclusively[12] parallels, see below)

What can be concluded from all this? First of all, narrative sequences really do regularly demand a pf. verb. Secondly, in sequences an ingressive verb is used for certain concepts (another example is *zasmejat'sja*[13]). In the case of the word *plakat'* I presume that the beginning is preferred when it has to do with especially fine-grained[14] (broadly speaking: viewed up close) sequences of events with decursive atelic meanings, when neither the entire action, nor the ending should be denoted. Deviations from the demand to mark the aspectual

---

[10] The first 50 hits checked on 9/6/2011 (of a total of 570) were all narrative with an ingressive function.

[11] For a taxical coincidence (physical and temporal identity): *Тут я не удержался и стал плакать.*

[12] Referring to the aforementioned hits tested on 9/6/2011.

[13] Cf. The following number of hits in NK for the underlined verb forms: *Горький выслушал, засмеялся, повесил трубку.* 6283, *посмеялся* 510, *и начал смеяться* 3, *и стал смеяться* 10, *и смеялся* 301, *ответил Зыбин и засмеялся* 544.

[14] See Marszk (1996).

beginning are extremely rare in Russian, for example, when the actions do not follow directly after each other:

Кямал заснул и <u>плакал</u> во сне. Утром мать спросила: ...

Я свернул в сад, долго и неподвижно лежал на остывающей в ночи земле, слушал, как притихает боль после перевязки раны, отходит сердце, защемлённое в груди, вроде и <u>поплакал</u>, потому что, когда очнулся, лицо было влажное.

Or when the sequence is not fine-grained:

Когда Лев X посетил Сан Лоренцо, где были гробницы его отца и деда, и <u>поплакал</u> над ними.

Summary: The prefixed, i.e., synthetic, ingressive verb can have grammatical character. It can be synonymous or semi-synonymous with an analytical word form with a phasal auxiliary. When fulfilling the grammatical default, using a pf. verb in the context of a sequence and in view of the fact that the analytical phasal word form can be combined with any semantically suitable verb, this is a grammatical phenomenon. Furthermore, synthetic aspect expansion (*zaplakal*) is grammaticalized more strongly because it is synthetic (and in Russian much more frequent) than analytical expansionary aspect (*stal plakat', stal zakryvat'*), on its part more strongly grammaticalized because it can be combined with all semantically appropriate verbs.

6. Conclusion

In view of the extensional complementarity of grammars and dictionaries it is appropriate to understand the term grammatical category in a broad sense. It includes, then, the "remaining" categories in the morphology sections of grammars, including expansionary categories. A list of facts has been presented that make it seem reasonable to see expansionary categories, which almost exclusively form analytical paradigms, as grammatical categories.

It proved fitting to localize the expansionary categories (just as further categories of morphology) as peripheral categories in a system of graded categories. How the categories were graded according to their grammaticality became clear by using different parameters, including the formal parameter (analytical and synthetic paradigms), the parameter of grammatical obligetoriness and that of the functions' proximity to lexical semantics. The grading effects different categories for each parameter, thus resulting in a multi-dimensional grammaticality continuum with central and peripheral categories.

The central and expansionary categories are formally and functionally graded and functionally close to each other. This proximity manifests itself in the

complementarity, differentiation and synonymy of their functions. Due to this proximity they form a case-oriented, modal, and aspectual hypercategory.

Literature

AG 1980 = Švedova, N. Ju. (ed.) 1980. *Russkaja grammatika*. Moskva. Bd. I. 1980.

Bartels, H. 2005. *Dativ oder Präposition. Zur Markierungsvariation im Kontext adjektivischer Prädikate im Deutschen, Russischen und Polnischen.* Oldenburg.

Berger, T. (in print). Ungewöhnliche Verwendungen des Aspekts im Tschechischen: der imperfektive Aspekt in Handlungssequenzen. http://homepages.uni-tuebingen.de/tilman.berger/Texte/texte.html

Bergmann, A. 2003. Zur Entwicklung der Präpositionalkasus zum Ausdruck kausaler und finaler Relationen im Russischen. In: Anstatt A., Hansen B. (eds.) *Entwicklungen in slavischen Sprachen 2*. München, 11-33.

Bondarko, A. V. 1987. *Teorija funkcional'noj grammatiki: Vvedenie. Aspektual'nost', Vremennaja lokalizovannost'. Taksis.* Leningrad.

Bybee, J., Dahl, Ö. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13, 51-103.

Dickey, S. M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic aspect: a cognitive approach.* Stanford, CSLI Publications.

Glovinskaja, M. Ja. 1996. Aktivnye processy v grammatike. In: Zemskaja E. A. (ed.) *Russkij jazyk konca XX stoletija (1985 - 1995)*. Moskva, 237-304.

Hansen, B. 2006. Na poluputi ot slovarja k grammatike: modal'nye vspomogatel'nye slova v slavjanskich jazykach. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2006/2, 68-84.

Hansen, B. 2001. *Das slavische Modalauxiliar.* München.

Ivančev, S. 1971. *Problemi na aspektualnostta v slavjanskite ezici.* Sofija.

Krumbholz, G. (in progress). *Der Ausdruck des Anfangs im Polnischen.* Dissertation Hamburg.

Lehfeldt, W., Kempgen, S. 1999. Formenbildung. In: Jachnow H. et. al. (ed.) *Handbuch der sprachwissenschaftlichen Russistik und ihrer Grenzdisziplinen.* Wiesbaden, 109-149.

Lehmann Ch. 1995. Thoughts on Grammaticalization. München / Newcastle.

Lehmann, V. 1999. Lexikalischer Stamm und grammatische Kategorie. *Slavistische Linguistik 1998*. München, 137-150.

Lehmann, V. 2001. Lexiko-grammatische und Grammatische Kategorien. *Slavistische Linguistik 2000*. München, 105-121.

Lehmann, V. 2003. Grammatische Derivation (Aspekt, Genus verbi, Komparation, Partizip und andere Phänomene zwischen Flexion und Wortbildung). In: Berger T., Gutschmidt K. (Hgg.) *Funktionale Beschreibung slavischer Sprachen.* München, 139-162.

Lehmann, V. (in print). *Linguistik des Russischen.* München.

MAS = Evgen'eva, A. P. 1981-84. *Slovar' russkogo jazyka*. V 4 tomach. Moskva.

Marszk, D. 1996. *Russische Verben und Granularität*. München.

NK = *Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo jazyka*. http://www.ruscorpora.ru/.

Plungjan V.A. 2000. *Obščaja morfologija*. Vvedenie v problematiku. Moskva.

Weiss, D. 2004. Das moderne Russische als antianalytische Sprache (ein Vergleich mit dem Polnischen). In: Hinrichs U. (Hg.) *Die europäischen Sprachen auf dem Wege zum analytischen Sprachtyp*. Wiesbaden (= Eurolinguistische Arbeiten. Volume 1), 263-283.

Žirmunskij, V. M. 1965. Ob analitičeskich konstrukcijach. In: Žirmunskij V. M., Sunik O. P. (eds.) *Analitičeskie konstrukcii v jazykach različnych tipov*. Moskva, Leningrad, 5-57.