

**A CONTRASTIVE STUDY
OF RUSSIAN AND CZECH ASPECT:**

INVARIANCE VS. DISCOURSE

ANNA STUNOVÁ

A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF RUSSIAN AND CZECH ASPECT:

INVARIANCE VS. DISCOURSE

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus
Prof. dr. P.W.M. de Meijer
ten overstaan van een door het college van dekanen ingestelde
commissie in het openbaar te verdedigen in de Aula der Universiteit
op dinsdag 14 december 1993 te 10 uur

door

ANNA STUNOVÁ

geboren te Praag

Amsterdam 1993

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor	: Prof. Dr. W.R. Veder
Co-promotor	: Dr. A.A. Barentsen
Overige leden	: Prof. Dr. A. Bondarko Dr. B.M. Groen Prof. Dr. F.H.H. Kortlandt Prof. Dr. C.J. Ruijgh Dr. A. Siewerska Prof. Dr. Y. Tobin

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has been prepared under the supervision of prof. dr W. R. Veder. I would like to express my gratitude to him for this. To my co-referent dr A. A. Barentsen I am greatly indebted for his guidance in the form of innumerable discussions on aspect as well as his technical aid.

I would like to thank all my colleagues from the Slavic department of the University of Amsterdam and Leiden for their critical remarks on my papers read during our meetings of the "Friday Club" and the "Promovendi Club" in which I was given the opportunity to present my research in its early stages.

To prof. Tobin I am especially grateful for teaching me the Sign-Oriented Approach and methodology of linguistic research which have been of vital importance not only for the present thesis but for my development as linguist in general.

I am also indebted to prof. C.H. van Schooneveld for illuminating discussion of the Prague School and his comment on my attempts to apply this theory in research.

My special thanks are due to dr Anna Siewierska for her insights and support indispensable in the final stages of writing this thesis.

I would like to thank the following scholars for their criticism of my previous publications and earlier versions of the manuscript: prof. A.V. Bondarko, prof. C.V. Chvany, prof. Ellen Contini-Morava, prof. G. Cummings, prof. S. Dik, prof. Eva Eckert, dr Ad Foolen, prof. H. Galton, prof. B. Gasparov, dr Sáva Heřman, dr Nel Keijsper, prof. F.V. Mareš, prof. P. Sgall, prof. D. Soudakoff, prof. N. Thelin, prof. Z. Topolińska and dr Ewa Zakrzewska. Their valuable suggestions led to many improvements. However, none of the above are responsible for my mistakes.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1:	5
THE INVARIANT MEANING OF ASPECT VS. ASPECT AS A DISCOURSE PHENOMENON	7
1. The notion 'invariant meaning' vs. aspect as a discourse phenomenon (an overview)	7
2. Aspectual differences between Russian and Czech	14
2.1 Sequence of events	15
2.2 The historical present	16
2.3 Iterated events	17
2.4 The gnomic present	18
2.5 Negation	19
3. Hypotheses and possible solutions	20
3.1 Hypotheses	20
3.2 Possible solutions	22
3.3 Conclusion	26
Notes	27
CHAPTER 2	31
ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF ITERATIVE EVENTS	
PART ONE	33
1. Introduction	33
1.0 Preamble	33
1.1 Iterated events	35
1.2 Hypotheses	35
1.3 Particular meanings of aspect and iterative contexts	35
1.4 Particular meanings and selection of aspect - a summary	39
2. The data	41
2.1 Expression of iteration in Czech and Russian	41
2.2 Quantitative data	44
2.3 Description of aspect/tense correspondences	47
I. The perfective preterite	47
II. The perfective present	49

III. The imperfective preterite	52
IV. The imperfective present	56
V. Combinations of correspondences	58
3. Conclusion	61
Notes	61
 <i>PART TWO</i>	
THE RUSSIAN IMPERFECTIVE VS. THE CZECH PERFECTIVE	63
1. Aspect in text (Passages)	64
1.1 Habitual situations	64
1.2 Series	67
1.3 Macro-processes	68
2. Additional quantification in Czech	70
2.1 Adverbial expressions denoting frequency	71
2.2 Aspect, grammatical number and quantification	74
2.3 Adverbs of manner	79
 APPENDIX 1	
MORE EXAMPLES OF RESTRICTED AND UNRESTRICTED ITERATION	80
1. Restricted iteration	80
2. Unrestricted iteration	82
2.1 Russian original text - Czech translation	82
2.2 Czech original text - Russian translation	85
 APPENDIX 2	
THE PRESENT TENSE	88
1. Additional indication of iteration in Czech	88
1.1 Adverbial expressions denoting frequency	88
1.2 Quantification of the object	90
1.3 Adverbs of manner	90
 <i>PART THREE</i>	
ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF NEGATED ITERATIVE EVENTS	95
1. Introduction	95
2. The data	96
2.1 Expression of negation in the data	96
2.2 Examples of negated sentences - the present tense	97
2.3 Examples of negated sentences - the past tense	99

CHAPTER 3	105
ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF SEQUENCES OF EVENTS	107
1. Introduction	107
1.0 Preamble	107
1.1 The hypothesis	108
1.2 Aspect in narrative texts	109
1.3 Russian aspect and the sequential chain of events	110
1.4 Comparison of Russian and Czech aspect in the denotation of sequence of events	111
1.5 The ingressive use of the Czech imperfective	113
1.6 Lexical groups of verbs	114
2. The data	
- Examples from Russian and Czech parallel texts	115
2.1 Types of aspectuality	115
2.2 Semantic classe of verbs	118
2.3 State of affairs	123
3. Conclusion	128
APPENDIX	
1. VERBA MOVENDI	130
1.1 <i>šel</i>	130
1.2 <i>jel</i>	136
1.3 <i>bežel</i>	137
1.4 other	139
2. IN MEDIAS RES, PROCESS VS. START OR RESULT	140
2.1 <i>stál</i>	140
2.2 <i>ležel</i>	142
2.3 <i>seděl</i>	142
2.4 <i>byl</i>	143
2.5 <i>měl</i>	145
2.6 other process vs. end state	147
2.7 other process vs. result	148
3. INGRESSIVITY	149
3.1 стал + inf.	149
3.2 начал + inf.	154
4. VERBA SENTIENDI / COGITANDI	155
4.1 sight	155
4.2 hearing	159
4.3 thinking, understanding, remembering, imagining, dreaming	161

5. VERBA DICENDI	163
5.1 prefix за-	163
5.2 prefix по-	164
5.3 статья + inf.	165
5.4 other	165
Note	166
CHAPTER 4	169
CZECH AND RUSSIAN ASPECT IN THE HISTORICAL PRESENT	171
1. Introduction	171
1.0 Abstract	171
1.1 Aspect and tense differences between Russian and Czech in the context of the historical present	171
2. The theory	173
2.1 The historical present	173
2.2 Tense	174
2.3 Aspect	175
2.4 The Czech perfective present - its motivation	177
3. The data	178
3.1 Quantitative data	178
3.2 The Czech perfective historical present - types of verbs	180
3.3 The Czech perfective present in text	183
4. Conclusion	190
Notes	191
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	193
BIBLIOGRAPHY	195
BIBLIOGRAPHY	197
CORPUS	211
SAMENVATTING	213

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, the problem of aspectual differences between Russian and Czech will be addressed. These differences concern discrepancies in the distribution and interpretation of aspectual forms in concrete contexts. Many of the differences in question have been described in a number of contrastive studies, cf.: Bondarko (1959), Eckert (1984, 1985, 1988, 1991), Galton (1976), Isačenko (1960), Ivančev (1961), Křížková (1955), Petruxina (1978, 1983), Širokova (1963, 1971), Smirnov (1971), including the present thesis. The studies provide enough evidence that the aspectual differences between the two languages are certainly not a matter of detail (as Maslov 1985: 31 states), but that they are significant in the sense that they show a systematic character and a considerably high frequency of occurrence.

Unfortunately, the systematic character of the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech has not been acknowledged sufficiently outside contrastive research. This is reflected in the broadly accepted assumption of one common invariant meaning of aspect for all Slavic languages. In the Slavic linguistic tradition, invariant meaning has been considered to be a crucial instrument in linguistic analysis because of the explanatory power assigned to it. Invariant meaning represents the semantic core of a grammatical form and has to be postulated at the level of the language system in such a manner to explain every occurrence of the given form in concrete contexts. As a consequence, the invariant meaning has to be formulated in highly general and abstract terms.

Considering the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech, a serious discrepancy arises between, on the one hand, the theoretical treatment of aspect assuming one common invariant meaning, and, on the other hand, the language facts, i.e. the evidenced systematic differences between Russian and Czech. Obviously, a cross-language invariant meaning can account merely for the similarities between individual languages, but not for their specific characteristics, and consequently, the differences between them.

Although this fact has not been explicitly stated (except in Eckert 1984), a need was felt in contrastive research 'to go beyond invariant

meaning' in explanations of aspectual differences between Russian and Czech. Some solutions have been formulated in terms of differences in the *functional load*, *functional potential* or *functional limits* of the aspectual forms (cf. *Russkaja grammatika* 1979, Petruxina 1985 and Širokova 1971, respectively). However, these notions have not been defined sufficiently to prove operational in the analysis. Another solution in terms of differences in the type of *neutralisation* of the aspectual opposition, i.e. *obligatory neutralisation* in Russian vs. *facultative neutralisation* in Czech (cf. *Russkaja grammatika* 1979), evokes objections, especially for Czech, suggesting a free choice of aspectual forms. This is in contradiction to the existing language rules.

The solution to the problem how to explain the systematic aspectual differences between Russian and Czech should be sought more in the functioning of aspect in discourse, as in the American studies of Russian (cf. Hopper 1979, Chvany 1980, 1985, Timberlake 1982 and Fielder 1990). At the same time, the interaction of aspect with various elements in the context, including types of verbs, types of situation (cf. Eckert 1984), relations between events (successivity, simultaneity) and other grammatical categories such as tense (cf. Bondarko 1992) has to be considered in the analysis.

The discourse approach maintained in this thesis is meant to complement and not to substitute the invariant approach. However, in contrast to the latter approach, the discourse approach has proved to be fruitful in the sense that when applied to data it provides an explanation of the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech in the form of different language-specific discourse strategies valid in each language. A number of partial hypotheses concerning these strategies have been formulated (cf. section 3 of Chapter 1) and tested on data in specific contexts analysed in each chapter. The analyses lead to the following general statement: it can be assumed that it is the discourse level in Russian that contributes substantially to the choice of the aspectual form, while in Czech this level is not of primary relevance. In other words, Russian aspect operates in larger discourse units, it has larger scope, or, a global orientation. On the other hand, Czech aspect concentrates on the internal structure of each individual event and the lexical meaning of the verb involved. In Czech, this local orientation is decisive for the selection of the aspectual form. It can therefore be stated that Czech aspect possesses a more lexical character than Russian.

The present thesis is based on previous publications (cf. Stunová 1986, 1988, 1991, 1992 and *forthc.*) concerning the linguistic problem of aspectual differences between Russian and Czech outlined above. However, on the basis of analyses, the research shifted from the originally maintained invariant approach to the discourse approach, which has turned out to be more fruitful. Therefore, the text has been completely rewritten and more evidence in the form of new data has been added.

The structure of the thesis is as follows. In Chapter 1 (section 1), the invariant and discourse approach to aspect in Slavic languages will be discussed. In section 2, the major aspectual differences between Russian and Czech will be introduced and illustrated by several examples. In section 3, the hypotheses and possible solutions to the linguistic problem will be formulated. An attempt has been made to relate the two approaches, the invariant and the discourse approach, which are believed to be compatible with each other. The remaining chapters contain analyses of the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech in concrete contexts. Each chapter is devoted to one particular aspectual context: Chapter 2 to iterative contexts, Chapter 3 to the context of sequences of events and Chapter 4 to the historical present. The data have been excerpted from a corpus of parallel literary texts, Russian original texts with their (published) Czech translations and *vice versa*. For the sake of objectivity concerning the occurrences of the aspectual forms, native speakers have been consulted.

THE INVARIANT MEANING OF ASPECT
VS.
ASPECT AS A DISCOURSE PHENOMENON

**1. The notion 'invariant meaning' vs. aspect as a discourse phenomenon
(an overview)**

Many influential analyses of aspect in Slavic languages have been conducted within the theoretical framework of European structuralism. Within this framework it was particularly the markedness theory of the Prague Linguistic Circle that was of influence (cf. Kučera 1981: 178). A great deal of attention has been paid to the semantics of aspect and especially to the postulation of its semantic core, i.e. the invariant meaning which consists of one or more semantic features. In the binary aspect opposition perfective vs. imperfective, it is the perfective that is generally considered to be 'marked' by a specific semantic feature, i.e. it contains the given feature. The 'unmarked' member of the opposition is non-committal, i.e. neutral regarding that feature. Speaking in Jakobson's terms, it is the non-statement of A (A = a semantic property): the unmarked imperfective does not say whether the feature is present or absent, i.e. it is neutral.¹ The search for an invariant meaning is crucial for the analysis of aspect in Slavic linguistic tradition. It is based on the axiom that it is primarily the (invariant) meaning of a form that motivates its distribution, i.e. its occurrence in concrete contexts. Therefore, the invariant meaning of a form, belonging to the level of the language system (Saussurian *langue*), has to be postulated in such a manner that it accounts for every occurrence of the given form in concrete contexts (*parole*)².

The semantic features *internal limit* and *totality* have been most frequently postulated in the invariant meaning of the Slavic aspect. According to Jakobson (1932: 76), the perfective aspect in Russian is marked, in contrast to its imperfective counterpart, for the *absolute limit* of the action. This absolute limit, termed also *internal limit* or *terminus*, (Russian *предел*) is considered to be inherent in the nature of the event denoted by the perfective (Vinogradov 1947, Avilova 1976). When the limit is achieved, as a culmination of a process³, the event is exhausted, that is, completed, and a transition to a new state takes place (cf. Maslov

1978: 13). Otherwise formulated, the perfective denotes "a complete situation change" (Barentsen 1985: 61).⁴ However, according to Bondarko (1990: 12), the "situation change" has to be considered as a functional consequence of the basic categorial meaning of the perfective, based on the features *internal limit* and *totality*, i.e. as their concrete realisation at the level of the utterance (*parole*).

A concept similar to *internal limit* is *closure*. However, closure is not conceived as a semantic feature that forms part of the invariant meaning of aspect, but as an *aspectual parameter*. In their typological study, Chung & Timberlake (1985: 239) characterize the Russian aspect as organized around the aspectual parameter *closure*. The use of the perfective is subject to two conditions: the event must be closed both at the predicate level (it is *telic*, i.e. it contains the internal limit), as well as at the propositional level (i.e. the internal limit is achieved)⁵. The perfective is considered to be a narrowly defined category, while the imperfective is broadly defined and expresses various types of events: those that are not closed at the predicate level (*atelic* processes, states and iteratives) and those not closed at the propositional level (*progressives*).

Totality is another central semantic feature postulated in the invariant meaning of the perfective. Dostál (1954: 15, 18) is explicit about the speaker's perspective on events which aspect can express. An event perceived as a whole, that is, in its totality, is denoted by the perfective; the imperfective cannot designate this perspective. The attitude of the speaker to events is not 'subjective', in the sense that he is bound by the grammatical means available. In other words, there is a limited choice between the two types of aspectual morphology. Similar semantic descriptions of the aspectual opposition perfective vs. imperfective by means of the feature *totality* (Russian *целостность*) are also very common in Russian aspectological studies (e.g. Maslov 1959, Bondarko & Bulanin 1967: 75 for Russian, Comrie 1976: 3, 16, cross-linguistically). The two features *internal limit* and *totality* are often viewed as complementary concepts (cf. Bondarko 1971: 18). This is the reason for including both in the definition of the Russian aspect in the Academy grammar (1980: 583):

"The category aspect is a system of two opposed paradigms of verb forms: one set of forms that denote events limited by a boundary (*ограниченное пределью*) in their totality: perfective verbs, and another set of verb forms that do not possess the feature 'total event limited by a boundary': imperfective verbs." (Translation mine, A.S.)

Van Schooneveld postulates the feature *dimensionality* for the perfective. Dimensionality means that the verbal process has boundaries, i.e. the focus would be either on the inception or completion of the action or both, and not on the evolution of the process. Later van Schooneveld replaced the term dimensionality by demarcatedness, which implies more forcefully the *limits* and the *totality* of the referent. *Demarcatedness* "means that the referent is distinct from its background and, if the background consists of units similar to the referent, then the feature means that the referent is distinct from all its peers. It is the same feature which is also characteristic (...) of the phoneme whose semantic invariant has been characterized by Jakobson's 'mere otherness'" (van Schooneveld in p.c.)⁶.

The semantic features as described above represent the general meaning of the perfective and imperfective members of the aspect opposition. The general meaning is the sum (cf. Jakobson's *Gesamtbedeutung*) of the recurrent semantic elements that all concrete occurrences of the aspectual forms share. In other words, the general meaning is a constant in each instance of aspect use, an *invariant*. This invariant meaning is independent of the concrete context and the lexical meaning of the verb. According to Hopper (1982: 4), "a form must have a consistent value or else communication is impossible; we cannot have linguistic forms which derive all their meanings from the context."

Few linguists would deny that a form should possess a constant meaning. However, it is typically the linguists of Praguian orientation who see the crucial nature of the semantic invariant of linguistic forms and therefore choose it as a tool for analysis. For instance, Soudakoff (1987: 229) in her contrastive semantic analysis of Polish and Russian prepositions is explicit about using semantic features (a system of features previously postulated by van Schooneveld) as a tool of analysis. Her detailed study was "meant to demonstrate how semantic features can be used as a tool both for establishing a single distinctive meaning for any preposition within a given language in relation to the other prepositions in that language and for comparing the prepositional systems of two languages". The main goal of Soudakoff's study was "to arrive at an invariant meaning or semantic property implicit in every instance of use". She analyzed contextual usages, but "only as a means for arriving at a single meaning, rather than as ends in themselves" (ibid: 20).

Timberlake (1982: 328) discusses the centrality of invariance in general. According to him, "the invariant can be understood as a necessary (but

probably not sufficient) metastatement of internal consistency among the specific rules that map aspect parameters into morphological aspect”.

Eckert (1984: 155, 175) in her contrastive, data-oriented study of Czech and Russian aspect claims that in order to explain the systematic differences occurring between the languages, it is necessary to go ‘beyond the invariant meaning of aspect’ and analyze primarily the variant meanings, i.e. occurrences of the aspectual forms in concrete contexts. According to Eckert, this is necessary, since “aspect is not an autonomous entity that projects its meaning onto a given verb, but the aspectual morphology of the given verb is a direct response to several influential factors” (ibid: 19), such as the type of verb, the type of verbal action and the temporal context. The aspectual morphology is further considered by this author as “the consequence rather than the primary cause of sentential semantics”.

Apart from the question whether aspect (and other grammatical categories) should be defined in terms of an invariant meaning or not, there are other questions related to this problem that have to be posed. They concern the relation between the scope of aspect and the nature of the invariant meaning. These questions will be discussed below. Invariant meanings postulated in the tradition of the Prague School are strictly of a paradigmatic nature, i.e. they are by definition inherent in the given form and do not refer to something in the context, i.e. outside this form. In other words, there is a clear distinction made between general and contextual meanings, cf. Tobin (1990: 74): “Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) may be considered to be the standard-bearer of the Saussurian notion of invariant meaning as it was later adopted by the Prague School. The hallmark of all of Jakobson’s theoretical linguistic and semantic work was his strict insistence on the rigorous distinction between general and contextual meanings (...)”. Jakobson himself says that ‘properties of meaning’ (i.e. invariant semantic features) are defined as *intrinsic* properties given by the linguistic system itself, not by external reality (cf. 1967: 671). Similarly, van Schooneveld (in p.c.) states: “I do not believe that a linguistic form can have a meaning that refers to something else in the context because I think that all meanings operate paradigmatically without any syntagmatic references. Certain morphemes like prepositions, conjunctions and the reflexive pronoun may contextually imply a reference to the context, but this is only contextual and does not belong to the semantic invariant of the morpheme”.

Until recently, aspect has been treated as a paradigmatic, ‘local-semantic’ phenomenon. The fact that aspect operates also at the syntagmatic

and discourse levels is, in the tradition of the Prague School, accounted for by the assumption that it may also be accompanied by contextual implications of the invariant meaning postulated at the paradigmatic level, i.e. "combinatory features of the aspectual syntagmatics dependent on the compatibility of aspectual forms in the text" (cf. Bondarko 1990: 11). "Although these functions are important, they are secondary and are derivable from the aspectual meaning of the grammatical form" (ibid.).

For instance, the fact that perfectivity tends to create chains of events (sequencing), since two events indicated by perfectives do not usually occur simultaneously, is considered as a contextual effect of perfectivity. Rassudova (1984: 39) states that sequencing "derives from the meaning of the perfective because each successive action in a sequential chain can begin only upon the completion of the preceding action". The perfective is defined by her as marked for *integrality* (cf. also Tobin 1990), that is comparable to the semantic feature *totality*, and *demarcation*, which is equal to the attainment of the internal limit. Similarly, Comrie (1985: 26ff.) argues that sequencing is not part of the meaning of the perfective, but an implicature deducible from the context by general conversational principles as formulated by Grice.

The problem of redefining aspect has arisen at the moment that various studies have clearly shown that, in addition to the paradigmatic level, the syntagmatic and the discourse level can be crucial for the selection of the aspectual form, i.e. the process of its morphological encoding (cf. Hopper 1979, Chvany 1980, 1985, Eckert 1984, Fielder 1990 and other studies in Thelin 1990). Hopper (1982: 5) posits a hypothesis that "the fundamental notion of aspect is not a local-semantic one but discourse-pragmatic". The perfective denotes then a "*completed event in the discourse*." Discourse-oriented studies for aspect generally do not work with invariant meanings, except perhaps for the previously mentioned analysis of the Serbo-Croatian verb system by Jovanović Gorup (1987) within the theoretical frame of Form-Content Analysis. Although this approach is related to the theory of the Prague School and invariant meanings are crucial for the analysis, they are not viewed as necessarily paradigmatic but can be formulated, for instance, in terms of a discourse instruction. Moreover, in this approach, invariant meanings may be considered not as absolute, but relative, or scalar. For instance, for the system of the Serbo-Croatian verb Gorup postulates *Focus* in the invariant meaning of the aspectual forms that differ with respect to each other in the degree of *Focus*: most - more - less *Focus*.

However, there also is a number of semantic definitions based on a more traditional, or Jakobsonian concept of invariant meanings that account explicitly for the syntagmatic and discourse characteristics of aspect⁷. They are constituted either by adding a syntagmatic feature (*juncture, sequential connection*) to a paradigmatic feature such as *totality* (Forsyth 1972, Barentsen 1985), or by concentrating entirely on the syntagmatic characteristics of aspect (*sequentiality, successivity*). In the latter definitions the roles are reversed with respect to the traditional Praguean view: an inherent characteristic of aspect such as *totality* or *internal limit* is considered as an implicature of sequentiality or successivity (Gurevič 1971 and Galton 1976). These semantic definitions will be discussed below.

Forsyth defines aspect in Russian by means of two semantic features: 1) *totality* and 2) a single specific *juncture*. *Totality* can be interpreted as referring to the paradigmatic level, while *juncture* can be viewed as operating at the paradigmatic, the syntagmatic and the discourse level, considering what Forsyth (1972: 495) states: "Aspect in modern Russian may be defined as a system based on the binary opposition of sets of verb forms, of which one, the perfective, inherently expresses the action as a total 'event' summed up with reference to a single specific 'juncture' (i.e. a point, essentially in the speaker's consciousness, focusing either inwardly on the process of the action itself, e.g. its 'beginning' or 'end', or outwardly on a moment in 'objective' time or in a 'subjective' narrative context). The other, the imperfective, does not inherently say anything about this meaning." (Emphasis mine, A.S.)

Barentsen (1985) postulates an invariant meaning for the Russian aspect as follows. The semantic structure of the Russian perfective is hypothesized as consisting of three hierarchically ordered features: 1. the *event unit* associated with the concept of a *specific limit*, 2. *totality* and 3. *sequential connection*. The first two features refer to the internal structure of the event. They are comparable to the concepts *internal limit* and *totality* discussed above. The third feature, *sequential connection*, is meant to account for the functions of aspect in larger contexts. It is an instruction in the sense that the 'total event', i.e. 'the complete situation change', must be thought of as a link in a greater whole, emphasizing the contrast between a preceding and/or a following situation. When the Russian perfective is used, all three features are necessarily present. Relative to its perfective counterpart, the Russian imperfective is defined as lacking at least one of these features, beginning with the one which is ranked highest (i.e. the *sequential connection*). In Barentsen's view this means that in every imperfective the feature *sequential connection*

is denied. The denial of a feature is meant as an explicit negation of the semantic feature, which can be translated in Jakobsonian terms as the statement of non-A, in contrast to the general treatment of unmarkedness in terms of the non-statement of A.

Gurevič (1971) discusses both the inherent characteristics of aspect (such as ingressivity, resultativity or processuality) as well as its outer, relational characteristics (the indication of relations between events, such as anteriority, successivity and simultaneity). However, the invariant meaning of aspect is defined solely at this latter level: "The aspect category in Russian can be presented as an opposition between the sequential meaning of forms of the perfective and the non-sequential meaning of the imperfective" (Gurevič 1971: 79). Sequentiality is generalized and not limited to a specific context, therefore, the prototypical use of the perfective as a link in a sequential chain of events is considered as a contextual variant that follows from the inherent sequential meaning of the Russian perfective. Ingressivity and resultativity which refer to the structure of events at the paradigmatic level are also considered variants that follow from the sequential meaning of the Russian perfective.

Opposed to the views of Bondarko, Rassudova and Comrie as discussed above, Galton adheres a similar idea to that of as Gurevič. According to Galton (1976: 11), "Slavic languages (as well as others) have created special morphological means for the presentation of the temporal succession, in the perfective aspect (pv.), as well as of its contradictory opposite - immutability, a state lasting unchanged while other events change; this is done by the imperfective aspect (ipf.)". Galton further maintains that "succession (i.e. the very essence of time⁸) is the invariant meaning of the perfective" and refers to Gvozdev (1958: 114) who had previously associated the concept of successivity with the meaning of aspect: "The succession of events one after the other is expressed by using verbs of the perfective aspect in the majority of the meanings proper to it". In Galton's theory, paradigmatic notions such as *limit* do not imply succession, but *vice versa*: the limitation of an event emerges naturally from its location on the time axis between preceding and following events (ibid.: 12). Similarly, the widespread concept of *completion* (a concept comparable to *limit*) used in definitions of aspect is criticized as too narrow: "*completion* very often does characterize one event succeeded by another, but adheres too much to the character of the action itself, rather than its temporal structure, to be serviceable in all occurrences of the pv. aspect such as should be covered by an invariant meaning" (on this point cf. also Galton 1980).

Above various problems concerning the semantics of aspect were discussed. One of the major questions was how to account for the syntagmatic and discourse characteristics of aspect in its semantic definition. The following solutions can be distinguished.

1. Traditionally, aspect has been treated as a paradigmatic, i.e. a local-semantic phenomenon. Its syntagmatic and discourse characteristics are viewed as a contextual implication, therefore these are not accounted for in the semantic definition of aspect.

2. In some approaches (Barentsen, Forsyth), aspect is defined at two levels at the same time by means of several hierarchically ordered features, accounting for both the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic or discourse characteristics of aspect.

3. In contrast to solution 1, in this solution, the internal characteristics of aspect such as the *internal limit*, *completion* or *totality* are considered as given, or implied by the position of the event denoted by the verb form on the time axis within a larger, discourse context. For instance, in a chain of events, it is successivity that is decisive for the choice of the perfective. When the event is backgrounded, it is simultaneity that determines the internal structure of the event (e.g. as a process), expressed by the imperfective.

4. In discourse approaches, like in solution 3, the discourse level is considered to be important or decisive for the morphological encoding of aspect. However, invariant meanings are not the primary concern of the research, and if they are, as is the case with the Form-Content Analysis, they are conceptually different from the meanings used in Slavic linguistics as originally defined by Jakobson.

2. Aspectual differences between Russian and Czech

In this section, the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech observed in various contrastive studies (cf. Bondarko 1959, Eckert 1984, 1985, Galton 1976, Isačenko 1960, Ivančev 1961, Křížková 1955, Petruxina 1978, 1983, Širokova 1963, 1971, Smirnov 1971, Stunová 1986, 1988, 1991, 1993 etc.) are presented in brief summary.

Two basic types of differences can be distinguished between Russian and Czech:

1. differences in the distribution (occurrence) of the aspectual forms,
2. differences in the interpretation of the same form.

Both types of aspectual differences can be divided into two subtypes based on the form used:

ad 1. a) the Russian perfective corresponds to both perfective and imperfective in Czech,

b) where only the Russian imperfective occurs, both imperfective and perfective occur in Czech.

ad 2. a) Russian and Czech perfectives have different interpretations in each language

b) and therefore so do the imperfectives.

A necessary methodological condition for this analysis is that the Russian and Czech contexts be identical or show a high degree of equivalence.⁹ Most of the following examples are cited from Russian and Czech texts, representing various styles and registers. Original Russian texts have been used with their (published) Czech translations or vice versa. To minimize the possible influence of the translator, the texts have been checked by native speakers. Below, the most typical contexts in which the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech occur will be introduced.

2.1 Sequence of events

The prototypical examples of the aspectual difference 1a, i.e. where the Russian perfective corresponds to both the perfective and imperfective in Czech, are found in narratives. Events are presented as a successive chain; the consistent perfective morphological marking in Russian serves to carry the narrative line. In Czech, this consistent use of the perfective is not obligatory: a string containing both aspectual forms can easily be interpreted as a chain of successive events, often without additional lexical markers.

After the analysis of numerous examples of sequences of events it became clear that the Russian aspect operates primarily at the level of the whole sequence: foregrounded events are consistently marked by the perfective irrespective of their internal structure. In Czech, the selection of aspect depends more on the internal structure of the individual events. Both the perfective and the imperfective occur within a sequence of events, depending on the internal structure of the event denoted.

The following example, which is part of a larger narrative, contains three imperfectives in Czech which correspond to three perfectives in the Russian translation.

- (1) Když mě **viděl**ⁱ, **poroučel**ⁱ se té paničce a **šel**ⁱ ke mně. (Čapek)
Увидев^p меня, он **распростался**^p с дамочкой и **подошел**^p ко мне.
 When he **saw** me, he **parted** from the lady and **approached** me.

If the three events are to be interpreted as sequential, Russian does not allow the imperfective. The choice of this form would have a different effect than in Czech: events would be viewed as simultaneous processes that are intertwined in a kind of continuum. If processes in Russian, denoted by imperfectives only, are to be seen as successive, additional sequential markers are needed, such as 'first', 'and then' etc. (cf. Rassudova 1984: 39). In Czech, a sequence of three perfectives as in Russian is possible, but consistent perfective marking is not obligatory. In the majority of cases, a mixture of both aspectual forms is encountered in Czech narratives: the narrative line is not solely carried by the perfective aspect as it is in Russian. More examples and an analysis in more detail can be found in Stunová (1988) and chapter 3 of the present study.

2.2 The historical present

The use of aspect in the context of the historical present is an example of the aspectual difference 1b, i.e. the Russian imperfective vs. the Czech perfective. In the narration of events that occurred in the past, the historical present is used as a technique to make the story 'more vivid'. Crucial events are highlighted by the contrast in the use of the verb forms. Not only is there a tense switch from past to present, cancelling the distance between the event and the listener, but also an aspectual switch from the perfective to the imperfective. In Russian this switch is obligatory (cf. e.g. Bondarko 1959). This holds irrespective of the internal structure of the event. In the Russian historical present, all kinds of events are denoted by the imperfective: both processes, normally expressed by the imperfective, as well as results, which are typically denoted by the perfective. In other words, the choice of the imperfective is determined at the macro-level of the narrative and not at the level of the internal structure of the individual event as is the case in Czech.

In Czech both aspects are encountered in the denotation of the narrative line in the past, as well as in the historic present. The choice of aspect is not determined at the discourse level. It depends, in contrast to Russian, primarily on the internal structure of the event, which is frequently transparent. A detailed analysis will be given in Chapter 4.

The following example illustrates what has been said above:

- (2) Ale zrovna na krok před chodcem se mu **udělá**^P v hlavě tma a celý svět se s ním pojednou **zatočí**^P; náhle vidíⁱ zblízka, zblizoučka pár pronikavých očí, jak se do něho vpíchlý, narazíⁱ na něčí rameno, **vypraví**^P ze sebe cosi jako “promiňte” a vzdalujeⁱ se s křečovitou důstojností. Po několika krocích **se zastaví**^P a **ohlédne**^P; ten člověk stojíⁱ a díváⁱ se upřeně za ním. Prokop **se sebere**^P a odcházíⁱ trochu rychleji (...). (Čapek)

Но ровно за шаг до прохожего в глазах у него **темнеет**ⁱ, и все вокруг **пускается**ⁱ в бешенную пляску; вдруг близко, совсем близко он видитⁱ пару цепких глаз, - они так и вонзились в него, - натываетсяⁱ на чье-то плечо, **выдавливает**ⁱ из себя нечто вроде «извините» и удаляетсяⁱ судорожно стараясь сохранить достоинство. Сделав несколько шагов, Прокоп **останавливается**ⁱ и **оборачивается**ⁱ: человек стоитⁱ, пристально смотрит ему вслед. Прокоп **срывается**ⁱ с места, торопясь уйти (...).

But just a step before the man who passed, it **gets dark** in his head and the whole world **is** suddenly **revolving** with him; suddenly he sees close by, very near, a couple of penetrating eyes that pierced him, he hits someone's shoulder, **utters** something like “excuse me” and goes further with a cramped dignity. After several steps he **stops** and **looks back**; that man is standing and looks piercingly at him. Prokop pulls himself together and goes away quickly (...).

2.3 Iterated events

In the context of iterated events, in Russian the imperfective is a dominant form whereas in Czech the perfective occurs frequently. Iterated events have been analyzed as macro-events consisting of a number of micro-events (cf. Timberlake 1982, Stunová 1986). This is of importance

for the selection of the aspectual form. It has been shown that the Russian aspect operates primarily at the level of the macro-structure, while in Czech the internal structure of the individual micro-event is relevant. Consider the following example:

- (3) Byl v několika drogeriích, a jakmile **řekl**^P: "Prosím lahvičku oleje posvěceného od biskupa", **dali**^P **se** někde do smíchu a jinde **skryli**^P **se** uděšení pod pultem. (Hašek)

He had been to several pharmacies, but as soon as he **uttered**: "Please, a little bottle of oil consecrated by the Bishop", in some places they **started** laughing, in others, in horror, they **hid** behind the counter.

Швейк побывал в нескольких аптекарских магазинах, но как только **произносил**ⁱ: "Будьте любезны, бутылочку елее, освященного епископом", всюду или **фыркали**ⁱ ему в лицо или в ужасе **прятались**ⁱ под прилавок.⁰

(...) everywhere they **laughed** him in the face or, in horror, they **hid** behind the counter.

The substitution of the Czech perfectives by their imperfective counterparts would cause various 'undesired' effects. For instance, with the second verb *dali se*, the corresponding imperfective would cause the effect of distributiveness and hesitation within each occurrence: now and then one person and then another, started to laugh and stopped again. The effect evoked by the imperfective would be in such a case farfetched, the perfective is therefore the appropriate form. In Russian, no such effects can be observed, because the imperfective functions as a signal of iteration and does not reveal anything about the internal structure of the individual micro-event. These and other problems are analyzed in detail in Chapter 2.

2.4 The gnomic present

Events denoted by what is called the gnomic present, are general truths about activities of people and their environment, such as proverbs or physical laws, valid at any time and therefore usually not located at any specific moment. Such 'omnitemporal' statements valid also at the moment of speech can be expressed by the perfective present in Czech (cf. Kopečný 1962: 31ff. and Townsend 1985: 292 on the 'characterizing' and 'atemporal' perfective present in Czech)¹⁰. A general truth is an

abstraction, based on observations of many (similar) concrete situations, a kind of a macro-event. It is often an independent and self-evident statement. The behaviour of the Russian and Czech aspect in this case is very similar to that in the denotation of iterated events.

In Russian, the subtle distinctions in the structure of the individual events that are generalized in the form of a general truth expressed by the gnomic present are not considered. The choice of aspect is determined at a higher, a more abstract level of the macro-event, i.e. the general truth. In Czech, both aspects occur: the choice depends on the internal structure of the individual event.

- (4) U kovů odpor při velmi nízkých teplotách úplně **zmizí**^P.

У металлов при очень низкой температуре сопротивление полностью **исчезает**ⁱ.

By very low temperatures the resistance of metals completely **disappears**.
(adapted from Petruxina 1983: 164)

The perfective in Czech indicates that the resistance of metals completely disappears in each instance. The corresponding imperfective 'mizí' can easily be interpreted as a process, i.e. non-totality, leading to the factual disappearance at the level of each concrete case. A general interpretation as in Russian would be also possible, but to exclude this ambiguity, the perfective is used. Some examples of instances of the gnomic present can be found in Part Two of Chapter 2 under the present tense.

2.5 Negation

Iteration and negation are, in fact, a kind of quantification that can have very similar effects on the behaviour of aspect. In Russian, the imperfective is dominant, whereas in Czech the perfective occurs frequently. Consider the following example:

- (5) Nikdy **jsem** nic **neudělal**^P naschvál ... (Hašek)

Никогда я ничего **не делал**ⁱ нарочно ...

I never **did** anything on purpose ...

More instances of negated iterative events are given in Chapter 2.

3. Hypotheses and possible solutions

In view of the above considerations, a number of hypotheses concerning the functioning of the Russian and Czech aspect in concrete contexts will be formulated, and several possible explanations of the systematic aspectual differences between the two languages in relation to the invariant meaning of aspect will be entertained.

3.1 Hypotheses

Following the Praguian and the related Sign-oriented approach, it may be assumed that it is the invariant meaning of the form that motivates its distribution in concrete contexts. The invariant meaning is meant to cover all the possible concrete instances of a form. Therefore, it has to be formulated in very general terms which can sometimes give the impression of vagueness. This fact, as well as the relative inaccessibility of meaning as such, can form an obstacle in the search for solutions to linguistic problems. In order to overcome these obstacles, and to address the problem of the systematic aspectual differences between Russian and Czech more directly, I decided to first formulate a number of hypotheses based on the observation of concrete data. The strategy is to step from these relatively concrete hypotheses to more abstract ones, in which the language-specific invariant meanings can later be formulated. This type of inductive strategy is widely used both in linguistics and scientific research in general.

The following two hypotheses have been formulated on the basis of the observation of data. The hypotheses have been divided according to the concrete contexts in which the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech occur.

Hypothesis 1.

An iterated event can be defined as a set of identical sub-events. In this complex structure, two separate levels can be distinguished: 1. the level of the individual sub-event as a part of the whole set, i.e. the micro-level, and 2. the level of the whole set, at which the individual sub-event is not necessarily taken into account, i.e. the macro-level. These levels do not contribute equally to the selection of the aspectual form: one of the two levels is dominant. The degree of relevance of these levels in the process of morphological encoding of aspect differs between Russian and Czech. On the basis of the data I assume that for Russian it is prima-

rily the level of the whole iterative macro-structure that is decisive for the selection of the aspectual form.

On the other hand, Czech concentrates on each individual sub-event and its internal structure, which is reflected in the choice of the aspectual form. In other words, Russian aspect operates at the level of the whole set, while Czech aspect operates at the level of members of the set, i.e. the individual sub-event.

A similar principle is valid for a number of other contexts in which an event can be viewed as a complex structure. They include iterated events in the present tense, i.e. general truths expressed by the gnomic present (see section 1.2 of this chapter), as well as absolute negation (illustrated by a selection of data in Chapter 2.). Also in these contexts, the aspectual difference: the Russian imperfective vs. the Czech perfective occurs.

Hypothesis 2.

In narrative contexts, particularly in the denotation of sequences of successive events and the historical present that form part of the narrative line, a similar principle, as described in Hypothesis 1, holds. However, while Hypothesis 1 applies minimally to one complex structure denoted by a single verb, Hypothesis 2 extends to complexes of events involving more than one verb form. It concerns series of events that are ordered in succession. In sequences of successive events, the Russian perfective operates at the level of the whole sequence, irrespective of the character of the individual event, or the lexical class to which the verb belongs. Outside sequences, events, such as states, or events involving verbs of specific lexical classes, such as *verba sentiendi*, are preferably expressed by the imperfective. However, within sequences of successive events, these 'latent imperfectives' are normally perfectivized. In other words, in Russian, the principle of orientation to larger wholes (as in the case of sequences of successive events) is dominant in the process of selection of aspect.

Similarly, the historical present in Russian, irrespective of the internal structure of the individual events, is expressed by the imperfective. In this language, such discourse rules operate within one tense, i.e. either within the past tense when a sequence of successive events is morphologically marked as consistently perfective, or within the present tense, when the events are marked consistently by the imperfective.

In Czech, the situation is different. Irrespective of the tense, each individual event within a sequence of successive events, or in the histor-

ical present, is morphologically marked depending on its internal structure and/or the lexical class to which the verb belongs.

On the basis of Hypothesis 1 concerning the functioning of aspect in complex structures involving minimally one verb, and Hypothesis 2, referring to the functioning of aspect in larger discourse structures, such as sequences of events, a generalisation can be made in the form of Hypothesis 3 formulated below.

Hypothesis 3.

This hypothesis is a generalisation based on the previous two hypotheses. It can be assumed that the discourse level contributes substantially to the choice of the aspectual form in Russian, while this level is not of primary relevance in Czech. The Czech aspect concentrates on the internal structure of each individual event and the lexical meaning of the verb involved, i.e. on the paradigmatic level as such. It is this level that is decisive for the selection of the aspectual form in Czech. It can therefore be said that the Czech aspect possesses a more lexical character than the Russian aspect. Generally speaking, the Russian aspect operates in larger wholes, i.e. it has a broader scope, while the Czech aspect focusses on each individual event.

3.2 Possible solutions

With respect to the problem of the systematic aspectual differences between Russian and Czech, several possible solutions will be discussed and, if possible, related to the hypotheses proposed above.

Solution 1.

Aspect in the Slavic languages is viewed as one system (cf. Heltberg 1981 for the North Slavic languages Russian, Czech and Polish). This assumption implies, in fact, that the one form - one meaning principle is involved from one language to another and that there is a universal system of forms out of which languages would choose. Invariant meanings of Russian (Polish) and Czech aspect would therefore not only be formulated in the same terms but they would be considered *identical*. Within this theoretical frame the aspectual differences between the languages, e.g. the fact that in similar contexts, different forms are chosen in each language thus cannot be explained by a difference in the meaning. Other explanations, necessarily outside the language system, have been sought.

Heltberg (ibid.: 48) sees the aspectual differences between the languages as "some accidental differences of use and some (more) typical differences in norm, but (with) no directed, or determined, genuine differences of a systematical character". This assumption can be easily refuted by the extensive Russian-Czech data collected for the present research and the contrastive studies mentioned above which prove the opposite. Similarly, the construction of one aspectual system that languages share meets necessarily with the strong objections as formulated in Solution 2.

Solution 2.

Invariant meanings of aspect in Slavic languages are defined in the same terms (for instance by means of the semantic feature *totality* or *demarcatedness* for the perfective). However, although formulated in the same terms, the invariant meaning in one language is not considered to be identical with the invariant meaning in the other language. Van Schooneveld (in p.c.) states: "The question whether the two aspects have the same meaning in different languages is automatically answered in the negative. If we think of linguistic systems as systems that are autonomous relative to each other (...), and that is an idea which has always been fundamental with the Prague School), and if two languages are each coherent systems, that is to say systems where the units condition each other (which is implied by the Prague concept of structure), and those two languages are different, then that means that if we compare corresponding units in the two languages, for instance the Czech preposition *v* and the Russian preposition *в*, they must differ in the same way as do the Russian preposition *за* and the Czech preposition *za*. In fact since both *v* and the perfective aspect are marked by demarcatedness, we must from the different usages of the perfective aspect in the two languages be able to predict the differences in usage of the preposition *v* in the respective languages". In sum: "The meaning of aspect is of course not the same in Czech and Russian, just as the meaning of the Czech genitive is not the same as the Russian genitive" (ibid.).

In his analyses, van Schooneveld uses a subtle system of six features operating at at least four levels of deixis applicable to any language system. This approach is based on the tenets of the Prague School as well as the modern cognitive research. This system has been successively applied as a tool of analysis in contrastive research by van Schooneveld and his students. However, to be able to exploit the specific value that van Schooneveld has added to the Prague School studies and linguistic research in general, for concrete analysis, a thorough methodological

preparation would be necessary. Unfortunately, I became acquainted with this apparently fruitful approach in the late phase of the present study. It has been only for this reason that I have not followed this line.

As an important factor that could explain differences between languages van Schooneveld proposes the *semantic coefficient*, cq. the *semantic dominant* (cf. 1983: 331-332), which would be language-specific. The semantic dominant is conceived as adding language-specific adjustments to any interlinguistic category like aspect, tense, case or the lexical system. However, as van Schooneveld himself stated, more research would be needed at this point to arrive to a solution to this problem.

Solution 3.

Invariant meanings are postulated in different terms explicitly as language-specific. For instance, for Russian in terms of a semantic feature (e.g. the *sequential connection* of Barentsen 1985) in addition to the generally postulated semantic feature *totality*, and for Czech in terms of the current feature *totality* only. This is done in order to explain the systematic aspectual differences between Russian and Czech (cf. Stunová 1991).

However, there are two points to be taken seriously:

1) Thinking the traditional Praguian approach through, there must be language-specific invariant meanings (according to van Schooneveld, as mentioned in Solution 2). "However, this is a deductive statement based on, as Sangster calls it, "the principle of relative autonomy", but this statement should be tested" (ibid.). This point will be further discussed in Solution 5.

2) When postulating semantic features, such as *succession*, *sekventnost'*, *sequential connection* or *focus* in the invariant meaning of aspect, clearly, the original paradigmatic concept of invariant meaning, as had been formulated by the Prague School, has been revisited because these features operate at a 'higher', syntagmatic or discourse level.

At this moment, there are three types of solutions left with respect to the problem of how to explain the systematic aspectual differences between languages considering invariant meanings, or other solutions abandoning invariance:

1) Either to adhere strictly to the tenets of the Prague School with its concept of invariant meaning as being exclusively paradigmatic, and therefore opt for solution 2,

2) to follow a *revised version* of the notion invariant meaning as formulated in solution 3 and 4,

3) to offer an alternative hypothesis, still considering the invariant meaning (see for discussion Solution 5), or

4) to abandon the concept of invariant meaning altogether.

Solution 4.

Another solution to the problem to be proposed here is the possibility to postulate a common feature in the invariant meaning of aspect in both languages, for instance *totality*. The difference between this solution and solution 2 is that the feature would operate at a different level in each language. In Czech the feature *totality* would be situated at a lower level than in Russian where this feature would operate at a 'hierarchically higher' level, comparable to the one at which the features *succession*, *sekventnost'* and *sequential connection* are postulated. In this manner, the systematic differences between the two languages, i.e. the fact that Czech aspect operates primarily at the paradigmatic level and the Russian aspect at a higher, syntagmatic (or discourse) level, could be accounted for. However, as has been said above, the invariant meaning postulated for Russian would probably not possess the strict paradigmatic nature in the sense of the tenets of the Prague School.

Solution 5.

As has been mentioned in the Introduction, a necessity was felt to go 'beyond invariant meaning' in contrastive research in order to explain the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech, although this fact has not been explicitly stated (except perhaps in Eckert 1984). Obviously, a cross-language invariant meaning can account merely for the similarities between the languages, but not for the differences between them.

In the Slavic contrastive research, postulation of language-specific invariant meanings has been generally avoided, except for van Schooneveld and his disciples (e.g. Soudakoff) who have been, in contrast to others, very explicit at this point (see above).

Below a group of solutions to the linguistic problem of the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech will be presented. The unifying factor is that although the authors acknowledge the existence of invariant meaning, they clearly seek the solution outside this domain. We mention the following solutions in terms of:

1. the differences in the additional characteristics of the *functional load* of the aspectual forms (cf. *Russkaja grammatika* 1979: 239)

2. differences in the *functional limits* of the aspectual forms (cf. Petruxina 1983, Širokova 1971)

3. differences in the *functional potential* of the aspectual forms (apart from the semantic functions including also other, expressive or stylistic functions (cf. Petruxina 1985)

4. differences in the *intercategorical potential*, i.e. the interaction between the central categorial (i.e. invariant) features of aspect and features belonging to other categories, i.e. tense (localisation of the event/situation in time), aspect/taxis properties (succession and simultaneity), (cf. Bondarko 1992: 20)

5. differences in the type of *neutralisation* of the aspectual opposition, i.e. in Russian *obligatory* vs. *facultative neutralisation* in Czech (cf. *Russkaja grammatika* 1979: 772), and

6. differences in the interdependence between aspect, types of verbs, types of verbal action and the context (cf. Eckert 1984).

3.3 Conclusion

Although the hypotheses presented above are based on observational facts, they possess a sufficient degree of generalisation in the sense that a) they can be applied to a larger number of contexts and b) they are compatible with the five solutions to the linguistic problem that have been proposed above. The compatibility of the hypotheses with the solutions will be discussed below.

ad 1. The hypotheses proposed above could be compatible with this (rather weak) solution in the sense that they would point to the cause of the differences between the languages in the choice of aspectual forms in terms of language-specific discourse strategies in concrete contexts.

ad 2. In the frame of solution 2, the different principles formulated in the hypotheses would form a logical consequence of the fact that the invariant meanings of aspect (although defined in the same terms) are *by definition* different. Further, these principles form a contextual implication of the paradigmatic invariant meanings by which they are motivated.

ad 3 and ad 4. Similarly to 2, the principles defined in the hypotheses are to be viewed as a direct sequel of the language-specific invariant

meanings by which they are motivated. So would the fact that Russian aspect operates in larger wholes, and that this is relevant for the choice of the aspectual form, be viewed as motivated by a semantic feature (such as *succession*, *sekventnost'*, *sequential connection*, or *totality*) postulated a 'hierarchically higher' level within the invariant meaning of the Russian aspect. However, as has been said above, this concerns a *revised version* of the Praguian notion *invariant meaning* which is originally strictly paradigmatic. On the other hand, the fact, formulated in the hypothesis, that the Czech aspect focusses primarily on the individual event which is decisive for the selection of the aspectual form, would find its motivation in a strictly paradigmatic feature, such as *totality*.

ad 5. Similarly to the studies mentioned in 5, in the present research, although the existence of invariant meaning has been acknowledged, the necessity 'to go beyond invariant meaning' in the analysis of the concrete data became apparent. As has been argued above, invariant meanings as such, without an additional apparatus (cf. van Schooneveld) do not seem to possess enough explanatory power for the problems addressed in the Slavic contrastive research at this moment. The advantages and disadvantages of the majority of the above mentioned approaches have been discussed. Because of their disadvantages, a number of discourse-oriented hypotheses have been formulated to help to deal with the phenomenon of the aspectual differences between Russian and Czech.

NOTES

¹ Markedness theory has been a controversial issue in Slavic linguistics for more than fifty years (cf. for more discussion Dokulil 1958, Glovinskaja 1982 and Kučera 1984). The relation between the members of a binary morphological opposition and the status of the unmarked member in particular, was not always clear due to its polyinterpretability as formulated in the original concept of Jakobson (1932: 22), saying about the unmarked member of the opposition that it does not express the semantic feature (which the marked member contains), but it does not exclude it either, i.e. "sie besagt nicht ob A anwesend ist oder nicht" (cf. also Bondarko & Bulanin 1967: 7).

² The theoretical principles discussed are those of the Prague School and its followers, continued in the Sign-Oriented Approach. The Sign-Oriented Approach is a set of linguistic theories which can be situated within the general European structuralistic framework. It is based on three cognate theories: that of de Saussure, the Prague School (including van Schooneveld) and the Form Content Analysis (initiated by Diver in the late sixties at the Columbia University, continued by e.g. García, Contini-Morava, Kirsner, Reid, Tobin). These theories share one common

definition of language as a flexible 'system of systems' used by human beings to communicate. In this view, the fundamental unit of language and therefore also of the analysis, is the sign, consisting of a form and a meaning which are inseparable. It is primarily the meaning of the sign that motivates its distribution in language. The theory aims to bridge the gap between the abstract code of the language system (Saussurian *langue*) and its concrete individual realizations in communication (*parole*). In other words, this implies that in order to explain the concrete observable language phenomena (at the level of *parole*), invariant meanings of signs have to be postulated at the level of the language system (*langue*). For further explanation of the theory and its application in the analysis see e.g. Tobin 1988 and 1990.

³ This type of event can be characterized as an accomplishment (in the sense of Vendler). However, Russian perfective cannot be confined to this type of event, it can denote also achievements (point-like events), ingressivity, quantified states (delimitative and perdurative perfectives) etc. For a recent classification of events with respect to the Russian aspect, see Padučeva (1990) who accounts for this problem.

⁴ Some authors define the semantics of the perfective by means of the feature 'change' (not the 'situation change' above), e.g. Antinucci & Gebert (1977: 19), Chung & Timberlake (1985: 213), Guiraud-Weber (1988) and also Topolińska (in personal communication).

⁵ Timberlake (1982: 310) establishes the following 'nested levels' in the semantic structure of events with respect to aspect:

- a) the lexical level (including base, verb, predicate),
- b) the propositional level (predicate plus its position in temporal and modal space),
- c) the narrative level (proposition plus its relationship to other events in discourse), also termed as discourse level.

The distinction between the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic level is based on the Saussurian dichotomy: *langue* (the language system) vs. *parole* (its concrete realisations in contexts). For an application of this distinction to the semantics of the Russian aspect, cf. Bondarko (1971: 176ff.), and particularly (1990: 6), where the following levels at which aspect can operate have been distinguished:

- a) the aspectual system, including 'categorical', i.e. 'invariant' meanings (of the perfective and of the imperfective) which are further realized in:
- b) lexical classes of verbs (types of word formation),
- c) particular aspectual meanings (variants realized at the level of *parole*),
- d) the 'aspectual situation' (the semantics of the utterance),
- e) aspectual characteristics of the text,
- f) in interaction with other categories such as tense, modality, taxis, and the communicative perspective of the utterance.

⁶ In his "Beitrag zur allgemeine Kasuslehre (1936), Jakobson defined the Russian case system in terms of three *features of perception*: *directionality*, *marginality* and *quantification*. Van Schooneveld developed this Jakobson's initial idea further in an elaborate system consisting of six conceptual features that form a hierarchy of inclusion relations in that each succeeding feature incorporates the preceding feature. The features are: 1. *plurality* (formerly *transitivity*), 2. *demarcatedness* (*dimensionality*), 3. *preidentity* (*identity*, *distinctness*, *duplication*), 4. *verification* (*extension*),

5. *cancellation (restrictedness)* and 6. *objectiveness*. Features 4., 5. and 6. correspond respectively to Jakobson's features as above enumerated. The number of such semantic features in each language is limited, but the fact that they operate on four levels of *deixis* can potentially generate vast numbers of forms, for instance in Russian 8.5×10^{37} . There are two varieties of identificational and transmissional deixis:, i.e. four deictic strata. All semantic categories of language, grammatical, as well as lexical, are formed by either single occurrence or cumulation of these features taken from more than one deictic stratum. The notion of deictic stratum goes back to Jakobson's *shifters*, i.e. deictic elements whose "general meaning cannot be defined without the reference to the message" (Jakobson 1957: 131). According to van Schooneveld, both lexical and grammatical meanings operate with *cues for identification*. Lexical meaning is unmarked (versus the grammatical); it gives identification cues which can be handled by any observer of the narrated situation. Grammatical meaning operates with cues for identification which NECESSARILY RELATE TO THE SPEAKER AND THE RECEIVER of the message. IDENTIFICATION CUES, THAT IS, SEMANTIC FEATURES AND CONSEQUENTLY MEANINGS, ARE CONCEIVED IN TERMS OF THE IDENTIFICATION ACT ITSELF, i.e. *autopoiesis* (van Schooneveld in his lecture in Antwerp, november 1992; for further explanation cf. any of his works, in particularly 1978, 1983, 1987; also Edna Andrews' lucid and insightful book on Markedness Theory 1990 as well as Rodney B. Sangster, *Roman Jakobson and Beyond: The quest for the ultimate invariants in language*. Berlin 1982; see also Dorothy Soudakoff 1987 for a convincing application of this theory to concrete linguistic problems).

⁷ The opposition Aorist vs. Imperfect, in which the imperfect is considered as marked by a semantic feature, has been analyzed in terms of a 'syntagmatic' feature for the imperfect. For instance, for the Old Church Slavic by Havránek (*Mélanges Bally* 1939). A similar approach can be found in the analysis of the verbal system of Modern Greek (cf. Seiler 1952, Bakker 1966) in which 'incidence' has been hypothesized in the meaning of the imperfect, indicating that besides the imperfect, another verbal term is necessarily present or implied, while the aorist stands in itself.

⁸ NB: Galton's theory is, in contrast to others, strictly temporal. Time is considered usually to be the domain of tense and therefore time-based theories of Slavic aspect are not numerous. For another time-related theory of Slavic aspect see the Introduction in Thelin (ed.) (1990).

⁹ The problems encountered in contrastive linguistics and particularly that of equivalence, have been studied by e.g. Barnet 1983, Nickel 1971 and is a current topic of discussion in *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*. García, van Putte and Tobin 1987 pose the question whether cross-linguistic equivalence, and consequently universal categories, can be assumed at all. Translation data which always somehow show a lack of matching, cannot warrant this assumption. If there is any equivalence, it is global: between message and message (ibid: 401). Concerning specifically the problems of the Russian - Czech translation see also Dokulil's article on translating aspect in *Kniha o překládání* (1953).

¹⁰ Kopečný (1962: 31) states on the origin of the atemporal and characterizing perfective present in Czech (referring to Maslov 1958: 35): "Mimočasová, obecná

platnost dokonavého presentu většinou nevzniká z transposice jeho futuralního významu, nýbrž je naopak starým jeho významovým rysem. Z dob, kdy ještě neexistoval dnešní vidový protiklad dokonavosti - nedokonavosti; kdy ještě i ty typy presentu, které jsou dnes dokonavé, mohly vyjadřovat přítomnost, ovšem neaktuální”.

ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF ITERATIVE EVENTS

PART ONE

1. Introduction

1.0 Preamble

This chapter deals with the Russian and Czech aspect in the denotation of iterative events with a particular attention to the systematic differences between the two languages. In Russian, the imperfective is the dominant form: in the numerous data collected for this research, the imperfective occurs in 89% of the cases. In Czech, on the other hand, the perfective is a common form in the denotation of iterative events; in our data it forms 44.8% of the occurrences. The systematic aspectual difference: Russian imperfective vs. the Czech perfective in iterative contexts has been previously signalled by a number of authors, e.g. Eckert (1984), Isačenko (1960), Petruxina (1978), Širokova (1966) and in the *Russkaja grammatika* (1979).

As has been stated in Chapter 1, the necessary question to be raised is how to explain these and other observed systematic differences between Russian and Czech. Obviously, when the differences between languages in the distribution of forms of the same category are so large, the forms and categories cannot be semantically identical, i.e. they cannot mean the same thing. However, the majority of the explanations of this problem that have been proposed are not formulated in terms of differences in the *invariant meaning* of aspect, but in terms of differences in the *functional load* or '*functional limits*' of the forms (e.g. Petruxina 1983, Širokova 1971). The predominance of the imperfective in Russian has also been formulated as a matter of *neutralization* of the aspect opposition in favour of the unmarked imperfective, specifically for iterative contexts (cf. Maslov 1974, 1984, Bondarko 1959); in the *Russkaja grammatika* (1979: 772). The neutralization of the aspect opposition is considered to have an obligatory character in Russian and a facultative character in Czech. However, the 'facultative character' of the neutralization suggests a free choice of aspect form in the latter language. This is certainly not the case: in many cases the perfective is the only possibility. A substitution

by the imperfective can cause a considerable change in the communicative message; the event denoted by the imperfective would be presented as having a different internal structure. Such effects will be demonstrated in the discussion of the data.

One solution of the problem of the systematic aspect differences between Russian and Czech, proposed by Eckert (1984), goes explicitly 'beyond the invariant meaning'. In her data-oriented study, Eckert shows that the aspect differences can be traced back to different interactions between aspect, type of the verbal action (state of affairs), type of the verb and larger context in each language.

As has been previously stated, according to the Praguian approach, differences between languages in the distribution of linguistic forms of the same category are motivated by their inherent (invariant) meanings. An invariant meaning is meant to cover all possible concrete uses of a form, therefore, it has to be formulated in more general terms which can give the impression of vagueness. This can sometimes form a problem as well as the relative inaccessibility of meaning as such. Therefore I decided to add a supplementary, more concrete hypothesis that would be closer to the observed linguistic facts; this hypothesis is presented in section 1.2.

This chapter consists of two parts. In part one, section 1, the following topics referring to aspect and iteration are dealt with: iterated events as a type of a complex structure (section 1.1) and particular meanings of aspect in iterative contexts (1.3). In section 2 a selection of the data that form the basis of this research is presented: various expressions of iteration in Czech and Russian (2.1), the quantitative data and their interpretation (2.2), the analysis of a number of concrete examples excerpted from parallel texts. In order to acquire more insight in the functioning of the aspect forms and their semantics, contrastive substitution tests have been applied. The material is organized according to the types of aspect/tense correspondences occurring, i.e. both the similarities and the differences between the two languages are shown. Part Two concentrates on the differences between Russian and Czech in the denotation of iterative events. It consists predominantly of a selection of data that illustrates these differences. The data is organized again according to the aspect- and tense-correlations, however, with a great number of subdivisions according to the type of the lexically expressed iteration.

1.1 Iterated events

An iterated event can be defined as a set of identical sub-events. In this complex structure, two separate levels have to be distinguished:

1. the level of the individual sub-event as a part of the set: the micro-level, and
2. the level of the whole set, where the individual sub-event is not necessarily taken into account: the macro-level (cf. Stunová 1986).

This definition is based on Timberlake (1982: 315) stating: "By its nature an iterative event has a complex structure, in the sense that it is composed of individual subevents that go together to form a collective, iterated macroevent." In the complex structure of the iterated event, Timberlake distinguishes the level of the subevent and the macroevent and says further that each level contributes to the selection of morphological aspect. These assumptions form the basis of the hypothesis formulated in the following section.

1.2 Hypothesis

It is not necessarily so that both the micro- and macro-level of the iterated event contribute equally to the selection of aspect, one of the two levels can be dominant in this process. The degree of relevance of these levels can differ even between cognate languages as Russian and Czech. On the basis of observation of the data I assume that for Russian it is primarily the macro-level of the whole set that is decisive for the choice of the aspect form; for Czech, on the other hand, it is the micro-level of the iterated sub-event that is crucial for the selection of aspect. In other words, while the Russian aspect operates primarily at the macro-level of the whole, the Czech aspect operates at the micro-level of each of its parts, which represent the whole set. In section 2.3 and in Part Two more evidence for this claim in the form of analysis of the data is supplied.

1.3 Particular meanings of aspect and iterative contexts

In the literature on Russian aspect, a number of 'particular meanings' (*частные значения*) related to iterative contexts has been distinguished; a survey of these aspectual meanings is given below. The terminology is borrowed from Maslov, Bondarko and other representatives of the 'Leningrad school of aspectology'.

1.3.1 The 'summative meaning' of the perfective ('суммарное значение')

- (1) Он меня два раза убедил^p.

In this and similar cases, an indication of the number of iterated sub-events is necessarily present. On the macro-level, the individual sub-events are summed up to a complex unit of a higher order. Only expressions indicating delimitation of the number of the sub-events, can have this summing effect and therefore allow for the use of the perfective. As to the micro-level, each sub-event must also have the properties that allow for the use of the perfective; in the terms of the Russian aspectology, the 'internal limit' (*предел*) must have been reached at this level, and/or each individual sub-event has to be seen as a 'totality' (*целостность*). With respect to the example nr. (1), this essentially means that the person in question had been convinced both times, i.e. both attempts had been successful. Otherwise, summing up is impossible, and the imperfective has to be used. This would be an instance of the following type of particular meaning:

1.3.2 The restrictedly-iterative meaning of the imperfective ('ограниченно-кратное значение')

- (2) Он меня два раза убеждалⁱ, (но не убедил^p).

In this sentence, the imperfective has a conative nuance: attempts took place without success. However, this nuance is certainly not always present. The proper interpretation depends on the lexical meaning of the verb and on further context (such as the minimal context supplied here by the clause in the parentheses). Instances of the restrictedly-iterative meaning of the imperfective which can be interpreted as iteration of complete, successful events, are quite frequent in Russian. Compare example (2) to the following one, which is free of any conativity:

- (3) Он два раза оборачивалсяⁱ. (Maslov 1984: 79)

1.3.3 Unrestrictedly-iterative meaning - the 'неограниченно-кратное значение' of the imperfective

- (4) Он меня часто убеждалⁱ.

This type of particular meaning is distinguished from type 2. by the absence of delimitation of the exact number of the sub-events. The sentence has two possible interpretations:

1. attempts had been without success (cf. example (2)) or
2. every attempt was successful.

In cases like this, the Russian imperfective form itself does not provide sufficient information for the choice of the proper interpretation in the sense whether the person had been convinced indeed. The Russian imperfective is thus ambiguous here, in other words, the structure of the individual sub-event remains opaque (an observation of Eckert 1984: 51). The aspectual properties of the individual sub-events at the micro-level do not find an explicit expression in the aspectual form. The selection of aspect is fully determined at the macro-level, i.e. the level of the whole series; the imperfective serves as a signal of iteration. In Russian, the imperfective is the most current form for the denotation of iterated events, especially in the past tense, where it is (with the exception of the 'summative meaning') the only possibility. An explicit expression of successful attempts by the perfective is impossible in the Russian preterite, when the number of the individual sub-events is not delimited (in contrast to example (1)).

- (5) * Он меня часто убедил^P.

In Czech, however, there is a different situation regarding the selection of the aspect form. When the individual attempts were successful, this fact can be explicitly denoted by the perfective form. In contrast to Russian, the combination of an indication of non-delimited iteration and the perfective is in Czech perfectly grammatical and frequent:

- (6) Často mě přesvědčil^P.

The overwhelming majority of the investigated data represents the type of non-delimited iterative events. The difference in the selection of aspect between the two languages, i.e. Russian imperfective vs. Czech perfective is qualitatively and quantitatively substantial. In section 2.3 (Part One) and in Part Two more examples of similar aspectual differences between the two languages will be analyzed.

1.3.4 'Vivid exemplification' - the '*наглядно-примерное значение*' of the perfective

- (7) Я это понимаю, со мной тоже бывает - скажу^P уверенно и сейчас же спохвачусь^P. (Горький)

To this type of particular meaning applies that the individual sub-event can be defined in terms of 'totality' (*целостность*) and/or a reached limit (*предел*); if not, the imperfective has to be used. In contrast to the summative meaning, in which all individual sub-events are presented as a sum by means of the perfective and a lexical indication of delimited iteration, in the particular meaning 'vivid exemplification' there is an emphasis on the individual sub-event, which serves as an example for the whole set of iterated events. For this phenomenon the terms 'particularisation' or 'singularisation' and 'individualisation' are used (cf. Mazon 1914: 49, Forsyth 1970: 163, 173 ff. and Eckert 1984: 20, respectively). 'Vivid exemplification' in Russian further has the following characteristics:

1. The Russian perfective in this type of particular meaning is bound to special conditions of use. In the majority of cases, it occurs only in a certain type of context, i.e. the '*кратно-соотносительный тип контекста*', in which there is a connection with other events (cf. Bondarko 1971: 197ff.). 'Connection' is a macro-level characteristics, for which the necessary prerequisites at the micro-level of the individual iterated event have to be fulfilled (i.e. that the perfective can be defined in terms of 'totality' and/or a 'reached limit').
2. The Russian perfective in the 'vivid exemplification' can almost always be replaced by its imperfective counterpart in the 'unrestrictedly-iterative meaning'. This phenomenon has been described as 'synonymical concurrence' (cf. Maslov 1974: 121 and 1984: 78)¹.
3. Concerning temporality, the present tense is most often used, even for the denotation of past iterated events. This usage of present instead of past has been described by the term 'time transposition' (cf. Isačenko 1960: 429, 464).
4. The perfective in this type of particular meaning is usually not stylistically neutral in Russian, but indicates mood. In other words, it often has an expressive or even an emotional nuance (cf. Petrushina 1983: 163).

As to Czech, the situation is different:

1. With denotation of iterative events, the perfective can be used in Czech irrespective of tense (cf. example (6)).
2. The Czech perfective is stylistically absolutely neutral, it does not show any 'expressive' colouring. For this reason, the term 'vivid exemplification' does not fit for Czech. Petrushina (1983: 164) proposes to use

Maslov's term '*конкретно-типическое значение*'. However, this term is more appropriate for a general characterization or for cases in which iteration comes close to the gnomic present (expressions of general truth). In order to cover all instances in which the Czech perfective occurs, both in the present and past tense, the terms 'particularization' and 'singularization', free of stylistic factors, seem to be presently the most appropriate ones.

3. The Czech perfective in the denotation of iterative events is not bound to such strict conditions as the Russian perfective is (cf. Bondarko 1971: 213, 216). The frequency of the perfective in Czech is in this context much higher: this will be demonstrated in the next section.

4. The Czech perfective cannot always be replaced by its imperfective counterpart, that in contrast to Russian; in some cases, the perfective in Czech is the only possibility (cf. Petruxina 1983: 165-166).

1.3.5 The potential meaning of the perfective (*'потенциальное значение'*)

This type of particular meaning is not usually directly associated with iteration. A typical instance of potential meaning is this: "Не скажу", i.e. "I can't say". However, this meaning can sometimes be associated with iterative events. Consider the following example:

(8) Иван любой праздник испортит^p.

This sentence can be interpreted as follows: Ivan is a kind of person, who is apt to spoil every party, given the occasion to do so. Clearly a modal element is present in this type of meaning. Compare this to the imperfective version in the unrestrictedly-iterative meaning:

(9) Иван любой праздник портитⁱ.

The real fact is expressed here, Ivan indeed spoils every party to which he comes.

1.4 Particular meanings and selection of aspect - a summary

In the previous section the 'particular meanings' of the Russian aspect and their Czech counterparts related to iterative contexts were discussed. The Russian imperfective is involved in the 'restrictedly-' and 'unrestrictedly-iterative meanings' while the perfective occurs in the 'summative meaning', 'vivid exemplification' and in some cases in the 'potential meaning'. When the Russian imperfective is used in the 'un/restrictedly-

iterative meanings', it is often not clear what the internal structure of the individual iterated sub-event is, i.e. whether it is, for instance, resultative or a process. In other words, the character of the iterated sub-event at the micro-level remains opaque, it is not taken into account. Frequently, when these events would be single, i.e. non-iterated, the perfective could be used. This can be seen in cases of the 'несобственная несовершенство' (term of Maslov 1984: 84); in the denotation of iterative events, in contrast to Czech, the Russian imperfective can often be combined with indications otherwise typical for the perfective, such as resultativity. The Russian imperfective does not operate primarily at the level of each individual sub-event, but at the macro-level of the whole iterative complex; it is used as a signal of iteration - often no other indications are needed. This can be seen especially in the numerous examples of the aspect correlation: Russian imperfective vs. the Czech perfective. In such cases, to indicate iteration in Russian solely the imperfective form is sufficient, in Czech, an iterative adverb or another lexical item signalling iteration has to be added to the Czech micro-level perfective. Similarly to the imperfective, in the denotation of iterative events, the Russian perfective operates at the macro-level. The macro-level characteristics are: in the 'summative meaning', a 'sum' of a restricted number of sub-events is created; this sum is of a higher, macro-hierarchical order. In contrast to the imperfective, with the perfective the micro-level remains more distinct. With iterative events, Czech aspect operates primarily at the micro-level of the iterated sub-event. This becomes particularly clear when applying substitution tests. In some cases the Czech imperfective can operate at the macro-level, for instance with habitual verbs. The macro-characteristics of the imperfective in Czech depend largely on the context, i.e. the position of the verb in the text. The position of the macro-imperfective is in the majority of cases paragraph- or passage-initial, i.e. when an introduction to a series of iterative events is given. Such introductory sentences contain a high percentage of habitual verbs. In spite of these cases, the data with applied substitution tests show that with respect to the selection of the aspect form the main tendency remains as follows: out of the two levels of the complex iterative event, the macro-level is dominant in Russian while the micro-level of the iterative event appears to be relevant in Czech.

2. The Data

2.0 The problems outlined above have been studied in more detail on the basis of literary texts of narrative character. Original texts in both languages and their translations have been examined and compared with each other, totally nearly 4.000 pages of text. All cases of iterated events, either with an explicit indication of iteration, or events which can be interpreted as iterative, have been excerpted; this resulted in a collection of parallel Russian and Czech sentences that forms the basis of the corpus of data. Section 2.1 deals with the expression of iterative events encountered in the texts, providing a list of various types of iterative expressions in both languages. The quantitative data presented in section 2.2 is based on countings of all instances of iterative events occurring in the texts. Section 2.3 concentrates on the types of aspectual correspondences between Russian and Czech; each correspondence is illustrated by one or more examples provided with a comment. Where relevant, substitution tests have been applied in order to illustrate how aspect functions in the denotation of iterative events, paying particular attention to the differences between the two languages.

2.1 Expression of iteration in Czech and Russian

Aspect plays an important role in the expression of iterative events. The imperfective alone, without additional indicators, can express iteration. This is most frequently the case in Russian. The perfective normally expresses single, non-iterated events; if the perfective is meant to express an iterative event, it has to be combined with an additional indication of iteration. This type of expression occurs often in Czech. In other words, the Russian imperfective alone corresponds to the Czech perfective accompanied by an extra adverb denoting iteration. In all cases it concerns unrestricted iteration. However, the imperfective alone might be ambiguous and is certainly not specific enough with respect to the type of iteration. Therefore, the imperfective, too, is often combined with an adverb indicating and specifying iteration. Apart from the two most frequent ways of expression of iteration, i.e. the grammatical expression by the imperfective aspect, and the lexical expression by adverbs, other types have been encountered in the data. They are lexical items involving certain adjectives, pronouns, verbs and conjunctions. Some syntactic constructions and the broad context play also a role. Below a list of the most frequent expressions of iteration occurring in the data is given.

2.1.1 Adverbial expressions

a) restricted or quasi-restricted iteration

The number of the sub-events is delimited, either by a numerical indication (e.g. *twice, three times*) or by approximation (*several times*).

Czech:

dvakrát, třikrát, desetkrát;

po každé, nejednou; kolikrát, několikrát, mnohokrát;

complex: *jednou za den, jednou za čtrnáct dní, několikrát za měsíc;*

Russian:

два раза, три раза, раз десять;

каждый раз, всякий раз, не раз;

сколько раз, несколько раз, много раз;

complex: *раз в день, два раза в месяц, по несколько раз в месяц.*

b) Unrestricted iteration

The number of the individual sub-events is not explicitly delimited.

Czech:

vždy, vždycky, většinou, (velmi) často, obyčejně, obvykle, někdy, časem, občas, zřídka(kdy), tu a tam, málo, chvílemi;

Russian:

всегда, часто, обычно, иногда, время от времени, порою, порой, редко, изредка, не однажды, минутами;

Sometimes a regular adverb of time such as *ráno, večer; утром, вечером*, is interpreted iteratively. When in plural, such as *по утрам*, it has to be interpreted as iterative.

When two iterated activities are contrasted or an activity has temporally; *jindy zase*, in Russian *снова*. These adverbs appear to be sufficient to indicate iteration in such contexts; they are mostly not accompanied by other iterative adverbs.

2.2.2 Adjectives

The adjective *každý/каждый* forms part of usual adverbial complexes, e.g. *každý den/каждый день*, as well as various kinds of *ad hoc* complexes denoting time, place and other circumstances, such as:

Czech:

po každém upotřebení, při každé otázce, na každém nádraží, do každé chalupy;

Russian:

после каждого употребления, на каждой станции, в каждую халупу.

The adjectives *každý*, *каждый*, *любой*, *všechen*, *všichni*, *vesь*, *все* modify the subject or object, in Czech occurring frequently in the singular, e.g. *každý*, in Russian in the plural, e.g. *все*.

2.1.3 Pronouns and pronominal adverbs

These are most often complex, containing an indication of unspecificity -*koliv*, -*либо*, etc.

Czech:

kdo(koliv), *cokoliv*, *kdykoliv*, *kdekoliv* and *kamkoliv*.

Russian:

кто(либо), *что-либо*, *когда-либо*, *куда бы ни*.

2.1.4 Conjunctions

The most current conjunctions in Czech are: *když*, *jakmile*, -*li* and *sotva*, in Russian *когда*, *лишь* (*только*), *если*.

2.1.5 Verbs

The verbs enumerated below occur in various expressions that often introduce iterated events. In Czech these are: *být*, *bývat*, *stát se*, *stačit*, *minout*, in Russian: *бывать*, *стоять*, *случаться*, *происходить*, *доходить до*. For example: Czech: *když se stalo*, *stačilo*, *aby*, *byly chvíle*, *kdy*, *nebylo minuty*, *neminulo dne*; Russian: *бывало*, *стоило*, *случалось*, *происходило это обычно*, *лишь только дело доходило до*. The Russian expression *бывало* occurs frequently, especially when 'time transposition' takes place, i.e. cases in which the perfective present refers to past events. In Czech this construction has not been encountered. Czech possesses a category of habitual verbs with the suffix -*va-* which is to a certain extent more productive than in Russian (e.g. *málo se vídali*). However, they are less frequent than could be expected; this is apparently caused by the specific habitual colouring. In the texts, habitual verbs usually introduce a series of other iterative events which are often expressed by perfectives.

2.2 Quantitative data

In this section the quantitative data based on the countings of all occurrences of iterative events in the texts are presented and the significant differences between Russian and Czech in the frequencies of the aspect and tense forms are commented on. The following four verbal forms were analyzed in the surrounding context: 1. the perfective past form, 2. the perfective present, 3. the imperfective past form and 4. the imperfective present form. Table 1 shows their frequencies:

Table 1. Aspect and tense forms in the denotation of iterated events

a) Russian

tense aspect	preterite	present	total	
perfective	1.3% (13)	9.7% (96)	11%	(109)
imperfective	72.4% (717)	16.6% (165)	89%	(882)
total	73.7% (730)	26.3%	100%	(991)

b) Czech

tense aspect	preterite	present	total	
perfective	29.5% (292)	15.3% (152)	44.8%	(444)
imperfective	46.1% (457)	9.1% (90)	55.2%	(547)
total	75.6% (749)	24.4% (242)	100%	(991)

data: Andreev, Erenburg, Gor'kij, Oleša, Hašek

The table shows a relatively small difference in tense between the two languages. In Russian, the number of present forms is slightly higher (1.9%). This phenomenon can be explained partly by the 'time transposition' (see section 1) and the use of the present tense for the denotation of past events in indirect speech after *verba dicendi* in Russian. As far as aspect is concerned, the differences between the two languages are really striking. Considering the total amounts in column 3, there are 33.8% more imperfectives attested in Russian than in Czech and, vice versa, 33.8% more perfectives in Czech. As to the distribution of aspect over the tenses, the differences are even larger. In the Russian preterite,

an almost absolute predominance of the imperfective can be observed, while in the present tense, the amounts of both aspect forms are more nearly equal.

In Czech, the perfective and the imperfective are current in both tenses. In the present tense, the ratio of these forms is even reversed in comparison with Russian, in other words, the number of perfectives is higher. This can be explained as follows: in the denotation of iterated events which are close to gnomic present, Czech tends to select the perfective. In Russian, the perfective present would often have a future interpretation in a similar context, which is not the case in Czech. This is an instance of the interaction of aspect and tense. In Czech, the perfective present seems to have a less close relation with the future meaning than in Russian (cf. Petruxina 1983: 171). For more details about this phenomenon see also Kopečný (1962: 40).

After this presentation of global data we proceed to more detailed information about the various aspect and tense correspondences between the two languages. In the left-hand column, the forms encountered in the original texts are given, in the right-hand columns, the corresponding forms in the translation are presented.

Table 2. Aspect/tense correspondences between Russian and Czech

a) Russian original texts – Czech translation

<u>Russian</u>			<u>Czech</u>		
tense	past	present	tense	past	present
aspect			aspect		
pf	100%	(5)	pf	80%	(4)
ipf			ipf	-	20% (1)
pf		100% (45)	pf	24.5% (11)	71.1% (32)
ipf			ipf	2.2% (1)	2.2% (1)
pf			pf	39.5% (200)	0.4% (2)
ipf	100% (506)		ipf	60.1% (304)	-
pf			pf	-	53% (44)
ipf		100% (83)	ipf	-	47% (39)

data: Andreev, Erenburg, Gor'kij, Oleša

b) Czech original text – Russian translation

<u>Czech</u>			<u>Russian</u>		
tense	past	present	tense	past	present
aspect			aspect		
pf	100% (77)		pf	-	9.1% (7)
ipf			ipf	85.7% (66)	5.2% (4)
pf		100% (74)	pf	4% (3)	46% (34)
ipf			ipf	-	50% (37)
pf			pf	3.3% (5)	-
ipf	100% (152)		ipf	95.4% (145)	1.3% (2)
pf			pf	-	20.4% (10)
ipf		100% (49)	ipf	-	79.6% (39)

data: Hašek

The table shows the following facts:

- a) In the majority of cases, the Russian perfective has been translated by the perfective in Czech. However, there is a considerable aspect shift in the Czech translation of the Russian imperfective: 39.9% out of the Russian imperfective past forms become perfective in Czech. In the present tense, the percentage indicating this aspect shift is even higher: 53% of the Russian imperfectives become perfective in the Czech translation.
- b) In the Russian translation of the Czech text, a movement in the opposite direction can be observed. The majority of Czech imperfective forms are translated by the same form in Russian. But this does not apply to the Czech perfective. In the Russian past tense, no corresponding perfective forms have been encountered, the only perfectives are in the present tense (9.1%). Although these perfectives refer to past events, they are subject to 'time transposition', i. e. the present tense has to be used. In the translation of the present tense, 50% of the Czech perfective forms become imperfective in Russian. The observed aspect shifts in the translations can be schematically represented as follows:

R IPF → C PF
C PF → R IPF

Both shifts reflect the same property, i.e. the aspect difference between Russian and Czech in the denotation of iterated events: a strong predominance of the imperfective in Russian and a relatively high frequency of the perfective in Czech. These differences will be treated in more detail in the analysis of concrete examples in the following section. The hypothesis that in each language a different level within iterative events is relevant for the choice of the aspect form, i.e. the macro-level for Russian and the micro-level for Czech, will be tested. Attention will be given also to the higher frequency of the Czech perfective and the factors contributing to it, such as the lexical meaning of the verb, the state of affairs, the context.

2.3 Description of aspect/tense correspondences

In this section, aspect and tense correspondences between Russian and Czech form the principle of the organization of the data. The forms will be treated in the following order: 1. the perfective preterite, 2. the perfective present, 3. the imperfective preterite, and 4. the imperfective present form. In the examples first the original text is given followed by its translation. The figures between parentheses indicate numbers of encountered forms per correspondence; the left-hand part represents: the Russian original vs. its Czech translation, the right-hand part the Czech original text with its Russian translation. At the end of this section longer passages will be dealt with in which various correspondences are combined.

I. The perfective preterite

1. Russian perfective preterite – Czech perfective preterite

(R - C: 5 - 4; C - R: 77 - none)

- (1) Но раз, другой они взглянули^P, улыбнулись^P ... (Андреев)
 Jednou či dvakrát zvedli^P sklopené oči, usmáli^P se ...

The occurrence of the Russian perfective preterite denoting iterated events is very infrequent (see also Table 1). There must be a special reason for the choice of this form, as there is in this case: a delimitation of the number of individual sub-events (раз, другой). This is an example of the 'summative meaning' of the Russian perfective (cf. section 1.3). The Russian perfective preterite occurs also in embedded clauses.

However, in some cases an embedded clause does not fall within the scope of iteration, therefore this type is not included in the analysis:

- (2) Люсьен наспех сочинял историю: он забыл^P бумажник дома ...
(Эренбург)

As has been already mentioned in section 1, the Russian perfective in the 'summative meaning' can be often replaced by its imperfective counterpart without effects that are observable in Czech. Consider now the Czech imperfective version of example (1):

Jednou či dvakrát zvedaliⁱ sklopené oči, usmívaliⁱ se ...

The effects of the substitution of the perfectives by imperfectives is as follows: the first imperfective verb suggests a very slow process. The second one gives the impression of an event presented *in medias res*. These effects are possible due to relevance of the micro-level in Czech.

2. Russian perfective preterite – Czech perfective present (R - C: 5 - none; C - R: 74 - 3)

- (4) Já mám, jak se říká, vyvinutej pozorovací talent, když už je pozdě a něco se stane^P nepříjemnýho. (Hašek)
У меня, как говорится, очень развит талант к наблюдению, но только когда уже поздно и когда неприятность уже произошла^P.

The Czech perfective present in this example is 'gnomic', i.e. expresses a generalized fact; it overlaps, however, with iteration. The Russian perfective preterite fulfills here the 'perfectum' function. The events are not presented in the chronological order but as anterior, which is stressed by the adverb *уже*.

3. Russian perfective preterite – Czech imperfective preterite (R - C: 5 - none; C - R: 152 - 5)

- (5) Stačilo to nejmenší, a důstojník se již loučilⁱ se svou posádkou a putovalⁱ na černoohorské hranice ... (Hašek)
Достаточно было пустяка, чтобы офицер распрощался^P со своим гарнизоном и отправился^P на черногорскую границу ...

The following paraphrase can be given: little was enough and it was already happening. Iteration is suggested in the introducing clause, then the individual events are presented. In Czech, their internal structure is

involved: the reader is confronted with the events *in medias res*, i.e. in the middle, which adds an effect of plasticity here. This is due to the intraterminal character of the imperfective. When replaced by the perfective, the events would have already happened, i.e. the officer would have parted and be gone. In Russian the possibility of such events is stressed, this modal nuance is expressed by the conjunctive.

4. Russian perfective preterite – Czech imperfective present
(R - C: 5 - 1; C - R: 49 - none)

- (6) (...) чуть что - прощай, (...) и пошел^P искать где лучше. (Горький)
(...) sotva se něco přihodí^P - sbohem, (...) a jdeⁱ si hledat něco lepšího.

This is a similar type of event as the previous one: 'a little is enough and it is already happening'. Repetition is given in the broader context, the 'iterative meaning' is used in the characterization of the person.

II. The perfective present

1. Russian perfective present – Czech perfective preterite
(R - C: 45 - 11; C - R: 77 - 7)

- (7) Он всю зиму ходил без работы; какая-то работенка перепадала - то починит^P швейную машину, то еще что. (Эренбург)
Celou zimu chodil bez práce - sem tam sehnal nahodilou - jednou spravil^P šicí stroj, po druhé zas něco jiného.
- (8) А потом та шванда, když někdy sklouzl^P а upadl^P s kalichem ... (Наšek)
Вот смеху бывало, когда он, к примеру, поскользнется^P и брякнется^P вместе с чашей ...

Iterative events referred to in these examples are located in the past; in Czech, the use of the past tense is consistent, in Russian it is not. After the introductory imperfectives (*ходил*, *перепадала* and *бывало*) more events are given as a specification (*к примеру*), i.e. as 'vivid exemplification' (cf. section 1.3). Such '*бывало*'-constructions with the perfective present standing for past are quite usual in Russian. The perfective can be used due to this 'time transposition', the perfective past is less acceptable in Russian, in Czech it is quite common.

2. Russian perfective present – Czech perfective present

(R - C: 45 - 32; C - R: 74 - 34)

- (9) Я это понимаю, со мной тоже бывает - скажу^P уверенно и сейчас же спохвачусь^P. (Горький)

Dovedu to pochopit, stává se mi to také (...) řeknu^P něco jistým tónem a hned se zarazím.

This is another case of 'vivid exemplification' in Russian. In section 1 it was mentioned that in the denotation of iterated events the Russian perfective occurs in certain contexts, such as the *кратно-соотносительный тип контекста*. A sequence of two related iterative events is termed as the *кратно-парная конструкция* (Bondarko 1971: 207). In such a construction, the events expressed by the perfective in Russian have a temporal, a causal, or any 'logical' relation with each other. Often it concerns the type 'if a, then b'. Examples 7, 8 and 9 can be included under this type. If the number of events in the series is more than two, it concerns the 'кратно-цепная конструкция' (cf. Bondarko 1971: 207). The following example illustrates this phenomenon. Note also the asyndetic character of the construction in Russian. The presence of the perfective here is already enough to suggest a connection; in Czech a conjunction (*jakmile*) has to be added.

- (10) И кругом, как воронье, начальство сторожитⁱ ... Увидит^P, вырвет^P, в харю тебе даст^P ... (Горький)

A kolem číhajíⁱ úřady jako krkavci ... Jakmile jej uvidí^P, vyrvou^P ti jej, dají^P ti přes hubu ...

When the Czech perfectives are replaced by their imperfective counterparts, the latter forms would indicate a process giving the reader the impression of witnessing the events himself.

Apart from the fact that the Russian perfective occurs often in a relational type of context, another factor that plays a role is 'modality'. This phenomenon has been described for Russian as the 'potential meaning' (see section 1.3). The quality of the subject is frequently stressed, for instance the type of person referred to and his/her ability to do something.

- (11) Она воспитываласьⁱ в тепле, ее баловалиⁱ всем (...) а сейчас, вот, пойдет^P семь верст ночью, одна ... (Горький)

Vyrostla^P v teple, hýčkaliⁱ ji (...), a teď, podívej se, půjde^P sedm verst noci, sama ...

For Czech, 'connection' and 'modality' are not necessary conditions, although they may be present. In many instances in which the Czech perfective occurs, these two factors are absent.

3. Russian perfective present – Czech imperfective preterite

(R - C: 45 - 1; C - R: 152 - none)

- (12) Случалосьⁱ, в тяжелые минуты он шепнет^P про себя, без молитвы ... (Андреев)

Někdy se stávaloⁱ, že tiše a bezděčně šeptalⁱ v těžkých chvílích, aniž se modlil ...

This is the only attested case of this correspondence. In both languages first an introduction is given: 'it used to happen'. What used to happen is in Russian further exemplified by the perfective present: 'time transposition' from past to present takes place. In Czech a perfective (*zašeptat*) would be possible, however, with an object (such as *něco*, something) - intransitive imperfectives have frequently a transitive perfective counterpart.

4. Russian perfective present – Czech imperfective present

(R - C: 45 - 1; C - R: 49 - 10)

- (13) (...) стоит кому-нибудь чихнуть, как его сейчас напоят^P липовым чаем (...), приготовят^P горчичники. (Эренбург)

(...) jak jen někdo kýchne^P, hned do něho lijíⁱ lipové thé (...) a obalí^P ho hořčičnými plackami.

Similarly to examples (5) and (6) the following paraphrase can be given: 'a little is enough and it is already happening'. In Russian this idea is expressed by the construction *стоит ... как* for which the perfective is usual. For the choice of this form in this context it is important that the event (*напоят*) is a reaction on the previous one (*стоит чихнуть*). In other words, the relation between the events, i.e. a macro-level characteristics plays a role here. On the other hand, it seems that Czech prefers in such cases the imperfective which evokes in this case a special effect, i.e. the situation is presented *in medias res*. In other words, the ingressive phase is omitted and the event is presented as a process accompanied by an element of unexpectedness. The replacement of the Czech imperfective by its perfective counterpart *nalijí* would have a different effect, the object is then quantified (cf. the 'compositional nature of aspect')²,

implying either that 1. the usual portion of tea is poured in, or 2. all the available tea is used. The synonymous perfective verb *napojí* would have a similar effect. In the Czech example below the ingressive phase is omitted too, although the effect is not necessarily that of *in medias res*. This type of occurrence of the imperfective in Czech is a common phenomenon in the past tense, especially with sequences of single events; for a more detailed description see the chapter on sequences of events.

- (14) Ten vždycky ztratí^p řeč, když vidíⁱ někoho z pánů oficírů. (Hašek)
У него всегда, как только увидит^p кого-нибудь из господ офицеров, язык отнимаетсяⁱ.

III. The imperfective preterite

1. Russian imperfective preterite – Czech perfective preterite
(R - C: 506 - 200; C - R: 77 - 66)

- (15) Сыновья выросли^p шалопаями, ничего не хотелиⁱ делать и выклянчивалиⁱ деньги у Фуже ... (Эренбург)
Jeho synové byliⁱ lenoši, nehnuli^p ani prstem, ale z Fougera vždy vyždímal^p peníze ...

This is the most frequent case of difference in aspect between Russian and Czech in the denotation of iterated events which has been attested in the data. It will be therefore described in more detail in Part Two of this chapter on iteration. Note the extra adverb *vždy* with the Czech perfective. The perfective expresses primarily single events; when the context is not clear about iteration, while it is intended, an extra 'iterative' adverb is added. In about 20% of the cases with the Czech perfective such an extra 'iterative' adverb was encountered; that in contrast to the Russian parallel text in which the imperfective was often sufficient to indicate iteration.

When replacing the Czech perfective in example (15) by its imperfective counterpart a conative nuance would arise: the sons tried to get the money; the perfective expresses that the sons were successful every time.

- (16) Встречаяⁱ колющий взгляд маленьких глаз, она робко двигалаⁱ бровями. (Горький)
A když se setkala^p s pichlavým pohledem jeho maličkých očí, plaše škubla^p obočím.

Replacing the Czech perfective by its imperfective counterpart *škubala* would have a special effect: every time the eyes of the two persons met, the woman's eyebrows moved several times. In other words, the sub-event at the micro-level consists of several movements; we call this phenomenon 'internal iteration'. The perfective, on the other hand expresses one little movement each time. In Russian, the imperfective indicates primarily iteration, i.e. the macro-level is relevant. A distinction at the micro-level similar to that in Czech cannot be made.

- (17) Он обладал удивительной способностью: за день молоделⁱ или старелⁱ лет на двадцать. (Эренбург)
 Měl podivuhodnou schopnost: za den omládl^p nebo zestárl^p o dvacet let.

This fragment describes the quality of the person in question: he can become 20 years younger or older within one day. This limit is of importance for the choice of the perfective in Czech, the result attained is of primary importance. The imperfective, on the other hand, would concentrate on the process of becoming younger or older. The Russian imperfective, in contrast to Czech, does not imply this progressiveness, but it does not exclude resultativity either. In the denotation of iterated events, the Russian imperfective can often be combined with typical perfective characteristics such as resultativity. This phenomenon has been described by Maslov (1984: 84) as 'несобственная несовершенство'.

- (18) Byl v několika drogériích, a jakmile řekl^p: "Prosím láhvičku oleje posvěceného od biskupa", dali^p se někde do smíchu a jinde skryli^p se uděšení pod pultem. (Hašek)
 Швейк побывал в нескольких аптекарских магазинах, но как только произносилⁱ: "Будьте любезны, бутылочку елея, освященного епископом", всюду или фыркалиⁱ ему в лицо или в ужасе пряталисьⁱ под прилавков.

The replacement of the Czech perfectives by their imperfective counterparts would have the following effects: the first substitution would generate an ungrammatical clause * *jakmile říkal*ⁱ. Generally, in this type of subordinate clause, the perfective is encountered. The second imperfective *dávali se do smíchu*, instead of the original perfective, would lead to the nuance of hesitation or distributiveness. As a reaction to Švejk's request, people would first think whether to laugh or not; some of them would slowly start laughing, others would not. The whole situation seems then even more awkward than in the original text. The perfective, on the

other hand, expresses just a fact: those people laughed as a natural response. The third replacing imperfective *skrývali se* would suggest that the people were already hiding before Švejk entered. The temporal and logical relation between the events would be disturbed. In Russian, perfectives would be ungrammatical, there is not really a choice within past tense. The occurring imperfectives are not associated with similar effects as is the case in Czech. Clearly different levels are relevant for the choice of aspect in each language: for Russian it is the macro-level of the whole set of iterated events, whereby the structure of the individual sub-events is not considered; in Czech, on the other hand, the internal structure of the iterated event at the micro-level is often decisive in the choice of aspect, when the perfective occurs, iteration has to be frequently expressed by an extra adverb.

2. Russian imperfective preterite – Czech perfective present
(R - C: 506 - 2; C - R: 74 - none)

This is not a typical example of iteration, but rather of distributivity. The Czech perfective occurs here as historical present (for more details on the historical present see Chapter 4).

- (19) Но Иисус молчит, (...) - и один за другим подходилиⁱ к Иуде смущенные ученики, заговаривалиⁱ ласково, но отходилиⁱ быстро и неловко. (Андреев)
Ale Ježíš mlčí, (...) zatímco jeden učedník za druhým, plni rozpaků, přistupujíⁱ k Jidášovi, zdvořile s ním prohodí^p pár slov, ale pak rychle a jaksi nemotorně poodejdou^p.

3. Russian imperfective preterite – Czech imperfective preterite
(R - C: 506 - 304; C - R: 152 - 145)

This is the most common type of correspondence found; the imperfective is the usual form in the denotation of iterative events in both languages, although in Russian it is clearly dominant (cf. Table 1 in section 2.2 for the frequencies of aspect forms per language).

- (20) Byl zde jeden s padoucníci, ten nám vždy říkalⁱ, že mu na jednom záchvatu nezáleží, tak jich dělalⁱ třebas deset za den. Svíjelⁱ se v těch křečích, zatínal pěstě, vypulovalⁱ oči, (...), bil sebou, vyplazovalⁱ jazyk, zkrátka vám řeknu, nádherná prvotřídní padoucnice, taková upřímná. (Hašek)

Был тут один эпилептик. Тот всегда нам говорилⁱ, что лишний припадок устроить ничего не стоит. Падалⁱ он этак раз в десять в день, извивалсяⁱ в корчах, сжималⁱ кулаки, выкатывалⁱ глаза под самый лоб, бился о землю, высовывалⁱ язык. Короче говоря, это была прекрасная эпилепсия, эпилепсия первый сорт, самая что ни на есть настоящая.

In this example, the events are presented as partly overlapping processes consisting of various repeated movements; these events together form a kind of a macro-process. Due to this presentation the reader easily imagines to be a witness of what is happening.

- (21) Приближаласьⁱ весна, таял снег (...). С каждым днем грязь настойчивее лезлаⁱ в глаза (...). Днем капалоⁱ с крыш (...). Все чаще на небе являлосьⁱ солнце. (Горький)
 Blížiloⁱ se jaro, sníh tál (...). Špína každým dnem bilaⁱ víc do očí (...). Ve dne kapaloⁱ se střeš (...). Na obloze se stále častěji objevovaloⁱ slunce.

In this passage, the approaching spring is described. Besides the element of progressiveness, an element of growth can be observed, expressed, in addition to the imperfective, by the instrumental case and the comparative (*с каждым днем, все чаще*). A substitution of the Czech imperfectives by their perfective counterparts would remove the impression of growth; other adverbials that do not contain this element should be used then.

Passages (20) and (21) have several features in common. Both the Russian and the Czech version are consistently imperfective. For Russian this is very usual; often there is no choice and the imperfective is the neutral form. In Czech, on the other hand, preferably both aspects occur within one passage. The consistence of the Czech imperfective here has a special meaning: in (20) a kind of a macro-process is expressed, similarly in (21) with an extra element of growth. This idea of a macro-process at the sentence level is created by the overlap of the unbounded micro-processes of which the macro-process consists.

4. Russian imperfective preterite – Czech imperfective present (R - C: 506 - none; C - R: 49 - none)

There is no attested case of this correspondence in the data.

IV. The imperfective present

1. Russian imperfective present – Czech perfective preterite (R - C: 83 - none; C - R: 77 - 4)

- (22) (...) a potom byl už takovej zvyk, že jakmile bylo slyšet první kanonádu, že pucflek hned vyházel^p všechny zábavný knížky.
(Hašek)
(...) а потом уже стало правилом: заслышав первую канонаду, денщик сразу вышвыриваетⁱ все книги для чтения.

This is quite a marginal type of correspondence. A habit in the past is described. The Russian imperfective is submitted to 'time transposition', i.e. the present tense is used. The Czech verb *vyházel* is accompanied by elements reinforcing perfectiveness: the adverb of suddenness *hned* and a quantification of the object *všechny*. However, although this verb is perfective, it contains an element of distributivity, the servant threw the books away one after another. A related, non-distributive perfective *vyhodil* would suggest that the books were thrown away all in once, within a second. The imperfective *vyhazoval* would mean that the servant was busy, he would not throw all the books away; the quantification of the object 'all' is less easy compatible with the imperfective.

2. Russian imperfective present – Czech perfective present (R - C: 83 - 44; C - R: 74 - 37)

- (23) Já jsem živnostník, když někdo přijde^p a dá^p si pivo, tak mu ho natočím^p. (Hašek)
Я трактирщик. Кто ко мне приходитⁱ, требуеⁱт пива, тому и наливаюⁱ.

Compare the original Czech sentence to a modified version, in which the perfectives have been replaced by their imperfective counterparts:

- (24) Já jsem živnostník, když někdo přicházíⁱ a dáváⁱ si pivo, tak mu ho točímⁱ.

In this sentence, the events can be interpreted as partly overlapping processes. This implies the following interpretation: while the person is entering, at the same moment he is ordering a beer while the innkeeper is already busy pouring it. The Russian imperfective does not cause such effects, it simply expresses the habituality of these events.

- (25) Галоши у меня тоже неизлечимо разорвались, и каждый день я промачиваюⁱ себе ноги. (Горький)
 Moje galoše jsou též nevléčitelně roztrhané a každého dne si promočím^P nohy.

The Czech perfective in this sentence is the appropriate form. The bi-aspectual verb *promáčím* would evoke a similar interpretation as the original verb, focussing on the resultativity and the fact that the person's feet become wet. Replacement by the imperfective *máčím* would cause a different interpretation: the person is trying hard to get his feet wet - a deliberate action which is not meant here. The Russian imperfective does not contradict the factual interpretation here, neither does it evoke the picture of intentionality; it simply indicates repetition. The fact that intentionality has some relation to aspect can be also demonstrated by the following example, taken from Petruxina (1983: 166):

- (26) Při mytí nádobí pokaždé něco rozbije^P.

Every time the person washes the dishes, he breaks something. This action is presented as unintentional, breaking of the dishes happens because the person is not handy enough. Replacing the original perfective by its imperfective counterpart *rozbijí* would cause the opposite effect: the person breaks the dishes (every time) deliberately, maybe with great pleasure. The Russian imperfective is neutral with respect to intentionality.

3. Russian imperfective present – Czech imperfective preterite (R - C: 83 - none; C - R: 152 - 2)

- (27) Vypravoval na četnických stanicích, že když von přišel^P na inspekci, (...) že tam vůbec inspekci nedělalⁱ a jen celej den s vachmistrem z radosti chlastalⁱ. (Hašek)
 По жандармским отделениям рассказывали, что если ротмистр делаетⁱ ревизию (...) - то уж не инспектируетⁱ, а на радостях весь день хлещетⁱ с вахмистром.

The Czech imperfectives can be replaced by their perfective counterparts:

- (28) (...), že tam vůbec inspekci neudělal^P a celej den s vachmistrem z radosti prochlastal^P.

In this example, negated resultativity is stressed, the inspection took *never* place. The whole day was filled with drinking, from the beginning

to the end. The imperfectives concentrate more at the processual character of the events.

4. Russian imperfective present – Czech imperfective present
(R - C: 83 - 39; C - R: 49 - 39)

- (29) Каждый день приноситⁱ новые сюрпризы (...) (Эренбург)
Každý den přinášíⁱ nová překvapení (...)

This is a regular type of correspondence. However, few longer passages containing an uninterrupted series of imperfectives have been encountered in Czech. In the majority of cases, both aspects are combined within a passage. This phenomenon will be treated below.

V. Combinations of correspondences

1. Russian imperfective present – Czech imperfective/perfective present
(R - C: 83 - 39/44)

- (30) Каждый день приноситⁱ новые сюрпризы: то актеры захватываютⁱ театр, то кассиры закрываютⁱ окошечко кассы, то могильщики отказываютсяⁱ рыть могилы. (Эренбург)
Každý den přinášíⁱ nová překvapení: jednou herci obsadí^p divadlo, jindy pokladníci zavírajíⁱ okénko pokladny, nebo hrobníci odmítajíⁱ kopat hroby.

This passage can be divided into two parts: an introduction and a specification. In the first clause, the fact that surprises take place is announced; in both languages the introductory verb is imperfective. However, as soon as the specific surprises are described, the perfective is used in Czech. The question arises: why is only the verb *obsadí* perfective and the other two verbs *zavírají* and *odmítají*, although specifying, are imperfective? In the verb *obsadí* the element of resultativity is quite strong. The perfective is therefore appropriate here. The corresponding imperfective *obsazují* would have an unintended effect, namely that of a conative nuance: although the actors were trying to occupy the theatre, they did not succeed. The other two imperfectives do not have such an effect. Closing a window, for instance, costs less effort than occupying a theatre. It is not really relevant here to mention also the actual result of the actions, as is the case of the occupation of the theatre. The Czech

imperfectives may be replaced by their perfective counterparts, however, a 'dry' sort of account of facts would be then obtained.

2. Russian imperfective preterite – Czech imperfective/perfective preterite
(R - C: 506 - 304/200)

- (31) Студент Орлов ухаживалⁱ за моей сестрой Верой. Он приезжалⁱ на дачу на велосипеде. Велосипед стоялⁱ над цветником, прислоненный к борту веранды. Велосипед был рогат. Студент снималⁱ со щиколоток сверкающие зажимы, нечто в роде шпор без звона, и бросалⁱ их на девевянный стол. Затем студент снималⁱ фуражку с небесным околышем и вытиралⁱ лоб платком. Лицо у него было коричневое, лоб белый, голова бритая ... Он не говорилⁱ со мной ни слова. (Олеша)

Studující Orlov chodilⁱ za mou sestrou Věrou. Jezdilⁱ k nám na chatu na kole. Kolo stávaloⁱ nad květinovým záhonem, opřeno o boční stěnu verandy. Mělo rohy.

Student si vždycky sundal^p s kotníků blýskavé sponky, něco jako ostruhy, které nezvoní, a hodil^p je na dřevěný stůl. Potom si sundal^p studentskou čepici světle modře lemovanou a utřel^p si čelo kapesníkem. Tvář měl hnědou, čelo bílé, hlavu vyholenou, měňavou, hrbolatou. Nepromluvil^p se mnou slovo.

Similarly to the previous passage, this fragment consists of two parts: an introduction and a specification. In the first part, the fact is mentioned that the student used to visit the speaker's sister; in the second part, indicated by a new paragraph, a specification of the details related to the student's visit is given, his behaviour is described in detail. The introductory verbs are imperfective in Czech (*chodil*, *jezdil*); the third verb *stávalo* is explicitly habitual, which is indicated with the suffix *-va-*. All the specifying verbs are further perfective. An extra adverb indicating iteration (*vždycky*) is added. As mentioned above, when the Czech perfective occurs in the context of iteration, it is frequently accompanied with an adverb reinforcing iteration in order to prevent an interpretation of a non-iterated, single event. A substitution of the perfectives by their imperfective counterparts would cause various effects, such as that of a slow-down. This would be the case with the movements that the student makes: taking the clips off, throwing them on the table, taking off his cap and wiping his forehead off. The student would make the movements not only at his leisure, but too slow in fact, which would cause an un-

natural effect. The perfective *nepromluvil* occurs here in combination with the quantified object; the student did not utter one word to the boy. All these actions form part of the episode, they are details on which the author does not dwell much time, therefore the perfective is the appropriate form. Russian has no choice here, in all the instances, the imperfective is used, indicating simply iteration. In other words, aspect in Russian operates at the macro-level of iteration and therefore, all the above described effects, which take place at the micro-level, do not apply to Russian.

- (32) Они часто встречалисьⁱ; заходили в небольшие кафе на окраинах; иногда он ее возилⁱ по мокрым, пустым дорогам, гнал - сто сорок в час, заражалⁱ своим беспокойством, потом отвозилⁱ ее и, прощаясь, церемонно целовалⁱ руку. (Эренбург)
 Stýkaliⁱ se často; chodiliⁱ do malých kaváren na periferii; někdy ji vozilⁱ po mokrých prázdných silnicích, jezdilⁱ rychlostí sto čtyřicet kilometrů za hodinu; nakazil^p ji svým neklidem; potom ji odvezl^p domů a při loučení ji obřadně políbil^p ruku.

Similarly to the previous two passage, this passage can be divided into two parts: the first sentence gives a general introduction; the fact that the two persons often met is mentioned. The rest of the passage is a description of the meetings. The only form that occurs in Russian is the imperfective. Czech makes a distinction between the introductory verbs (imperfectives) and the specification that follows (perfectives). The introductory verb *stýkali se* is imperfective as in the majority of the investigated passages. We assume that such an introductory imperfective operates at the macro-level as is the case in Russian. Such verbs are a kind of signal: the following events will be iterated. This assumption is supported by the fact that the introductory verbs are often habitual, already containing an element of iteration. The imperfective *stýkali se* could be replaced by the perfective *setkali se*, but the introductory character would disappear. The verb *chodili* can be replaced by the perfective *zašli*, however, accompanied with an extra adverb indicating iteration. The perfective cannot be easily combined with the plural, it would give the idea that all the cafés had been visited at the same time. The singular has to be used instead:

- (33) Někdy zašli^p do jedné z malých kaváren na periferii (...)

The imperfective verbs *vozil* and *jezdil*, being undetermined, or 'two-way' verbs, imply iteration. The determined verbs *vezl* and *jel* express only

'one-way'. It is difficult to replace the Czech perfective *nakazil* by its imperfective counterpart *nakažoval*, in general this verb is not much used. *Nakazil* is a strongly resultative verb, the imperfective would have a conative nuance or that of a deliberate action, which is not intended here. The perfective *odvezl* is resultative and determined as to place by the adverbial *domů*. The imperfective *odvážel* would imply that the person was on his way. The last perfective verb *políbil* indicates that the man kissed the hand of the lady every time only once; this is supported by the adverbial *obřadně* (церемонно), the custom allows to kiss the hand only once. The imperfective *líbal* would express several kisses each time and less ceremony.

3. Conclusion

The previous discussion of the examples has shown that the choice of the aspectual forms denoting iterated events is not arbitrary. While in Russian the imperfective is often the only possible form, the Czech perfective has to be used in similar positions. If the Czech perfective is replaced by its corresponding imperfective, a different picture of the event arises, causing various effects. The event expressed by the (replacing) imperfective contains one of the following characteristics: 1. progressive-ness, 2. conativity, 3. intentionality or 4. internal iteration. When these effects are not intended, the perfective must be chosen in Czech. The Russian imperfective is not necessarily associated with these effects, it simply denotes iteration.

All the data and facts that have been discussed point to the relevance of different levels within the iterated event in each language. While Czech is primarily oriented at the micro-level, for Russian the macro-level is decisive for the selection of the aspectual form.

NOTES

¹ 'Synonymical concurrence' is originally a term of Mathesius (1947).

² Verkuyl (1971) views aspect as a category extending from the verb to other grammatical categories including nominal ones, which can form 'configurations'. For Slavic languages, the interaction between the verbal and the nominal categories is very typical. For descriptions of this phenomenon see Wierzbicka (1967) for Polish and Eckert (1984: 71ff.) for Czech and Russian. Verkuyl (1971: 42) states: "The basic idea (...) is that the categories DURATIVE and NONDURATIVE should not be considered semantic primitives assigned to Verbs but that they should rather be assigned to a higher node than V. In other words, (...) the terms 'Durative

Aspect' and 'Non-durative Aspect' apply to configurations of underlying categories among which necessarily a subcategory of V." (emphasis mine, A.S.). Verkuyl (1971: 104) says further: "(...) Aspects cannot be taken as semantic primitives assigned to Verbs (...)", and "(...) the term 'Aspects' appears to be applicable to configurations of certain categories generated by the base. The mechanism underlying the composition of the Aspects seems relatively clear: a certain fundamental subcategory of an underlying V is combined with a complex set of categories of a nominal nature and pertaining to quantity."

ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF ITERATIVE EVENTS

PART TWO

THE RUSSIAN IMPERFECTIVE VS. THE CZECH PERFECTIVE

Part Two of this chapter concentrates on the major aspectual difference between Russian and Czech in the denotation of iterative events, i.e. the contexts in which the Russian imperfective correlates with the Czech perfective. The data are organized according to a number of criteria: aspect, tense, type of iteration and partly according to the function of aspect in text and the source (i.e. the original text or translation). The following subdivisions have been made:

The past tense

1. Aspect in text (Passages)
 - 1.1 Habitual situations
 - 1.2 Series
 - 1.3 Macro-processes
2. Additional quantification in Czech
 - 2.1 Adverbial expressions denoting frequency
 - 2.2 Aspect, grammatical number and quantification
 - 2.3 Adverbs of manner

Appendix 1

1. Restricted iteration
2. Unrestricted iteration
 - 2.1 Russian original - Czech translation
 - 2.2 Czech original - Russian translation

Appendix 2

The present tense

1. Additional indication of iteration in Czech
2. Unrestricted iteration

1. Aspect in text (Passages)

The following 14 passages illustrate how aspect functions in text. In the Russian passages all the verb forms referring to iterative events are imperfective, while in their Czech equivalents both the perfective and the imperfective occur. As far as the structure of the individual iterated sub-events is concerned, it remains opaque in Russian. No distinction is made between process and result by the means of aspect. Russian aspect functions here at the hierarchically higher macro-level of the whole of the iterative event and signals primarily iteration. In Czech the situation is more complex. The Czech imperfective can operate at the macro-level as an introduction to a series of other iterated events, however this is contextually given. It happens in the beginning of a passage, frequently by means of a habitual verb. After this introduction, which consists most often of one verb, individual iterated events are presented. The internal structure of the repeated sub-event is made transparent by means of aspect, it is clear whether a sub-event has a processual or resultative character. In these instances aspect obviously functions at the micro-level of the iterated sub-event. The passages below are subdivided in three types: habitual situations, series of repeated events that are not necessarily habitual and macro-processes consisting of a number of iterated sub-events.

1.1 Habitual situations

The following six examples illustrate habits of individual persons. After an introduction (e.g. *he lived in such way, I used to visit*), the individual events are specified. In example 1, first a characteristic of the person is given (*Vlasov lived in such a way, he had a bad relation with his boss and therefore earned little money*). Then a particular instance of this complex behaviour is focussed on (*every feast he beat someone and they tried to beat him back*). Note the overall imperfective in Russian and the aspectual differentiation in Czech.

- (1) Так **жил**ⁱ и Михаил Власов, слесарь, волосатый ... Лучший слесарь на фабрике и первый силач в слободке, он **держался**ⁱ с начальством грубо и по этому **зарабатывал**ⁱ мало, каждый праздник кого-нибудь **избивал**ⁱ, и все его не любили, боялись. Его тоже **пробовали**ⁱ **бить**ⁱ, но безуспешно. (Горький)

Tak **žil**ⁱ i zámečník Michal Vlasov ... Byl nejlepším zámečníkem v továrně a největším silákem v kolonii, ale **vydělával**ⁱ málo,

protože **se chovalⁱ** k představeným hrubě; **každý svátek** někoho **zbil^p**, nikdo ho neměl rád a všichni se ho báli. **Pokusili^p se** mu také **nařezat^p**, ale bez úspěchu.

Example nr. 2 is a continuation of the description of Vlasov's habits, more exactly his activities after the dinner when he gets drunk. Note the clear distinction at the micro-level of the iterated sub-event between processes or states denoted by the imperfective and resultative actions denoted by the perfective in Czech.

- (2) После ужина он **сбрасывалⁱ** посуду со стола на пол, если жена **не успевалаⁱ** вовремя убрать ее, **ставилⁱ** перед собой бутылку водки и, **опираясьⁱ** спиной о стену, глухим голосом наводившим тоску, **вылⁱ** песню ... **Пелⁱ** он до поры, пока в бутылке была водка, а потом **валилсяⁱ** боком на лавку или **опускалⁱ** голову на стол и так **спалⁱ** до гудка. (Горький)

Po večeři **shazovalⁱ** nádobí se stolu na zem, jestliže se ženě **nepodařilo^p** včas je uklidit, **postavil^p** před sebe láhev kořalky, **opíralⁱ** se zády o zeď a temným hlasem, který vyvolával stesk, **vyllⁱ** píseň ... **Zpívalⁱ** tak dlouho, pokud byla v láhvi kořalka a potom **se svalil^p** na lavici nebo **položil^p** hlavu na stůl i tak **spalⁱ**, dokud nezahoukala tovární píšťala.

The introductory sentence of the fragment expresses the character of the contact between the mother and her son: the contact was not very intensive. Then a description of particular instances of this contact is given. Russian uses the imperfective irrespective of the global or partial perspective and of the internal structure of the individual events. The aspect variation in Czech provides the passage with more variation. If only the imperfective were used similarly to Russian, overlapping processes would be denoted.

- (3) **Говорилиⁱ** они мало и мало **виделиⁱ** друг друга. Утром он молча **пилⁱ** чай и **уходилⁱ** на работу, в полдень **являлсяⁱ** обедать, за столом **перекидывалисьⁱ** незначительными словами, и снова он **исчезалⁱ** вплоть до вечера. А вечером тщательно **умывалсяⁱ**, **ужиналⁱ** и после долго **читалⁱ** свои книги. (Горький)

Mluvíliⁱ spolu málo a málo **se vídaliⁱ**. Ráno mlčky **vypil^p** čaj a **odešel^p** do práce, v poledne **přicházelⁱ** k obědu, u stolu **vyměnili^p** spolu několik bezvýznamných slov a znovu **zmizel^p** až do večera. A večer **se** pečlivě **umyl^p**, **povečeřel^p** a dlouho **četlⁱ** ve svých knihách.

The following example is a continuation of the description of the habits of the son and his mother, focussing on what she does during the day. For the choice of aspect the same principles are valid as in the previous example.

- (4) В девять часов он **уходилⁱ** на службу, она **убиралаⁱ** комнаты, **готовилаⁱ** обед, **умываласьⁱ**, **надевалаⁱ** чистое платье и, сидя в своей комнате, **рассматривалаⁱ** картинки. (Горький)

O deváté hodině **odcházelⁱ** do služby, matka **uklidila^p** pokoje, **připravovalaⁱ** oběd, **umyla^p se**, **oblékla^p** čisté šaty a sedíc ve svém pokoji, **prohlíželaⁱ** si obrázky.

In the following passage, the way of life of Dessère is described by means of a number of his habits beginning each day. The first verb forms the introduction to the whole passage. After getting up (habitual), Dessère goes to the kitchen. Then there is a *close-up* on two particular actions, i.e. eating up one tomato or a piece of cheese and drinking a glass of white wine. The sequence of iterative events is continued with: *after having read the newspapers*. This is one of the few cases attested in which in Russian the perfective occurred³. The following imperfectives in Czech denote processes - Dessère was on his way and was smiling to everybody he met. Two more resulative verbs follow, after having entered the office, the figures covered everything. Except for the perfective gerund (expressing finishing reading), in Russian there is no distinction made in the internal structure of the individual events as in Czech. This is due to the difference in the relevance of the levels within the complex structure of the iterative event: while the Russian aspect operates at the macro-level of this complex, for the Czech aspect the micro-level of the individual sub-event is decisive allowing for the distinctions described above.

- (5) Дессер **жилⁱ** под Парижем в небольшом поместьи. Он **вставалⁱ** с петухами, **шелⁱ** на кухню и там **закусывалⁱ** помидором или куском сыра, **запиваяⁱ** его белым вином. **Прочитав^p** газеты, он **уезжалⁱ** в Париж. Он **улыбалсяⁱ** школьникам и собакам, но вскоре цифры **заслонялиⁱ** все. (Эренбург)

Dessère **bydlilⁱ** u Paříže v nevelkém domě se zahradou. **Vstávalⁱ** se slepicemi, **odebíralⁱ se** od kuchyně, **snědl^p** tam rajske jablíčko nebo kousek sýra a **zapl^p** je bílým vínem. Pak si **přečetl^p** noviny a **odjíždělⁱ** do Paříže. **Usmívalⁱ se** na školáky a psy. Sotva se však **dostal^p** do kanceláře, číslice mu **zastřely^p** všechno.

In the following passage the regular visits of the writer in the shop of Mrs. Severyn are briefly depicted. In the introductory Czech sentence the fact of this habit is expressed, in Russian, the very start of this habit. Further on, two representative sub-actions are named, the caressing of the abominable dog of Mrs. Severyn and the buying of one or another little carpet each time. By means of these actions the writer hopes to get hold of the priceless carpet on which the dog always sleeps.

- (6) Tedy já jsem jednou za čtrnáct dní chodilⁱ k paní Severýnové mrknout se, je-li tam v koutě ještě ten koberec se všemi svými ptáky, podrbal^p jsem tu odpornou Aminu, až rozkoší kvičela, a aby to nebylo nápadné, koupil^p jsem pokaždé nějaký ten koberec. (Čapek)

Ну, что ж, я стал^p раза два в месяц наведыватьсяⁱ в лавку Севериновой, чтобы взглянуть, там ли еще “птичий” ковер. Обычно я чесалⁱ Амине спину, так что эта тварь повизгивала от удовольствия, и для отвода глаз каждый раз покупалⁱ какой-нибудь коврик.

1.2 Series

The following four passages contain series of iterated events that are not necessarily habitual. In Russian, the imperfective is consistently used as a signal of iteration at the macro-level of the iterated event, the internal structure of the individual sub-events remains opaque. If not iterated, the perfective would be used in Russian to denote such a series of successive events. In Czech the majority of the verb forms are perfective denoting resultative events that follow each other in succession. However, there is a distinction made between these results and processes at the level of the iterated sub-event. Processes are denoted by the imperfective.

- (7) Всегда на собраниях, чуть только споры начиналиⁱ принимать слишком горячий и бурный характер, вставалⁱ хохол и раскачиваясь, точно язык колокола, говорилⁱ своим звучным гудящим голосом что-то простое и доброе, отчего все становилисьⁱ спокойнее и серьезнее. (Горький)

Po každé, když na schůzkách počaly^p debaty nabývat příliš prudkého a bouřlivého rázu, povstal^p chochol a rozhoupává se jako srdce zvonu, promluvil^p svým zvuchým dunivým hlasem něco prostého a dobrého, že se všichni uklidnili^p a zvážněli^p.

- (8) Замечалаⁱ она, что когда к Николаю приходилⁱ кто-либо из рабочих - хозяин становилсяⁱ необычно развязен, что-то сладкое являлосьⁱ на лице его, а говорилⁱ он иначе, чем всегда, не то грубее, не то небрежнее. (Горький)

Zpozorovala^p, že když k Nikolajovi přišel^p některý dělník, že Nikolaj se počal^p chovat neobvyčejně nenuceně, že se v jeho tváři objevilo^p cosi sladkého, ale že mluvilⁱ jinak než obvykle, buď trochu drsněji nebo nebdaleji.

- (9) Когда им жилосьⁱ трудно под властью царей, они науськивалиⁱ черный народ на царскую власть, а когда народ поднималсяⁱ и вырывалⁱ эту власть из рук короля, человечки обманом забиралиⁱ ее в свои руки и розгонялиⁱ народ по конурам, если же он спорилⁱ с ними - избивалиⁱ его сотнями и тысячами. (Горький)

Když se jim pod vládou králů špatně žiloⁱ, poštvali^p pracující lid proti královské moci, ale když se lid vzbouřil^p a tuto moc vytrval^p z rukou krále, tu tito chlapíci se jí zmocnili^p podvodem, zahnali^p lid nazpět do jeho brlohů a jestliže se jim stavěliⁱ na odpor - pobíjeliⁱ je po celých stech a tisících.

- (10) Stal-li^p se takový případ, že se důstojník zachránil^p útekem před zajetím a on tam zůstal^p, neopomenul^p důstojnický sluha v žádném případě odvléknout do zajetí i zavazadla svého pána. Ona přešla^p v jeho majetek, na kterém lpěl s celou duší. (Hašek)

Если случалосьⁱ, что офицер спасалсяⁱ бегством, чтобы не попасть в плен, а денщик попадалⁱ в плен, то последний никогда не забывалⁱ захватить с собой и офицерские вещи, которые отныне становилисьⁱ его собственностью и которые он берег как зеницу ока.

1.3 Macro-processes

The following four passages denote various types of macro-processes. In the first fragment the sleep of a drunk fishmonger is described. In the course of the sleeping process the fishmonger becomes half-awake, beats with his fist on the table, mutters something and sleeps further. The beating and muttering is quantified, there is one beat and the man utters one sentence every time. In this instances the perfective is more natural in Czech, the imperfective would suggest repeated beating the table with

his fist, and the repetition of the same utterance each time the man wakes up. Clearly, the micro-level of the iterated event is involved in Czech. Russian does not make this distinction.

- (11) U jednoho stolu spalⁱ opilý sardinkář, chvílemi se probouzelⁱ, uhodil^P pěstí do stolu, zabreptal^P: "Nejde to!", a zas spalⁱ dál. (Hašek)

За одним столом спалⁱ пьяный сардинщик. Временами он просыпалсяⁱ, ударялⁱ кулаком по столу, бормоталⁱ: "Не выйдет!" - и снова засыпалⁱ.

The boy is involved in the process of reading, absorbed in his newspapers. However, every now and then he throws a glance at his mother. When their glances cross the mother smiles. In Czech these three punctual actions are expressed by perfectives. In Russian no distinction is made between the processes in the introductory sentence (expressed by imperfectives in Czech) and the punctual actions. All the events are imperfectively marked regardless of their internal structure.

- (12) Мальчик читалⁱ газету и как будто не слышалⁱ ничего, но порою глаза его смотрелиⁱ из-за листа в лицо матери, и, когда она встречалаⁱ их живой взгляд, ей было приятно, она улыбаласьⁱ. (Горький)

Chlapec četlⁱ noviny a dělalⁱ, jako by nic neslyšelⁱ, ale chvílemi se jeho oči přes noviny podívaly^P na matku, a když se setkala^P s jejich živým pohledem, bylo jí to příjemné a usmála^P se.

An iterated macro-process of the changing weather is described below, consisting of a number of micro-processes and results. As soon as the sun showed itself, everything came to life (resultative), the buds were becoming fuller and women more beautiful (processes). Then a change takes place, the clouds cover the sky and cause the rain (results). Note that this distinction is made in Czech, in Russian the structure of the individual micro-events remains inaccessible and therefore opaque. The consistently used imperfective in Russian remains at the macro-level of the whole process.

- (13) Погода то и дело меняласьⁱ: стоилоⁱ показаться^P солнцу, как все оживалоⁱ, выступалиⁱ почки на каштанах, женщины хорошелиⁱ; потом холодный ветер наметалⁱ низкие тучи, и дождь былⁱ по зимнему скучным. (Эренбург)

Počasí se každou chvílí měniloⁱ; jakmile se ukázalo^p slunce, všechno hned ožilo^p, pupeny na kaštanech se nalévalyⁱ, ženy krásnělyⁱ, potom studený vítr přihnál^p nízké mraky a spustil se^p déšť, studený a nudný jako v zimě.

The last passage in this series is a description of a hall of the railway station where Mother is sitting and waiting for her mission. The atmosphere is depicted as a mosaic consisting of a great number of various overlapping actions, processes and fragmentary impressions. In Russian all these events are consistently marked as imperfective. In Czech two episodes are marked by the perfective, the closing and opening of the door with the accompanying effects: the noise the door produces when it is slammed and the fresh air streaming inside each time when the door is opened by the passing travellers. These micro-events are momentary, which is a typical characteristic of the perfective. I have the impression that these particular events are focussed on because they are related to the mother and the way she feels while waiting. Although the mother is described as a part of the background, she is the protagonist here.

- (14) Люди курилиⁱ, разговаривалиⁱ, пили чай, водку. У буфета кто-то раскати́сто смеялсяⁱ, над головами носилисьⁱ волны дыма. Визжалаⁱ, открываясьⁱ, дверь, дрожалиⁱ и звенелиⁱ стекла, когда ее с шумом захлопывалиⁱ. Запах табаку и соленой рыбы густо бил в нос. Мать села у входа на виду и ждала. Когда открываласьⁱ дверь - на нее налеталоⁱ облако холодного воздуха, это было приятно ей ... (Горький)

Lidé kouřiliⁱ, rozmlouvaliⁱ a popíjeliⁱ čaj a vodku. U nálevního stolu se někdo hlučně smálⁱ, nad hlavami lidí se vznášelyⁱ mraky kouře. Vrzalyⁱ otvírané dveře, a když je někdo přirazil^p, skla se v nich zatřásla^p a zařinčela^p. Do nosu vnikalⁱ neodbytně zápach tabáku a slanečků. Matka se posadila u vchodu, kde na ni bylo dobře vidět, a čekala. Když někdo otevřel^p dveře, zavanul^p na ni chladný vzduch; bylo jí to příjemné ...

2. Additional quantification in Czech

As previously stated, the imperfective alone can express an iterative event; often no additional indicators of iteration are necessary. The perfective expresses normally single, non-iterated events; therefore an extra indicator of iteration is needed when expression of iterated events is

concerned. One fifth of the Russian and Czech 'iterative data' contain the following correspondence: Russian imperfective vs. Czech perfective involves an additional indication of iteration in Czech. The Russian imperfective alone signals iteration at the macro-level of the iterative event. The individual sub-events are not taken into account, their internal structure remains opaque; they can be processes as well as resultative actions. The Russian imperfective is ambiguous, it does not provide any information about the character of the individual sub-events. The Czech perfective does, it indicates here resultative actions. However, the global fact of iteration cannot be provided by the perfective, therefore an extra indication has to be added. It concerns, in the majority of cases, a frequency adverb, in some cases also quantification of the object and infrequently an additional adverb of manner. The following examples illustrate the correspondence: Russian imperfective alone vs. Czech perfective plus an additional indication of iteration, and in a few cases of extra perfective characteristics. The data is organized according to the indications and the degree of frequency.

2.1 Adverbial expressions denoting frequency

This section contains examples of expressions of unrestricted iteration that accompany the Czech perfective, the Russian counterpart is formed by the imperfective alone. It has been established that the imperfective can express iteration, however, of the unrestricted type and not iteration of the numerical type (*twice, ten times*). It is therefore logical that the Czech perfective in these cases combines only with indications of unrestricted iteration. In this part of the data the following frequency adverbs occur: *vždy, vždycky, často, někdy, občas, sem tam*, as well as the adverbial expressions containing the adjective *každý: každou minutu, pokaždé*. In a few cases also the additional lexical negation *nikdy* has occurred. In several instances, an additional perfective characteristic such as an expression of momentaneity and quantification of the object is added in Czech.

a) *vždy/cky*

- (1) Хозяин усадьбы любил бездельшки; на письменном столе за которым работал, генерал Л., стояли чернильница в виде Пизанской башни, пингвин из копенгагенского фарфора (...). Работая, генерал отодвигалⁱ пингвина: боялся разбить. Он не выносилⁱ ущерба: его оскорблялиⁱ чернила, пролитые на паркет (...). (Эренбург)

Pán usedlosti měl rád titěrné věcičky: na psacím stole kde pracoval generál L., stál kalamář v podobě věže z Pisy, tučňák z kodaňského porcelánu (...) . Při práci generál vždy odsunul^p tučňáka; bál se, že ho rozbije. Nestrpěl^p poškozené věci kolem sebe; šelⁱ mu na nervy inkoust, vytlitý na parkety (...).

- (2) Идеи осенялиⁱ отца Федора неожиданно, и он сейчас же принималсяⁱ за работу. Отец Федор начиналⁱ варить мраморное стирочное мыло: наваривалⁱ его пуды, но мыло, хотя и заключало в себе огромный процент жиров, не мылилось и вдобавок стоило втрое дороже, чем “плуг-и-молотовское”. Мыло долго потом моклоⁱ и разлагалосьⁱ в сених, так что Катерина Александровна, проходя мимо него, даже всплакивалаⁱ. А еще потом мыло выбрасывалиⁱ в выгребную яму. (Ильф & Петров)

Ideje ho vždy osvítily^p zčistajasna jako blesk a on je bez meškání uvádělⁱ v život. Vařilⁱ žíhané mýdlo na praní: navaril^p ho skoro metrák, ale třebaže jeho mýdlo obsahovalo ohromné procento tuku, vůbec nemydlo a nadto bylo třikrát dražší než mýdlo z kooperativu Pluh a kladivo. Dlouho potom mokvaloⁱ a rozkládaloⁱ se v síni a Kateřina Alexandrovna si vždycky poplákala^p když šla kolem. Nakonec naházeli^p všechno do žumpy.

- (3) Раз или два в месяц Янсон напивалсяⁱ, и происходило это обычно в те дни, когда он отвозилⁱ хозяина на большую железнодорожную станцию, где был буфет. (Андреев)

Vždycky jednou či dvakrát za měsíc se Janson opil^p a stávalo se to obyčejně, když odvaželⁱ hospodáře na velké nádraží, kde byl bufet.

b) *každý*

- (4) Klára na kozlíku výskala radostí. Kromě toho se koně každou minutu splášili^p z toho jejího kvikotu a kokrhání, inu, byla to čerchmantská jízda. (Čapek)

Клара на козлах прямо визжала от удовольствия. Лошади шарахалисьⁱ от визга и кудахтанья Клары, в общем, чертовская была поездка.

- (5) Но Сашенька не нравилась ей, и когда она являласьⁱ, мать чувствовалаⁱ себя тревожно, неловко ... (Горький)

Sášenka se jí však nelíbila, a po každé, když přišla^p, zmocňovalyⁱ se matky neklid a stísněnost ...

c) **často**

- (6) Kradlⁱ ze zásady jen čistokrevné psy a mohl být soudním znalcem. Dodávalⁱ do všech psinců i soukromým osobám, jak se dalo, a šel-liⁱ po ulici, tu na něho vrčeliⁱ psi, které kdysi ukradl, a když stálⁱ někde u výkladní skříně, často nějaký mstivý pes vyzdvihl^p u něho za zády nožičku a pokropil^p mu kalhoty. (Hašek)

Благник принципиально воровалⁱ только породистых собак и мог бы стать судебным экспертом. Он поставлялⁱ собак и на псарни, и частным лицам, как придется. Когда он шелⁱ по улице, на него рыдали собаки, которых он когда-то украл. А стоило ему остановиться, где-нибудь перед витриной, как мстительный пес закидывалⁱ лапу и опрыскивалⁱ у него брюки.

d) **někdy**

- (7) Он бродил по знойным улицам; на террасах люди ели; (...). Потом он нападалⁱ на какого-нибудь приятеля: литератора (...). Люсьен наспех сочинялⁱ историю: он забыл бумажник дома или сегодня невыгодно ... и, дерзко ухмыляясь, выклянчивалⁱ пять-десять франков, которые тотчас проедалⁱ. (Эренбург)

Bloumal po žhavých ulicích, na terasách jedli lidé ... Někdy potkal^p nějakého známého: literáta (...) Lucien si vždy vymyslíl^p nějakou výmluvu: zapomněl si doma peněženku ..., a potom s drzým smíchem vymáčkl^p na nich padesát franků, které ihned projedl^p.

- (8) Бывалаⁱ Муш и у Монтиньи. Не принимая участия в общем разговоре, она рассеянно раглядывала старые альбомы. (Эренбург)

Mouche zašla^p také někdy se svým mužem k Montignymu. Nezúčastnila se však hovoru a roztržitě listovala ve starých albech.

e) **občas**

- (9) И ко всему, происходившему на суде, обнаруживалиⁱ они то смягченное, сквозь дымку, любопытство, которое свойственно людям или очень тяжело больным, или же захваченным одною огромною, всепоглощающей мыслью. Быстро взглядывалиⁱ,

ловилиⁱ на лету какое-нибудь слово, более интересное, чем другие, - и снова продолжалиⁱ думать с того же места, на каком остановилась мысль. (Андреев)

O všechno, co se při procesu dalo, projevovaliⁱ onen mírný a poněkud mdlý zájem, který je vlastní buď lidem těžce nemocným, nebo žijícím jedinou obrovskou a vše pohlcující ideou. Občas rychle vzhledli^p, zachytili^p v letu nějaké zajímavé slovo a znovu pokračovaliⁱ v úvahách tam, kde přestali.

f) *sem tam*

- (10) Был он человек добрый, но вспыльчивый; покрикивалⁱ на жену, ругалⁱ адъютанта. Любил только военное дело и садоводство. (Эренбург)

Byl to dobrák, ale popudlivý; sem tam křikl^p na ženu, vynadal^p pobočníkovi. Miloval jen strategii a zahradnictví.

g) *nikdy*

- (11) До пятидесяти лет он не хворалⁱ; много пилⁱ, курилⁱ без остановки, недосыпалⁱ. Все случилось сразу. Он был мнителен; внимательно выслушивалⁱ докторов, но предписаний не выполнялⁱ; жилⁱ, как прежде, беспорядочно и утомительно. (Эренбург)

Do svých padesáti let Dessère nechuravělⁱ: hodně pilⁱ, kouřilⁱ bez přestání, nikdy nedospal^p. Teď na to vše doplácel. Byl sice do jisté míry hypochondr, vyhledávalⁱ lékaře a pozorně jim naslouchalⁱ, ale jejich příkazy neplnil. Žilⁱ jako dříve: nepořádně a škodlivě.

2.2 Aspect, grammatical number and quantification

It has previously been stated that the perfective in Czech denotes singularization, i.e. a manner of presentation of a series of iterated events by means of one of them as an example, a *pars pro toto*. However, it is not solely the perfective verb that effectuates singularization. The interaction between the verb, the subject, the object, adverbial expressions of time and place play a role, too. In Czech, the grammatical number of the object (and other participants in the sentence) has influence on the choice of aspect (an observation of Eckert 1984: 71ff. who has also supplied evidence for this claim; for Polish see Wierzbicka 1967). The imperfective correlates with the plural and the perfective with the singular

forming certain *configurations*. This interdependency of the verbal category aspect and “categories of a nominal nature and pertaining to quantity” has been described by Verkuyl (1971) in terms of *configurations*². Another observation supporting this claim is that of Maslov (1984: 84) on the ‘несобственная несовершенство’ of the Russian aspect. The unmarked imperfective can be easily combined with typical perfective characteristics such as resultativity. In contrast to Czech, the grammatical number of the object, resultativity and similar phenomena characteristic of the individual sub-events have no influence on the choice of aspect. It is the iteration itself at the macro-level of the whole complex that is crucial. The interaction of aspect and grammatical number will be illustrated below by a number of examples.

Examples 12 and 13 contain intransitive imperfectives in Russian vs. transitive perfectives in Czech. In other cases (examples 14-16), both the Russian imperfective and the Czech perfective are transitive. However, the object of the perfective verb in Czech has to be quantified. If not, in example 14 the interpretation would be that *all* the workers had been dismissed and in 15 that *all* the *bourgeois* that remained in the city had been attracted. Without the quantification of the object *několik* in example 16, the interpretation could be that of a definite object: certain, well-known words were exchanged. Instead of quantification an indefinite adjective can be used, such as *nějaký* (some), which also has a quantifying effect, referring to a part of the whole. Examples (18-20) illustrate cases in which the Czech perfective correlates with a single object while the Russian imperfective corresponds with an object in the plural. The same principle applies to other categories such as adverbial expressions of time and place and the subject (examples 21-25).

2.2.1 Additional object

každý

- (12) To je zrovna tak jako jednou u Valšů, dole v restauraci, taky takovej jeden nekňuba měl ducha, ale nehrál ho a **vodložil^p vždycky** ty nejmenší do talónu a **pustil^p každého** na betla. (Hašek)

Точь-вточь такое случилось как-то раз в винном погребе ‘У Вальшов’. Там тоже один дуралей имел на руках козыри, но не пользовался ими, а **все время откладывалⁱ** самые маленькие карты в прикуп и **пасовалⁱ**.

pár

- (13) Но Иисус молчит, (...) - и один за другим подходилиⁱ к Иуде смущенные ученики, заговаривалиⁱ ласково, но отходилиⁱ быстро и неловко. (Андреев)

Ale Ježíš mlčí, (...) zatímco jeden učedník za druhým, plni rozpaků, přistupujíⁱ k Jidášovi, zdvořile s ním prohodí^p pár slov, ale pak rychle a jaksi nemotorně poodejdou^p.

2.2.2 Additional quantification of the object

много

- (14) Министры аккуратно каждое утро подписывалиⁱ декреты об увольнении непокорных телеграфистов и кочегаров. Предприниматели рассчитывалиⁱ рабочих. Голод душил сотни тысяч безработных. (Эренбург)

Ministři podpisovaliⁱ pečlivě každého rána dekrety o propuštění z práce vzdorných telegrafistů a topičů. Podnikatelé vyhodili^p mnoho dělníků na dlažbu. Hlad mučil statisíce nezaměstnaných.

- (15) Каждый год четырнадцатого июля бывалⁱ военный парад. Обычно он привлекалⁱ буржуа, застрявших случайно в городе. (Эренбург)

Čtrnáctého července se konalaⁱ každoročně vojenská přehlídka. Obyčejně přilákala^p mnoho měšťáků, kteří se náhodou ještě zdrželi ve městě.

několik

- (16) Говорилиⁱ они мало и мало виделиⁱ друг друга. Утром он молча пилⁱ чай и уходилⁱ на работу, в полдень являлсяⁱ обедать, за столом перекидывалисьⁱ незначительными словами, и снова исчезалⁱ вплоть до вечера. (Горький)

Mluviliⁱ spolu málo a málo se vídaliⁱ. Ráno mlčky vypil^p čaj a odešel^p do práce, v poledne přicházelⁱ k obědu, u stolu vyměnili^p spolu několik bezvýznamných slov a znovu zmizel^p do večera.

všechno

- (17) Ke mně jich chodíⁱ ze Scotland Yardu mnoho, abych jim vyložila karty; a řeknou^P mně všechno, co mají na srdci. (Čapek)
У меня бываютⁱ многие из Скотленд-Ярда, делятсяⁱ своими горестями...

2.2.3 The Russian imperfective and plural vs. the Czech perfective and singular - direct object

- (18) Каждый день приносилⁱ ему новые волнения (pl.). (Эренбург)
Každý den mu přinesl^P nové rozčilování (sg.).
- (19) Андре заставлял себя работать; но час спустя снова бросалⁱ кисти (pl.): не выходит! (Эренбург)
André se nutil do práce; ale po hodině zas odhodil^P štětec (sg.): práce se nedařila.
- (20) Обращали вы внимание на то, что соль спадает с кончика ножа, не оставляяⁱ никаких следов (pl.), - нож блещет, как нетронутый. (Олеша)
Všimli jste si někdy, že sůl spadne se špičky nože a nezanechá^P po sobě žádnou stopu (sg.) - nůž se třpytí jako netknutý.

2.2.4 The Russian imperfective and plural vs. the Czech perfective and singular - other categories

- (21) Был он человеком впечатлительным, слабовольным; порой друзья толкалиⁱ его на неожиданные поступки (pl.). (Эренбург)
Byl to člověk bohaté vnímavosti, ale slabé vůle; někdy ho přátelé přiměli^P udělat něco (sg), co by o své vůli nikdy neudělal.
- (22) Но в последние дни он показал себя храбрым и находчивым. От Камбре батальон отошел с боем; два раза переходилⁱ в контратаки (pl.). (Эренбург)
Ale v posledních dnech se osvědčil jako statečný voják a vynalézavý velitel; od Cambrai ustoupil s praporem teprve po urputných bojích; dvakrát přešel^P k protiútoku (sg.)

- (23) *На все вопросы* (pl.) на суде он, *вскакивая*ⁱ быстро, *отвечал*ⁱ коротко (...) (Андреев)
При каждой otázce (sg.) během přelíčení hbitě *vyskočil*^p a *odpověděl*^p krátce (...).

- (24) Když musel jít pěšky, dělal dojem nejzničenějšího člověka. *V takovém případě* (sg.) *nechal*^p zavazadla svého pána v zákopech a táhl jen svůj majetek. (Hašek)

Если же ему приходилось идти пешком, он производил впечатление человека, совершенно изничтоженного. *В таких случаях* (pl.) он *бросал*ⁱ багаж своего офицера в окопах и волок только свое собственное имущество.

- (25) A já si myslím, kdyby tam přibalili (...). Proto si někdy *zaskočí*^p *k tomu či onomu tepicháři* (sg.), sednu si na hromadu koberců (...). (Čapek)

Вот думаю не попадется ли мне (...). Потому-то я и *заглядываю*ⁱ *в эти лавки* (pl.), сажусь на кипу ковров (...).

2.2.5 Additional subject and its grammatical number

The interaction between aspect and the grammatical number takes place also with the subject. The first example illustrates an additional subject in Czech vs. an implicit one in plural in Russian. The second example contains the correlation: the Russian imperfective plus a plural subject vs. the Czech perfective plus a single subject, which is in both languages explicit, in contrast to the first example.

- (26) Визжала, открываясь, дверь, дрожали и звенели стекла, когда ее с шумом *захлопывали*ⁱ (pl.). (Горький)

Vrzaly otvírané dveře, a když je *někdo přirazil*^p, skla se v nich zatřásla a zařinčela.

- (27) Каждый раз, когда *книги* (pl.) *исчезали*ⁱ из ее рук, перед нею вспыхивало желтым пятном (...) (Горький)

Po každé, když z její rukou *zmizel*^p *balíček* (sg.), vzplanula před ní (...).

2.3 Adverbs of manner

The two attested additional adverbs *náhle* and *okamžitě* stress the momentaneous character and/or sudden inception of the events denoted by the Czech perfective.

a) *náhle*

- (28) Он весь **загорался**ⁱ от одного слова, а потом **погружался**ⁱ в беспричинную молчаливую печаль. (Эренбург)

Celý **se rozplamenil**^p jedním slovem a potom **se náhle celý pohro-
užil**^p v bezdůvodný, mlčenlivý žal.

- (29) Иногда на всем ходу **останавливался**ⁱ, **набирал**ⁱ полную грудь воздуха и отдувалсяⁱ, как человек, который слишком долго пробыл под водою. (Андреев)

Občas **se** v prudké chůzi **náhle zastavil**^p, **nabral**^p plnými doušky vzduch do plic a pak zhluboka, těžce dýchalⁱ, připomínaje člověka, který zůstal na své síly příliš dlouho pod vodou.

b) *okamžitě*

- (30) Изредка Анна **оглядывался**ⁱ и, точно обжегшись, **снова под-
нимал**ⁱ голову к потолку и усиленно жевалⁱ губами. (Андреев)

Jen občas **se** Annáš **ohlédl**^p, ale zrovna jako by se spálil, **okamžitě zase zvrátil**^p hlavu, **upřel**^p zrak do stropu a ještě horlivěji žmoulalⁱ rty.

APPENDIX 1

MORE EXAMPLES OF RESTRICTED AND UNRESTRICTED ITERATION

In this section, more examples of the aspectual correspondence: the Russian imperfective vs. the Czech perfective in the denotation of iterative events will be given. In contrast to the previous section, in which the Russian imperfective alone corresponded to the Czech perfective with an additional indication of iteration, in this section, the examples of both languages contain expressions denoting iteration. The data is organized as follows: in section 1 instances of restricted or quasi-restricted iteration are given, in section 2 instances of unrestricted iteration are provided. Section 2.1 contains examples from Russian original texts with their Czech translation, section 2.2 vice versa.

1. Restricted iteration

This section contains examples of restricted, numerical iteration (e.g. *два раза*) and quasi-restricted iteration (e.g. *несколько раз*) combined with the imperfective in Russian and the perfective in Czech.

- (1) Но за последние дни он показал себя храбрым и находчивым. От Камбре батальон отошел с боем; два раза переходилⁱ в контратаки; отбили у немцев двенадцать солдат, отставших при переходе. (Эренбург)

Ale v posledních dnech se osvědčil jako statečný voják a vynalézavý velitel; od Cambrai ustoupil s praporem teprve po urputných bojích; dvakrát přešel^p k protiútoku; obklíčili německý oddíl a zajali dvanáct Němců ...

- (2) Já jsem to tříkrát přeměřil^p: od toho kolíku na tu cestičku, to je navlas devatenáct metrů a dvacet sedm centimetrů. (Čapek)

Я три раза промерялⁱ - от моего колышка до тропинки ровно девятнадцать метров двадцать семь сантиметров.

- (3) Asi patnáctkrát tu zeď od magacínu s těma nápisama i mým podpisem páni od vojenskýho soudu fotografovaliⁱ, desetkrát mně dali^p napsat, aby zkoumali můj rukopis, 'My na vojnu nepůjdeme, my se na ni vyséreme', patnáctkrát muselⁱ jsem psát před nimi

‘Supák Schreiter je hnát’, a nakonec přijel jeden znalec písma a dal mně napsat ... (Hašek)

Раз пятнадцать приблизительно господ из военного суда фотографировалиⁱ стену цейхгауза со всеми надписями и моей подписью в том числе. Чтобы после исследовать мой почерк, меня раз десять заставлялиⁱ писать: ‘На войну мы не пойдем, на нее мы на все се..ем’, пятнадцать раз мне пришлось^p в их присутствии писать: ‘Фельдфебель Шрейтер - сволочь’. Наконец приехал эксперт-графолог и велел мне написать ...

- (3) Билье, торговавший оптом кофе, знал, что Лебро человек честный: не раз он пользовалсяⁱ его услугами для охраны товара от утечки. (Эренбург)

Billier, takto velkoobchodník s kávou, věděl, že Lebrault pracuje poctivě; nejednou použil^p jeho služeb, aby zabránil krádeži svého zboží.

- (4) Игра, конечно, опасная... Сколько раз Бретейль колебалсяⁱ! Поддерживала его вера в бога, в провидение. (Эренбург)

Ovšem, hra je nebezpečná... Kolikrát už Breteuil zaváhal^p. Romáhala mu víra v Boha, v Prozřetelnost.

- (5) Несколько раз ее обыскивалиⁱ, но всегда на другой день после того, как листки появлялисьⁱ на фабрике. (Горький)

Několikrát ji prohledali^p, ale vždy - až druhého dne po tom, kdy se v továrně objevily^p letáky.

- (6) Старичок несколько раз останавливалⁱ Павла, что-то разъяснялⁱ ему, однажды даже печально улыбнулся. (Горький)

Stařeček několikrát Pavla přerušil^p a něco mu vysvětlovalⁱ a jednou se dokonce truchlivě usmál.

- (7) Мир для Люсьена хорошел; люди становились милыми. Много раз выручалⁱ товарищей; делал это просто, не задумываясь. (Эренбург)

Svět byl teď pro Luciena krásnější, lidé milí. Mnohokrát zachránil^p kamarády; dělal to prostě, bez dlouhých úvah.

- (8) Каждый раз, когда ей давалиⁱ какое-нибудь поручение, ее крепко охватывалоⁱ желание исполнить это дело быстро и хорошо, и она уже не могла думать ни о чем, кроме своей задачи. (Горький)

Po každé, když dostala^p nějaký úkol, zmocnilo^p se jí naléhavé přání rychle a správně jej splnit a nemohla již na nic jiného myslet než na to, co má vykonat.

- (9) Je však také pravdou, že jsou tam úplně tichý blázni. Jako tam byl jeden vzdělanej vynálezce, který se pořád rýpal v nose a jenom jednou za den řekl^p: ‘Právě jsem vynášel elektřinu’. (Hašek)

Но, по правде сказать, там были только тихие помешанные. Например, сидел там один ученый-изобретатель, который все время ковырял в носу и лишь раз в день произносилⁱ: ‘Я только что открыл электричество’.

- (10) Это стало ее делом. По несколько раз в месяц переодетая монахиней, торговкой кружевами и ручным полотном, зажиточной мешанкой или богомолкой-странницей, она разъезжалаⁱ и разхаживала по губернии, с мешком за спиной или чемоданом в руках. (Горький)

Stalo se to jejím zaměstnáním. Několikrát za měsíc, převlečena za jeptišku, obchodnici s krajkami a ručně tkaným plátnem, zámožnou měštku nebo nábožnou poutnici, rozejela^p se po gubernii nebo putovala pěšky s pytleм на zádech nebo se zavazadlem v ruce.

2. Unrestricted iteration

2.1 Russian original text - Czech translation

The material is further divided into sub-sections according to the expressions of iteration that the examples contain.

a) *всегда*

- (1) Его орловец ‘Маклер’ с отличным аттестатом всегда приходилⁱ первым. (Ильф & Петров)

Jeho orelský klusák Maklér s výborným rodokmenem vždycky doběhl^p první.

b) *часто*

- (2) Дюкан выбрал себе место на крайней правой; но часто он смущалⁱ своих соседей неожиданными заявлениями. (Эренбург)

Ducamp zaujal ve sněmovně místo na krajní pravici, ale často překvapil^p své sousedy neočekávanými názory.

c) *иногда*

- (3) Он ел морковь, свеклу. Иногда встречный солдат, грязный и небритый, как Люсьен, делилсяⁱ с ним хлебом. Иногда в деревне давалиⁱ миску парного молока... (Эренбург)

Jedl mrkev a červenou řípu. Někdy narazil^p na nějakého vojáka, špinavého a neholeného, jako byl on sám; rozdělil^p se s ním o chléb, měl-li jaký. Někdy dostal^p ve vsi misku čerstvě nadojeného mléka...

- (4) Иногда приходилⁱ какой-то человек и осторожно оглядываясь, говорилⁱ Павлу: - Ну-ка, брат, ты тут книги читаешь, законы-то известны тебе. Так вот, объясни ты... (Горький)

Časem někdo přišel^p a opatrně se rozhlížeje, řekl^p Pavlovi: "Nu, bratře, ty čteš knihy a znáš zákony. Tak mi tedy vysvětlí..."

d) *порой, порою*

- (5) Порою кто-нибудь презрительно усмехалсяⁱ, что-то говорилⁱ товарищам, по их лицам тоже пробежалаⁱ насмешливая улыбка. (Горький)

Tu a tam se některý z nich pohrdavě usmál^p a řekl^p cosi kamarádům, po jejichž tvářím rovněž přelétl^p úsměšek.

- (6) Был он человеком впечатлительным, слабавольным; порой друзья толкалиⁱ его на неожиданные поступки. (Эренбург)

Byl to člověk bohaté vnímavosti, ale slabé vůle; někdy ho přátelé přiměli^p udělat něco, co by o své vůli nikdy neudělal.

e) *редко*

- (7) Никогда Тесса так не трудился; редко вырывалⁱ он часок для Полет. (Эренбург)

Nikdy ještě Tessat tolik nepracoval; zřídka kdy si urval^p hodinku pro Paulettu.

f) **каждый**

- (8) Каждый день приносилⁱ ему новые волнения. (Эренбург)

Každý den mu přinesl^p nové rozčilování.

- (9) Каждый раз, когда книги исчезалиⁱ из ее рук, перед нею вспыхивалоⁱ желтым пятном, точно огонь спички в темной комнате, лицо жандармского офицера... (Горький)

Po každé, když z jejích rukou zmizel^p balíček, vzplanula^p před ní jako plamen zápalky v tmavém pokoji žlutou skvrnou tvář četnického důstojníka...

g) **все**

- (10) На все вопросы на суде он, вскакиваяⁱ быстро, отвечалⁱ коротко, твердо и даже как будто с удовольствием: Верно! (Андреев)

Při každé otázce během přelíčení hbitě vyskočil^p a odpověděl^p krátce, sebejistě, a dokonce s jakýmsi uspokojením: "Dobrá!"

h) **не однажды**

- (11) - Хромого Нила дочка? Лицо мне знакомое, ибо не однажды дралⁱ меня за уши... (Горький)

"Chromého Nila dcera? Na toho se pamatuju, protože mě nejednou vytahal^p za uši..."

i) **то ... то**

- (12) Какой-то вечный неугомон сидел в нем и то скручивалⁱ его, как жгут, то разбрасывалⁱ его широким снопом извивающихся искр. И воду он пил чуть ли не ведрами, как лошадь. (Андреев)

Jakýsi věčný nepokoj mu seděl v týle - někdy ho zkroutil^p jako šňůru, jindy ho zas v mžiku proměnil^p v bohatou spršku vířících jisker. A vodu pil div ne po vědrech.

j) **снова**

- (13) Андре заставлял себя работать; но час спустя снова бросалⁱ кисти: не выходит! (Эренбург)

André se nutil do práce; ale po hodině zas odhodil^P štětec: práce se nedařila.

k) вдруг

- (14) ... пили пиво или вермут; потом расставалисьⁱ. Проходилⁱ год. Пьер вдруг вспоминалⁱ про Андре и, вбегаяⁱ в мастерскую, кричалⁱ... (Эренбург)

... pili pivo nebo vermut; potom se rozloučili^P. Uběhl^P rok. Pierre si náhle vzpomněl^P na Andrého, vběhl^P do ateliéru a křičelⁱ...

l) когда

- (15) Когда мяч попадалⁱ к нему, Валя, сидевшая на высоте, взвизгивалаⁱ, как будто сейчас же, немедленно, должна была увидеть что-то ужасное и преступное. (Олеша)

Kdykoliv se míč dostal^P k němu, Valja sedící vysoko nahoře vypískla^P, jako by teď, v tu chvíli, měla spatřit něco strašlivého a zločinného.

m) syntactic constructions

- (16) Таков был человек: он быстро загоралсяⁱ, быстро остывалⁱ. (Эренбург)

Taková už byla jeho přirozenost: rychle se nadchl^P a rychle ochladl^P.

- (17) К деньгам он был равнодушен: набегалиⁱ - тратилⁱ, не было - вместо обеда ел хлеб с колбасой. (Эренбург)

K penězům byl lhostejný: když přišly^P, utratil^P je, když nebyly, jedl místo oběda chléb se salámem.

2.2 Czech original text - Russian translation

a) vždycky

- (1) A když se něco u regimentu stalo^P, tak se vždycky našel^P mezi manšaftem nějaké dobrodinec, kerej to dal^P do novin pod názvem 'Тежрání воjáků'. (Hašek)

A когда что-нибудь случалосьⁱ в полку, всегда находилсяⁱ какой-нибудь благодетель, который пускалⁱ в газету статейку под заголовком 'Истязание солдат'.

b) občas

- (2) Na chodbách bylo slyšet odměřený krok hlídek, občas otevřel^p se otvor ve dveřích a kukátkem se dívalⁱ bachař. (Hašek)

Из коридора доносились размеренные шаги часовых, время от времени открывалсяⁱ глазок в двери и архангел заглядывалⁱ внутрь.

c) každý

- (3) Horko bylo, jako se někdy koncem září vydaří, a já vlezl^p do každé chalupy a musel si nechat líbit ledajaké hrubství... (Čapek)

Жарина была адская, такая редко выдается в конце сентября, а я лезⁱ в каждую халупу и терпеливо слушал разные грубости...

- (4) Ale už to nebylo jako na začátku války, kdy se vojáci cestou na front převedli^p na každém nádraží a kdy je vítalyⁱ družičky v pitomých bílých šatech... (Hašek)

Но торжественные встречи уже не носили того характера, как в начале войны, когда отправляющиеся на фронт солдаты объедалисьⁱ на каждой станции и когда их повсюду встречалиⁱ целые выводки одетых в идиотские белые платья девочек...

d) když

- (5) Klopýtající po silnici nemohli od sebe a závodčí táhl Švejka přes hromádky kamenů, a když upadl^p, strhl^p Švejka s sebou. (Hašek)

Оба спотыкались, и ефрейтор тащил за собой Швейка через кучи камней, а когда падалⁱ, то увлекалⁱ его за собой.

e) zase

- (6) “Vstaň, Bašto!”, zařval^p na něho četník. “Dál!” Bašta se potácivě zvedl^p a pletl nohama o kousek cesty dál, pokud se zase nezhroutil^p únavou. (Čapek)

- Встань, Башта! - оралⁱ на него жандарм. - Не здесь. Пошел! Башта, шатаясь, поднималсяⁱ и плелся дальше, пока снова не падалⁱ от усталости.

f) *takový*

- (7) Když jsem sloužil před léty u mýho regimentu, bejvaloⁱ to ještě horší. To takovýho maroda svázali^p do kozelce a hodili^p do díry, aby se vykurýroval. (Hašek)

Когда несколько лет тому назад я отбывал военную службу, в нашем полку случалосьⁱ еще хуже. Больного связывалиⁱ в козлы и бросалиⁱ в каталажку, чтобы он вылечился.

- (8) Když musel jít pěšky, dělal dojem nejzničenějšího člověka. V takovém případě nechal^p zavazadla svého pána v zákopech a táhlⁱ jen svůj majetek. (Hašek)

Если же ему приходилось идти пешком, он производил впечатление человека, совершенно изничтоженного. В таких случаях он бросалⁱ багаж своего офицера в окопах и волокⁱ только свое собственное имущество.

g) *no additional indication of iteration*

- (9) Těšil se oblibě vojáků, poněvadž byl neobyčejně spravedlivým a neměl ve zvyku někoho týrat. Šarže se před ním třásly a z nej-surovějšího šikovatele udělal^p za měsíc beránka. (Hašek)

Он пользовался расположением солдат, так как был нарекость справедлив и не имел обыкновения придирааться. Унтера дрожали перед ним. Из самого свирепого фельдфебеля он в течение месяца делалⁱ агнца.

- (10) Tak tam mně dovolili, abych hledal známky v koších na papír; to bylo mé nejbohatší loviště; tam se vám našel^p Siam a Jižní Afrika, Čína... (Čapek)

И мне разрешили приходить на фабрику и искать марки в корзинах для бумаг; здесь были мои самые богатые охотничьи угодья; тут я находилⁱ Сиам и Южную Африку, Китай...

APPENDIX 2

THE PRESENT TENSE

Within the correlation Russian imperfective - Czech perfective in the present tense similar principles apply as in the past tense. In section 1 the Russian imperfective as such signals iteration, in Czech a lexical expression of iteration is added to the singulative perfective. These expressions are divided according to the degree of frequency of iteration. Similarly as with the past tense, other elements have to be sometimes added to the perfective, such as quantification of the object or an adverb of manner. For the linguistic analysis of similar examples see Part One of this chapter.

1. Additional indication of iteration in Czech

1.1 Adverbial expressions denoting frequency

a) *vždy/cky*

- (1) Редко вижу людей, когда кто-нибудь заходитⁱ, начинаюⁱ говоритьⁱ. (Горький)

Stýkám se málo s lidmi, a když někdo ke mně zajde^p, tak se vždy rozpovídám^p.

- (2) Von se vůbec stydí mluvit. (...) Pan major Wenzl nechá^p ho vždy stát na chodbě, když jde někam do města... (Hašek)

Совсем забитый ребенок. Одним словом - молокосос. Господин майор Венцель оставляетⁱ его в коридоре, когда сам уходит в город.

- (3) ... protože taková frajle v podnájmu má vždycky strašně ráda něco svého a pěkného, a pak si koupí^p takovou zbytečně drahou věc. (Čapek)

... девицы, снимающие комнату, любят красивые вещи, вот и покупаютⁱ что-нибудь ужасно дорогое.

b) *někdý*

- (4) A já si myslím, kdyby tam přibalili... Proto si někdý zaskočím^p k tomu nebo onomu tepicháři, sednu si na hromadu koberců, pokuřuju a koukám, jak se prodávají ... (Čapek)

Вот думаю не попадется ли мне... Потому-то я и заглядываюⁱ в эти лавки, сажусь на кипу ковров, покуриваю и гляжу, как купцы продают ...

- (5) To se tak někdý stane^p, když člověk napíše víc dopisů, že je strčí do nepravých obálek. (Čapek)

Та это и бываетⁱ: человек напишет несколько писем, и перепутает конверты.

c) *sem tam*

- (6) При мне, конечно, молчатⁱ. Но все-таки до меня доходитⁱ через Мориса, через Жанну... (Эренбург)

V mé přítomnosti nepadne^p ovšem o tobě ani slovo. Přece se však sem tam něco doslechnu^p prostřednictvím Maurice, Jeanny ...

d) *tu a tam*

- (7) Čemu tedy věřím? Náhodě, Toníku; takovým těm mimovolným, bezděčným nebo nekontrolovaným hnutím nebo činům nebo slovům, které člověku tu a tam uklouznou^p. Všecko se dá falšovat, jenom náhoda ne; ta se pozná^p na první pohled. (Čapek)

Чему же я верю? Случайностям, Тоник! Этаким непроизвольным, безотчетным, импульсивным побуждениям, поступкам или высказываниям, которые бываютⁱ свойственны всякому. Все можно изобразить, только не в случайностях, их видно сразу.

e) *nikdy*

- (8) Дениз? Но девушка молчит, не ходит в церковь, не отвечаетⁱ матери. (Эренбург)

Denisa? Ale ta je zamklá, do kostela nechodí, matce nikdy nic neřekne^p.

1.2 Quantification of the object

- (9) Já mám jenom smůlu. Já myslím vždycky všechno dobře a nakonec se mně to vždycky vobráťí^P k tomu horšímu jako tamhletomu mučedníkovi na tom obraze. (Hašek)

Мне просто не везет. Я все стараюсь как получше, а у меня все выходитⁱ колом, все равно как у того мученика на иконе.

- (10) Ke mně jich chodí ze Scotland Yardu mnoho, abych jim vyložila karty; a řeknou^P mně všechno, co mají na srdci. (Čapek)

У меня бывают многие из Скотленд-Ярда, делятсяⁱ своими горестями...

1.3 Adverbs of manner

a) *hned*

- (11) Но он здоров, отчаянно, неприлично здоров, ест за троих, бродит весь день, стоит лечь - засыпаетⁱ. (Эренбург)

André je však zdravý, zdravý jako buk, jí za tři, celé dny se toulá, a když je čas k spánku, hned usne^P.

b) *náhle*

- (12) ... a maloval si, jak prohlíží vlaky, zastavují auta, letící k hranicím, čekají na svou kořist za rohem ulice a náhle vykročí^P se slovy: "Ve jménu zákona ..." (Čapek)

... и представлял себе как обыскивают поезда, останавливают несущиеся к границе автомашины, подстерегают свою добычу за углом и вырастают из-под земли со словами: "Именем закона!"

2. Unrestricted iteration

- (13) Fanatik tvrdě řekl: "Pozoruji, že vy klejete." "To je zvyk," odpověděl Katz, "někdy se přistihnu^P dokonce, že se rouhám ..." (Hašek)

Фанатик твердо сказал: - Я замечаю, что вы сквернословите.
- Привычка, - сказал Кац. - иногда даже ловлюⁱ себя на богохульстве.

- (14) Totiž to je tak: Já se znám se všemi obchodníky s koberci, co u nás jsou, a někdy si je tak obejdu^p, abych se podíval, co mají na skladě; víte, ti agenti v Anatólíi a Persii někdy jenom popadnou^p nějaký starý kus ukradený z mešity nebo odkud, a přibalí^p jej k tomu druhému metrovému zboží; ten celý balík ať je v něm co je, se potom prodává na váhu.

Дело обстоит так. Я знаю всех торговцев коврами, какие есть в нашем городе, и иногда захожуⁱ к ним поглядеть на товар. Видите ли, их закупщикам в Анатолии и Персии иной раз попадаетсяⁱ старинный ковер, украденный в мечети или где-нибудь; они суютⁱ его в тюк обычного метрового товара, и потом он продается на вес, что бы то ни было.

- (15) Андре не читает газет. Редко слушает радио. Иногда вспоминаетⁱ - Жаннет ... Но это было давно, в другой жизни. (Эренбург)

André nečte noviny. I radio poslouchá zřídka. Tu a tam si vzpomene^p na Jeannettu ... Ale to už ani není pravda, bylo to v jiném městě.

- (16) Он поет по утрам в клозете ...

В дверь уборной вделано матовое овальное стекло.

Он поворачиваетⁱ выключатель, овал освещаетсяⁱ изнутри и становитсяⁱ прекрасным, цвета овала, яйцом. (Олеша)

Ráno si vždycky na záchodě zpívá ...

Do dveří záchodu je vsazeno matné oválné sklo.

Otočí^p vypínačem, ovál se zevnitř osvětlí^p a promění^p se v krásné vejce opálové barvy.

- (17) Он моется, как мальчик: дудит, приплясывает, фыркает, испускает вопли. Воду он захватывает пригоршнями и, не донося до подмышек, рассшлепываетⁱ по циновке. Вода на соломе рассыпаетсяⁱ полными, чистыми каплями. Пена, падая в таз, закипаетⁱ, как блин. Иногда мыло ослепляетⁱ его, - он чертыхаясь, раздирает большими пальцами веки. Полощет горло он с клетотом. Под балконом останавливаются люди и задирают головы. (Олеша)

Мыje se jako kluk, hvízdá si, poskakuje, frká a stříká. Vodu nabírá celými hrstmi, a než ji donese k podpaží, rozčáká^p ji po rohoži.

Voda se na slámě roztrhne^P do velkých čirých kapek. Pěna, která padne^P do umyvadla, vzkypí^P pokaždé jako lívancové těsto. Někdy se mu dostane^P mýdlo do očí, a tu kleje a zuřivě si mne víčka velkými prsty. Při kloktání vydává skřeky. Pod balkónem se zastavují lidé a dívají se vzhůru.

- (18) Синие лямки подтяжек висят по бокам. Он идет в спальню, находитⁱ на стуле пенсне, надеваетⁱ его перед зеркалом и возвращаетсяⁱ в мою комнату. Здесь, стояⁱ посередине, он поднимаетⁱ лямки подтяжек, обе разом, таким движением, точно взваливает на плечи кладь. Со мной не говоритⁱ он ни слова. (Олеша)

Modré popruhy šlí mu visí podél boků. Jde do ložnice, nahmatá^P na židli skřípec, nasadí^P si ho před zrcadlem a vrátí^P se do pokoje. Postaví^P se doprostřed, hodí^P si na ramena popruhy šlí pohybem, jako by zvedal náklad. Se mnou nepromluví^P slovo.

- (19) Меня не любят вещи ...
Если какая-нибудь дрянь - монета или запонка - падаетⁱ со стола, то обычно закатываетсяⁱ она под трудно отодвигаемую мебель. Я ползаю по полу и поднимаюⁱ голову, вижу, как буфет смеется. (Олеша)

Mne nemají věci rády ...

Upadne-li^P mi se stolu nějaká drobnost - mince nebo knoflíček -, zakutálí^P se obvykle pod těžký kus nábytku. Lezu po podlaze, a když zvednu^P hlavu, vidím jak se mi přiborník směje.

- (20) Я очень люблю уличные зеркала. Они возникают неожиданно поперек пути. Ваш путь обычен, спокоен - обычный городской путь, не сулящий вам ни чудес, ни видений. Вы идете, ничего не предполагая, поднимаетеⁱ глаза, и вдруг, на миг, вам становитсяⁱ ясно: с миром, с правилами мира произошли небывалые перемены. (Олеша)

Mám velmi rád pouliční zrcadla. Vynořujíⁱ se nečekaně napříč cesty. Vaše cesta je obyčejná, klidná - obyčejná městská cesta, neslibující žádné zázraky ani zjevení. Jdete, nic netušíte, vzhlednete^P a náhle, v mžiku zjistíte^P, že se světem, s řády světa se udály nebyvalé změny.

- (21) Dejme tomu, že ta holka byla služka. Taková služka každou chvíli něco rozbije^p, a když se jí to stane^p potřetí, řekne^p jí ta paní ... (Čapek)

Допустим, эта девушка - служанка. Служанки то и дело бьютⁱ хозяйскую посуду. Когда это случаетсяⁱ в третий раз, хозяйка говоритⁱ ей ...

- (22) Je zde víc takových lidí. Ten padne^p v Karpatech s mou nezaplacenou směnkou, ten jdeⁱ do zajetí, te se mně utopí^p v Srbsku, ten umře^p v Uhrách ve špitále. (Hašek)

И таких у меня в книжке много. Один погибаетⁱ на Карпатах, с моим неоплаченным векселем, другой попадаетⁱ в плен, третий, как назло, тонетⁱ в Сербии, а четвертый умираетⁱ в госпитале в Венгрии.

- (23) “Dnes je to legrace, bejt zavřenej”, liboval si Švejk dále, “žádný čtvrcení, žádný španělský boty, kavalce máme, stůl máme, lavici máme, nemačkáme se jeden na druhýho, polévku dostanem^p, chleba nám dají^p, džbán vody přinesou^p, záchod mámeⁱ přímo pod hubou. Ve všem je vidět pokrok. (Hašek)

- Теперь сидеть в тюрьме - одно удовольствие! - похваливал Швейк. - Никаких червертований, никаких колодок. Койка у нас есть, стол есть, лавки есть, места много, похлебка нам полагаетсяⁱ, хлеб даютⁱ, жбан воды приносятⁱ, отхожее место под самым носом. Во всем виден прогресс.

ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF ITERATIVE EVENTS

PART THREE

ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF NEGATED ITERATIVE EVENTS

1. Introduction

In Part Three of the present chapter, aspectual differences between Russian and Czech in the denotation of negated iterative events will be illustrated: i.e. the cases in which Russian selects the imperfective whereas Czech opts for the perfective. A similar tendency has been observed for Russian and Slovak (Smirnov 1971).

During the investigation of the data it became obvious that aspect behaves with respect to negation very similarly as with respect to iteration. Eckert (1984) has drawn attention to this phenomenon and done research on it. In the previous parts of this chapter it has been shown that with iterated (non-negated) events, the imperfective is the dominant form in Russian, while in Czech both aspects occur, with a relatively high frequency of the perfective. The Russian imperfective operates primarily at the macro-level of the complex iterated event, while the Czech aspect is oriented to the micro-level of the individual iterated event. In this context, Russian often does not make a distinction between types of events (e.g. processes, results), their internal structure remains opaque. The Russian imperfective serves frequently as a signal of iteration. This shows especially in cases, in which iteration is designated solely by means of an imperfective in Russian, while in Czech an extra lexical means of iteration has to be added.

The behaviour of aspect in the denotation of negated and iterated events is very similar: in Russian the imperfective is the dominating aspect, while the perfective is a frequent form in Czech. This is true especially of the past tense. Similarly to an iterated event, the negated event can be viewed as a complex structure in which two levels can be distinguished: 1. the level of one concrete negated occurrence, and 2. the level of all possible negated instances of this one occurrence. In other words, the scope of negation can extend either to all possible instances of the negated event, or be limited to one concrete individual non-occurrence. Although the perfective is possible in Russian with negated events,

especially when the single non-occurrence is stressed by extra lexical means as *ни разу*, there seems to be a bias towards the imperfective. On the other hand, although the imperfective is not infrequent with negated events in Czech, the perfective is preferred. The selected examples below illustrate this aspectual difference between the two languages, i.e. the contrast between the Russian imperfective vs. the Czech perfective. With the Russian imperfective, it is often not clear what is the internal structure of the single non-occurrence out of the negated complex. All types of events are unified under the umbrella of the Russian imperfective operating at the macro-level of the negated complex. The Czech perfective aspect is oriented towards the micro-level of the single non-occurrence, therefore, its structure is accessible. In the examples below, the perfective denotes the following types of events: resultative or momentaneous single non-occurrences. This singleness is in some cases stressed with extra lexical means (e.g. *ani*) and by an quantified object (e.g. *not one/a single word*). With other types of events such as processes, an imperfective would have to be used in Czech.

2. The data

Figure 1 below shows the occurrence of aspect in the denotation of negated events. The sentences that form this collection were excerpted from various parallel literary texts. The sample is probably not large enough to serve as conclusive evidence, but it can give an indication of how aspect works in negative contexts.

Figure 1. Russian and Czech aspect in the denotation of negated events

	<u>Russian</u>			<u>Czech</u>		
	past	present	total	past	present	total
PF	33	17	50	69	28	97
IPF	69	27	96	30	19	49
			<u>146</u>			<u>146</u>

Data: Čapek, Hašek; Andreev, Erenburg, Gor'kij, Il'f & Petrov, Oleša

2.1 Expression of negation in the data

The most common expression of negation encountered in the data is the negation of the verb, in Czech by means of the negative prefix *ne-* and in Russian the particle *не*. The negated verb is often combined with

other means denoting negation, such as adverbs, pronouns, adjectives and conjunctions that contain an element of negation (*ne-, ní-, не-, ни-*) or the lexical meaning is clearly negative (e.g. *žádný*). In some cases of this lexical negation, the verb is not necessarily negated (e.g. *нелегко отступается*). Various expressions of negation that have been encountered in the data are enumerated below (under a)), also some means that are as such not negative, but stress or specify negation (under b)).

Czech:

- a) *nic, nikdo, nikdy, nikam, nikde; žádný; ani, ani ... ani, ani jeden; aniž; nejednou;*
- b) *ještě ne, už ne, víc ne, dál ne; hned tak ne;*
jestli ne, jestliže ne, aby ne, dokud ne, pokud ne.

Russian:

- a) *ничего, никто, никогда, никуда, нигде; никакой; ни, ни ...ни, не ...и / и ... не, ни один;*
неоднократно, ни разу, не раз, не однажды;
нелегко;
- b) *уже не, больше не, не очень, не совсем, даже не;*
если не, пока не.

2.2 Examples of negated sentences - the present tense

- (1) Vodmalička mám takovou smůlu. Vždycky chci něco vopravit, udělat dobře, a **nikdy nic** z toho **nevyjde**^P než nějaká nepříjemnost pro mne i pro okolí. (Hašek)

С малых лет мне не везет. Я всегда хочу поправить дело, чтобы все было по-хорошему, и **никогда ничего** из этого **не выходит**ⁱ, кроме неприятностей и для меня и для других.

- (2) Дениз? Но девушка молчит, **не ходит** в церковь, **не отвечает**ⁱ матери. (Эренбург)

Denisa? Ale ta je zamlklá, do kostela **nechodí**, matce **nikdy nic neřekne**^P.

- (3) Обращали вы внимание на то, что соль спадает с кончика ножа, **не оставляя**ⁱ **никаких** следов, - нож блещет, как нетронутый. (Олеша)

Všimi jste si někdy, že sůl spadne se špičky nože a **nezanechá**^P po sobě **žádnou** stopu - nůž se třpytí jako netknutý.

- (4) - Для окраски есть замечательное средство 'Титаник'. Получено с таможни. Контрабандный товар. Не смываетсяⁱ ни холодной, ни горячей водой, ни ... (Ильф & Петров)

"K barvení mám znamenitý přípravek Titanik. Dostal jsem ho přímo z celnice. Pašované zboží. Nesmyje^p se ani studenou, ani horkou vodou ...

- (5) - Но ведь мне аптекарь говорил, что это будет радикально черный цвет. Не смываетсяⁱ ни холодной, ни горячей водой, ни мыльной пеной, ни керосином ... Контрабандный товар. (Ильф & Петров)

"Ale lékárník mi říkal, že je to radikální černá barva. Nesmyje^p se studenou ani horkou vodou, mýdlem ani petrolejem ... Pašované zboží.

- (6) Je to nějaká zábava? Ani ten kupletista se neobjeví^p. Ani pít dnes mladší důstojníci neumí. Není ještě dvanáct hodin, a už je za stolem jak vidíte, pět opilých. (Hašek)

А нынче? Разве это развлечение? Куплетист - и тот не появляетсяⁱ. Даже пить теперь младшие офицеры не умеют! Двенадцати часов еще нет, а за столом уже, как видите, пять пьяных.

- (7) Вы просыпаетесь ... Не шевелитесьⁱ, чтобы не нарушить неподвижности освещения. (Олеша)

Probudíte se ... Ani se nehnete^p, abyste neporušili nehybné osvětlení.

- (8) Teda to víte: když si chlap něco vezme do hlavy, tak hned tak perovolí^p; a když je to sběratel, tak půjde třeba vraždit ... (Čapek)

Вы сами знаете: мужчина нелегко отступаетсяⁱ от того, что взбрело ему в голову. И если он коллекционер, то готов пойти и на убийство.

- (9) Оказалось, что 'Маклер' не орловец, а перекрашенный метис, а метисы гораздо резвее орловцев, и их к ним на версту не подпускаютⁱ, (Ильф & Петров)

Ukázalo se, že Makléř nebyl čistokrevný orelský kůň, ale nabarvený

крі́женец, а крї́жenci jsou mnohem bujnějš́í než oreľší́, непусті́^p je na kilometr k sobě.

- (10) Ale von je potvora, kouše o všechno pryč. Nedá^p se pohladit. (Hašek)
Но кусается, сволочь, зверски. Погладить не даетсяⁱ.

2.3 Examples of negated sentences - the past tense

2.3.1 Extra lexical negation

a) *nikdy nic / никогда ничего*

- (11) Nikdy jsem nic neudělal^p naschvál ... (Hašek)
Никогда я ничего не делалⁱ нарочно ...
- (12) Já jsem nikdy nic neukrad^p ... zeptejte se ... (Čapek)
Я никогда ничего не кралⁱ ... хоть кого спросите ...

b) *nikdy nikam / никогда никуда*

- (13) O manévrech prováděl se svým plukem právě divy. Nikdy nedorazil^p nikam včas, vedl pluk v kolonách proti strojním puškám ... (Hašek)
На маневрах полковник творил со своим полком прямо чудеса: никогда никуда вовремя не поспевалⁱ и вел полк колоннами против пулеметов.

c) *nikdy / никогда*

- (14) Он ее не бил, не ругал, но и не ласкалⁱ никогда. (Горький)
Не бил ho, nenadával mu, ale také ho nikdy nepohládil^p.
- (15) Mně nikdy v životě nenapadlo^p, že existuje nějakéj plešatej generál-major. (Hašek)
Мне никогда в голову не приходилоⁱ, что существует на свете какой-то плеши́вый генерал-майор.
- (16) Б. старался не оттолкнуть его и никогда при нем не заикалсяⁱ о сотрудничестве с Германией. (Эренбург)

B. si ho předcházel a **nikdy se** před ním **nepodřekl^P** o spolupráci s Německem.

- (17) Иногда приходила Сашенька, она **никогда не сиделаⁱ** долго ... (Горький)

Občas přicházívала Sašenka, **nikdy se** dlouho **nezdržela^P**.

- (18) Муш поняла, что **никогда** прежде **не встречалаⁱ** таких людей. (Эренбург)

Mouche si uvědomila, že **nikdy** předtím **se nesetkala^P** s lidmi jeho druhu.

- (19) Порывистая душа отца Федора не знала покоя. **Не зналаⁱ** она его **никогда**. Ни тогда, когда он был воспитанником духовного училища, Федей, ни когда он был усатым семинаристом. (Иль & Петров)

Vznětlivá duše otce Fjodora neznala klidu. **Nepoznala^P** ho **nikdy**. Ani když ještě býval žákem Feďou a později vousatým studentem teologie ...

- (20) До пятидесяти лет он не хворал; много пил, курил без остановки, **недосыпалⁱ**. (Эренбург)

Do svých padesáti let Dessere nechuravěl: hodně pil, kouřil bez přestání, **nikdy nedospal^P**.

- (21) И прежде почему-то было так, что Иуда **никогда не говорилⁱ** прямо с Иисусом, и тот **никогда** прямо **не обращалсяⁱ** к нему ... (Андреев)

Ani dříve **se** kupodivu **nikdy nestalo^P**, aby Jidáš přímo rozmlouval s Ježíšem a Kristus ho také **nikdy** přímo **neoslovil^P**.

d) *nikdo / никто*

- (22) - А твоего барина что, шлепнули? - неожиданно спросил Остап.
- **Никто не шлепалⁱ**. Сам уехал. Что ему тут было с солдатней сидеть ... (Ильф & Петров)

“А tvého pána odbouchli?” znenadání se zeptal Ostap.

“**Nikdo** ho **neodbouch^P**. Sám odjel. Co by se tu bavil s vojáky.

- (23) Už to začalo být jaksi trapné; **nikdo** z přítomných **se nezvedl^p**. (Čapek)

Возникла атмосфера неловкости: **никто** из присутствующих **не вставалⁱ**.

- (24) Началось спокойное течение служебного дня. **Никто не тревожилⁱ** стол регистрации смертей и браков. (Ильф & Петров)

Úřední hodiny míjely v klidu a pokoji. Registrátora úmrtí a sňatků už **nikdo nevyrušil^p**.

- (25) Totiž jsou to moc chytří lidé. Ale já **jsem** to **neřekl^p** nikomu, čestné slovo. (Čapek)

... они очень ловкие люди. Я **никому не говорилⁱ** о документе, честное слово.

e) *nic / ничего*

- (26) Každé její slovo, každou její vytáčku jsem desetkrát obracel a kuchal; ale **nenášel^p jsem nic**. (Čapek)

Десятки раз я перетолковывал и обдумывал каждое ее слово и отговорку, но **не находилⁱ ничего** ...

f) *ani / ни* etc.

- (27) Před třemi roky mně zemřela žena. Já to **nepřiznal^p** sobě **ani** jiným, ale bylo mně hrozně smutno. (Čapek)

Три года назад умерла моя жена. Я **не признавалсяⁱ** **ни** себе, **ни** людям, но мне было невыносимо грустно.

- (28) Хотя дела своего мужчина в пиджаке еще **и не начиналⁱ**, но уйти ему уже хотелось. (Ильф & Петров)

Třebaže svou záležitost ještě **ani nezačal^p**, už by byl nejradši odešel.

- (29) Он проглатывал десяток газет и **не пропускалⁱ** **ни** одной демонстрации. (Эренбург)

Hltal desaterý noviny a **nepropásl^p** **ani** jednu demonstraci.

- (30) 'Já jsem tady od patnáctého února a neodešel^P jsem ani na půl dne, já mám na to svědky.' (Čapek)

- Я здесь с пятнадцатого февраля и никуда не отлучалсяⁱ, у меня свидетели есть.

g) *nejednou / не однажды, не раз*

- (31) - Хромого Нила дочка? Лицо мне знакомое, ибо не однажды дралⁱ меня за уши ... (Горький)

'Chromého Nila dcera? Na toho se pamatuju, protože mě nejednou vytahal^P za uši ... '

- (32) Б., торговавший оптом кофе, знал, что Л. человек честный: не раз он пользовалсяⁱ его услугами для охраны товара от утечки. (Эренбург)

B., takto velkoobchodník s kávou, věděl, že L. pracuje poctivě; nejednou použil^P jeho služeb, aby zabránil krádeži svého zboží.

2.3.2 No extra lexical negation

- (33) Скупа она была до чрезвычайности, и только бедность Ипполита Матвеевича не давалаⁱ развернуться этому захватывающему чувству. (Ильф & Петров).

Lakomá byla až bůh brání a jenom zeřova chudoba nedovolila^P, aby se tento její silný rys jak náleží rozvinul.

- (34) ... pět let mě okrádal můj prokurista, a já jsem na to nepřišel^P! (Čapek)

... пять лет меня обкрадывал мой собственный управляющий, а я даже не догадывалсяⁱ!

- (35) Potom jsem dostal spálu, a Lojzika ke mně nepustili^P, třeba stával u nás na chodbě a pískal ... (Čapek)

Но вот я заболел скарлатиной, и Лойзика не пускали^P ко мне, хотя он торчал у нас в коридоре и насвистывал ...

- (36) A pak jsem si vzpomněl: 'Tedy Lojzík mně ty známky neukradl^P! Kriste Pane, jak já mu křivdil!' (Čapek)

А потом пришла мысль: значит, Лойзик не кралⁱ этих марок. Господи боже, как я был к нему несправедлив.

- (37) ... ale dole, to není nic, ten chlap nemá v trupu žádný švunk. Já myslím, pane okresní, že to nehodil^p. (Čapek)

С таким корпусом не может быть мощного замаха. Нет, господин судья, он не бросалⁱ камня.

- (38) Končiv čtenie, mládež dloho sporiła, no V. ne priíimálⁱ učastiä v sporäx. (Gorький)

Když bylo předčítání skončeno, mládež dlouho debatovala, ale V. se debat nezúčastnil^p.

- (39) Он не выносилⁱ ущербä: его оскорбляли чернила ... (Эренбург)
Nestrpěl^p poškozenné věci kolem sebe; šel mu na nervy inkoust ...

- (40) Она думала, что должна от него уйти, но не уходилаⁱ. (Эренбург)
Řekla si, že by bylo lépe od něho odejít hned, ale neodešla^p.

- (41) На душе Ипполита Матвеевича снова стало необыкновенно радостно. Он не представлялⁱ себе, как будет приходиться в опустевшую, замусоренную квартиру. (Ильф & Петров)

Zmocnil se ho pocit neobyčejné ošklivosti. Nedovedl^p si představit, jak bude vcházet do prázdného neuklizeného bytu.

- (42) ... následkem toho směl chodit po lesích s tím tragickým průvodem, aniž se na něho někdo utrhl^p, že tu nemá co dělat. (Čapek)

... и ему позволили сопровождать это трагическое шествие, то есть никто не гналⁱ его - нечего, мол, тебе тут делать.

- (43) Švejek právě seděl na posteli po obvyklé denní kůře předepsané dr. Grunsteinem, obklopen skupinou vychrtlých a vyhladovělých simulantů, kteří se doposud nevzdali^p a houževnatě zápasili s dr. Grunsteinem na půdě úplné diety. (Hašek)

Швейк только что вернулся на свою койку после обычного ежедневного тура, предписанного доктором Г., и сидел, окруженный толпой исхудавших и изголодавших симулянтов, кото-

рые до сих пор не славалисьⁱ и упорно продолжали состязать со строгой диетой доктора Г.

- (44) После ужина он сбрасывал посуду со стола на пол, если жена не успевалаⁱ вовремя убрать ее ... (Горький)

Po večeri shazoval nádobí se stolu na zem, jestliže se ženě nepodařilo^p včas je uklidit ...

- (45) Asi za deset dní - po těch deset dní jsme se museli skrývat, aby nás kaktusáři neroztrhali^p samými dotazy - jsem poslal druhou zprávu ... (Čapek)

День через десять, - все это время мы вынуждены были скрываться, чтоб^y нас не допекалиⁱ расспросами встревоженные любители кактусов, - я послал в газету еще одну заметку такого содержания ...

- (46) И до тех пор раскачивал он тяжелого Петра, пока не просыпалисьⁱ в нём засохшие воспоминания ... (Андреев)

A a dlouho pobízel těžkopádného Petra, dokud se v něm neprobudily^p zasuté vzpomínky ...

ASPECT IN THE DENOTATION OF SEQUENCES OF EVENTS

1. Introduction

1.0 Preamble

This chapter deals with Russian and Czech aspect in the denotation of sequences of successive events. The context has been restricted to past, non-iterated events. In both Russian and Czech, the perfective is generally considered to be the typical form denoting succession. However, after the investigation of a considerable number of narrative texts containing sequences of events, it became clear that while in Russian the perfective is predominant, Czech shows a relatively high frequency of the imperfective (see Figure 1 in section 1.4). It was Ivančev (1961) who first drew attention to this phenomenon in his monograph on the “contextually conditioned ingressive use” of imperfective verbs in Czech in comparison with other Slavic languages. Ivančev gives numerous examples of the Czech imperfective as part of sequences of successive events; in many cases the imperfective follows a perfective and/or is ‘sandwiched’ between two perfectives. The ingressive use of the Czech imperfective occurs typically with the determined verbs of motion which are ‘susceptible’ to an ingressive interpretation, and with other verbs with an element of motion and inchoative verbs, as well as with expressions of states but also with certain lexical groups of verbs such as *verba dicendi*, *sentiendi* etc. (cf. Ivančev 1961, particularly 78-80, and Stunová 1988). The ingressivity of the Czech imperfective often becomes clear through translation in other languages, e.g. Russian where the perfective is used in similar positions. However, it is not only ingressive verbs that are used to translate the Czech imperfective into Russian, terminative verbs occur frequently, too. In other words, apart from the “contextually determined ingressive use” of the Czech imperfective signalled by Ivančev, a “contextually determined terminative use” can be assumed as well. This will be illustrated below by a collection of examples.

The necessary question to be raised is how to explain the observed systematic differences in the use of aspect between Russian and Czech, one of which is the “contextually determined ingressive use” of the Czech imperfective vs. the perfective in Russian in similar positions. Ivančev

gives a diachronic explanation in which the influence of German on Czech plays an important role. Also Galton (1976: 70) offers a diachronic explanation, but from a totally different point of view: he explains the spread of the ingressive use to other categories than the determined verbs of motion by the loss of the imperfective aorist. This form used to denote "an action in progress for some time between two limiting points; in the major North Slavic languages, this can now be replaced only by a perfective aspect which accounts for the succession, but not for the duration, or by an imperfective past which renders the duration, but not the succession" (ibid.). Galton disagrees further with the thesis of Ivančev concerning the German influence on the Czech aspect, but doubts also the possibility of the maintenance of the Czech imperfective aorist, be it in another form. Galton (in p.c.) states that: "I still stick to my belief that German influence counts for nothing in this Czecho-Slovak peculiarity, but it is also hard to credit the Old Czech imperfective aorist with such a staying power, even through the assumption of its function by another tense". However, it might nevertheless be possible that the loss of such specialized forms as the (imperfective) aorist, the imperfect, the (plu) perfect etc. can cause a certain semantic ambiguity of the remaining few forms. In other words, the 'cumulation of functions' that has taken place with the remaining forms (cf. Dostál 1967) can lead to a kind of semantic polyinterpretability of the forms, in which each language can have its own semantic bias.

1.1 The hypothesis

Apart from the diachronic explanation of the ingressive and terminative use of the Czech imperfective in contrast to Russian and other Slavic languages, an explanation from the synchronic perspective might be valid as well. In Chapter 1 explanations based on invariant meanings were discussed. It has been mentioned above that the problem of invariant meanings was their seeming vagueness and relative inaccessibility. Therefore, supplementary to the invariance hypothesis, another proposal will be made, which is conform recent investigations of aspect in discourse. For instance, Fielder (in Thelin 1990) stresses the importance of the discourse level in the process of encoding of the Russian aspect. My research leads to a similar conclusion. On the basis of observation of numerous data of various types an inductive hypothesis has been formulated concerning the selection and functioning of aspect in discourse (see also Chapter 1).

In sequences of events, the Russian aspect operates at the level of the whole sequence, irrespective the character of the individual event. Events that would be normally expressed by the imperfective such as states are perfectivized. The same applies also to certain lexical groups of verbs such as *verba sentiendi* that generally prefer the semantically broader imperfective, however not in sequences. It can be assumed that certain factors at the discourse level contribute to the choice of aspect in Russian, while this level is not of primary importance in Czech. Czech aspect concentrates on the internal structure and the lexical meaning of each individual verb that are situated at the paradigmatic level. It is this level that is decisive for the selection of the aspectual form. It can therefore be said that the Czech aspect possesses a more lexical character than the Russian aspect. Generally, Russian aspect operates in larger wholes, i.e. it has a broad scope, while the Czech aspect concentrates on the particular events and their structure that form part of a larger whole.

1.2 Aspect in narrative texts

In contrast to the relatively recent discourse-oriented studies, which work with text as the unit of the analysis, the majority of the traditional linguistic works devoted to the semantics of the Russian aspect are conducted at the sentence, or clause level. This implies a tacitly assumed semantic autonomy of the sentence (cf. Filatova-Hellberg 1975: 85). However, sentences usually form part of enunciations or texts larger than one sentence. Discourse-oriented studies show the importance of the textual (narrative) level for the morphological encoding of aspect (cf. Timberlake 1982, Fielder 1990). Similarly, Gasparov (1979: 126) states that the use of aspect depends on rules at both the sentence level and the text level. In comparison to the related categories 'tense' and 'modality', which form the basic means of predication in the sentence, aspect in Russian plays an analogical role at the textual level (ibid.). Benveniste (1966: 77) distinguishes two basic types of texts: 'histoire' (narrative) and 'discours' (e.g. dialogue). This distinction in the type of text can also play an important role in the selection of the aspectual forms (cf. Barentsen 1992).

This chapter concentrates on the narrative type of text. Narrative texts are organized along two axes: the axis of successivity and the axis of simultaneity. Relating this to aspect, the following formulation based on the classical Latin grammar can be found in Maslov (1984: 191-193): "Perfecto procedit, imperfecto insistit narratio". This principle is valid

for many languages and the presence of the grammatical opposition between the axis of successivity vs. the axis of simultaneity can serve as a clear criterion for the aspectual category in the past tense (*ibid.*). In Slavic aspectology, the principle "Perfecto procedit, imperfecto insistit narratio" is also reflected in the theory of 'situation types' (i.e. the opposition 'tlo - następ' in Koschmieder 1934, adapted by Galton 1976 in 'background - emergence'), in the Russian theory on the types of aspectual contexts ('фон - наступление', cf. Bondarko 1971: ch. 4), as well as in the American theory of grounding in which the relationship of the perfective and the imperfective in discourse comes close to the foreground - background distinction. The perfective expresses kinetic, sequential events which are central to the unfolding narrative (Hopper 1979: 58, Chvany 1980, 1985). In narrative texts, the Russian perfective can serve as a cohesive means for linking events with each other in a narrative line (cf. Stunová 1991: 294 on Russian, and also Contini 1987 on cohesion and the meaning of aspect in Swahili). The imperfective aspect is used typically for backgrounding: situations, descriptions and actions which are simultaneous or overlapping with an event expressed by the perfective (Hopper: *ibid.*). However, although the correlation of aspect and grounding is strong, it is not automatic; sequentiality is a much stronger factor (cf. Chvany 1985: 257).

1.3 Russian aspect and the sequential chain of events

In this section, *sequential chain* or *sequence of events* (Russian *цепь*) will be briefly discussed. Sequential chains usually form part of the narrative line and therefore do not necessarily fall within the confines of a single sentence, but operate at the suprasentential, textual level. Sequence of events is a type of aspectual context in which a series of perfective forms expresses successive, changing events (Bondarko & Bulanin 1967: 62). In this context, the Russian perfective past form is used in one of its two main partial meanings, i.e. the *aorist meaning*, defined as a fact or a sum of facts in the past (*ibid.*: 91). Below an example of a minimal sequence is given (from Bondarko 1971: 180):

- (1) Он **вернулся**^P, медленно **разделся**^P и **лег**^P. (Чехов: Поцелуй)

Bondarko (*ibid.*) explains the functioning of aspect in the sequential chain of events as follows: in such a chain, an aspectual dependency emerges between the verb forms. The first form establishes the temporal plan and conditions the aspect of the following form that forms a link

in the chain of events. In other words, in such a structure, the first form is decisive and every following form is conditioned by the previous one. As far as aspect concerns, a similar principle applies: each form defines aspectually the following form in the chain, except for the last one, which is only conditioned. This aspectual dependency is not absolute: a breaking point in the homogeneous chain of events can emerge or the chain can come to an end and a switch from the perfective to the imperfective aspect can take place. According to Rassudova (1984: 39), in Russian, the occurrence of the perfective past form is considered obligatory if the sentence does not contain any special sequential markers such as *сначала* - first, *потом, затем* - then etc. In the following example an illustration is given of a more complex sequence of events that surpasses the sentence level.

- (2) Только за Поповым закрылась дверь, Ваганов **сел**^P к столу писать. Он **записал**^P так (...). **Прочитал**^P. **Посвистел**^P (...). Аккуратно **разорвал**^P лист, **собрал**^P клочки в ладонь и **пошел**^P и **бросил**^P их в корзину. **Постоял**^P над корзиной (...). (Шукшин; Рассудова)

To Rassudova (ibid.), the function of the Russian perfective to express temporal relations such as sequencing "derives from the meaning of the perfective because each successive action in a sequential chain can begin only upon the completion of the preceding action". A crucial theoretical point is thus whether sequencing should be regarded as a part of the meaning proper, or as derived from the meaning (Rassudova), or rather as a mere implicature, an approach advocated by Comrie. Comrie (1985: 26) argues that sequencing is not a part of the meaning of the perfective, but an implicature deducible from the context by general conversational principles as formulated by Grice.

1.4 Comparison of Russian and Czech aspect in the denotation of sequence of events

As has been stated above, in Russian a chain of successive events in the past is typically expressed by means of the perfective preterite. Considering example (3), the situation in Czech might seem to be identical.

- (3) Tedy ta poslední kasa, co si ten Balabán **vybral**^P, byla u firmy X. On tam **vlezl**^P oknem (...). A na tom místě, kde tu kasu **načal**^P, ji taky **otevřel**^P (...). Potom **vybral**^P peníze, asi šedesát tisíc, **snědl**^P kus špeku a chleba, co si s sebou přinesl^P, a zas **odešel**^P oknem (...). Potom **donesl**^P ty peníze k sestřenici (...). (Čapek)

И вот Балабан **выбрал^P** свою 'последнюю' кассу (...). Балабан **вылез^P** в контору через окно (...). Кассу он **вскрыл^P** с первого же 'захода' (...). **Вскрыл^P** кассу, Балабан **вынул^P** деньги, тысячу около шестидесяти, **съел^P** кусок хлеба со шпиготом, что принес^P с собой, и снова **вылез^P** в окно. Он **спрятал^P** деньги у двоюродной сестры (...).

However, examination of a number of texts clearly has shown that the Czech imperfective occurs frequently in positions in which the Russian perfective is encountered.

- (4) Když mě **vidělⁱ**, **poroučelⁱ** **se** té paničce a **šelⁱ** ke mně. (Čapek)

Увидев^P меня, он **распрошлся^P** с дамочкой и **подошел^P** ко мне.

For the Russian native speaker, the occurrence of three imperfectives in a sequence of successive events without any markers whatsoever would have a different effect than in Czech: an impression of lengthy processes taking place simultaneously is created. In the Czech original sentence, the imperfectives do not deny the idea of a sequential chain. Even though the events might be interpreted as partly overlapping, the interpretation of a sequence is preferred here. If a narrow, i.e. strictly successive interpretation of a sequence is required, lexically related perfectives can be used as in the following sentence.

- (5) Když mě **uviděl^P**, **odporoučel^P** **se** té paničce a **přišel^P** (**přistoupil^P**) ke mně.

Galton (1976: 71) observes that in such cases the narration acquires a *staccato* character. In the majority of examples of sequence of events in which the Czech imperfective was encountered, it was possible to substitute it by its perfective counterpart. However, under influence of various factors, Czech frequently prefers the imperfective; this in contrast to Russian, where the perfective almost exclusively occurs. Investigation of the data has revealed that it was usually impossible to substitute the Russian perfective by the related imperfective. Figure 1 below shows the frequency of aspect forms in the examined sample of texts.

Figure 1. Encountered aspect forms in sequences of events

aspect	perfective	imperfective	total
Russian	135	5	140
Czech	75	65	140

data: Čapek, Il'f & Petrov (original version and translation)

(All the Czech forms are in the past tense, Russian includes 15 perfective gerunds)

Although this sample is relatively small and perhaps not sufficient to supply conclusive evidence, nevertheless a notable difference in the distribution of aspect forms in the two languages is signalled. In the meantime, more relevant data has been collected showing that the use of the Czech imperfective as part of sequences of successive events is a rather common phenomenon. Part Two of this chapter contains numerous examples illustrating the aspectual difference: the Russian perfective vs. the Czech imperfective.

1.5 The ingressive use of the Czech imperfective

One of the important factors which plays a role in the different distribution of aspect forms in Czech and Russian in sequences of events, has been discovered by Ivančev (1961) in his excellent monograph, later discussed by Galton (1976: 68-71) and Maslov (1984: 194). As has been mentioned in the preamble to this chapter, Ivančev reports an 'ingressive use' of the imperfective past to be typical particularly for Czech in contrast to some other Slavic languages, such as Bulgarian or Russian. Below one of his examples is given to illustrate this phenomenon:

- (6) Bretschneider umkl^P a dívalⁱ se zklamaně po pusté hospodě.
(Hašek)

Бретшнейдер замолчал^P и стал^P с разочарованием рассматриватьⁱ пустой трактир.

Other evidence of this type of occurrence of the Czech imperfective can be found in Kopečný (1962: 81) who also refers to Ivančev (1961). Kopečný concentrates on the determined verbs of motion and states that a general tendency can be observed in Czech to replace an ingressive type of construction containing a perfective by an imperfective, which does not explicitly express ingressivity. So instead of the perfectives as in (7), Czech would prefer the imperfective as in (8).

- (7) Vstal^P a začal^P běžetⁱ k řece / Vstal^P a dal^P se do běhu.
(8) Vstal^P a běželⁱ k řece.

If example (8) would be literally translated into Russian, a less well-formed sentence would be produced as in (9):

- (9) Он поднялся^P и *бежалⁱ к реке.

Russian definitely prefers the ingressive perfective (as in (10)):

- (10) Он поднялся^P и побежал^P к реке.

Some determined verbs of motion in Czech show a deficiency in the aspect system. The ingressive perfective past forms **pošel*, **pojel*, **po-běžel* etc. which would correspond with the Russian forms *пошел*, *по-ехал*, *побежал*, do not exist. However, as has been mentioned above, the Czech imperfective past form does not necessarily have an ingressive interpretation each time. Kopečný (1962: 13) mentions that determined verbs of motion (such as *šel*) generally occur in 'perfective situations', i.e. situations in which a perfective verb would be expected. Kopečný¹ gives the following example:

- (11) Kde je Tonda? Šelⁱ do města (= *odešel*^P).

In the data section that follows it will be shown that the use of the Czech imperfective in sequences of events in positions in which the perfective would be expected is not confined to ingressivity, but terminativity or delimitation play a role as well. Although verbs of motion are frequent, this phenomenon applies equally to other lexical groups of verbs.

1.6 Lexical groups of verbs

Lexical meaning of the verb plays an important role in the choice of the Czech aspect. This became even more obvious from observations based on an additional, larger corpus or texts. Below in Figure 2 a sample of correspondences: Russian perfective vs. Czech imperfective in the context of sequences of events is analyzed according to the lexical and semantic group to which the verb belongs.

Figure 2. The Russian perfective vs. the Czech imperfective in sequences
(parameters: lexical groups of verbs, aspectual phase, state of affairs)

		%
<i>verba movendi</i> (incl. 102 prefix <i>po-</i>)	206	(46.3)
<i>verba dicendi/sentiendi/cogitandi</i>	99	(20.3)
movement (Rus.) vs. state/ <i>in medias res</i> (Cz.)	58	(12)
ingressive (Rus.) vs. middle aspect phase (Cz.)	53	(11)
other = modal, durative, conative, iterative	70	(14.4)
<hr/>		
total	486	(100%)

data: Bulgakov, Hašek I, II, Rybakov

The largest group is that of verbs of motion (46.3%). There is a tendency in Czech to use the imperfective with the determined verbs of motion (e.g. *šel, jel, běžel*) since this group is 'defective', i.e. there are no corresponding perfectives with the prefix *po-* as in Russian. However, many other verbs of motion that occur in sequences do possess a perfective in Czech, but it does not occur frequently in this context. The majority of these verbs express a determined movement.

Generally, in both languages the imperfectives of the *verba dicendi/sentiendi/cogitandi* are preferred because they are semantically broader and thus more neutral than the frequently ingressive perfective. However, this tendency is not valid in sequences of events in Russian.

The following two groups are very similar. In Czech the middle aspectual phase is expressed in the form of a state, process or *in medias res*, in Russian the ingressive phase or movement, however, the latter is not necessarily ingressive, it can also be terminative.

The last category consists of verbs denoting modality, durativity, conativity and iterativity, i.e. categories that prefer the imperfective in both languages. However, again, this principle is not valid for Russian in sequences of events.

2. The Data - Examples from Russian and Czech parallel texts

2.1 Types of aspectuality

In this section, 24 examples are given to illustrate the difference between Russian and Czech in the occurrences of aspect forms in the context of sequence of events. In all the examples given below, the Czech imperfective corresponds with the Russian perfective. In Russian, the

event expressed by the perfective is interpreted either in its initial, i.e. ingressive phase, or in its final, i.e. terminative phase. In this sample, the terminative interpretation occurs even more frequently than the ingressive one. In a few cases, the event is presented as delimited. In such cases the event unit spans only a relatively short period of time. The correspondences between Czech and Russian will be divided according to these three encountered types of aspectuality expressed in the Russian perfective:

1. ingressivity
2. terminativity
3. delimitation.

ad 1. Ingressivity

The event is interpreted in Russian in its ingressive phase. Two types of expression have been encountered:

- a) the Russian ingressive perfective verb with a prefix fulfilling chiefly this aspectual function (*за-, по-, у-* etc.);
- b) constructions with a perfective phasal verb (*стать, начать*) in combination with an infinitive or a noun. Consider the following examples:

- (1) Když **jsem** tedy **přijel**^P do Liverpoolu, **čekali**ⁱ mě ti Angličani na nádraží a **odvezli**^P mě do hotelu, abych si odpočal; ale když **jsem se vykoupal**^P, tak **jsem** se **šel**^P podívat na město, a při tom **jsem se ztratil**^P. (Čapek)

Так вот, **приехал**^P я в Ливерпуль. Меня уже ждалиⁱ на вокзале и **отвезли**^P в гостиницу отдохнуть. Я **принял**^P ванну, **пошел**^P осмотреть город ... и **заблудился**^P.

- (2) Když jsem tedy u těch pánů **nepochodil**^P, **vylezl**^P **jsem** na takový pěkný javor v našem parku a **přemýšlel**ⁱ **jsem**. (Čapek)

Не преуспев^P у этих двух господ, я **залез**^P на раскидистый клен в нашем парке и **начал**^P **думать**ⁱ.

ad 2. Terminativity

The terminative interpretation of the Czech imperfective as expressed by the Russian perfective is illustrated by the following example:

- (3) (...) **jste** pro něj **přijel**^P (...). Jak bylo s Bendou smluveno, **nešel**ⁱ **jste** nahoru, ale **troubil**ⁱ **jste** dole. Za chvíli **přišel**^P Benda. (Čapek)

Подъехав^P к дому, вы, как было условлено с Бендой, **не поднялись**^P в квартиру, а **дали**^P сигнал. Вышел Бенда.

ad 3. Delimitation

This type of aspectuality as expressed by the Russian perfective occurs less frequently than the first two types. The Russian delimitative verbs present the event spanning relatively a short period of time.

- (4) (...) šlo jen o to, jak otevřít okno do krámu. Na tu práci **jsem si koupil**^P sklenářský diamant a **učil**ⁱ **jsem se** na svých vlastních oknech, jak se vyřízne tabulka skla. (Čapek)

(...) главное - проникнуть в лавку через окно. Для этой цели я **купил**^P алмаз и **попрактиковался**^P на собственных окнах, вырезывая отверстия в стекле.

- (5) Nějaký čas nato jelⁱ pan Janík nočním vlakem (...). Načež **vlezl**^P ve W. do lůžka (...). **Uložil**^P **se** pěkně jako nebožtík, chvilku **uvažoval**ⁱ o různých obchodech a **usnul**^P. (Čapek)

Некоторое время спустя ехалⁱ пан Яник ночным поездом (...). После этого пан Яник **влез**^P в купе спального вагона, (...), **улегся**^P удобненько, словно покойничек, **поразмывлял**^P маленько о своей торговле и **заснул**^P.

Note the difference in the expression of delimitation between the two languages (example 5): in Czech delimitation is expressed only lexically (*chvilku* = a while), while in Russian two distinct means of expression are found, i.e. the prefix *по-* (in *поразмывлял*) in combination with an adverb (*маленько*).

Summing up: the Russian perfective corresponding to the Czech imperfective refers to events in the ingressive or terminative phase, and in some cases to delimited events.

In the following section, other factors than aspectual phase (cf. section 1.6), that are of influence on the choice of aspect, will be examined:

1. the lexical meaning of the verb and the semantic class to which the verb belongs,
2. the manner of presentation of events, i.e. the *state of affairs* and in particular a certain type of state labeled here *in medias res*.

Both the lexical meaning and the state of affairs are related with the internal structure of events, i.e. the paradigmatic level at which aspect operates in Czech. As has previously been said, the assumption is that this level is crucial for the choice of aspect form in Czech while in Russian the higher, discourse level is decisive.

2.2 Semantic classes of verbs

2.2.1 Verbs of motion

Verbs of motion show a frequently recurring difference in aspect, i.e. in contexts in which Russian selects the perfective past form, Czech tends to use the imperfective past. One reason is the previously mentioned deficiency in the Czech aspect system: in contrast to Russian, Czech determined verbs of motion do not possess an ingressive perfective past form (such as **pošel*), the imperfective is used instead (cf. section 1.5). This phenomenon is illustrated by the example (6). However, the Czech imperfective in sequences does not occur solely with the typically determined verbs of movement such as *jít* or *běžet* which have a perfective counterpart with the prefix *по-* in Russian, but it occurs with verbs of movements in general (cf. example 9).

- (6) Агрономша деловито **перекрестилась**^P и, не скрывая своего любопытства, вместе с мужем, бородатым агрономом, **побежала**^P в дом Ипполита Матвеевича. (Ильф & Петров)

Paní agronomová **se** rozšafně **pokřičovala**^P a s neskryvanou zvědavostí **běžela**ⁱ s mužem, vousatým agronomem, do bytu Vrabčinského.

However, the Czech imperfective past of determined verbs of motion is not always interpreted ingressively in the corresponding Russian perfective. Consider example (7) in which the Czech imperfective corresponds to a typically terminative verb in Russian:

- (7) Potom **donesl**^P ty peníze k své sestřenici, nástroje **schoval**^P u nějakého Líznera, **šel**ⁱ domů, **vyčistil**^P si šaty a boty, **umyl**^P **se** a **vlezl**^P do postele jako každý pořádný člověk. (Čapek)

Он **спрятал**^P деньги у двоюродной сестры, инструменты **отнес**^P к некоему Лизнеру, **пришел**^P домой, **вычистил**^P одежду и обувь, **умылся**^P и **лег**^P спать, как всякий честный труженик.

Another, quite current interpretation of the Czech imperfective has been observed through the contrast with Russian. Although the verb is aspectually terminative, it is the initial phase of a movement that is expressed. Russian often prefers a verb with a different lexical stem (compare the Czech verb *jel jsem* vs. the Russian *отправился* instead of *поехал*).

- (8) (...) pak **jsem** to spokojeně **zalepil^P**, **napsal^P jsem** na obálku svou vlastní adresu a **jelⁱ jsem** do nejbližšího města dát to do schránky. (Čapek)

(...) я **заклеил^P** письмо, **написал^P** на конверте собственный адрес и **отправился^P** в ближайший город опустить послание в почтовый ящик.

- (9) K ránu doktor Goldberg **zbledl^P**, **řekl^P** si nahlas, že je idiot, a **hnalⁱ se** do své garáže. (Čapek)

Под утро, доктор, вдруг **побледнел^P**, **сказал^P** себе, что он идиот, и **бросился^P** в гараж.

The Russian perfectives in the four examples above cannot be easily substituted by their imperfective counterparts. In examples 6, 7 and 8 the Russian imperfective would denote processes, in example 9 an iterative event. Without additional markers the events would not be interpreted as part of the sequential chain, but would overlap or be simultaneous with other events. In Czech, on the other hand, a reverse substitution of the imperfective by a perfective is always possible. Instead of the ingressive perfectives with the prefix *po-* that are, in contrast to Russian, lacking in the Czech system of determined verbs of motion, perfectives with other prefixes or verbs with a similar lexical meaning can occur in the same context, as for instance the (terminative) verbs in the right column:

ad (6) instead of	<i>běželaⁱ</i> (* <i>poběžela</i>) :	<i>odběhla^P</i>
ad (7) instead of	<i>šelⁱ</i> (* <i>pošel</i>) :	<i>přišel^P</i>
ad (8) instead of	<i>jelⁱ jsem</i> (* <i>pojel jsem</i>) :	<i>odjel^P jsem</i>
ad (9) instead of	<i>hnalⁱ se</i> (* <i>pohnal se</i>) :	<i>vrhl^P se</i>

2.2.2 Verba sentiendi

Verba sentiendi which have an ingressive perfective (as *vidět* - *uvidět* and *видеть* - *увидеть*) show in both languages frequently a preference

for the imperfective (cf. Lubensky 1985). However, it can be observed on the basis of the data, part of which is presented in the Appendix of this chapter, that this tendency does not apply to Russian in sequential chains.

- (10) (...) konduktér **otevřel**^P kupé jakémusi pánovi, který se **začal**^P svlékat a **vyšplhal**^P se do hořeního lůžka. Pan Janík v polosnu **viděl**ⁱ ještě pár nohavic a bimbající se neobyčejně chlupaté nohy, **slyšel**ⁱ hekání člověka, který se zahrabává do pokrývek, pak **cvakl**^P vypínač (...) (Čapek)

(...) проводник **открыл**^P купе новому пассажиру; **раздевшись**^P, тот **взобрался**^P на верхнюю полку. Спросонья пан Яник **увидел**^P над головой пару штанин и необычайно волосатые ноги, **услышал**^P кряхтенье человека, закутывающегося в одеяло; потом **щелкнул**^P выключатель (...)

- (11) Když ráno ta ženská **viděla**ⁱ, že její dítě je mrtvé, **šla**ⁱ to hlásit na faru; ale cestou **viděla**ⁱ ten kočárek paní Landové, a tu jí **napadlo**^P, když bude mít jiné dítě, že jí ten pán bude platit alimenty dál. (Čapek)

Когда эта женщина **увидела**^P, что ребенок мертв, она **отправилась**^P об этом заявить в церковь, да по дороге **заметила**^P колясочку пани Ландовой и **передумала**^P; ей пришло в голову, что и за чужое дитье этот господин будет платить ей алименты, как и прежде.

A substitution of the Russian perfectives (*увидел*, *услышал* and *увидела*, *заметила*) by their imperfective counterparts is not possible if the idea of a sequence is to be preserved. In Czech, on the other hand, a reverse substitution of the imperfective by the perfective can be applied similarly as in the examples discussed above; so for instance, *viděla*ⁱ can become *uviděla*^P or *všimla*^P si. However, there is apparently no need to use the perfective in Czech; the Czech imperfective does not obstruct the interpretation of events as part of a sequential chain as opposed to Russian.

2.2.3 Verba dicendi

In sequences of events, verbs belonging to the semantic class of *verba dicendi*, show a behaviour similar to that of *verba sentiendi*. In positions in which Czech takes the imperfective, the perfective is obligatory in

Russian. The Czech imperfective past can be interpreted either in its ingressive or its terminative phase (cf. section 2.1).

- (12) Pak tam **přišli^P** dva lidé, mužský se ženskou, ale **neviděliⁱ** mne; **seděliⁱ** zády ke mně a tiše **hovořiliⁱ** (...) (Čapek)

Потом **подошла^P** какая-то парочка, мужчина и женщина, и, **не заметив^P** меня, **уселись^P** ко мне спиной и тихо **заговорили^P**.

In this example, the Czech imperfective *hovořili* corresponds to the Russian perfective *заговорили* with the prefix *за-* referring to the ingressive phase of the event. The Czech original sentence contains two other imperfectives, *verbum sentiendi neviděli* and an expression of a state *seděli*. It is not a clear sequence of successive events, the imperfective allows an interpretation of overlapping or simultaneity; the latter phenomenon applies to the last two events *seděli* and *hovořili*. In many cases in which the Czech imperfective is ambiguous or neutral with respect to successivity, in Russian, events are arranged in a sequential chain by means of a series of perfectives. In Czech a similar occurrence of perfectives that denote strict successivity is possible, however it does not occur so frequently and consistently as in Russian. The following example is a paraphrase of (12) in which the original imperfectives are substituted by perfectives, which is very close to Russian.

- (12a) Pak tam **přišli^P** dva lidé, mužský se ženskou, ale **nevšimli^P** **si** mne; **sedli^P** **si** a **začali^P** tiše **hovořit**.

In the next example two imperfective *verba dicendi* occur in Czech (*nadával, mluvil*); these are interpreted ingressively in the Russian translation and are expressed by means of a construction consisting of an ingressive phasal verb plus an imperfective infinitive or a noun.

- (13) Hlídač **se zarazil^P** a **omezil^P** **se** na to, že mně **nadávalⁱ** přes plot. Ale byl to nejspíš samotář; za chvíli **přestal^P** **nadávat** a **mluvilⁱ** sám se sebou. (Čapek)

Сторож **опешил^P** и **ограничился^P** тем, что **стал^P** **ругать** меня через забор. Старик, видимо, жил бобылем; вскоре он **перестал^P** **браниться** и **завел^P** **разговор** сам с собой.

The Czech imperfectives *nadával* and *mluvil* can be substituted by perfectives similar to the Russian ingressives *začal nadávat* and *zavedl řeč*. It is not that the Czech imperfective is fully neutral to successivity

or simultaneity. Marking of a sequence in Czech is sometimes sufficient by means of one or two perfectives that alternate with imperfectives as is the case in almost all the examples. For instance the pattern of example (13) is in Czech: pf + pf + ipf + pf + ipf, while in Russian it is consistently the perfective: pf + pf + pf + pf + pf. Apart from the ingressive perfectives (example 13), a terminative perfective occurs in both languages (*přestal nadávat, перестал браниться*); the terminative phase is explicitly expressed by the phasal verbs (*přestal, перестал*). The following two examples contain two imperfective *verba dicendi* in Czech (*jsem nadával, vyprávěl*) that correspond with two terminative perfectives in Russian (*выругался, рассказал*); the terminative phase is expressed by means of a prefix (*вы-, рас-*) and not a separate phasal verb as in the previous example.

- (14) (...) **kopl^P** мне můj vlastní brankář do kostrče (...). V tom kalupu **jsem** jenom chvilku **nadávalⁱ**, a pak **jsem** na to **zapomněl^P** (...) (Čapek)

(..) мой же собственный голкипер **двинул^P** меня ногой в крестец (...). В пылу игры я только **выругался^P** и **забыл^P** об этом.

- (15) Ипполит Матвеевич **снял^P** с головы шляпу, **расчесал^P** усы, и, решительно **откашлявшись^P**, **рассказал^P** Остапу Бендеру все. (Ильф & Петров)

Hypolit Vrabčinský **sundal^P** klobouk, **rozčesal^P** si kníry, energicky si **odkašlal^P** a **vyprávělⁱ** Ostapu Benderu vše (...).

2.2.4 Other verbs

The aspectual difference: Russian perfective vs. Czech imperfective has been observed not only with verbs belonging to a particular lexical group as mentioned above, but with other verbs as well. Consider example (6) from section 1 which is repeated below:

- (16) Když mě **vidělⁱ**, **poroučelⁱ** **se** té paničce a **šelⁱ** ke mně. (Čapek)

Увидев^P меня, он **распроштался^P** с дамочкой и **подошел^P** ко мне.

Apart from the *verbum sentiendi* *viděl* and the verb of movement *šel*, the verb *poroučel se* occurs here. Obviously, the ingressive or terminative use of the Czech imperfective is not confined to certain lexical groups of verbs that have been discussed above, although these are the most

frequent ones. This applies also to the following example containing the verb *přerovnával*, (to arrange).

- (17) “Uf”, *odplivl^P si* pan Janík, *pohrozil^P* pěsti (...) a *šelⁱ* se na toaletu doobléci. Když konečně *přerovnávalⁱ* obsah svých kapes, *strnul^P* hrůzou: v náprsní kapse měl místo jedné tašky s penězi dvě. (Čapek)

“Тьфу!” - *плюнул^P* в сердцах пан Яник, *погрозил^P* кулаком (...) и *отправился^P* в уборную завершать туалет. *Проверив^P* содержимое карманов, пан Яник *остолбенел^P*: в нагрудном кармане вместо одного бумажника он *обнаружил^P* два.

There is a causal relation between the two events expressed by the verbs *přerovnával* - *strnul* and *проверив* - *остолбенел*. There are several possibilities to modify this relation, depending on aspect and for Russian also whether a gerund is used; (in Czech gerunds are obsolete). In the Russian translation of the Czech original text, the gerund allows for an interpretation of a somewhat looser relationship between the two events, in the sense that they do not follow each other in a strict successive order, but that they may partly overlap², as is the case in Czech. Strict sequentiality would be expressed by a perfective personal form in both languages:

- (17a) Když pan Janík *přerovnal^P* obsah svých kapes, *strnul^P* hrůzou.
 (17b) Когда пан Яник *проверил^P* содержимое карманов, он *остолбенел^P*.

2.3 State of affairs

2.3.1 Expression of states

In both Russian and Czech, states are typically denoted by means of the imperfective. However, in the context of sequences of past events in Russian states are often expressed by means of the perfective past tense form or a perfective gerund (cf. Lebedeva 1959), while in Czech the imperfective occurs.

The Russian perfective denotes in such cases the *source* of the state which is interpreted as a state, in Czech, on the other hand, the *state proper* finds frequently its expression. This phenomenon is illustrated by the following example:

- (18) Долго, с удивлением смотрелⁱ он на спящих в его постели людей. Ничего не понял^p, он взял метлу и направился^p на улицу исполнять свои прямые обязанности (...). (Ильф & Петров)

Dlouho užasle civělⁱ na lidi spící v jeho posteli, ale nebylⁱ z toho moudrý, a tak vzal^p koště a šelⁱ na ulici za svými běžnými povinnostmi (...).

According to the Russian text, the person literally did not get grip of the situation and therefore did not understand, in Czech he just was not in the state of understanding, he 'was not wise of it'. A substitution by a perfective is possible in Czech, the effect is then comparable to that in Russian:

- (18a) (...), nic nepochopil^p, a tak vzal^p koště a vydal^p se za svými povinnostmi (...)

In this case a reverse substitution, of the perfective by the imperfective, can be applied in Russian. However, the state of not understanding forms then a background to the other events:

- (18b) (...) ничего не понимаяⁱ / так как он ничего не понималⁱ, он взял^p метлу и направился^p на улицу (...)

The imperfective past form of the verb 'to be' is quite common in sequences of events in Czech. In the following example, the state of darkness is expressed: 'it was dark again', only the adverb *zase* (again) denotes the change. In Russian the source of the darkness is communicated: 'everything immersed in the darkness'.

- (19) Pan Janík v polosnu vidělⁱ ještě pár nohavic (...), slyšelⁱ hekání člověka (...), pak cvakl^p vypínač a bylaⁱ zase rachotící tma. (Čapek)

Спросонья пан Яник увидел^p пару штанин (...), услышал^p кряхтенье человека (...), потом щелкнул^p выключатель, и снова все погрузилось^p в грохочущую колесным стуком темноту.

A substitution of the Czech imperfective *byla* (*tma*) by a perfective analogous to Russian is possible:

- (19a) (...) pak cvakl^p vypínač a vše se ponořilo^p do rachotící tmy.

Concerning a reverse substitution in Russian, the judgement of native speakers was negative with respect to the verb *быть*. There was an association with the archaic context of the Genesis:

- (20) (...) и была тьма, (...) и был день (...).

The contrast between the *source of the state* in Russian versus the *state proper* in Czech is sometimes accompanied by the opposition active vs. passive. In the following example, the state of fatigue is expressed, in Russian by the perfective gerund and in Czech by means of the past perfective participle *passive*. In Russian the events are presented in the chronological order, in Czech, the state of fatigue is given as a retrospective explanation (*protože byl unaven* - because he was tired):

- (21) **Lehl^P si** na sofa, protože **bylⁱ unaven** tím rozčilováním, a **malovalⁱ si**, jak sto, dvě stě, tři sta mužů prohlíží vlaky (...). (Čapek)

Устав^P от волнений, он **лег^P** на диван и **представил^P себе**, как сто, двести, триста сыщиков обыскивают поезда (...).

Unlike in Russian, an active form in Czech would rather imply an active participation by the subject to reach the state of fatigue:

- (21a) Když **se unavil^P** tím rozčilováním, **lehl^P si** na sofa (...).

States expressed by the imperfective can also function as pluperfects, as is the case in the Czech example below. The relative location of the event before the other actions is stressed by the adverb *už* (already). In Russian a plain sequence of events is presented.

- (22) (...) a **šelⁱ jsem** rovnou k vlaku. Ale když **už jsem sedělⁱ** ve vagóně a vlak **se hnul^P**, já **jsem se**, pane, **dal^P** do breku jako malý kluk (...). (Čapek)

(...) **отправился^P** прямехонько на вокзал. **Уселся^P** я в вагон, поезд **тронулся^P**, и тут я **заплакал^P**, как мальчишка.

Within a sequence of events, the Russian perfective cannot usually be substituted by its imperfective counterpart because the event would be interpreted as simultaneous, instead of successive. However, with the pluperfect such an effect does not arise as the relative temporal location of the event with respect to the others is explicitly expressed (frequently by the adverb *уже*). Below such an example is given analogous to the Czech original text.

- (22a) Когда я **уже сиделⁱ** в вагоне, поезд **тронулся^P**, и тут я **заплакал^P**...

A reverse substitution can be applied in Czech, i.e. the imperfective can be replaced by a perfective. This form would become part of a regular

sequence, similarly to that in Russian. However, as has been stated in section 1.4, a plain series of perfectives only invokes in Czech an impression of a rather dry account of facts, i.e. a 'staccato effect' (Galton 1976: 71). Consider the following example:

- (22b) Sedl^P jsem si do vagónu, vlak se hnul^P a já jsem se, pane, dal^P do breku ...

2.3.2 'In medias res'

The term *in medias res* is used here for the presentation of situations which give the reader the impression of finding himself suddenly in the middle of the events. The way aspect functions in this type of context, is similar to its functioning in the denotation of states, which has been shown in the previous section. In cases that in Russian the *source* of the state was expressed by a perfective, in Czech the *state proper* was presented by means of an imperfective. Similarly, in the context of *in medias res* Russian expresses its *source* by means of a perfective; the resulting situation has to be inferred. In Czech, only the resulting state is expressed, i.e. *in medias res* 'proper'. The action leading to this situation is, as it were, omitted. This causes the unexpected perspective 'from within'. The phenomenon will be illustrated by two examples below.

- (23) Jen to řek^P, a už leželⁱ na zemi se strašnou bolestí v levém rameni (...) (Čapek)

Только сказал^P это, как почувствовал^P страшный удар в левое плечо и грохнулся^P наземь.

In both languages typical constructions expressing unexpectedness, or a quick succession of situations, are used. In Czech: *jen pf*, *a už ipf*; in Russian: *только pf*, *как pf*. In Czech the effect *in medias res* is primarily reached by means of the imperfective *ležel*. It corresponds to the Russian perfective *грохнулся* expressing the *source* of the final situation. The Russian clause *почувствовал страшный удар* renders the Czech nominal phrase *se strašnou bolestí*. A substitution of the Czech imperfective by a perfective is possible, analogue to Russian. However, this removes the perspective 'from within'.

- (23a) Jen to řek^P, a vtom pocítil^P strašnou bolest v levém rameni a svalil^P se na zem.

Interestingly, the substitution of the Czech imperfective *ležel* by the

related ingressive perfective *lehl si* is problematic here. The reason for this is that this perfective contains an element of *intentionality*, that would clash with the general sense of the utterance (23), which describes an unintentional, spontaneous event caused by somebody else.

(24) “Já ho najdu ...”, *vzlykalⁱ* a *pokoušelⁱ se* vstát; *vtom už bylⁱ* u něho jeden z tajných a *zvedalⁱ* ho téměř něžně. (Čapek)

- Я найду ... - *всхлипывалⁱ* он и *попытался^P* подняться; *тут к нему подскочил^P* один из тайных агентов и почти нежно *подхватил^P* под руки.

This example illustrates the same phenomenon as example (23), i.e. the expression of a state *in medias res* in Czech (*vtom už byl u něho*) vs. its source in Russian (*тут к нему подскочил*). As in the majority of examples, the Russian imperfective cannot be substituted by an imperfective analogue to Czech:

(24a) (...) тут у него уже * *былⁱ* один из тайных агентов (...)

A reverse substitution in Czech is very acceptable, however, the effect of *in medias res* is then replaced by the expression of its source as in Russian.

(24b) (...) *vtom k němu přiskočil^P* jeden z tajných a *zvedal* ho (...)

Concerning the other verbs in the example (24), the first verb (*vzlykal / всхлипывал*) is in both languages imperfective, which is the regular expression of iterative events. In Russian, the sequence is further consistently marked by three perfectives, in Czech three imperfectives are encountered. The verb *pokoušel se* is conative and typically expressed by the imperfective. However, in Russian it is made delimitative by the prefix *по-*, i.e. , *попытался*, to fit in the sequence of successive events. The sequence follows with the above discussed verb *подскочил* and the verb *подхватил*. The latter verb can be seen as a kind of parallel to the verb *подскочил* as it also denotes the begin of an action. The policeman sprang towards the murderer and consequently found himself near to him; then he gripped his arm to lift him. In Czech the begin of these actions is omitted: the man found himself near the person, he ‘was with him’ and was lifting him tenderly - a process *in medias res*. Although the Czech example contains a series of four imperfectives, this does not impede the interpretation of these events as forming a sequence of successive events. With the exception of iterated events, in Russian a consistent marking of sequences by perfectives takes place, events are presented in their ingressive or resultative aspectual phase, or in their delimitation.

3. Conclusion

In this chapter, concrete usage of aspect forms within one particular type of narrative context, i.e. sequence of events, has been investigated. The context has been restricted to the past, non-iterated events. In both Russian and Czech, the perfective is considered to be the typical form to denote succession. However, even within a small sample, Russian shows already a much higher frequency of the perfective; this form is highly dominant, in contrast to Czech where both the perfective and the imperfective occur (see Figure 1 in section 1). In this chapter, we focused on the correspondence between the imperfective past form in Czech and the Russian perfective past in the denotation of the sequential chain. This difference in the selection of aspect occurs in many cases when the verb belongs to a certain lexical group, for instance the *verba sentiendi* and *verba dicendi*. Another factor that plays a role in Czech with respect to the choice of the imperfective is an aspectual deficiency, i.e. when a verb is an *imperfectivum tantum* or when it lacks certain forms. This is the case with the determined verbs of motion, which, unlike Russian, do not possess an ingressive perfective. These are some typical factors contributing to the preference for the imperfective in Czech. However, it has been shown above that the selection of the imperfective is not confined to certain lexical classes but applies in general. The imperfective in Czech expresses either an intraterminal, i.e. middle phase of the event, such as a process or a state (for instance *in medias res*), or is neutral to this, or can even be interpreted with the support of the contexts as implicitly ingressive, terminative or delimitative. In many cases, the Czech imperfective does not impede the idea of a sequence of successive events. Substitution tests have shown that in the majority of cases the perfective can occur instead of the imperfective, making the sequence of successive events explicit, however, with an effect of a 'dry' account of facts or a 'staccato effect'. Apparently, there is a preference to use both aspects within sequences in Czech, providing the narrative with more relief.

In sequences of events, the choice of aspect in Russian is much more consistent than in Czech, the perfective is very dominant. In contrast to Czech, verbs belonging to certain groups of verbs (such as *verba sentiendi*) that generally prefer the imperfective form, are in Russian within sequences perfectivized. This applies also to some other types of events, typically expressed by the imperfective, such as *conative* events. These have been made perfective by a delimitative prefix *no-*. With the perfective, the ingressive or terminative aspectual phase, i.e. the begin or end limit of the event, is made explicit in Russian, or the event is delimited

quantitatively. All three types of aspectuality give the events a certain *contour*. In the sequence of successive events where the Russian aspect is consistently perfective, events are linked up with each other by their ends or contours. In this way, aspect works as a *liaison*, i.e. a cohesive means over the sequence of successive events. A substitution of the encountered perfectives by their imperfective counterparts has been applied in Russian, in the majority of cases unsuccessfully. Within a sequence of successive events the perfective appears to be obligatory, an imperfective was either ungrammatical or changed the context radically into a cluster of events taking place simultaneously.

Considering the evidence obtained from the investigation of the data, it becomes clear that in Czech the choice of aspect is primarily determined by factors related to the internal structure of events, while in Russian discourse factors are highly relevant.

APPENDIX

1. VERBA MOVENDI

1.1 *šel*1.1.1 *šelⁱ - пошел^p*a) *set off*

- (1) - Пройдите!

Саша *поднял^p* узелок и *пошел^p*, не испытывая уже ничего, кроме любопытства. [a105]¹

“Pojďte!”

Saša *zvedl^p* uzlík a *šelⁱ*, necítilⁱ už nic, leda zvědavost. [a103]

(*pustil^p* se za ním)

b) *prepositions*

- (2) Polní kurát, který tak krásně v praxi *vyložil^p* zatraceně starou věc, vězně navštěvovati, *odešel^p* do sakristie, *převlékl^p* se, *dal^p* si *nalít* z demizónu do konvice mešní víno, *vypil^p* je a s pomocí zrzavého ministranta *vsedl^p* na svého jezdeckého koně na dvoře přivázaného, ale pak *si vzpomněl^p* na Švejka, *slezl^p* a *šelⁱ* do kanceláře k *auditorovi* Bernisovi. [s117] (*odkráčel^p*)

Фельдкурат, так хорошо и оригинально проводивший в жизнь старый, избитый обычай посещения узников, *прошел^p* в ризницу, *переоделся^p*, *велел^p* себе налить церковного вина из громадной оплетенной бутылки, *выпил^p* и с помощью рыжего ministranta, *сел^p* на свою верховую лошадь, которая была привязана во дворе. Но тут он *вспомнил^p* о Швейке, *слез^p* с лошади и *пошел^p* в канцелярию к следователю Бернису. [s107]

- (3) Po cestě jim Švejk vypravovalⁱ různé anekdoty a v dobré náladě *vstoupili^p* na Kuklík a *udělali^p* to tak, jak Švejk radilⁱ. Ručnice *uschovali^p* v kuchyni a *šliⁱ* do *lokálu*, kde housle a harmonika naplňovaly místnost zvuky oblíbené písně “Na Pankráci...” [s130] (*vstoupili^p*)

По дороге Швейк рассказывалⁱ разные анекдоты, и они в чудесном настроении пришли^p в «Куклик» и поступили^p так, как советовалⁱ Швейк. Ружья *спрятали^p* на кухне и *пошлиⁱ* в

общий зал, где скрипка с гармоникой наполняли все помещение звуками излюбленной песни «На Панкратце...». [s118]

- (4) Potom, když přišel^P pan Kokoška, pan Tauchen šelⁱ s ním do komptoáru, a když vyšel^P ven, ukazovalⁱ nám dva zlatníky, ne jeden, jak měl slíbeno, a chtělⁱ se s panem Ferdinandem rozdělit napolovic. [s2/246] (odešel^P, zašel^P)

Затем, когда пришел^P пан Кокошка, пан Таухен пошел^P с ним в контору, а выйдя оттуда показал^P нам два золотых, а не один, как ему было обещано. [s417]

c) goal activity

- (5) U stanoviště drožkářů Švejk posadil^P polního kuráta ke zdi a šelⁱ vyjednávatⁱ s drožkáři o převoz. [s140] (odešel^P)

У стоянки изводчиков Швейк посадил^P фелькурата на тротуар, прислонив его к стене, а сам пошел^P договариватьсяⁱ с изводчиками. [s126]

1.1.2 šelⁱ - подошел^P

- (6) Při té rozmluvě byl jeden starší pán, zámečník ze Smíchova, který šelⁱ k Švejkovi a řekl^P k němu: “Prosím vás, pane, počkejte na mne venku, já s vámi musím mluvit.” [s156] (přistoupil^P)

Свидетелем этого разговора был пожилой человек, слесарь со Смихова. Он подошел^P к Швейку и сказал^P:

- Будьте добры, сударь, подождите меня на улице, мне нужно с вами поговорить. [s139]

1.1.3 šelⁱ - пришел^P

- (7) Через два дня Вика позвонила^P и позвала^P к себе. Варя пришла^P. [a241]

Za dva dni Vika volalaⁱ a pozvala^P Varju k sobě.

Varja šlaⁱ. [a253] (přišla^P)

1.1.4 šelⁱ - зашел^P

- (8) На следующий день сразу после работы Варя зашла^P к Софье Александровне. Та, сидя за столом, писала, видимо письмо Саше. [a484]

Příštího dne **šlaⁱ** Varja rovnou z práce k Sofje Alexandrovně. Ta seděla zrovna za stolem a psala dopis, komu jinému než Sašovi. [a525] (zašla^p)

1.1.5 **šelⁱ - прошел^p**

- (9) Проводив^p Березина, Булягин **прошел^p** на кухню, заварил^p себе крепкий чай. [a432]

Když Budagin Berjozina **vyprovodil^p**, **šelⁱ** do kuchyně a **uvařil^p** si silný čaj. [a466] (zašel^p)

1.1.6 **šelⁱ - ушел^p**

- (10) Софья Алексанровна **отложила^p** в сторону перо, **сняла^p** очки. - **Велела^p** ему **уйти**. Он **поартачился^p**, потом **ушел^p**. [a485]

Sofija Alexandrovna **odložila^p** pero a **sundala^p** si brýle. "Řekla^p jsem mu, aby se vystěhoval. Napřed **se štajfovalⁱ**, ale pak **šelⁱ**. [a526] (odešel^p)

1.1.7 **šelⁱ - вышел^p**

- (11) Орджоникидзе **поднялся^p** с кресла, **вышел^p** в соседнюю комнату, **набрал^p** по внутреннему телефону гараж, **позвал^p** к аппарату своего шофера Барабашкина. [a518]

Ordžonikidze **vstal^p**, **šelⁱ** do vedlejšího pokoje, **zavolal^p** státní linkou garáže a **vyžádal^p** si k telefonu svého šoféra Barabaškina. [a564] (vyšel^p)

1.1.8 **šelⁱ - отошел^p**

- (12) Я **получила^p** хлеб, **отошла^p**, и он **отошел^p**, но хлеба не взял^p, он стоялⁱ за мной, чтобы показать меня другому, такой у них способ. [a82]

Koupila^p jsem chleba a **odešla^p** jsem, on **šelⁱ** taky, ale chleba nekoupil^p, stálⁱ za mnou jen proto, aby mě ukázal tomu druhému, to je taková jejich praktika. [a78] (odešel^p)

1.1.9 **šelⁱ - other than prefix + шел**

1.1.9.1 *šelⁱ - отправился^p*

- (13) Саша **понял^p**, какого повара он имеет в виду. Потом Саша **отправился^p** к Лозгачеву. Тот **улыбнулся^p** так, будто рад его успеху. [a96]

Saša **pochočil^p**, koho miní tím kuchařem. Pak **šelⁱ** za Lozgačovem. Lozgačev **se usmál^p**, jako by měl radost z jeho úspěchu. [a93]
(vypravil se^p)

1.1.9.2 *šelⁱ - направился^p*

- (14) Долго, с удивлением, смотрелⁱ он на спящих в его постели людей. Ничего **не поняв^p**, он **взял^p** метлу и **направился^p** на улицу исполнять свои прямые обязанности. [il]

Dlouho užasle civělⁱ na lidi spící v jeho posteli, ale **nebylⁱ** z toho moudrý, a tak **vzal^p** koště a **šelⁱ** na ulici za svými běžnými povinnostmi. [il]
(vydal^p se)

1.1.9.3 *šelⁱ - поднялся^p*

- (15) Pan Janík **se** sice velmi **divilⁱ**, kde vlastně je, ale protože mu po tom koňaku bylo všechno jedno, **šelⁱ** po nějakých schodech **nahoru** a **otevřel^p** dveře, za kterými slyšel hlučný hovor. [ca77] (vyšel^p)

Хотя пан Яник очень **удивился^p**, очутившись невесть где, но, поскольку после выпитого коньяка ему и море было по колено, он **поднялся^p** по какой-то лестнице **наверх** и **открыл^p** двери, из-за которых доносились громкие голоса. [ca246]

1.1.9.4 *šelⁱ - спустился^p*

- (16) **Встал^p**, **спустился^p** в погреб, приятно обдало сырым, земляным холодком, **взял^p** с доски крынку со сметаной, покрытую деревянной крышкой, **поднялся^p** на кухню, **вынул^p** из-под полотенца калач, еще теплый, мягкий, обмакивая в сметану, **съел^p**. [a356]

Vstal^p, **šelⁱ** do sklepa, příjemně na něj zavanul vlhký zemitý chlad, **vzal^p** s police džbánek s kyselou smetanou, zaklapnutý dřevěným víčkem, **vrátil^p** se do kuchyně, **vytáhl^p** zpod utěrky pšeničný pletenec, ještě teplý, měkký, namáčel si ho do smetany a **snědl^p** ho. [a380]
(sešel^p)

1.1.9.5 *šelⁱ - тронулся^p*

- (17) Švejkovi **se** však **přestalo^p** již na Kuklíku **líbit**, a proto jim **pohrozil^p**, že půjde sám. Tak **šliⁱ**, ale **muselⁱ** jim slíbit, že se všichni ještě někde zastaví. [s135] (vydali^p se na cestu)

Однако Швейку в «Куклике» уже **надоело^p**, и он **пригрозил^p**, что пойдет один. **Тронулись^p** в путь, однако Швейку **пришлось^p** пообещать, что они сделают еще один привал. [s121]

1.1.9.6 *šelⁱ - other*

- (18) Б. **рванул^p** дверь, **пропустил^p** И.М. и сам **увязался^p** за ним... [il24]

В. **trhl^p** dveřmi, **uvolnil^p** V. cestu a **šelⁱ** mu v patách... [il13] (pustil^p se za ním)

- (19) “Tedy platí,” **řekl^p** lehkomyšlně polní kurát, “buď pozitří sto korun, nebo Švejka.” **Prohrál^p** i těch sto korun a **šelⁱ** smutně domů. [s198] (odešel^p)

- Идет, - легкомысленно **согласился^p** фельдкурат. - Послезавтра получишь или сто крон, или Швейка. Он **проиграл^p** и эти сто крон и, опечаленный **побрел^p** домой. [s173]

- (20) Jeden člověk ve Zhoří taky **vyoral^p** nějaký kalich na poli, kterej pocházel ze svatokrádeže a byl tam schovanej na lepší doby, až se na to zapomene, a **považovalⁱ** to taky za pokyn boží a **šelⁱ**, místo aby jej rozšmelcoval, k panu faráři s tím kalichem, že prý ho chce darovat kostelu. [s162] (zanesl^p)

Один человек из Згоржа тоже вот и пахал и **нашел^p** в земле чашу для причастия, которую кто-то украл и закопал до поры до времени в землю, пока дело не забудется. **Выкопавший^p** чашу тоже **увидел^p** в этом перст божий и, вместо того чтобы чашу переплавить, **понес^p** ее священнику, - хочет, дескать пожертвовать ее в костел. [s146]

- (21) **Dali^p** se do jídla a **šliⁱ** brzy **spatⁱ** v teplé sednici, rozložení po lavicích. [s2/46] (uložili se ke spánku)

Все **занялись^p** едой и скоро **разлеглись^p** в натопленной избушке на лавках **спатьⁱ**. [s262]

- (22) K ránu **dal^P se** četnický závodčí, ležící na posteli u protější stěny, do takového chrápání provázeného pískáním v nose, že to Švejka **probudilo^P**. **Vstal^P**, **zatřásl^P** závodčím a **šelⁱ** si opět **lehnout^P**. [s2/68] (lehl^P si)

К утру жандармский ефрейтор, спавший на кровати у противоположной стены, **поднял^P** такой храп с присвистом, что Швейк **проснулся^P**. Он **встал^P**, хорошенько **потряс^P** ефрейтора и **улегся^P** опять. [s279]

- (23) **Převalil^P se** na bok a okamžitě opět **usnul^P**. Švejk **šelⁱ** opět k telefonu, **posadil^P se** a **počal^P klímatⁱ** na stole. **Probudilo^P** ho zvonění. [s2/265] (si sedl k telefonu)

Он **повернулся^P** на бок и тотчас опять **заснул^P**. Швейк **сел^P** опять около телефона и, **положив^P** голову на стол, **задремал^P**. Его **разбудил^P** телефонный звонок. [s431]

- (24) Přednosta našeho oddělení slavil jmeniny a **pozval^P** nás do jedné vinárny, pak **se šloⁱ** do druhé, do třetí, do čtvrté, do páté, do šesté, do sedmé, do osmé, do deváté ... [s51] (jsme zapadli^P do)

Видите ли, начальник нашего отдела справлял свои именины и **позвал^P** нас в винный погребок, потом мы **попали^P** в другой, в третий, в четвертый, в пятый, в шестой, в седьмой, в восьмой, в девятый ... [s58]

- (25) Pak **se šelⁱ** Švejk **podívat^P** ke Kalichu. Když ho paní Palivcová **uviděla^P**, **prohlásila^P**, že mu nenaleje, že asi utekl. [s156] (zašel^P)

Швейк **заглянул^P** также и в трактир «У чаши». **Увидав^P** его, жена Паливца **заявила**, что не нальет ему пива, так как он, наверное, дезертир. [s139]

- (26) (...) **оконčil^P** Промышленное училище с наградой, потом **поступил^P** на подготовительные курсы при Томском технологическом институте, готовился стать инженером. [a394]

(...) průmyslovku **vychočil^P** s vyznamenáním, pak **šelⁱ** do přípravných kursů při technologickém ústavu v Tomsku, chtěl být inženýrem. [a423] (postoupil^P)

1.1.10 *пошел^P* - other

- (27) Марк Александрович *пересек^P* Арбатскую площадь и *пошел^P* по Воздвиженке, неожиданно тихой и пустой после оживленного Арбата. [a31]

Přešel^P Arbatské náměstí a *krácelⁱ* po Vozdvizence, nečekaně tiché a liduprázdné po rušném Arbatu. [a19] (pustil^P se)

- (28) - Разве вы без шпаги пришли? удивилась^P Гелла.
Буфетчик что-то *буркнул^P* и быстро *пошел^P* вниз. [ma207]

“Copak jste přišel bez kordu?” divilaⁱ se panská.
Něco *zahučel^P* s *drandil^P* dolů. [ma167] (seběhl^P)

- (29) А подозрительный профессор *сделал^P* надменное лицо, *повернулся^P* и *пошел^P* от Ивана прочь. [ma53]

Podezřelý profesor *se zatvářil^P* povýšeně, pak *se otočil^P* a *odcházelⁱ*.
Ivan cítil, že je v koncích. [ma40] (odešel^P, vzdálil^P se)

- (30) Повинуясь этому желтому знаку, я тоже *свернул^P* в переулок и *пошел^P* по ее следам. [ma138]

Podřídil jsem se žlutému znamení, *zahnul^P* jsem taky a *sledovalⁱ* neznámou. [ma111] (pustil^P se po stopě neznámé)

- (31) *Загрятели^P* стулья, *отодвинули^P* стол, все *пошли^P* танцевать. [a78]

Zarachotili^P židlemi, *odšoupli^P* stůl a všichni *letěliⁱ* tancovat. [a73] (se vrhli^P)

1.2 *jel*1.2.1 *jelⁱ* - *поехал^P*

- (32) Když *přečetla^P* dopis, *vrátila^P* se její rezolutnost, která se vyjádřila tím, že *poručila^P* Švejkovi, aby jí obstaral fiakra, a když to *byloⁱ* vyplněno^P, *rozkázala^P* mu, aby si sedl k fiakristovi na kozlík. *Jeliⁱ* domů. Když *byliⁱ* v bytě, *sehrála^P* roli paní domu znamenitě. [s230] (odjeli^P)

Когда дама **прочла**^P письмо, к ней **вернулась**^P решительность, выразившаяся в том, что она **велела**^P Швейку нанять извозчика. Когда Швейк это **исполнил**^P, она **приказала**^P ему сесть к кучеру на козлы. Они **поехали**^P домой. **Войдя** в квартиру, дама превосходно **разыграла**^P роль хозяйки. [s196]

1.2.2 *jelⁱ - приехал^P*

- (33) Через несколько дней Дьяков **позвонил**^P и **попросил**^P приехать в Наркомат юстиции. Юра **приехал**^P. [a296]

Za několik dní mu Ďakov **zavolal**^P, aby přišel na lidový komisariát spravedlnosti. Jura tam **jel**ⁱ. [a313] (přijel^P)

1.2.3 *jelⁱ - отправился^P*

- (34) (...) pak **jsem** to spokojeně **zalepil**^P, **napsal**^P **jsem** na obálku svou vlastní adresu a **jel**ⁱ **jsem** do nejbližšího města **dát**^P to do schránky. [ca165]

Довольный собой, я **заклеил**^P письмо, **написал**^P на конверте собственный адрес и **отправился**^P в ближайший город **опустить**^P послание в почтовый ящик. [ca284] (vydal^P jsem se)

1.3 *běžel*

1.3.1 *běželⁱ - побежал^P*

- (35) Добродушная фельдшерица Прасковья Федоровна **навестила**^P поэта во время грозы, **встревожилась**^P, видя, что он плачет, **закрыла**^P штору, чтобы молнии не пугали больного, листки **подняла**^P с полу и с ними **побежала**^P за врачом. [ma116]

Dobromyslná Praskovja Fjodorovna, která ho za bouřky **navštívila**^P, **se polekala**^P, když viděla, že pláče. **Zatáhla**^P závěs, aby blesky nemocného neděsily, **sebrala**^P se země papíry a **běžela**ⁱ s nimi za lékařem. [ma93] (odběhla^P pro lékaře)

- (36) В Канске слышал, - уклончиво **ответил**^P Ивашкин и **побежал**^P искать себе квартиру. [a279]

“Slyšel jsem to v Kanskú,” **odpověděl**^P vyhýbavě Ivaškin a **běžel**ⁱ si shánět byt. [a295] (odběhl^P si shánět byt)

1.3.2 *běželⁱ - other*

- (37) Наскоро она **приготовила^p** Нине обед, **взяла^p** учебники и **отправилась^p** к Зое. [a206]

Narychlo **uvažila^p** pro Ninu oběd, **vzala^p** si učebnice a **běželaⁱ** za Zojou. [a216] (vypravila^p se za Zojou)

1.3.3 *побежал^p - other*

- (38) Наташа **сгребла^p** в узел, что ей попало под руку, платья, туфли, чулки и белье, и **побежала^p** вон из спальни. [ma226]

Nataša **shrábla^p** do uzlíku, co jí přišlo pod ruku, šaty, střevíce, punčochy i prádlo - a **upalovalaⁱ** z ložnice. [ma185] (vypadla^p)

1.3.4 *пробежал^p - other*

- (39) **Вырвавшись^p** на воздух, буфетчик рысью **пробежал^p** к воротам и навсегда **покинул^p** чертов дом № 302-бис. [ma207]

Vyběhl^p ven, **klusalⁱ** k vratům a navždycky **opustil^p** ďábelský dům číslo 302b. [ma167] (se rozběhl^p, vrhl^p se)

1.3.5 *кинулся^p бежатьⁱ - other*

- (40) Седой как снег, без единого черного волоса старик, который недавно еще был Римским, **подбежал^p** к двери, **отстегнул^p** пуговку, **открыл^p** дверь и **кинулся^p** **бежатьⁱ** по темному коридору. [ma157]

Bývalý Rimskij, teď stařec s vlasý zbělenými jako sníh, **se rozběhl^p** ke dveřím, **odemkl^p** a **upalovalⁱ** po tmavé chodbě. [ma126] (dal^p se do běhu)

- (41) **Испустив^p** крик отчаяния, буфетчик **кинулся^p** **бежатьⁱ** вниз, а котенок свалился^p с головы и брызгнул вверх по лестнице. [ma207]

Bufetář bolestivě **vykřikl^p** a **pádilⁱ** dolů. Kotě seskočilo^p a marš! nahoru po schodech. [ma167] (vrhl^p se)

1.4 other

- (42) Сделав несколько петель, вся компания под тревожную дробь барабана из оркестра подкатилась к самому краю сцены, и зрители первых рядов **ахнули^P** и **откинулись^P**, потому что публике показалось, что вся тройка со своими машинами грохнется в оркестр. [ma119]

Parta vykouzčila^P několik smyček za zneklidňujícího víření bubnu v orchestru, dojela^P až na kraj scény a diváci v prvních řadách zděšeně **vypískli^P** a **uhýbaliⁱ**, protože to vypadalo, že trojice s koly spadne do orchestru. [ma95] (uhnuli^P)

- (43) А нежли **яsem mohⁱ** něco bleptnout^P, **пřiskočil^P** ke mně vachmajstr a **dal^P** mně takovou facku v těch dveřích, že **яsem** po těch dřevěnejch schodech **letělⁱ** až dolů a nezastavil jsem se až v Kejžlicích. [s2/46] (sletěl^P)

He успел^P я и пикнуть^P, **подскочил^P** ко мне вахмистр, да ка-ак даст^P по морде! **Полетел^P** я со всех лестниц, да так и не останавливался до самых Кейжлищ. [s262]

- (44) Лишь только Тузбубен **вбежал^P** в кабинет финдиректора, он **зарычал^P**, **оскалив^P** чудовищные желтоватые клыки, затем **лег^P** на брюхо и с каким-то выражением тоски и в то же время ярости в глазах **пополз^P** к разбитому окну. [ma183]

Sotva **vběhl^P** do ředitelské kanceláře, **zavrčel^P**, **vycenil^P** mohutné zažloutlé tesáky a pak **si lehl^P** na břicho a s napůl smutným, napůl zuřivým výrazem v očích **se plazilⁱ** k rozbitému oknu. [ma147] (se začal^P plazitⁱ)

- (45) И оба **подхватили^P** администратора под руки, **выволокли^P** его из сада и **понесли^P** с ним по Садовой. [ma114]

Nakonec ho oba **chytili^P** pod paždí, násilím **odvlékli^P** z parku a **uháněliⁱ** s ním po Sadové. [ma91] (pustili^P se)

- (46) Řečnil půl hodiny a teprve potom si všiml, že salutují v cylindru. To už **zvolal^P** jen, že zítra mám jít k regimentšraportu, a **hnalⁱ** to na koni ze vzteku až bůhvíkam jako divoký jezdec (...). [s2/96] (odcválal^P)

Ораторствовал целых полчаса и потом только заметил, что я отдаю ему честь в цилиндре. Тут он **возопил**^P, что завтра я должен явиться к нему на полковой рапорт, и как бешеный **поскакал**^P бог знает куда, словно дикий всадник (...). [s302]

- (47) **Подобрав**^P рясу и не обращая внимания, отец Федор **пронесся**^P к выходу. [il 25]

Pravou rukou si **podkasal**^P řízu, a aniž věnoval pozornost, **spěchal**ⁱ k východu. [il14] (odkráčel^P)

- (48) **Byl**ⁱ za to **zavřenej**^P až byl černej, a zas ho nanovo **vedli**ⁱ k přísaze. [s2/208] (odvedli^P)

Ну, **замучили**^P его в тюрьме чуть не до смерти, а потом опять **повели**^P к присяге. [s389]

2. IN MEDIAS RES, PROCESS VS. START OR RESULT

2.1 **stál**ⁱ

- (1) ... ласково поманил^P его пальцем на сцену. И Никанор Иванович, не помня как, **оказался**^P на сцене. В глаза ему снизу и спереди ударил^P свет цветных ламп... [ma161]

...a přátelským posuňkem ho pozval^P na scénu. Než se předseda vzpamatoval^P, **už stál**ⁱ na jevišti. [ma129]

- (2) И не успел^P буфетчик оглянуться, как он **оказался**^P в кабинете профессора Кузьмина. [ma208]

Než se bufetář stačil^P rozkouskat, **už stál**ⁱ v ordinaci profesora Kuzmina. [ma168]

- (3) В воздухе раздался^P свист, и черное тело, явно промахнувшись, обрушилось^P в воду. Через несколько мгновений перед Маргаритой **предстал**^P тот самый толстяк-бакенбардист, что так неудачно представился на том берегу. [ma240]

... náhle cosi zahvízdalo^P a černé tělo zřejmě nechtěně žuchlo^P do vody. Za několik vteřin **už stál**ⁱ před Markétou tloušťák s licousy, který se tak nešťastně uvedl na protějším břehu. [ma197]

- (4) “Halt!” Před nadporučíkem stálⁱ plukovník Kraus von Zillergut. Nadporučík Lukáš zasalutoval^p a stálⁱ před plukovníkem, omlouvaje se, že neviděl. [s259]

«Halt». Перед поручиком стоялⁱ полковник Краус фон Циллергут. Лукаш взял^p под козырек, остановился^p и стал оправдаться тем, что не видел его. [s219]

- (5) Колонна двинулась^p. Не доходя до Триумфальной площади, опять остановились^p. Саша подошел^p к своей группе... [a50]

Průvod znovu vykročil^p. Nedošli^p ještě na Triumfální náměstí a už zase stáliⁱ. Saša zamířil^p ke své skupině... [a41]

- (6) Загремел^p запор, открылась^p дверь, возник^p конвойный в тулупе, с винтовкой в руках. [a120]

Zařinčel^p zámek, dveře se otevřely^p a v nich stálⁱ strážný v dlouhém kožíše, s puškou v ruce. [a119]

- (7) И когда оркестр заиграл^p румбу, он очутился^p возле столика Вари, сделал^p общий поклон и, обращаясь к Виталию, попросил^p разрешения пригласить его даму. [a247]

A když orchestr spustil^p rumbu, stálⁱ náhle u Varjina stolu, uklonil^p se všem dohromady a požádal^p Vitalije, aby si směl zatancovat s jeho dámou. [a260]

- (8) Лена сбросила^p сарафан и осталась^p в черном купальнике, как будто бы наклееном на теле. [a312]

Lena shodila^p sukni a stálaⁱ tu v černých plavkách, jako přilepených na tělo. [a332]

- (9) “Já se ti divím,” řekl^p Vodička, vstupujeⁱ za Švejkem do předsíně, “že s takovým smradem mluvíš.” Stáliⁱ v předsíni, zavřeli^p dveře na chodbu a Švejk jen poznamenal^p... [s2/192]

- Как это ты можешь со всяким дерьмом разговаривать? Закрыв^p за собой дверь, они остановились^p в передней. Швейк заметил^p: ... [s376]

2.2 *leželⁱ*

- (10) Уполномоченный велел^P открыть шкаф, вывернуть карманы пиджака, там оказалась^P записная книжка с адресами и телефонами, и она легла^P на стол. [a102]

Úředník nařídil^P otevřít skříň, obrátit naruby kapsy saka, našel^P tam notes s adresami a telefony, a už leželⁱ na stole. [a99]

- (11) Jako jednou v Nuslích, právě u mostu přes Botič, přišel^P ke mně v noci jeden pán, když jsem se vracelⁱ od Banzetů, a praštil^P mě bejkovcem přes hlavu, a když už jsem leželⁱ na zemi, posvítíl^P si na mne a povídáⁱ: ‘Tohle je mejlka, to není von.’ [s37]

Как-то в Нуслях, как раз у моста через Ботич, когда я ночью возвращалсяⁱ от Банзета, ко мне подошел^P один господин и хватил^P меня арапником по голове; я, понятно, свалился^P на землю, а он осветил^P меня и говоритⁱ: «Ошибка, это не он!» [s46]

- (12) “Vlez mně někam, ty troubo!” Jen to řek^P, a už leželⁱ na zemi se strašnou bolestí v levém rameni; [ca89]

«Поди-ка ты, знаешь куда, дубина!» Только сказал^P он это, как почувствовал^P страшный удар в левое плечо и грохнулся^P наземь. [ca250]

2.3 *sedělⁱ*

- (13) Ale když už jsem sedělⁱ ve vagóně a vlak se hnul^P, já jsem se, pane, dal^P do breku jako malý kluk... [ca14]

Уселся^P я в вагон, поезд тронулся^P, и тут я заплакал^P, как мальчишка. [ca211]

- (14) Naporučík Lukáš podíval^P se na Švejka a vyšel^P z kupé. Když sedělⁱ opět na svém místě, objevila^P se za chvíli ve dveřích upřímná tvář Švejкова. [s2/13]

Поручик Лукаш посмотрел^P на Швейка и вышел^P из купе; не успел^P он усесться^P на свое место, как в дверях появилась^P открытая физиономия Швейка... [s239]

- (15) “Tak vidíte, hoši,” vykládalⁱ, když seděli^P kolem pece, ve které se vařilyⁱ brambory na loupáčku... [s2/41]

- Так-то, ребята, - стал^P рассказыватьⁱ дед, когда все уселись^P вокруг печки, в которой вариласьⁱ картошка в мундире. [s259]

2.4 *bylⁱ*

- (16) “Já ho najdu...” vzlykalⁱ a pokoušelⁱ se vstát; vtom už bylⁱ u něho jeden z tajných a zvedalⁱ ho téměř něžně. [ca73]

- Я найду... всхлипывалⁱ он и попытался^P подняться; тут к нему подскочил^P один из тайных агентов и почти нежно подхватил^P под руки. [ca243]

- (17) Иван увидел^P серый берег в гуще в начале Большой Никитской, или Герцена. В мгновение ока Иван и сам оказался^P там. [ma54]

Básník zahlédl^P jeho šedý baret v davu na začátku Velké Nikitské nebo Gercenovy ulice. V mžiku bylⁱ tam, ale hnalⁱ se zbytečně. [ma42]

- (18) Nadporučík Lukáš si povzdechl^P. Nebyl to vzdech lítosti. Byloⁱ mu lehce u srdce, že Švejek zůstal^P na peróně. [s2/18]

Когда он увидел^P, что Швейк остался^P на перроне, у него стало^P легко на душе. [s243]

- (19) “Tak najednou, to se mně nelíbí.”
Švejek bylⁱ opět sám. Za chvíli ozval^P se opět telefon. [s2/247]

- Так внезапно... Это что-то мне не нравится.
Швейк опять остался^P один. Через минуту снова раздался^P звонок. [s418]

- (20) Nyní, vypovídav^P se, bylⁱ desátník sám sebou spokojen a čekalⁱ, co na to řekne jednoroční dobrovolník. [s2/158]

Высказавшись, капрал остался^P очень собою доволен и стал^P ждатьⁱ, что скажет на это вольноопределяющийся. [s351]

- (21) Pak když ty voba vojáci umřeli^P, přišlo^P to do parlamentu a bylo^P to v novinách. Ty noviny hned nám zakázali^P číst a dělaliⁱ nám prohlídku v kufříkách, kdo má ty noviny. [s85]

Но когда оба солдаты померли^P, дело дошло^P до парламента, и все это попало^P в газеты. Тут нам сразу запретили^P читать

эти газеты и даже обыскали^Р наши сундучки, нет ли у кого газет. [s83]

- (22) Nebo v Bendlovce jsem dal^Р jednou jednomu funebrákovi facku a on mně ji vrátil^Р. Abychom se smířili, museli^і nás oba zatknout, a hned to bylo^і v poledníčku. [s53]

Или, например, в Бендловке дал^Р я раз одному факельщику из похоронного бюро по роже, а он мне сдачи. Для того чтобы нас помирить, пришлось^Р обоих посадить в каталажку, и сейчас же это появилось^Р в вечерке. [s60]

- (23) A tak mě našli^Р u ní sedět druhý den sousedi. Potom jsem byl^і v blázinci ve Slupech, a když nás potom před válkou v Bohnicích postavili^Р před komisi, byl^і jsem uznán^Р za vyléčenýho a hned jsem musel^і jít dosluhovat na vojnu za ty léta, so jsem promeškal. [s210]

Так меня на другой день и застали^Р соседи. Потом попал^Р я в сумашедший дом на Слупах, а когда нас перед войной вызвали^Р в Богницы на комиссию, признали^Р меня излеченным, и пришлось^Р идти дослуживать военную службу за пропущенные годы. [s390]

- (24) Švejk ho přitáhl^Р k sobě a polní kurát zapomněl^Р na vlak a počal^Р napodobit různé zvířecí hlasy. Nejdéle se zdržel^Р u kohouta a jeho kikeriki vítězně zaznělo^Р z drožky. Byl^і vůbec nějakou chvíli velmi čilý, neposedný a pokoušel^і se vypadnout z drožky, spílaje^і lidem, které drožka mýjela, uličníků. Potom vyhodil^Р z drožky kapesník a křičel,^і aby zastavili, že ztratil zavazadla. [s144]

Швейк с силой притянул^Р его к себе, и фельдкурат забыл^Р про поезд и принялся^Р подражать крику разных животных и птиц. Дольше всего он подражал^і петуху, и его «кукареку» победно неслось^і с дрожек. На некоторое время он стал^Р вообще необычайно деятельным и неусидчивым. Он сделал^Р попытку выскочить из пролетки, ругая всех прохожих хулиганами. Затем он выбросил^Р из пролетки носовой платок и закричал^Р, чтобы остановились, так как он потерял багаж. [s128]

- (25) Vrchní průvodčí byl^і již venku, dal^Р signál a vlak se opět rozjel^Р. [s2/16]

Обер-кондуктор вышел^Р, дал^Р свисток, и поезд тронулся^Р. [s240]

- (26) Vzal^P jsem to k údolí Kačáku do lesů, do jedné rokle, a za půl hodiny byliⁱ už dva ty vlčáci u mne, povalili^P mne... [s2/45]

Направился^P я к долине Качака в лес и спрятался^P в овраге. И полчаса не прошло^P, как прибежали^P два волкодава и поваляли^P меня на землю... [s262]

- (27) Než se ta věc vyřídila^P, tak jsem zůstal^P na peróně sám. Vlak bylⁱ pryč, pan obřlajtnant i s kufry, i se všema svýma, mýma dokumenty taky pryč, a já tu zůstal^P civět jako sirotek bez dokumentů. [s2/30]

Пока дело выяснилось^P, я оказался^P покинутым на перроне. Поезд ушел^P, господин поручик с чемоданами и со всеми - и своими и моими - документами уехал^P тоже, а я остался^P без документов и болтался, как беспризорный. [s251]

- (28) Jeliⁱ tedy se svým drožkářem, vrátili^P všechno poctivě, až na tu láhev mešního vína. A když byliⁱ doma, poukázavše^P nešťastného drožkáře na velitelství, pokud se týká náhrady za ty dlouhé jízdy, řekl^P Švejkl k polnímu kurátovi... [s168]

Они поехали^P на том же извозчике и честно вернули^P все, кроме бутылки церковного вина. Когда они вернулись^P домой и в наказание за медленную езду отправили^P несчастного извозчика рассчитывать в комендантское управление, Швейк обратился^P к фельдкурату... [s150]

2.5 *mělⁱ*

- (29) Když se dr. Grunstein vrátilⁱ, postavil^P se opět do bojovné pózy a mělⁱ dlouhou řeč. [s96]

Доктор Грюнштейн опять принял^P боевую позу и произнес^P длинную речь. [s91]

- (30) U Vlašimě bylⁱ (...) jeden děkan a ten mělⁱ, když mu jeho stará hospodyně utekla^P s klukem i s penězi, posluhovačku. A ten děkan na stará kolena dal^P se do studování svatýho Augustýna (...). [s174]

- Во Влашине (...) былⁱ один настоятель. Когда его прежняя экономка от него сбежала^P вместе с ребенком и деньгами, он нанял^P себе новую служанку. Этот настоятель на старости лет принялся^P изучать святого Августина (...) [s155]

- (31) Tož jednou k ránu **byloⁱ slyšetⁱ** dvě rány, **bylⁱ** nějaký poplach a pak **našli^p** toho barona. Náprsní portfej **mělⁱ pryč^p**, ale jinak tam nezůstala^p žádná stopa. [ca223]

И вот, однажды, на рассвете, **хлопнули^p** два выстрела, **послышался^p** какой-то шум и потом барона **нашли^p** мертвым. Бумажник его **исчез^p**, но никаких следов преступник не оставил^p. [ca304]

- (32) A to **bylⁱ** konec slavného detektiva Bretschneidra. Když **mělⁱ** již ve svém bytě sedm takových ohav, **uzavřel^p se** s nimi v zadním pokoji a nedal^p jim tak dlouho nic jíst, pokud ho nesežraly^p. [s70]

И вот **наступил^p** конец знаменитого сыщика Бретшнейдера. Когда у него в квартире **появилось^p** уже семь подобных страшилищ, он **заперся^p** с ними в задней комнате и не давалⁱ им ничего жрать до тех пор, пока псы не сожрали^p его самого. [s72]

- (33) Но Иешуа почему-то **заспешил^p**, **сказал^p**, что у него в городе неотложное дело, и **ушел^p** около полудня один. [ma174]

Ale Ješua **mělⁱ najednou naspěch**, **prohlásil^p**, že musí ve městě vyřídit jistou neodkladnou záležitost, a **odešel^p** k polednímu sám. [ma140]

- (34) Маргарита так и сделала^p. Козлоногий поднес^p ей бокал с шампанским, она **выпила^p** его, и сердце ее сразу **согрелось^p**. [ma240]

Margarita poslechla^p. Kozonoh jí přinesl^p pohár šampaňského. **Napila^p se** a hned **mělaⁱ** hřejivý pocit u srdce. [ma196]

- (35) (...) ale od té doby **dostal^p** Mlíčko zlost na svou velkou stříbrnou medaili za udatnost a **šelⁱ ji zastavit** do zastavárny a tam ho **zadrželi^p** i s medailí. **Mělⁱ** z toho oplétání, a je nějaký takový čestný soud pro válečné invalidy, a tam ho **odsoudili^p** k tomu, že mu vzali tu stříbrnou medaili a pak ho **odsoudili^p** ještě ku ztrátě nohy... [s2/108]

(...) но с тех пор он **разозлился^p** на свою большую серебряную медаль «За храбрость» и понес^p ее **закладывать** в ломбард. Там его за это вместе с медалью **сцапали^p**, и **начались^p** не-

приятности. Существует какой-то там суд чести для инвалидов войны, и этот суд **постановил**^P отобрать у него эту серебряную медаль и, кроме того, **присудил**^P отобрать и ногу... [s311]

- (36) Plukovník Schröder v mrzuté náladě **odešel**^P domů, a když **se** ráno **probudil**^P, **měl**ⁱ ještě horší náladu, poněvadž v novinách, které četlⁱ v posteli, několikrát našel^P větu ve zprávách z bojiště (...) [s2/115]

Полковник **пошел**^P домой в отвратительном настроении. На следующее утро настроение у него **стало**^P еще хуже, потому что в газетах, которые он читалⁱ лежа в постели, несколько раз наталкивалсяⁱ на фразу (...) [s316]

2.6 other process vs. end state

- (37) “(...) a na tucty to vždycky přijde lacinějc,” **odpověděl**^P Švejk. **Panovalo**ⁱ ticho, které **přerušil**^P sám Švejk povzdechem (...). [s12]

- (...) да на дюжину и дешевле выходит, **ответил**^P Швейк. **Вонарилась**^P тишина, которую **нарушил**^P сам Швейк, вздохнув^P (...). [s27]

- (38) Nad Švejkem i nadporučíkem Lukášem **vznášela**ⁱ **se** ve vzduchu katastrofa. [s254]

Над Швейком и поручиком Лукашом **нависла**ⁱ катастрофа. [s215]

- (39) - Покайся, Иваныч! Тебе скидка выйдет!
С глазами, налитыми кровью, Никанор Иванович **занес**^P кулаки над головой жены хрипя:
- У, дура проклятая! [ma104]

“Přiznej se, Ivanyči! Oni ti sleví trest!

Bosý s očima zalitýma krví **mával**ⁱ pěstmi ženě nad hlavou a ryčelⁱ:
“Káčo pitomá!” [ma82]

- (40) **Поднявшись**^P с камня, он **швырнул**^P на землю бесполезно, как он теперь думал, украденный нож, **раздавил**^P флягу ногою, лишив себя воды, **сбросил**^P с головы кефи, **вцепился**^P в свои жидкие волосы и **стал**^P **проклинать**ⁱ себя. [ma176]

V záchvatu zuřivosti **vyskočil**^P z balvanu, **mrštil**^P na zem zbytečně ukradený nůž, **rozdupal**^P láhev a **zůstal**^P bez vody, **strhl**^P s hlavy kefi, **rval**ⁱ **si** řídké vlasy a **proklínal**ⁱ sám sebe. [ma142]

- (41) Нагие ведьмы, **высочив^p** из-за верб, **выстроились^p** в ряд и **стали^p** приседать и кланяться придворными поклонами. Кто-то козлоногий **подлетел^p** и **припал^p** к руке, **раскинув^p** на траве шелк, **осведомился^p** о том, хорошо ли купалась королева, **предложил^p** прилечь и отдохнуть. [ma240]

Nahé divoženky **se vyhouply^p** z vrbin, **postavily^p** se do řady a hluboce, dvorně **se uklánělyⁱ**. K Markétě **přiskočil^p** jakýsi kozonoh a **sápalⁱ** se jí po ruce. Pak **rozprostřel^p** na trávě hedvábnou roušku, **vyptávalⁱ** se, jestli se královna dobře vykoukala, a **navrhovalⁱ**, aby si na chvíli lehla a odpočinula. [ma196]

2.7 other process vs. result

- (42) **Ozvalo^p** se opět zarachocení klíče ve dveřích a profous na chodbě **rozsvěcovalⁱ** lampičku. [s2/99]

Опять **послышалось^p** щелканье ключа в замке, и профос **зажегⁱ** керосиновую лампу в коридоре. [s304]

- (43) - Я извиняюсь, - **вскричал^p** Коровьев, - это именно галлюцинация, вот он, ваш документ, - и Коровьев **подал^p** мастеру документ. [ma282]

“Pardon,” **zavřeštěl^p** Korovjev, “to jsou halucinace! Tady, prosím,” a **podávalⁱ** mu legitimaci. [ma231]

- (44) Повинуясь жестам человека в капюшоне, один из палачей **взял^p** копье, а другой **принес^p** к столбу ведро и губку. [ma179]

Na pokyn muže v kápi jeden kat **zvedl^p** kopí a druhý **přinášelⁱ** vědro a houbu. [ma143]

- (45) Potom, když **přišel^p** pan Kokoška, pan Tauchen **šelⁱ** s ním do komptoáru, a když **vyšel^p** ven, **ukazovalⁱ** nám dva zlatníky, ne jeden, jak měl slíbeno. [s2/246]

Затем, когда **пришел^p** пан Кокошка, пан Таухен **пошел^p** с ним в контору, а **выйдя** оттуда **показал^p** нам два золотых, а не один, как ему было обещано. [s417]

- (46) Závodčí **počal^p** **choditⁱ** po pokoji, **podíval^p** se z okna, zas **se vrátil^p**, **utrhl^p** kus papíru z novin na stole a **žmoulalⁱ** mezi prsty papírovou kuličku. [s2/69]

Ефрейтор **зашагал**^P по комнате, **взглянул**^P в окно, **вернулся**^P, **оторвал**^P кусок от лежавшей на столе газеты и **скатал**^P из него шарик. [s280]

- (47) **Přestal**^P být skeptikem a duši jeho **naplnila**^P soustrast k Švejkovi. **Hledali**ⁱ tedy vhodný průjezd, kde **sňali**^P bodáky, a tlustý **dovolil**^P Švejkovi, aby kráčel vedle něho. [s129]

Он **перестал**^P **быть** скептиком, и душа его **наполнилась**^P состраданием к Швейку. Тут они **высмотрели**^P подходящее место за воротами, **сняли**^P там штыки, и толстяк **разрешил**^P Швейку идти рядом с ним. [s117]

- (48) **Lehl**^P si na svůj slamník u dveří a **vzpomínal**ⁱ na domov a na zabíjačky. [s2/268]

Он **лег**^P на свой соломенный матрац у дверей и **вспомнил**^P родной дом и дни, когда резали свиней. [s434]

- (49) - Раз! - в руке у него **оказался**^P пистолет, он **крикнул**^P:

- Два! [ma124]

“Raz!” **Najednou držel**ⁱ v ruce pistoli. “Dva!” [ma99]

- (50) И без того худой финдиректор как будто еще более похудел^P и даже постарел^P, а глаза его в роговой оправе **утратили**^P свою обычную колючесть, и **появилась**^P в них не только тревога, но даже как будто печаль. [ma108]

Beztať už hubený ředitel jako by ještě víc seschl^P a snad i zestárl^P. Oči za kostěnými obroučkami brýlí **ztratily**^P obvykle pichlavý výraz a **zračil**ⁱ **se** v nich nejenom neklid, ale dokonce smutek. [ma86]

3. INGRESSIVITY

3.1 стал^P + inf.

- (1) “Lže,” **řekl**^P Švejk a **čekal**^P. [s67]

- Врет! - **сказал**^P Швейк и **стал**^P **ждать**ⁱ. [s70]

- (2) “Maxi!” **zavolał**^P na něj Švejk, “pojď ke mně!”

Šelⁱ s nedůvěrou, Švejk ho **vzal**^P na klín, **hladil**ⁱ a ponejprv Max zbytkem svého kupírovaného ohonu zavrtěl^P přátelsky (...). [s252]

- Максик, - позвал^p его Швейк, - поди сюда!

Макс недоверчиво подошел^p. Швейк **взял^p** его на колени и **стал^p гладитьⁱ**. Тут Макс в первый раз приятельски завилал^p своим обрубком (...). [s214]

- (3) Komorník, připomínající svými ježatými licousy Babinského, přitáhl^p objemný koš k posteli, zatímco společnice staré baronky, vysoká dáma s uplakanou tváří, **sedla^p** si na Švejkovu postel a **urovnávalaⁱ** mu slaměný polštář pod záda s fixní myšlenkou, že se to patří dělat nemocným hrdinům. [s93]

Камердинер, напоминающий своими взъерошенными бакенбардами Бабинского, притащил^p к постели громадную корзину. Компаньонка баронессы - высокая дама с заплаканным лицом - **уселась^p** к Швейку на постель и **стала^p поправлятьⁱ** ему за спиной подушку, набитую соломой, с твердой уверенностью, что так полагается делать у постели раненых героев. [s90]

- (4) Čahoun chvíli sám se sebou zápasilⁱ. A jako **ztratil^p** již svůj skepticismus, **ztrácelⁱ** pomalu i svou odměřenost a zbytek rozvahy. [s133]

Верзила с минуту боролсяⁱ с самим собой, но **потеряв^p** свой скептицизм, мало-помалу **стал^p терятьⁱ** и сдержанность и последние остатки рассудительности. [s119]

- (5) Nadporučíkovi bezděčně **zacvakaly^p** zuby, **vzdychl^p si**, **vytáhl^p** z pláště Bohemii a **četlⁱ** zprávy o velkých vítězstvích (...). [s2/7]

Поручик невольно **заскрежетал^p** зубами, **вздыхнул^p**, **вынул^p** из кармана шинели «Богемию» и **стал^p читатьⁱ** сообщения о колоссальных победах (...) [s235]

- (6) **Zůstal^p** jen průvodčí vlaku se Švejkem a železničním zřízencem. Průvodčí vlaku **vytáhl^p** zápisní knížku a **sestavovalⁱ** relaci o celém případě. [s2/16]

Швейк, железнодорожный служащий и кондуктор **остались^p** одни. Кондуктор **вынул^p** записную книжку и **стал^p составлятьⁱ** протокол о происшествии. [s240]

- (7) **Zůstal^p** průvodčí se Švejkem a **mámilⁱ** na něm dvacet korun pokuty, zdůrazňuje, že ho musí v opačném případě předvést v Táboře k přednostovi stanice. [s2/17]

Со Швейком **остался**^P кондуктор, который **стал**^P **вымогать**ⁱ у него двадцать крон штрафа, угрожая, что в противном случае сдаст его в Таборе начальнику станции. s241

- (8) **Položil**^P **si** na stůl malý balíček, **vytáhl**^P rozbitou tobolku a **pře-počítával**ⁱ **si** peníze. [s2/21]

Положив^P на стол маленький узелок, он **вынул**^P истрепанный кошелек и **стал**^P **пересчитать**ⁱ деньги. [s245]

- (9) (...) “jen se pořádně napij.”
Pochopil^P, **napil**^P **se**, **poděkoval**^P: “Köszönöm szivesen,” a dál **prohlížel**ⁱ obsah své tobolky a nakonec **vzdychl**^P. [s2/21]

(...) пей на здоровье.

Тот **понял**^P, **выпил**^P и поблагодарил^P:

- Köszönöm szivesen.

Затем он снова **стал**^P **просматривать**ⁱ содержимое своего кошелька и под конец **вздыхнул**^P. [s245]

- (10) Závodčímu dalo mnoho obtíží přesvědčit ho, že je již ráno. Konečně **prokoukl**^P, **mnul**ⁱ **si** oči a nejasně **se začal**^P **upamatovávat**ⁱ na včerejšek. [s2/69]

Ефрейтору стоило немалого труда убедить его, что уже утро. Наконец, он **продрал**^P глаза, **стал**^P их **тереть**ⁱ кулаком и с трудом, постепенно **начал**^P **воскрешать**ⁱ в памяти вчерашний вечер. [s280]

- (11) Vrchní polní kurát vtom spadl^P z lavice a spalⁱ na zemi dál. Desátník **se** na to hloupě **díval**ⁱ a pak za všeobecného ticha **zvedal**ⁱ ho beze všeho přispění druhých na lavici sám. [s2/145]

В этот момент обер-фельдкурат скатился^P со скамьи и продолжалⁱ спатьⁱ на полу. Капрал **бросил**^P на него растерянный **взгляд** и при общем молчании **стал**^P **втаскивать**ⁱ его обратно на скамью. [s340]

- (12) Nyní, **vypovídav**^P **se**, bylⁱ desátník sám sebou spokojen a **čekal**ⁱ, co na to řekne jednoroční dobrovolník. Ozval^P se však Švejka. [s2/158]

Высказавшись^P, капрал **остался**^P очень собою доволен и **стал**^P **ждать**ⁱ, что скажет на это вольноопределяющийся. Однако отозвался^P Швейк. [s351]

- (13) К слову «Аннушка» привязались^p слова «подсолнечное масло», а затем почему-то «Понтий Пилат». Пилата поэт отринул^p и стал^p вязатьⁱ цепочку, начиная со слова «Аннушка». И цепочка эта связалась^p очень быстро и тотчас привела^p к сумасшедшему профессору. [ma52]

Ke slovu “Anuška” se připojila^p další, “slunečnicový olej” a pak neznámo proč i “Pilát Pontský”. Piláta Bezprizorný rezolutně odvrhl^p a pátralⁱ po souvislostech, počínaje slovem “Anuška”. Postupně splétalⁱ řetěz, až konečně dospěl^p k bláznivému profesorovi. [ma39]

- (14) Вслед за тем, откуда ни возьмись, у чугунной решетки вспыхнул^p огонечек и стал^p приближатьсяⁱ к веранде. Сидящие за столиками стали^p приподниматьсяⁱ и всматриватьсяⁱ и увидели^p, что вместе с огонечком шествует к ресторану белое привидение. [ma65]

Brzy nato, kde se vzalo tu se vzalo, zazářilo^p náhle u kovové mříže světélko a blížiloⁱ se k terase. Hosté u stolků vstávaliⁱ, natahovaliⁱ krky a viděliⁱ, že se světélkem kráčí k restauraci bílý přízrak. [ma51]

- (15) И вот проклятая зелень перед глазами разтаяла^p, стали^p выговариватьсяⁱ слова, и главное, Степа кое-что припомнил^p. [ma81]

Zelené kruhy před očima zmizely^p, slova plynulaⁱ lehčeji, a hlavně Lotrov se pomalu rozpomínalⁱ. [ma64]

- (16) Через несколько секунд денежный дождь, все густея, достиг^p кресел, и зрители стали^p бумажки ловитьⁱ. [ma124]

Za několik vteřin zesílený déšť bankovek dopadl^p na křesla a diváci je loviliⁱ. [ma99]

- (17) Но врач быстро успокоил^p всех встревоженных, скорбных главою, и они стали^p засыпатьⁱ. [ma169]

Ale lékaři brzy uklidnili^p vyšinuté pacienty, takže všichni postupně usínaliⁱ. [ma136]

- (18) Потом Маргариту **бросили**^P на хрустальное ложе и до блеска **стали**^P **растирать**ⁱ какими-то большими зелеными листьями. Тут **ворвался**^P кот и **стал**^P **помогать**ⁱ. [ma254]

Pak ji **položily**^P na křišťálové lože a **třely**ⁱ ji velikánskými zelenými lupeny, až se celá leskla. Vtom **vtrhl**^P dovnitř kocour a **začal**^P vydatně **pomáhat**ⁱ. [ma208]

- (19) После этого она **кинулась**^P к мастеру, **обхватила**^P его шею и **стала**^P его **целовать**ⁱ в губы, в нос, в щеки. [ma353]

Po těch slovech se mu **pověsila**^P na šíji a **líbala**ⁱ ho na try, na nos i na tváře. [ma289]

- (20) Но тут она **опомнилась**^P, **подбежала**^P к платью, **подняла**^P и **стала**^P **отряхивать**ⁱ его. [ma226]

Vtom se **vzpatoval**^P, rychle **posbírala**^P spadlé věci a horlivě je **oprašovala**ⁱ. [ma185]

- (21) Тут **стали**^P **подниматься**ⁱ по каким-то широким ступеням, и Маргарите **стало**^P **казаться**ⁱ, что конца им не будет. [ma242]

Stoupaliⁱ po širokých pohodlných schodech, které se Markétě **zdály**ⁱ nekonečné. [ma198]

- (22) Наш обрšt **zakázal**^P vůbec vojákům **číst**ⁱ, (...). Vod tý doby vojáci **začli**^P **číst**ⁱ a náš regiment **byl**ⁱ **nejvzdělanější**. [s85]

Наш полковник вообще **запретил**^P солдатам **читать**ⁱ, (...). И вот с этого-то времени солдаты **принялись**^P **читать**ⁱ. Наш полк сразу **стал**^P самым **начитанным**. [s84]

- (23) Nejdéle se zdržel^P u kohouta a jeho kikeriki vítězně zněloⁱ z drožky. **Byl**ⁱ vůbec nějakou dobu velmi **čilý**, **neposedný** a **pokoušel**ⁱ se **vypadnout**^P z drožky, spílaje lidem (...). [s144]

Дольше всего он подражалⁱ петуху, и его «кукареку» победно несло с дрожек. На некоторое время он **стал**^P вообще необычайно **деятельным** и **неусидчивым**. Он **сделал**^P попытку **выскочить**^P из пролетки, ругая всех прохожих (...). [s128]

3.2 начал^P + inf.

- (24) To už **zvolal^P** jen, že zítra mám jít k regimentsraportu, a **hnalⁱ** to na koni ze vzteku až bůhvíkam jako divoký jezdec, a zas **přicválal^P**, opět nanovo **řvalⁱ**, **zuřilⁱ**, **bilⁱ** **se v prsa** a **poručil^P** mne okamžitě ze cvičiště odstranit a dát do hauptvachu. [s2/96]

Тут он **возопил^P**, что завтра я должен явиться к нему на полковой рапорт, и как бешеный **поскакал^P** бог знает куда, словно дикий всадник, а потом **прискакал^P** галопом обратно, снова **начал^P** **оратьⁱ**, **бесноватьсяⁱ** и **битьⁱ** **себя в грудь**; меня **велел** немедленно убраться с плаца и посадить на гауптвахту. [s302]

- (25) (...) a vona mě, bestie, **vodnesla^P** ze žebříku na zem, tam si na mne **klekla^P** a **vrčelaⁱ** a **cenilaⁱ** mně zuby do vobličeje. [s2/45]

(...), а она - бестия! - **доставила^P** меня с лестницы наземь, а там на меня **влезла^P** и **начала^P** **рычатьⁱ** и **скалитьⁱ** зuby над самым моим носом. [s262]

- (26) Человек со связанными руками несколько **подался^P** вперед и **начал^P** **говоритьⁱ**: - Добрый человек, поверь мне... [ma25]

Viník se svázanýma rukama **se** poněkud **naklonil^P** dopředu a **ujišťovalⁱ**: "Věř mi, dobrý člověče..." [ma17]

- (27) **Постояв^P** некоторое время, цилиндр **начал^P** **вращатьсяⁱ** до тех пор, пока не выскочила^P надпись: «Няня». [ma87]

Chvilku **vyčkávalⁱ** a pak **se** pomalu **zasouvalⁱ**, až vyskočil^P jiný nápis: Ošetřovatelka. [ma69]

- (28) Весть о гибели Берлиоза **распространилась^P** по всему дому с какою-то сверхъестественной быстротой, и с семи часов утра четверга к Босому **начали^P** **звонитьⁱ** по телефону, а затем и лично **являтьсяⁱ** с заявлениями, в которых содержались претензии на жилплощадь покойного. [ma96]

Zpráva o Berliozově smrti **se rozšířila^P** po celém domě s jakousi nadpřirozenou rychlostí. Ve čtvrtek od sedmi hodin ráno **vyzvánělⁱ** v bytě Bosého telefon a později **přicházeliⁱ** nájemníci osobně s písemnými žádostmi o přidělení nebožtíkova bytu. [ma76]

- (29) В партере **запелись**^p, **начали**^p **приставать**ⁱ, и наконец, какой-то гражданин, которого, точно, звали Парчевским, весь пунцовый от изумления, **извлек**^p из бумажника колоду и **стал**^p **тыкать**ⁱ ею в воздух, не зная, что с нею делать. [ma123]

V hledišti to **zašumělo**^p, lidé **vstávali**ⁱ a nakonec jakýsi muž, který se skutečně jmenoval Parčevský, překvapením rudý až do kořínků vlasů, **vytáhl**^p z náprsní tašky sadu karet a **začal**^p s ní **mávat**ⁱ ve vzduchu. [ma98]

- (31) Но тот неизвестно отчего **впал**^p в тоску и беспокойство, **поднялся**^p со стула, **заломил**^p руки и, обращаясь к далекой луне, вздрагивая, **начал**^p **бормотать**ⁱ: И ночью при луне мне нет покоя, зачем потревожили меня? [ma279]

Ten náhle **zneklidněl**^p a **rozesmutnil**^p se. **Vstal**^p, **lomil**ⁱ rukama, nervózně sebou pošukával a zmateně **blekotat**ⁱ tváří v tvář vzdálenému měsíci:

“Ani v noci při měsíčku nemám klid... Proč jste mě vyrušili? [ma228]

4. VERBA SENTIENDI / COGITANDI

4.1 sight (vidět etc.)

4.1.1 vidělⁱ - увидел^p

- (1) В большой рабочей комнате сиделⁱ за столом Поскребышев. Марк Александрович **увидел**^p его впервые и **подумал**^p, какое у него грубое, неприятное лицо. [a34]

Ve velké pracovně sedělⁱ za stolem Poskrebyšev. Rjazanov ho **viděl**ⁱ poprvé a **pomyslel**^p si, jakou má hrubou, nesympatickou tvář. [a22]

- (2) **Возвратившись**^p с завода, Саша **увидел**^p в дырочках почтового ящика синий конверт. Письмо от отца, его почерк. [a69]

Když se **vrátil**^p domů, **viděl**ⁱ Saša dírkami v poštovní schránce prosvítat něco modrého. Dopis od otce, jeho písmo na obálce. [a63]

- (3) Тут ужас до того обладел^p Берлиозом, что он **закрыл**^p глаза. А когда он их **открыл**^p, **увидел**^p, что все кончилось (...) [ma13]

Berlioz zděšením **zavřel**^P oči. Když je znovu **otevřel**^P, **viděl**ⁱ, že je po všem. [ma8]

- (4) Paní Müllerová, která čekalaⁱ nahoře na mostě s vozíkem na Švejka, když ho **viděla**ⁱ pod bajonety, **zaplakala**^P a **odešla**^P od vozíku, aby se vícekrát k němu nevrátila. [s80]

Когда пани Мюллер, с коляской ожидавшая Швейка у моста, **увидела**^P его между двумя штыками, она **заплакала**^P и тихо **отошла**^P от коляски, чтобы никогда уже к ней не возвращаться... [s79]

- (5) Když se vlak **hnul**^P, **vyhlédl**^P nadporučík Lukáš z okna a **viděl**ⁱ na peróně stát Švejka, zabraného ve vážný rozhovor s přednostou stanice. [s2/18]

Когда поезд **тронулся**^P, поручик Лукаш **выглянул**^P в окно и **увидел**^P на перроне Швейка, увлеченного серьезным разговором с начальником станции. [s243]

4.1.2 **vidělⁱ** - other

- (6) - Из тех? - поднял^P брови Эрик.

Заметив^P интерес Эрика к графине, Вика **ответила**^P:

- Из тех, но не из главных, из захудалых. [a246]

“Z těch Šeremetěvů? zvedl^P obočí Erik.

Když Vika **viděla**ⁱ Erikův zájem o hraběnku, **odpověděla**^P:

“Ано, не овšem z těch hlavních, ale z těch zchudlých.” [a259]

- (7) **Открыл**^P глаза, он **убедился**^P в том, что на холме все без изменений (...). [ma176]

Оtevřel^P oči a **viděl**ⁱ, že situace na kopci zůstává nezměněná (...) [ma142]

4.1.3 **увидел^P** - other

- (8) **Полежав**^P некоторое время неподвижно (...), Иван **увидел**^P кнопку звонка рядом с собою. [ma87]

Chvilku **ležel**ⁱ nehybně v (...) posteli a pak **zpozoroval**^P vedle sebe zvonek. [ma69]

- (9) Маргарита **наклонилась**^P к глобусу и **увидела**^P, что квадратик земли расширился (...). [ma252]

Markéta **se sklonila**^P ke glóbusu a **sledovala**ⁱ, jak se čtvereček země rozšířil (...) [ma206]

- (10) Варенуха молча **подал**^P ему телеграмму, и финдиректор **увидел**^P в ней слова: «Умоляю верить...» [ma107]

Varenucha mu **podal**^P beze slova telegram a ředitel **četl**ⁱ: “Snažně prosím (...)” [ma85]

4.1.4 **dívalⁱ se - other**

- (11) Celkem vzato, desátník z toho **pochopil**^P jedině tolik, že je chybujícím; proto **odvrátil**^P se opět k oknu a zasmušile **se díval**ⁱ, jak ubíhá cesta. [s2/144]

Из всего этого капрал **понял**^P только одно, что ему ставятся на вид его собственные ошибки. Он **отвернулся**^P опять к окну и **стал**^P мрачно **глядеть**ⁱ, как убегает дорога. [s339]

- (12) Kuchař okultista **zahalil**^P se v roucho mlčení, **podpřel**^P si hlavu o ruku a **díval**ⁱ se na mokrý, politý stůl [s2/261]

Повар-окультист **погрузился**^P в молчание, **подпер**^P рукой голову и **стал**^P **созерцать**ⁱ мокрый, облитый стол. [s428]

- (13) Vrchní polní kurát vtom **spadl**^P z lavice a spalⁱ na zemi dál. Desátník **se** na to hloupě **díval**ⁱ a pak za všeobecného ticha **zvedal**ⁱ ho beze všeho přispění druhých na lavici sám. Bylo vidět, že ztratil všechnu autoritu, a když **řekl**^P slabým beznadějným hlasem: “Mohli byste mně také pomoci,” tu všichni z eskorty **dívali**ⁱ se strnule a **nehla**^P se ani živá noha. [s2/145]

В этот момент обер-фельдкурат **скатился**^P со скамьи и продолжалⁱ спать на полу. Капрал **бросил**^P на него растерянный **взгляд** и при общем молчании **стал**^P **втаскивать**ⁱ его обратно на скамью. Никто **не пошевелился**^P, чтобы ему помочь. Видно было, что капрал потерял всякий авторитет, и когда он безнадежным голосом **сказал**^P:

- Хотя бы помог кто... - конвойные только **посмотрели**ⁱ на него, но никто **не пошевелился**^P. [s340]

4.1.5 поглядел - other

- (14) Прокуратор хорошо знал, что именно так ему ответит первосвященник, но задача его заключалась в том, чтобы показать, что такой ответ вызывает его изумление.

Пилат это сделал с большим искусством. Брови на надменном лице поднялись^P, прокуратор прямо в глаза поглядел^P первосвященнику с изумлением. [ma39]

Pilát dobře věděl, co mu velekněz odpoví, ale chtěl dát najevo, že ho taková odpověď překvapuje. Zhostil se své úlohy mistrovsky. Zvedl^P tázavě obočí, zatvářil^P se povýšeně a hledělⁱ udiveně veleknězi přímo do očí. [ma29]

- (15) - Не услышал бы нас кто-нибудь, игемон?

Пилат мертвыми глазами поглядел^P на первосвященника и, оскалившись, изобразил^P улыбку. [ma41]

“Co kdyby nás někdo slyšel, vladaři...”

Pilát ho pozorovalⁱ vyhaslýma očima a pokusil^P se o úsměv. [ma30]

4.1.6 other

- (16) Увидев^P Маргариту, толстяк стал^P вглядыватьсяⁱ, а потом радостно заорал^P: - Что такое? Ее ли я вижу? Клодина, да ведь это ты, неунывающая вдова? И ты здесь? - тут он полез^P здороватьсяⁱ. [ma239]

Sotva tloušťák uviděl^P Markétku, chvíli si ji prohlíželⁱ a pak radostně zahuhlal^P: “Co to vidím? Je to opravdu ona? Jsi to ty, Claudino, veselá vdovo? Ty a tady?” a už se k ní hrnulⁱ a chtěl ji obejmout na přivítanou. [ma195]

- (17) - Пожалуйста, пожалуйста, - отозвался^P кот и стал^P в бинокль смотретьⁱ на доску. [ma249]

“Prosím, račte,” zapištěl^P kocour a sledovalⁱ kukátkem šachovnicové pole. [ma204]

- (18) Анушка отбежала^P от окна, спустилась^P вниз к своей двери, быстрехонько открыла^P ее, спряталась^P за нею, и в оставленной ею щелке замерцал^P ее исступленный от любопытства глаз. [ma287]

Anuška **odskočila**^p od okna, **rozběhla**^p se dolů ke dveřím vlastního bytu, rychle **odemkla**^p a **schovala**^p se za dveřmi. Ve škvíře **se blýskalo**ⁱ její oko, nepřičetné zvědavostí. [ma235]

- (19) - Знаю, знаю! - бесстрашно **ответил**^p чернобородый Каифа, и глаза его **сверкнули**^p. [ma41]

“Vím, vím!” **odpověděl**^p nebojácně černovousý Kaifáš a **metal**ⁱ očima **blesky**. [ma30]

- (20) «Лжет!» - **воскликнул**^p мысленно финдиректор. И тут вдруг его глаза **округлились**^p и **стали**^p совершенно **безумными**, и он **установился**^p на спинку кресла. [ma156]

Lže! **blesklo**^p hlavou řediteli. Vtom **vykulil**^p oči a divoce **zíral**ⁱ na opěradlo křesla. [ma125]

- (21) Но зато, когда профессор **вернулся**^p к столу, **содрав**^p наконец с себя халат, он как бы **врос**^p возле стола в паркет, **прико-
вавшись**^p **взглядом** к своему столу. На том месте, где лежали этикетки, сидел черный котенок-сирота с несчастливой мордочкой и мяукал над блюдечком с молоком. [ma209]

Zato když **se** profesor **vrátil**^p ke stolu a konečně ze sebe **strhal**^p plášť, **zůstal**^p **stát**ⁱ jako přikovaný a **civěl**ⁱ před sebe. Na místě, kde ještě před chvílí ležely viněty, sedělo černé zatoulané kotě a nešťastně mňoukalo nad miskou s mlékem. [ma169]

- (22) **Занявшись**^p паскудным котом, Иван едва **не потерял**^p самого главного из трех - профессора. [ma54]

Ivan **pozoroval**ⁱ to zlořečené kocouřisko a přitom div **neztratil**^p z dohledu vůdce bandy - profesora. [ma42]

4.2 hearing

4.2.1 slyšelⁱ - услышал^p

- (23) **Odhrabal**^p si slámu a **slyšel**ⁱ zcela blízko sebe hlas: “Vod kterýho regimentu? Kam se neseš?” [s2/39]

Он **отгреб**^p себе соломы и вдруг над самой своей головой **услышал**^p голос: - Какого полка? Куда бог несет? [s257]

- (24) Nadporučík Lukáš **řekl^p**, oblékaje se rychle, když **slyšelⁱ**, že měl již být před půlhodinou u plukovníka Schrödra: "Vy jste mně, Švejku, zas pomohl na nohy." [s2/243]

Услышав^p, что еще полчаса тому назад он должен был быть у полковника Шредера, поручик **стал^p** быстро одеватьсяⁱ. - Опять, Швейк, удружили мне! - **сказал^p** он (...). [s415]

4.2.2 вы/слушал^p - po/naslouchalⁱ

- (25) Voják z eskorty cosi nejasně zabručel^p a kaprál provázející eskortu **přiblížil^p se a naslouchalⁱ** dalšímu výkladu jednoročního dobrovolníka (...) [s2/124]

Конвойный что-то невнятно пробормотал^p. Начальник конвоя, капрал, **подошел^p** ближе и **стал^p слушатьⁱ** объяснения вольноопределяющегося. [s323]

- (26) Nina тоже вела себя миролюбиво, **подошла^p** к доске, **спросила^p**, что Варя чертит, со вниманием **выслушала^p** Варины объяснения. [a481]

Nina se taky chovala přátelsky, **přistoupila^p** ke stolu, **zeptala^p se**, co to Varja rýsuje, se zájmem **poslouchalaⁱ** Varjino vysvětlování. [a522]

4.2.3 byloⁱ slyšetⁱ

- (27) "Já mám svýho obrlajtnanta."

Byloⁱ slyšetⁱ, že se vedle blízko nesmějeⁱ jen jeden, ale tři. Když se smích **utišil^p**, **optal^p se** Švejka, od jakého regimentu jsou oni. [s2/40]

- У меня там обер-лейтенант.

Послышался^p смех. Но смеялсяⁱ не один - смеялись целых трое. Когда смех **стих^p**, Швейк **спросил^p**, какого они полка. [s258]

- (28) Potom **se vzdálili^p** a **byloⁱ slyšetⁱ** zas za hodnou chvíli za rohem z druhé řady baráků hlas Vodičky: "Švejku, Švejku, jaký mají pivo u Kalicha?" [s2/227]

Отошли^p еще дальше друг от друга, и вдруг из-за угла второго ряда барakov **донесся^p** голос Водички:

- Швейк! Швейк! Какое «У Чаши» пиво? [s404]

4.3 thinking, understanding, remembering, imagining, dreaming

4.3.1 thinking

- (29) To se ví, že všichni **vodešli^P**, a já tam s ním **zůstal^P** sám, a po-
něvadž mám vždycky smůlu, tak von potom, když **se probudil^P** a
podíval^P se do zrcadla, **se rozčlil^P** a **myslelⁱ**, že jsem to jemu
udělal já, a chtěl mně dát taky pár facek. [s2/12]

Но все, понятно, **ушли^P**, а я с ним **остался^P** один. Мне, из-
вестное дело, всегда не везет. Когда он **проснулся^P** и **посмотрел^P**
в зеркало, то **разозлился^P** и **подумал^P**, что это я написал, и
тоже хотел мне дать пару оплеух. [s238]

- (30) “ (...) Tak ho vzali s sebou a von jim všechno v separaci rozbil.”
Závodčí na to **neřekl^P** ani slova a **myslelⁱ si**: “Co mně to vypra-
vuješ. Zás začínáš vypravovat nějakou pohádku o Budějovicích.”
[s2/75]

- Полицейские его забрали, а он там в участке все расколотил.
Ефрейтор **не сказал^P** ни слова и **подумал^P**: «На кой ты мне
все это рассказываешь? Опять начал заправлять арапа насчет
Будейовиц». [s284]

- (31) - Разрешите подуматъ, - смиренно **отвѣтил^P** кот, **положил^P**
локти на стол, **уткнул^P** уши в лапы и **стал^P думатьⁱ**. [ma251]

“Rozmyslím si to, jestli dovolíte,” **odpověděl^P** mírně Kňour a
přemýšlelⁱ, hlavu v tlapách. [ma205]

4.3.2 understanding

- (32) - А тут еще алкоголизм...

Рюхин ничего **не понял^P** из слов доктора, кроме того, что дела
Ивана Николаевича, видно, плоховаты, **вздыхнул^P** и **спросил^P**:

- А что это он все про какого-то консультанта говорит? [ma74]

“(...) А к тому ještě alkoholismus...”

Sviňkov **nerozumělⁱ** ani za mák, ale **pochopil^P**, že je to s Ivanem
špatné. **Zavzdychal^P** a **zeptal^P se**: “Proč pořád mluví o nějakém
konsultantovi?” [ma58]

- (33) Долго, с удивлением, смотрел он на спящих в его постели людей. Ничего не понял^P, он взял метлу и направился^P на улицу исполнять свои прямые обязанности. [il]

Dlouho užasle civěl na lidi spící v jeho posteli ale nebyl^P z toho moudrý, a tak vzal^P koště a šelⁱ na ulici za svými běžnými povinnostmi. [il]

4.3.3 remembering

- (34) И вот проклятая зелень перед глазами растаяла^P, стали^P выговариватьсяⁱ слова, и, главное, Степа кое-что припомнил^P. [ma81]

Zelené kruhy před očima zmizely^P, slova plynulaⁱ lehčeji, a hlavně Lotrov se pomalu rozpomínalⁱ. [ma64]

- (35) Lehl^P si na svůj slamník u dveří a vzpomínalⁱ na domov a na zabíjačky. [s2/268]

Он лер^P на свой соломенный матрац у дверей и вспомнил^P родной дом и дни, когда резали свиней. [s434]

4.3.4 imagining

- (36) Теперь, познакомившись^P с одним из его произведений, Никанор Иванович загрустил^P, представил^P себе женщину на коленях, с сиротами, под дождем, и невольно подумал^P: «А тип все-таки этот Куролесов!» [ma165]

Teď, když se konečně s jedním z jeho děl seznámil^P, posmutněl^P, v duchu si představovalⁱ ženu, jak klečí se sirotky v dešti, a mimoděk usoudil^P s odporem: že je ale ten Kurolesov pěkně rošťák! [ma133]

4.3.5 dreaming

- (37) (...) usnul^P nepokojným spánkem. Zdáloⁱ se mu, že si pozval nějakého nešiku řezníka a tomu že při nabíjení jitrnic praskají jitrnicová střívka. Potom zas, že řezník zapomněl udělat jelita, že ztratil ovar a že se nedostává špejlů na jitrnice. Potom se mu zdáloⁱ něco o polním soudu, poněvadž ho chytli, když tahal z polní kuchyně kus masa. Nakonec vidělⁱ sám sebe, že visí na jedné lípě v aleji vojenského tábora v Brucku nad Litavou. [s2/268]

(...) он уснул^P беспокойным сном. Ему приснилось^P, что он позвал к себе неумелого колбасника, который так плохо набивает ливерные колбасы, что они тут же лопаются. Потом, что мясник забыл сделать кровяную колбасу, пропала буженина и для ливерных колбас не хватает лучинок. Потом ему при-снился^P полевой суд, будто его поймали, когда он крал из походной кухни кусок мяса. Наконец он увидел^P себя повешенным на липе в аллее военного лагеря в Бруке на Лейте. [s434]

5. VERBA DICENDI

5.1 prefix за-

- (1) Стравинский как будто ждал этого вопроса, немедленно уселся^P и заговорил^P: - На том основании (...) [ma94]

Profesor jako by čekal na tuhle otázku. Okamžitě se znovu posadil^P a vysvětlovalⁱ: "Protože sotva (...)". [ma74]

- (2) Sestřenice paní Müllerové nebyla k upokojení. Za stálého vzlykání a nařikání projevila^P nakonec obavu, že Švejk utekl z vojny a chce ještě i ji zkazit a přivést do neštěstí. Nakonec s ním mluvilaⁱ jako se zvrhlým dobrodruhem. [s155]

Двоюродная сестра пани Мюллер никак не могла успокоиться. Всхлипывая и причитая, она, наконец высказала^P опасение, что Швейк удрал с военной службы, а теперь хочет и на нее навлечь беду и погубить ее. И она заговорила^P с ним как с прожженным авантюристом. [s139]

- (3) "U nás v Čáslavi byl jeden redaktor z Vídně, Němec. Sloužil jako fénrich. S námi nechtěl česky ani mluvit, ale když ho přidělili^P k maršce, kde byli sami Češi, hned umělⁱ česky. [s2/27]

- У нас в Чаславе был в полку один редактор из Вены, немец. Служил прапорщиком. По чешски с нами не хотел разговаривать, а когда прикомандировали^P его к маршевой роте, где были сплошь одни чехи, сразу по-чешски заговорил^P. [s249]

- (4) Naklánějeⁱ se k uchu strážmistra, šeptalⁱ: "Že jsme všichni Češi a Rusové jedna slovanská krev (...)" [s2/69]

И, **наклонясь** к самому уху вахмистра, **зашептал**^P: - Что все мы - чехи и русские - одной славянской крови (...). [s280]

- (5) **Posadil**^P se a **bručel**ⁱ: “Okolo měsíce kola se dělají. (...)” [s145]

Потом **уселся**^P и **забормотал**^P: - «В сиянье месяца золотого...» [s130]

- (6) Potom **vyhodil**^P z drožky kapesník a **křičel**ⁱ, aby zastavili, že ztratil zavazadla. [s144]

Затем он **выбросил**^P из пролетки носовой платок и **закричал**^P, чтобы остановились, так как он потерял багаж. [s128]

- (7) Ta ženská **vykřikla**^P hrůzou a něco mu rozčileně **říkala**ⁱ... [ca219]

Женщина **вскрикнула**^P от ужаса и возмущенно **затараторила**^P. [ca291]

- (8) (...) **přetáhl**^P ho páskem a **namočil**^P mu v loužičce čumák, že se nestačil olizovat. **Kňučel**ⁱ nad tou potupou a **počal**^P **běhat**ⁱ po kuchyni (...) [s251]

Швейк **вытянул**^P Макса ремнем и **ткнул**^P его мордой в лужу, так что тот долго не мог дочиста облизаться. Пес **заскулил**^P от позора и **начал**^P **бегать**ⁱ по кухне (...). [s214]

5.2 prefix по-

- (9) Harmonikář **považoval**ⁱ Švejka za dezertýra a **radil**ⁱ mu, aby šel s ním do Horažďovic (...). [s2/36]

Гармонист **принял**^P Швейка за дезертира и **посоветовал**^P ему идти вместе с ним в Гораждевицы (...). [s256]

- (10) После обеда в пятницу в квартире его, помещающейся в доме у Каменного моста, **раздался**^P звонок, и мужской голос **попросил**^P к телефону Аркадия Аполлоновича. [ma322]

V pátek odpoledne **zazvonil**^P v jeho bytě nedaleko Kamenného mostu telefon a mužský hlas **se sháněl**ⁱ po soudruhu Semplejarovovi. [ma263]

- (11) А он **отпустил**^P его обратно в Мозгову, **намекнул**^P на перевод в Кежму, на работу в МТС, ничего **не потребовал**^P взамен. [a395]

А on ho zatím **poslal**^P zpátky do Mozgovy, **naznačil**^P mu za to, že ho převede do Kežmy na práci ve strojní stanici, a nic za to **nežádal**ⁱ. [a424]

- (12) Березин **помолчал**^P, потом **спросил**^P: - (...) [a298]
Berjozin **chvilí mlčel**ⁱ, pak **se otázał**^P: (...) [a316]

5.3 **стать + inf**

- (13) “Так видите, хоši,” **vykládal**ⁱ, když **seděli**ⁱ kolem pece, ve které se vařily brambory na loupáčku (...). [s2/41]

- Так-то, ребята, - **стал**^P **рассказывать**ⁱ дед, когда все **уселись**^P вокруг печки, в которой варилась картошка (...). [s259]

- (14) (...) **сбросил**^P с головы кефи, **вцепился**^P в свои жидкие волосы и **стал**^P **проклинать**ⁱ себя. [ma176]

(...) **strhl**^P s hlavy kefi, **rval**ⁱ si řídké vlasy a **proklínal**ⁱ sám sebe. [ma142]

5.4 **other**

- (15) Гость **потемнел**^P лицом и **погрозил**^P Ивану кулаком, потом **сказал**^P: - Я - мастер. [ma136]

Neznámý **se zasmušil**^P, **pohrozil**^P mu pěstí a pak **vysvětloval**ⁱ: “Jsem Mistr.” [ma110]

- (16) Толстяк радостно **ослабился**^P, видя, что Маргарита не сердится, и восторженно **сообщил**^P, что оказался без брюк (...). [ma239]

Tloušťák **se radostně zazubil**^P, když poznal, že se Markétka nezlobí, a překotně **sděloval**ⁱ, že se právě ocitl bez kalhot (...) [ma196]

- (17) - Смело пейте, - **сказал**^P Воланд, и Маргарита тотчас **взяла**^P стакан в руки. - Гелла, садись, - **приказал**^P Воланд и **объяснил**^P Маргарите:

- Ночь полнолуния - праздничная ночь (...). [ma268]

“Jen se klidně napijte,” domlouvalⁱ jí Woland a ona poslušně uchopila^p oběma rukama číši. “Hello, posaď se,” poroučelⁱ mág a vysvětlovalⁱ Markétě: “Ve sváteční noci při novoluní (...)” [ma220]

- (18) Кто-то козлоногий подлетел^p и припал^p к руке, раскинул^p на траве шелк, осведомился^p о том, хорошо ли купалась королева, предложил^p прилечь и отдохнуть. [ma240]

K Makétě přiskočil^p jakýsi kozonoh a sápalⁱ se jí po ruce. Pak rozprostřel^p na trávě hedvábnou roušku, vypřávilⁱ se, jestli se královna dobře vykoukala, a navrhovalⁱ, aby si na chvíli lehla a odpočinula. [ma196]

- (19) Вернув^p Маргарите подарок Воланда, Азazelло распрошлся^p с нею, спросил^p, удобно ли ей сидеть, а Гелла сочно расцеловалась^p с Маргаритой (...). [ma289]

Azazello odevzdal^p Markétě ztracený dar, rozloučil^p se a zajímalⁱ se, jestli se jí pohodlně sedí, Hela jí vlepila^p šťavnatou pusou (...) [ma237]

- (20) - Нет, не оставляю, - ответила^p Маргарита и обратилась^p к Воланду:
- Прошу опять вернуть нас в подвал (...). [ma280]

“Ne, já tě neopustím,” trvalaⁱ na svém Markéta a obrátila^p se k Wolandovi: “Prosím, učiň, abychom se mohli vrátit (...)” [ma229]

NOTE

¹ The code refers to the source (usually with the page number). The following abbreviations have been used:

a Rybakov, Anatolij

1988 *Deti Arbata*. Moskva: Knižnaja palata.

1989 *Děti Arbatu*. Praha: Lidové nakladatelství.

ca Čapek, Karel

1961 *Povídky z jedné kapsy. Povídky z druhé kapsy*. Praha: Čs. spisovatel.

1963 *Válka s mloky*. Praha: Čs. spisovatel.

1971 *Krakatit*. Praha: Naše vojsko.

- 1986 *Vojna s salamandrami. Rasskazy.* Minsk: Narodnaja Asveta.
 1987 *Krakatit.* Alma-Ata: Nauka.
- il** Il'f, Il'ja & Petrov, Evgenij
 Dvenadcat' stul'ev. Zolotoj telenok.
 Dvanáct křesel. Zlaté tele. Prague.
- ma** Bulgakov, Michail
 1967 *Master i Margarita.* Moskva: Xudožestvennaja literatura.
 1990 *Mistr a Markétka.* Praha: Odeon.
- s** Hašek, Jaroslav
 1975 *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války.* Praha: Čs.
 spisovatel.
- Gašek, Jaroslav
 1958 *Poxoždenija bravogo soldata Švejka.* Kišinev: Škoala sovietiké.

CZECH AND RUSSIAN ASPECT IN THE HISTORICAL PRESENT

1. Introduction

1.0 Abstract

The historical present is usually considered to be a stylistic device which is used in narratives to present crucial events as more vivid or dramatic. The stylistic effects of the historical present notwithstanding, its use is based on the possibilities of the language system in question. Individual languages, even closely related ones, may differ in the exploitation of elements of the language system. Such is the case with respect to Russian and Czech which differ considerably in the use of aspect and tense in the historical present. This chapter concentrates on the aspectual differences between the two languages, focussing on the Czech perfective present which, in contrast to Russian, occurs rather frequently. Special attention will be given to the motivation of this form in concrete contexts. The assumption is that in addition to the currently postulated basic meaning of the perfective, i.e. 'totality', the lexical meaning of the verb and the internal structure of the event play an important role in the selection of the aspect form in Czech. In order to substantiate this claim, after a theoretical introduction of the historical present, tense and aspect (section 2), several concrete analyses of actual data will be presented (section 3). This presentation will involve quantitative data of occurrences of aspect and tense in Russian and Czech (section 3.1), an analysis of the lexical meanings of the Czech perfective present encountered in the data (section 3.2) and an analysis of the Czech perfective present functioning in concrete contexts and contrasted to Russian.

1.1 Aspect and tense differences between Russian and Czech in the context of the historical present

In this section, aspect and tense differences between Russian and Czech in the denotation of the historical present will be briefly introduced. The observations given below are based on the previously conducted studies of this problem (cf. Křížková 1955, Bondarko 1958, 1959, Petruxina 1977, 1983) as well as my own research.¹

In telling a story in Modern Russian, the perfective past form is highly dominant in the expression of a narrative line which consists generally of sequences of successive past events. When renarrating the story in the historical present, it is not only that the 'tense-switch' from past to present takes place, but this 'tense-switch' is necessarily accompanied by an "aspect-switch" from the perfective to the imperfective. In contrast to the diachronic situation, in Modern Russian this aspect switch is obligatory. Due to its regularity it has been proposed as a test for 'pure' aspectual pairs (cf. Maslov 1948: 307).

In Czech, the situation is different. In a narration, a sequence of past events is not necessarily expressed by the perfective past forms so exclusively as in Russian, (although it is possible), but the imperfective past occurs regularly, too (cf. Chapter 3). In the context of the historical present, next to the prevalent imperfective present form, the perfective present is frequent. Thus within both past and present narration in Czech the two aspects occur, in contrast to Russian in which one aspect per tense is encountered. In other words, in Czech, there is no automatic aspect switch from the perfective to the imperfective, as there is in Russian, when replacing the past by the present tense. To illustrate the differences between the two languages as outlined above, two examples are given below:

- (1) "Rrrrr." Silnice **se obrací**, **motá se** do kopce a zase dolů. Nějaký statek, **je slyšet** psa, člověk **jde** po silnici a **povídá** "dobrý večer". Domků **přibývá**, **jde** to do kopce. Pošta **zatáčí**, vysoké "rrrr" náhle **ustane**^p a kůň **se zastaví**^p. (Čapek)

- Prrrrr! Дорога **петляет**, **взбирается** на холмы и снова **сбегает** с них. Какая-то усадьба, **лает** собака, человек **идет** по дороге, **здоровается**: "Добрый вечер". Домиков **становится** все больше. Тележка **сворачивает** с дороги, пронзительное "prrrr" **обрывается**ⁱ, лошадь **останавливается**ⁱ.

In this example, the Czech imperfective and perfective present correspond to the Russian imperfective present; in the next example, the Czech perfective and imperfective present has its parallel in the Russian perfective past.²

- (2) "No, už jsme tady," **povídá** pošťák znovu. Ponenáhlou křeče **povolí**^p a Prokop **slézá** s kozlíku, chvěje se na celém těle. Jakoby po paměti **otvírá** vrátka a **zvoní** u dveří. Uvnitř zuřivý štěkot a mladý hlas **volá**: "Honzíku, ticho!" Dveře **se otevrou**^p, a stěží hýbaje jazykem **ptá se** Prokop: "Je pan doktor doma?" (Čapek)

- Приехали, говорю, **повторил** почтарь.

Постепенно судорога **ослабла**^{PP}. Прокоп **слез** с козел, охваченный неумемной дрожью, **отворил** калитку, словно она была ему знакома, **позвонил** у дверей. Внутри **раздался** яростный лай, и молодой голос **крикнул**: "Гонзик, тихо!" Дверь **открылась**^P, и Прокоп, тяжело ворочая языком, **спросил**: - Пан доктор дома?

The typical tense/aspect correspondences between the two languages in narratives are summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1.

RUSSIAN AND CZECH TENSE/ASPECT CORRESPONDENCES IN NARRATIVES (main tendencies in the denotation of the narrative line)

	Russian	Czech
past	PF PAST	PF/IPF PAST
hist. pres.	IPF PRES	IPF/PF PRES

2. The theory

2.1 The historical present

The historical present is one of the possible functions of the present tense in narratives, both spoken and written. It must therefore be distinguished from other kinds of uses of the present tense such as the gnomic present (statement of a general truth) or the habitual present. One of the characteristics of the historical present, in contrast to e.g. the gnomic present, is the possibility of substitution by the past tense. This possibility holds for a historical present already given in the text or an oral account. However, the production of such a text or account works the other way round: the narrative line, i.e. a sequence of past successive events is expressed primarily by past tense forms and the historical present is used to highlight the crucial events. The historical present has been discussed by a number of authors, though mainly with respect to tense.³ The prevailing view is that the historical present is used in narratives to make them 'dramatic', 'vivid' or 'animated'. The speaker

or writer is involved with his story and "as it were, forgets all about time, and imagines or recalls what he is recounting as vividly as if it were now present before his eyes" (Jespersen 1929: 19).

Following Benveniste (1956), Jakobson (1957) made a distinction between two processes in the structure of narratives: 'procès de l'énoncé' (narrated event) and 'procès de l'énonciation' (speech event). Tenses may have two reference points: one inside the narrative, the other at the moment of narration. Thus in spite of the illusion of the present moment or the 'actual present' created by the speaker using the present tense, its point of reference is that of the narrated event in the past; in other words, there is a discrepancy between tense and the time referred to. However, in the majority of the analyses of tense, this time-tense mismatch is not explained. In the following section two analyses of tense that account for this phenomenon will be outlined.

2.2 Tense

In his article on the historical present (1988 and also in 1989), Tobin gives an analysis of the system of tense in Modern Hebrew that accounts for both the temporal matches of the tense morphology with 'real-world time' (e.g. the use of the present tense when referring to speech events), and the subjective mismatch between the morphology and the time of the events referred to (e.g. the use of the present tense when referring to the past, narrated events, i.e. the historical present). In this analysis, the motivating force for the occurrence of linguistic forms in concrete contexts are their invariant meanings: for both the past and present tense 'experienced' by the speaker (in contrast to the future) and 'proximate', i.e. close to the speaker for the present tense in contrast to the past (and future) tense for which the meaning 'remote', i.e. distant to the speaker are postulated.

For Slavic languages, specifically for Russian, an analysis of the tense system based on invariant meanings in terms of distance and proximity has been presented by Barentsen (1985). All temporal forms (in contrast to the atemporal ones) are 'localized in time' and express one or another 'perspective' of the speaker. Within this 'perspective' category a dichotomy is made between the 'remotospective' and the 'irremotospective' subcategories. Both the perfective and the imperfective past forms, are characterized as 'remotospective', while the non-past forms are all 'irremotospective'. Further distinction can be made only within the imperfective forms: the imperfective present is characterized as 'neutrospective' and the imperfective future tense form as 'prospective'. The perfective

present covers the whole irremotospective field: indicating future is merely one of its possible uses. In sum, all the temporal forms as described above contain specific information on the localization of events they express; the category 'perspective' does not refer primarily to the objective localization of events in 'real-world time', but to the 'subjective' view of the event by the speaker. In this way, both the 'objective' use of tenses (when the tense matches with 'real-world time') and the 'subjective' use (e.g. the historical present) are accounted for.

Considered globally, the two analyses of tense have some traits in common:

1. they both operate with invariant meanings which are considered to be the motivating force for all occurrences of the linguistic forms,
2. differences between the tenses are formulated in terms of
 - a) proximity vs. distance, and
 - b) a strong 'subjective' element, either as 'experienced' by the speaker (Tobin), or as the 'perspective' of the speaker (Barentsen).

Both authors consider their analyses language-specific, and they definitely are. A similar analysis of the Czech tenses in terms of invariant meanings has still to be made. However, this chapter focuses primarily on aspect.

2.3 Aspect

In this section several theoretical explanations of the aspect and tense differences between Russian and Czech in the context of the historical present will be briefly discussed. In section 1.1 the following facts have been shortly described: for the denotation of a narrative line Russian uses either the perfective past form or the imperfective historical present. In the historical present the perfective present form is avoided and occurs relatively infrequently under specific conditions. One of the explanations of these facts is Barentsen's hypothesis proposed specifically for Russian. When choosing the perfective past form, 'a chain of events' is presented, while with the imperfective present, the links of the chain become isolated and are presented one by one (cf. Barentsen 1985: 223). This 'isolating manner of presentation' is inherent in the semantics of the Russian imperfective which motivates its occurrence in concrete contexts. For the perfective, apart from the semantic feature 'totality', which is common in the aspectological literature⁴, Barentsen postulates an additional semantic feature 'sequential connection'. The 'isolating manner of presentation' in the contexts of the historical present is, according to Barentsen, directly

related to the negation of the semantic feature 'sequential connection' by the Russian imperfective (*ibid*: 180).

In the traditional grammars of Modern Russian, the dominance of the imperfective present and the avoidance of the perfective present in the context of the historical present have been explained by the semantics of the perfective present, the basic meaning of which is future. This future meaning is not compatible with the image of an event that occurred, or is occurring. This explanation can be found for instance in Vinogradov (1947) and Potebnja (1941) for Modern Russian and Koschmieder (1934) for Modern Polish as discussed by Křížková (1955).

The question Křížková raises is how to explain the frequent use of the perfective historical present in Czech if the perfective present form has the same basic meaning as in Russian, i.e. that of future. Křížková's idea is that in the context of the historical present, the future meaning of the Czech perfective present form, in contrast to Russian, is shifted to the background, i.e. is neutralized while the aspect meaning (event as a 'totality') remains. Czech can thus express aspectual distinctions within the present tense, while Russian has to choose for the past tense when the 'perfective' meaning is to be expressed. This explains also the more frequent switches of tenses in Russian than in Czech in the context of the historical present. However, Křížková's 'neutralisation of the future meaning' of the Czech perfective present form (*ibid*: 251) has to be distinguished from the 'neutralisation of the aspectual opposition'. This latter neutralisation, and especially a distinction between its types, is used as an explanation of aspect differences between Slavic languages in various contexts.

Bondarko (1959) in his article on the historical present in Slavic languages gives the following typology of neutralisations of the aspect opposition:

1. full neutralisation of aspect distinctions in the form of the imperfective, i.e. the absence of the aspect opposition (can be found for instance in the Russian, Polish or Bulgarian literary languages),
2. full and consistent opposition of the perfective and imperfective aspect, i.e. the neutralisation of the aspect opposition does not take place (in Serbian, Croatian, Slovene),
3. partial neutralisation, i.e. an inconsistent aspect opposition (in Czech and Slovak).

The full neutralisation of the aspect opposition is considered 'obligatory' in Russian and the partial neutralisation 'facultative' in Czech. The distinction 'obligatory' vs. 'facultative' neutralisation as an explanation of aspect differences between the two languages has been regularly invoked in the Russian-Czech contrastive linguistics.⁵

However, the notions obligatoriness and facultativity are quite relative. The use of the imperfective in the historical present is not absolutely obligatory in Russian: under special conditions the perfective may occur as well (e.g. the 'kak'-constructions and iterative events). The term 'facultative' does not seem very felicitous because it suggests randomness, i.e. the 'facultative' neutralisation of the Czech aspect opposition in the historical present would imply a random or 'free' choice of the aspect form. This idea does not hold either, because some regularities in the choice of the perfective in Czech have already been described (see next section), but probably not with enough evidence yet to drop the term 'facultative'.

2.4 The Czech perfective present - its motivation

If one were to compare a Czech narrative written in the past tense with its version re-written in the historical present, one would not see the same aspect differentiation; for instance, not all perfective past forms would correspond to the perfective historical present, the imperfective would be frequent instead. As mentioned above, for this phenomenon the term 'facultative neutralisation of the aspect opposition' is used (cf. for instance Bondarko 1959, Petruxina 1978). The occurrence of the Czech perfective present form in the context of the historical present is thus considered 'facultative' (cf. Bondarko 1958: 558) except for some special cases in which the perfective becomes obligatory, such as with *perfectiva tantum* or when the imperfective opposite has a different lexical meaning (ibid: 565). Even so, the Czech perfective present occurs under certain conditions and has a more general motivation, as has been observed by Křížková (1955), Bondarko (1958) and Petruxina (1977, 1983). According to these authors, the Czech perfective is used in the historical present for the following reasons:

1. to express the meaning of the perfective, i.e. that of 'totality' in contrast with what the imperfective expresses (often a process), as well as certain temporal relations between events such as successivity, anteriority and posteriority.

2. special meanings related to the basic aspect meaning of 'totality', for instance, singular (not iterated) momentaneous events, or a sudden entry of a new situation. Momentaneity expressed by the perfective is in this context very typical for Czech; about half of Bondarko's material represents this type. When the momentaneous verbs are substituted by their imperfective opposites, either a process or a repetition are expressed. In the denotation of iterative events similar effects arise (cf. Chapter 3). Below an attempt will be made to describe and explain more regularities in the occurrence of the Czech perfective present in the context of the historical present. This will be contrasted with the situation in Russian and illustrated by a number of relevant data.

3. The data

3.1 Quantitative data

For the purpose of this study, the occurrence of the historical present has been investigated in a number of parallel narrative texts: Czech originals and their (published) Russian translation and vice versa. Reference to the context of the historical present below implies that at least in one of the languages the historical present form occurred. Counting the tense/aspect correspondences occurring in the context of the historical present yields the following quantitative data:

Figure 2.

CZECH - RUSSIAN TENSE/ASPECT CORRESPONDENCES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE HISTORICAL PRESENT

	CZECH	RUSSIAN	
1.	IPF PRES	- IPF PRES	706
2.	IPF PRES	- PF PAST	244
3.	PF PRES	- PF PAST	99
4.	PF PRES	- IPF PRES	73
5.	IPF PRES	- IPF PAST	48
6.	IPF PAST	- IPF PRES	16
7.	PF PRES	- PF PRES	13
8.	PF PAST	- IPF PRES	9
9.	IPF PRES	- PF PRES	5

TOTAL CORRESPONDENCES 1213

data: Čapek, Il'f & Petrov

The overwhelming majority of correspondences is formed by the imperfective present in both languages (706). The second well represented correspondence is the Czech imperfective present vs. Russian perfective past form (244). In other words, the Czech imperfective present corresponds generally to the same form in Russian, or to the Russian perfective past form; in a smaller number of cases to the imperfective past form (48) and only in 5 cases to the Russian perfective present. The Czech perfective present corresponds either to the perfective past in Russian (99) or to the imperfective present (73) and in 13 cases to the same form. The total 18 cases of the Russian perfective present were found in cases of 'kak-constructions', iterative events or expression of near future within the context of the historical present. In sum, the most frequent types of tense/aspect correspondences are given below:

Figure 3.

CZECH	RUSSIAN	CZECH	RUSSIAN
	IPF PRES		PF PAST
IPF PRES		PF PRES	
	PF PAST		IPF PRES

The correspondences shown in figure 2 were contrasted to show the number occurrences of the individual verb forms:

Figure 4.

CZECH AND RUSSIAN VERB FORMS IN HISTORICAL PRESENT

	IPF PRES	PF PRES	IPF PAST	PF PAST	total
CZ	1003	185	16	9	1213
RUS	804	18	48	343	1213
					<hr/> 2426

data: Čapek, Il'f & Petrov

The imperfective present form is clearly dominant in both languages. However, the fewer instances of the imperfective present in Russian (804) in contrast to Czech (1003) and the generally smaller number of present forms in Russian (822) as opposed to Czech (1188) is compensated for by past forms: its total 391 in the first language vs. 25 in the latter. These numbers confirm the previously stated stability of the Czech tense and the Russian tendency to switch tenses in the context of the historical present. Apart from these differences, a prominence of the Russian perfective past (343) and of the Czech perfective present (185) can be observed. Thus Czech allows for aspect variation within the present tense while Russian does not. The main facts as described above are summarized as follows:

Figure 5.

ASPECT/TENSE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE HISTORICAL PRESENT
(typical occurrences)

CZECH	RUSSIAN
IPF	IPF PRES
} PRES	
PF	PF PAST

3.2 The Czech perfective historical present - types of verbs

This section presents an overview of types of verbs occurring in our data within the Czech perfective historical present. Figure 4. shows that as far as sheer quantitative measurements are concerned, the Czech perfective present is relatively infrequent : in contrast to 1003 imperfective present forms, there were only 185 perfective present forms encountered. The small quantity of the perfective has to be related to its quality: the more rare a form is, the more 'special' it usually is. Investigation of the data gives more evidence for Bondarko's assumption concerning the Czech perfective historical present, i.e. that, apart from its basic aspect meaning 'totality', this form expresses some 'special meanings' related to 'totality', such as momentaneity, a sudden entry of a new situation etc. However, momentaneity and other 'special meanings' are not only related to aspect but also to the lexical meaning of the verb and the semantic

group to which it belongs; moreover the relationship of the event with other events plays an important role as also does its place within the entire text. In this section it will be investigated to which semantic groups the Czech perfective historical present belongs and what kind of lexical meanings this form expresses. Below the major semantic groups of verbs are presented.

Figure 6.

SEMANTIC GROUPS OF VERBS - CZECH PERFECTIVE PRESENT (in the context of the historical present)

MOVEMENT	105
verbs of movement (55), element of movement (41)	
begin (2), end (9) of movement	
SOUND	38
sounds (20), verba dicendi (18)	
VISION	25
appearance (12), verbs of vision (7)	
discovery (6)	
OTHER	17
feeling, thinking, 'modality'	
	—
	185
data: Čapek, Il'f & Petrov	

More than half of the Czech perfectives in the context of the historical present is represented by verbs of movement or verbs with an element of movement. These verbs express the movements of subjects and their manipulation of objects in a concrete space. The other verbs often express events belonging to the human mental space, such as vision, hearing, feeling or thinking. However, more essential than the large semantic fields to which the verbs belong, are the smaller groups such as 'element of movement' or 'discovery', and even finer distinctions that end up with individual lexical meanings. Below some of these distinctions will be presented and illustrated with examples of verbs in question encountered in the data.

1. MOVEMENT

a) movement of the subject

'out of'	- vyletí, vyskočí, vytrhne se, vyřítí se
'leave'	- odejde, zajde, ustoupí, ucukne
'enter'	- vejde, vrazí (do dveří)
'come'	- přijde, přizene se, přišoupne se
'set off'	- (náhle) vykročí, vyrazí, vrhne se
'through'	- přeběhne, proskočí, proletí
'open'	- (dveře) se rozletí, otevrou
'close'	- (dveře) se zavrou
'taking position'	- sednu si, se položí, sklouzne, utkví
'complex movement'	- se zatočí, se zaplete, zakličkuje
'movement begins'	- začne se svíjet, počne kroužit
'movement stops'	- se zastaví, ustane

b) element of movement (object)

'touch'	- pohladí, dotkne se, zalehtá ho, přejede dlaní
'take'	- vemu, popadnu
'take from'	- vyrve, vyjme, vydlobne si
'throw'	- hodím, odhodí, přehodí si
'put'	- položím (něž), složí, všoupne
'manipulation'	- rozškrtnu (sírku), zalomcuje jí

2. SOUND

a) sounds heard

ozve se, cvakne, bouchne, zapraská, zahlučí, zaburácí

b) expressive verba dicendi

vyhrkne, vypraví ze sebe, dají se do křiku, utrhne se, vysouká ze sebe, zaskřehotá, zavrčí, zařve

3. VISION

a) 'appearance'

zjeví se, ukáže se, vynoří se

b) 'manner of appearance'

rozzáří se, zajiskří, vyšlehne, rozprskne se

- c) **'discovery'**
najdu, natrefím, objeví
- d) **verbs of vision**
podívá se, zhlédnu, pohlédne

4. OTHER

- a) **'feeling'**
zastydí se, nesnese
- b) **'thinking'**
zamyslí se, náhle pochopí, si vzpomenou
- c) **'modality'**
nedovolí, nedá si ji vzít

The majority of these verbs are momentaneous; they express sudden movements, quick manipulations, quick perceptions, sounds etc. Many of these verbs can be associated with body language, expressions of state of mind of the subject. This category goes through some previously distinguished semantic groups of verbs. Below some typical examples of this body language category will be given: *odplivne si, zívne, svraští (čelo), zapláče, usměje se, vzdychne, vydechne, kývne, mávne (rukou), olízne, zamlaská, zatroubí, rozzáří se* etc.

In the next section the functioning of the Czech perfective in the context of the historical present will be examined. To show its motivation and how it differs from its imperfective counterpart in meaning and the communicated message, substitution tests will be applied and their effect will be discussed.

3.3 The Czech perfective present in text

In this section, various factors will be discussed that possibly have influence on the choice of aspect and tense, for instance, the lexical meaning of the verb, the type of state of affairs, relations between events, the type of text and context. Bondarko (1958) examined occurrences of the Czech historical present in literary texts as well as in dialect data which consisted of written-down spoken material. The author observes a difference between the two types of text, spoken and written: while the aspect differentiation in a literary text is facultative for Czech, in the

spoken dialect data it seems to be obligatory. In other words, the aspect differentiation in the spoken language would be identical both in the past and present, implying a relatively high frequency of the perfective present form. The data used here are all excerpted from literary texts ⁶. However, when looking within this type of text, a similar distinction can be made, namely that between a dialogue (direct speech) and a descriptive passage. And a similar question arises: is this distinction of any relevance in regard to the choice of aspect? In the material a slightly higher frequency of the perfective in direct speech than in descriptive passages could be observed, however, due to the literary character of the entire text and the stylisations applied, the difference is smaller than between an authentic spoken text and a written description.

- (1) Tož on přitápkal blíž, a já k němu pomalu **natahuju** ruku a **vemu**^P tu škeblu z jeho nožičky. (...) Tak jsem vzal svůj nůž a tu škeblu jsem otevřel; **hmátnu**^P prstem, není-li tam perla, ale nebyla tam, (...). Tak na, **povídám**, ts-ts-ts, sežer si to, když chceš. A **hodím**^P mu tu otevřenou škeblu.

И вот она притопала поближе, а я потихоньку **протягиваю** руку и **беру**ⁱ раковину у нее из лапки. (...) Взял я свой нож и открыл раковину; **пошупал**^{PP} пальцем, нет ли жемчужины, но там ничего не было, (...). Ну вот, на, **говорю**, тс-тс-тс, жри себе, если хочешь. И **кидаю**ⁱ ей открытую раковину.

This is an example of direct speech in the first person; the captain is telling his own story. Both the Czech imperfective and perfective present correspond to the Russian imperfective present, except for the perfective present *hmátnu* which is translated by the Russian perfective past form. The three Czech perfectives *vemu*, *hmátnu* and *hodím* express quick manipulative actions that contrast with the slowly stretching hand *pomalu natahuju ruku*. The imperfective would in the three cases denote processes, which would cause a slow-down: *beru* and *házím* would make the listener a witness of the very act of taking and throwing, *hmatám prstem* as well, with a nuance of taking a long time to look thoroughly for a pearl through all that unpleasant material. However, these details are not salient for the story and are therefore avoided, the little movements happened quickly. In such a case, the perfective is more suitable.

The next example is a part of a dialogue, too, only the story is not about the speaker himself but a third person.

- (2) Tedy ten sedlář **sedí** po obědě v kruhu své rodiny, a najednou mu někdo **tluče** na okno: "Ježíšmarjá, sousede, vždyť vám hoří střecha nad hlavou! Ten sedlář **vyletí^P**, a na mou duši, krov je v plamenech. To se ví, děti **se dají^P** do křiku, žena s pláčem **vynáší** hodiny (...)

Так вот, этот шорник **сидит** себе после обеда со своим семейством, и вдруг кто-то **стучит** в окно. - Сосед, у вас крыша горит! Шорник **выбегаетⁱ** на улицу - и верно, крыша у него вся в огне. Ну, конечно, дети **ревутⁱ**, жена с плачем **выносит** стенные часы.

The Russian translation contains all imperfective present forms, Czech has two perfectives present forms *vyletí* and *dají se do křiku*. When substituting these perfectives by their imperfective counterparts, the following effects can be observed. If the prefix *vy-* is preserved, the imperfective would mean that the person is literally in the process of flying out of the house, there is a strong concentration on this movement. It is thus a different lexical meaning, a concrete one, in contrast to the metaphorical meaning intended. Prefixed imperfective verbs of movement are often difficult to use in such contexts, either because their processual meaning is too strong or they have an iterative connotation. The unprefixed imperfective *letí* is possible, but it denotes a process with no beginning or end. What happens here is that the man suddenly and in no time 'flies out' of his house. To communicate this message, the perfective is the appropriate form. Finally, if the imperfective *dávají se do křiku* were to be substituted for the original perfective, it would express much hesitation or distributiveness. To avoid such undesired effects, the perfective has to be used.

The following example illustrates the occurrence of the historical present in indirect speech, introducing a dialogue. The passage presents a bunch of annoyed newspaper reporters waiting for big news in the middle of the 'cucumber season' and discussing how to invent this big news.

- (3) A zatím v redakci **sedí** pět nebo šest opuštěných lidí, neboť ostatní kolegové jsou také na dovolené, kde tlukou rozhořčeně novinami a stěžují si, že teď v těch novinách nic, ale docela Nic není. A ze sazárný **vyjde^P** pan metér a **povídá** vyčítavě: "Páni, páni, ještě nemáme na zítřek úvodník."
 "Tak tam třeba dejte... ten článek... o hospodářské situaci v Bulharsku," **míní** jeden z opuštěných pánů.
 Pan metér těžce **vzdychne^P**: "Ale kdo to má číst, pane redaktore?"

Už zase v celém listě nebude Nic ke Čtení." Šest opuštěných pánů zvedne^p oči ke stropu, jako by tam bylo možno objevit Něco ke Čtení.

"Kdyby se takhle Něco stalo," navrhuje jeden neurčitě.

"Nebo mít... nějakou... zajímavou reportáž," nadhazuje druhý.

"O čem?"

"Nebo vymyslet... nějaký nový vitamín," bručí třetí.

"Teď v létě?" namítá čtvrtý. "Člověče, vitamíny, to jsou vzdělané věci, to se hodí spíš na podzim -"

"Ježíši, to je horko," zívne^p pátý.

А тем временем в редакции сиротливо сидят пять или шесть человек, ибо остальные коллеги в отпуске и тоже яростно комкают газетные листы и жалуются, что теперь в газетах нет ничего, ровно Ничего. А из наборной приходитⁱ метранпаж и укоризненно говорит: "Господа, господа, у нас еще нет на завтра передовой..."

- Тогда дайте... ну, хотя бы эту статью... об экономическом положении Болгарии,- говорит один из сиротливых людей. Метранпаж тяжело вздыхаетⁱ.

- Но кто же ее станет читать, пан редактор? Опять во всем номере не будет ничего "читабельного".

Шестеро осиротевших поднимаютⁱ взоры к потолку, словно там можно найти нечто "читабельное".

- Хоть бы случилось Что-нибудь, - неопределенно произносит один из них.

- Или если бы... какой-нибудь... увлекательный репортаж,

- перебывает другой.

- О чем?

- Не знаю.

- Или выдумать... какой-нибудь новый витамин, - бормочет третий.

- Это летом-то? - возражает четвертый. - Витаминами, брат, это для образованной публики, такое большое годится осенью...

- Господи, ну и жара!... зеваетⁱ пятый.

The forms of the Russian historical present are all imperfective. In Czech, the *verba dicendi*, both introducing and concluding direct speech, are imperfective: *povídá*, *miní*, *navrhuje*, *nadhazuje*, *bručí* and *namítá*. Perfective is the verb of movement *vyjde*, to which applies what has been said about the verb *vyletí* in the previous example: such prefixed imperfective

verbs of movement are not easily interpreted as a regular process; they have either an iterative connotation or can be rather lengthy. In the scenic present where a meticulous description of all actions is given, an imperfective be appropriate; however, not in the historical present, where the story has to move forward. Other perfectives in this passage are: *vzdychne*, *zvedne oči* and *zívne*, all physical expressions of a mental state, little actions with an element of movement. These are not really essential here for the development of the story; they accompany the dialogue. The difference with the *verba dicendi* in this passage is that *verba dicendi* have content, the words that are being said, while these three verbs do not. In the two cases they are used instead of *verba dicendi*, there is an ellipsis; so *vzdychne* should be interpreted as 'he said with a sigh' and *zívne* as 'he said yawning'. The perfective verb *vzdychnout* is semelfactive and its imperfective opposite *vzdychat* would denote iteration: the person is giving a long series of sighs. The imperfective *zívá* would have the same lengthy effect as the imperfective *zvedá oči ke stropu*, this could take a couple of minutes. But the story moves and does not dwell on these details unimportant to the plotline. For this message, the perfective is the appropriate form.

The next example is a short description of a series of actions by Prokop, the hero of Čapek's novel *Krakatit*. In Czech, the imperfective as well as the perfective occur, in the Russian translation they are both imperfective.

- (4) ... vskutku, nic se nevyrovná kráse letního jitra, ale Prokop **se dívá** do země, **usmívá se**, pokud to vůbec dovede, a **putuje** samými závorkami až k řece. Tam **objeví^P** - ale u druhého břehu - poupatá leknínů; tu zhrdaje vším nebezpečím **se svlékne^P**, **vrhne^P se** do hustého slizu zátoky, **poreže^P si** nohy o nějakou zákeřnou ostřici a **vrací se** s náručí leknínů.

(...) в самом деле, ничто не сравнится красотой с летним утром, но Прокоп **не отрывает** глаз от земли, **улыбается** в меру своего уменья и через множество калиток **добирается** до реки. И там, только у противоположного берега, **обнаруживаетⁱ** бутоны кувшинок; пренебрегая всеми опасностями, он **снимаетⁱ** платье и **бросаетсяⁱ** в густую слизь заводи, **ранитⁱ** ноги о какие-то коварные острые листья, но **возвращается** с охапкой цветов.

Prokop's looking to the ground and smiling are durative processes and are expressed by the imperfective. He acts like this because he is slightly

in love with a young girl. He decides to bring her flowers and walks relaxed to the river (the imperfective *putuje*, 'is on his way'). There he discovers flowers. Verbs like 'to discover', 'to find' or 'to meet' are momentaneous, for which Czech prefers the perfective. A series of quick resolute actions follows, expressed by perfectives. These actions serve the purpose of getting the flowers, so dwelling on them is not relevant. All three actions contain an element of movement, Prokop's taking off his clothes, his throwing himself into the water and cutting his feet with a mean sort of grass unexpectedly and certainly not on purpose. These two last facts are important for the choice of the aspectual form; the substituting imperfective would have the effect of intentionality. When replacing the other verbs by imperfectives, i.e. *svléká se*, the taking off the clothes would take too much time; the throwing himself into water, *vrhá se*, would have something of an eye-witness report. With this verb of movement, the same problem occurs as with other verbs of this lexical group, as has been mentioned in the comment on the previous examples. The last verb is imperfective *vrací se* - 'he is on his way', thinking how to make a nice bouquet.

- (5) Tu se rozsvítilo v prvním patře okno. Je to Ančina ložnice. Prokopovi **bouchá** srdce. **Ví**, že je to hanebnost, tajně se tam dívat; jistě, to by jako host dělat neměl. **Pokouší se** dokonce zakašlat (aby to slyšela), ale jaksi to selhalo; i **sedí** jako socha a **nemůže** odvrátit oči od zlatého okna. Anči tam **přechází**, **shýbá se**, něco dlouze a široce **robí**; aha, **rozestýlá si** postýlku. Teď **stojí** u okna, **dívá se** do tmy a **zakládá** ruce za hlavu: zrovna tak ji viděl ve snu. Teď, teď by bylo radno se ozvat; proč to neudělal? Už je na to pozdě; Anči **se odvrací**, **přechází**, je ta tam; ba ne, to **sedí** zády k oknu a zřejmě **se zouvá** hrozně pomalu a zamyšleně; nikdy se nesní líp než se střevícem v ruce. Aspoň teď by bylo na čase zmizet; ale místo toho vylezl na lavičku, aby líp viděl. Anči **se vrací**, už nemá na sobě živůtek; **zvedá** nahé paže a **vyndává si** z účesu vlásničky. Nyní hodila hlavou, a celá hřívá **se jí rozlévá** po ramenou; děvče jí **potřese^P**, hurtem **si přehodí^P** celou tu úrodu vlasů přes čelo a teď jí **zpracovává** kartáčem a hřebenem, až má hlavu jako cibulku; je to patrně velmi směšné, neboť Prokop, hanebník, přímo **září**.

Anči, panenka bílá, **stojí** se skloněnou hlavou a **splétá si** vlasy ve dva copy; **má** víčka sklopena a něco **si šeptá**, **zasměje^P se**, **zastydí^P se**, až jí to ramena zvedá; pásek košile pozor sklouzne. Anči

hluboce přemýšlí a hladí si bílé ramínko v nějakém rozkošnictví, zachvěje^P se chladem, pásek se smeká už povážlivě, a světlo zhaslo.

Тут во втором этаже осветилось окно. Это спальня Анчи. У Прокопа гулко забилося^{PP} сердце. Он знает - подло и стыдно тайком заглядывать туда; как гость он, конечно, не должен этого делать. Он даже попробовал^{PP} покашлять (чтобы она слышала), но почему-то не вышло; и он сидит, неподвижный, как статуя, и не может оторвать взор от золотого окна. Анчи ходит по комнате, нагибается, что-то делает, плавно широко разводя руками - ага, постилает свою кровать. Теперь стала^{PP} у окна, смотрит во тьму, закинув^{PP} руки за голову; точно такая, какую он видел ее во сне. Вот теперь, теперь надо дать о себе знать, хотя бы из приличия - почему ты не сделал этого? А теперь уже поздно; Анчи отвернулася^{PP}, ходит, исчезла^{PP}; да нет, просто села^{PP} спиной к окну, видимо, снимает туфли - очень медленно и задумчиво; никогда так славно не мечтается, как с ботинком в руке. Ну вот, хоть сейчас пора бы тебе скрыться; вместо того он встал на скамью, чтобы лучше видеть. Анчи вернулася^{PP} к окну, она уже без блузки; подняла^{PP} нагие руки, вынимает шпильки из прически. Тряхнула головой - густые волосы разлились^{PP} по плечам; девушка встряхнула^{PP} ими, разом перебросила^{PP} всю эту пышную благодать на лицо, принялася^{PP} расчесывать щеткой и гребнем - расчесывать до тех пор, пока голова не стала круглой, как луковичка; наверно, это очень смешно, потому что Прокоп, бесстыдник, так и сияет.

Анчи, белая дева, стоит, склонив голову, заплетает волосы в две косы; глаза ее потуплены, и она что-то шепчет, вот засмеялась^{PP}, застыдилась^{PP} чего-то, поежилась^{PP}; осторожно, бретелька сейчас соскользнет! Анчи глубоко задумалась^{PP}, гладит свое белое плечико в приливе какой-то сладострастной неги; вздогнула^{PP} от холода - бретелька совсем спустилася^{PP} - и свет погас.

In this passage Prokop who is in love with Anči is secretly witnessing her rituals before she goes to sleep. All her actions, walking back and forth in the room, taking off her shoes and combing her hair in a leisurely way, unfold in front of his eyes. In the Czech original text the neutral form to render this series of actions is the imperfective historical present which is absolutely dominating; in the Russian version, the perfective past form prevails (in this example it is underlined). Except for

a very few past tense forms, Czech remains within one tense, the present, while Russian regularly switches tenses, from the past perfective to the imperfective present and vice versa which gives an effect of relief. In Czech, some relief is created by aspect variation. The five perfectives occurring here express momentaneous events, three of which are semelfactive, i.e. contain one movement: *potřeše*, *hurtem si přehodí* and *zachvěje se*. The second perfective is reinforced by the adjective *hurtem*, i.e. quickly. If these forms would be replaced by their imperfective counterparts, repeated movement would be denoted. The other two perfectives *zasměje se* and *zastydí se* express Anči's momentaneous state of mind, a quick response to something she recalls; the corresponding imperfectives would have an effect of rather lengthy events. In sum, the imperfective would express either repetition or a process, which would further have an effect of a certain extension in time, as if the event were dwelled upon. However, the relevant events involve five 'little actions' which are not so essential for the narrative to attract full attention which the imperfective would evoke. By using the perfective, the 'undesired' effects can be avoided and the story can move on. In sum, many of the encountered perfective present forms in the context of the historical present are associated with momentaneous events that either form part of the narrative line, or represent 'little', insignificant actions that accompany other, more important events which unfold the narrative line and are most often expressed by the imperfectives. Due to their character and accompanying function in the discourse, the 'little' actions are not the ones to be dwelled upon, therefore the perfective is the appropriate form.

4. Conclusion

Previous discussion of the data in the context of the historical present has demonstrated that the choice of the Czech aspect is not 'facultative' but has a specific motivation. Apart from the basic meaning of aspect (i.e. 'totality' for the perfective) which is generally considered its motivating force, it is also the lexical meaning of the verb and the internal structure of the event that play an important role. In the analysis of the Czech perfective present it has been shown why this form occurs where it does and why the imperfective would be inappropriate in such a context. Substitution tests were applied: when replacing the perfective by its imperfective counterpart, various 'undesired' effects would arise, for instance, that of lengthiness, slow-down, concentration on the repeated movement etc. instead of, for instance, momentaneity. These effects can

be traced back to the two submeanings of the imperfective: processuality and iterativity. The effects do not apply to the Russian imperfective: in the Russian historical present, aspectual distinctions are not made at the level of the individual event but at a higher, syntagmatic or textual level. Although Czech aspect responds to the stimuli at the textual level, this remains a contextual implication. In contrast to Russian, the lexical meaning of the verb and the internal structure of the event are of relevance for the selection of the aspect form in the context of the historical present.

NOTES

¹ For other studies concentrating on the historical present in Russian see, for instance, Avdeev (1976, 1977a, 1977b), Manning (1939) discussing Mazon (1914) and a comprehensive study of the Russian perfective historical present in e.g. the 'kak-constructions' by Panzer (1963). References to the historical present can be found also in grammars and other general studies, see, for instance: Bondarko (1971: 176, 237), Bondarko & Bulanin (1967: 233), Forsyth (1970: 35, 147-151), Maslov (1974: 120), Mazon (1914: 123, 149-159, 1945 [1943]: 224), Rathmayer (1976: 128-130).

For comparisons of the Russian and Czech historical present see Galton (1976: 16-17, 24-31, 99), Isačenko (1960: 450-461). For studies on Czech see Galton (1987: 58-9), Havránek & Jedlička (1959 [1981]: 251), Kopečný (1962a: 28-29, 92-100), Mazon (1921: 261), Šmilauer (1946: 87).

² In the examples, the forms of the historical present are printed in bold type of letter; in addition to this, the Czech perfective present and its counterparts in the Russian translation are underlined. Russian perfective past forms are underlined in example (2) (section 1.1) and example (5) (section 3.3). The majority of the forms is imperfective in both languages. Only the differences are indicated, i.e. when the Russian and Czech aspect and tense do not correspond with each other. The imperfective is indicated with an ⁱ, the perfective present with a ^P and the perfective past with ^{PP}. In Figures, the perfective is abbreviated as PF, the imperfective as IPF, the present tense as PRES and the past tense as PAST.

³ For other analyses of the historical present in some modern, non-Slavic languages see, for instance, Casparis (1975), Shiffrin (1981), Silva-Corvalán (1983), Wolfson (1979).

⁴ In the structuralist theory of aspect, the feature 'totality' ('celostnost'), often together with the feature 'internal limit' ('predel'), is considered to be the semantic basis ('invariant meaning') of the perfective. The imperfective is 'unmarked' with respect to its perfective counterpart, i.e. it is neutral or negative with respect to the features contained by the perfective. The 'totality' hypothesis has a considerable adherence in the Slavic aspectology. See for discussion of this problem and definitions of 'totality' and 'predel' also Bondarko (1971: 18ff., 1990, 1991), Bondarko & Bulanin

(1967: 75), Forsyth (1970), Galton (1980), Maslov (1974, 1978, 1985: 30), Rassudova (1984), *Russian Academy Grammar* (1980: 583).

⁵ The explanation of the differences between Russian and Czech by means of the 'obligatory' vs. 'facultative' neutralisation can be found (in addition to the mentioned authors in section 2.3. and 2.4) also in Maslov (1974), Širokova (1971) *Russkaja grammatika* (1979: 772). This explanation is considered to be valid for various contexts, apart from the historical present, also, for instance, for the context of iterative events.

⁶ The cited sources are all of Karel Čapek:

1. *Povídky z jedné kapsy. Povídky z druhé kapsy*. Praha: Čs. spisovatel, 1961
2. *Válka s mloky*. Praha: Čs. spisovatel, 1963
3. *Krakatit*. Praha

Russian translations: Карел Чапек:

1. *Война с саламандрами. Рассказы*. Минск: Народная Асвета, 1986
2. *Кракатит*. Алма-Ата: Наука, 1987.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The goal of the present thesis was to analyse and the explain systematic aspectual differences between Russian and Czech aspect occurring in concrete contexts. The solution to this problem has been formulated in a number of hypotheses in which language-specific discourse strategies have been claimed.

For Russian it can be assumed that it is the discourse level that contributes substantially to the selection of the aspectual form. Russian aspect operates in larger discourse units and it has a more global orientation, or, larger scope than Czech aspect.

For Czech, on the other hand, it has been claimed that the discourse level is not of primary importance for the choice of the aspectual form. Czech aspect concentrates on the internal structure of each individual event and the lexical meaning of the verb involved, i.e. it is this local orientation that is decisive. It can therefore be stated that Czech aspect possesses a more lexical character than Russian aspect.

The hypotheses have been tested on data involving a number of aspectual contexts in which differences between Russian and Czech typically occur: iterative contexts (including negated iterative events), sequences of events in narratives, and the historical present. Partial analyses of other contexts have been conducted: the gnomic present and the (plu-) perfect in narratives and dialogues. In the gnomic present, the distribution of aspectual forms in each language is comparable to that in iterative contexts, while in the (plu-)perfect aspect behaves similarly as in sequences of events. However, to arrive to a conclusive evidence, more data would be needed and therefore these analyses have not been included.

The present research has focussed on the Russian and Czech aspectual -temporal forms: the perfective and imperfective past, the perfective and imperfective present and future. The atemporal forms, e.g. the infinitive, the imperative and gerunds would certainly deserve a separate study.

It would also be interesting to set up a Czech-Polish-Russian contrastive study, since Polish aspect seems to behave similarly to Czech in some instances, and to Russian in others.

The present thesis was meant not only to provide evidence of the systematic aspectual differences between Russian and Czech in particular contexts and to offer a solution to this problem, but also to enhance further research in this field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

'Academy Grammar'

- 1980 *Russkaja Grammatika* (Švedova, N.J. ed.). Moscow: Akademija nauk SSSR.
- Adamec, P.
1960 "K ekvivalentům sloves *býti* a *míti* v ruštině", *Rusko-české studie, Sborník VŠP v Praze, Jazyk a literatura* II, 191-213.
- Andrews, E.
1990 *Markedness theory: The Union of Asymmetry and Semiosis in Language*. Durham, North Carolina.
- Anikina, A. V.
1964 "Soščetaemost' glagolov soveršennogo i nesoveršennogo vida s narečijami i drugimi leksičeskimi edinicami, xarakterizujuščimi sposob dejstvija", *Naučnye doklady vyššej školy, Filologičeskije nauki*, 3, 165-173.
- Antinucci, F. & Gebert, L.
1977 "Semantyka aspektu czasownikowego", *Studia gramatyczne* I, 7-43.
- Avdeev, F. F.
1976 "Rol' imperfektivnogo prezensa v istoričeskom nastojaščem ediničnogo dejstvija", *Izvestija Voronežskogo GPI* 172, 98-106.
1977a "K voprosu o nejtralizacii vida v istoričeskom nastojaščem ediničnogo dejstvija", *Voprosy russkoj aspektologii* II. (= *Učenyje zapiski Tartuskogo gos. un-ta* 434), 47-65.
1977b "O vyražeenii povtorjajuščixsja dejstvij glagolami soveršennogo vida v istoričeskom nastojaščem", *Voprosy russkoj aspektologii* II. (= *Učenyje zapiski Tartuskogo gos. un-ta* 434), 66-75.
- Avilova, N.S.
1976 *Vid glagola i semantika glagol'nogo slova*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Bakker, W.F.
1966 *The Greek Imperative*. (An investigation into the aspectual differences between the present and aorist imperatives in Greek prayer from Homer up to the present day). Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Barentsen, A.A.
1973 "K opisaniju semantiki kategorij 'vid' i 'vremja'", *Tijdschrift voor Slavische Taal en letterkunde*, 5-32.
1979 "Nabljudenija nad funkcionirovaniem sojuza *poka*", *Dutch contributions to the eighth international congress of slavists* (Meijer, J. ed.), 57-159. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.
1984 "Notes on *Praesens pro futuro* in Modern Russian", *Signs of Friendship. To Honour A.G.F. van Holk*. J.J. van Baak (ed.), 29-55. Amsterdam.
1985 '*Tijd*', '*Aspect*' en de conjunctie *poka*. (Over betekenis en gebruik van enkele vormen in het moderne Russisch). Dissertation. Amsterdam.
1992 "Ob obstojatel'stvax ograničennoj kratnosti dejstvija v russkom jazyke. Čast' I." *Studies in Russian Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, vol. 19), 1-67. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- Barentsen, A. A. & Hindriks, J. H.
 1988 "Deepričastie i soveršennyj vid v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke", *Dutch contributions to the tenth international congress of slavists, Sofia. Linguistics*. (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11), 1-41. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Barnet, V.
 1983a "K problému ekvivalence při lingvistickém srovnávání", *Konfrontační studium ruské a české gramatiky a slovní zásoby* II, Hrabě, V. & Širokova, A. (eds.), 7-26. Praha.
 1983b "Možnosti a hranice slovanské konfrontační lingvistiky", *Československá slavistika 1983. (Lingvistika, historie)*, 81-90. Praha.
- Barnetová, V. & Barnet, V.
 1962 "O konfrontačním studiu příbuzných jazyků", *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica, Slavica Pragensia* IV, 53-60.
- Barnetová, V. & Skoumalová, Z.
 1976 "Aspektuální a temporální charakteristika výpovědi", *Opera Universitatis Brunensis - Facultas Philosophica*, 225, *Otázky slovanské syntaxe* IV/1, 151-155.
- Bartschat, B.
 1974 "Die Behandlung des Verbalaspekts auf dem VII. Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Warschau", *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 475-488.
 1987 "Aspekt und 'grounding' in russischen Texten", *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 40, 6, 758-771.
- Beaugrande, R. de & Dressler, W.
 1981 *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London/New York: Longman.
- Benveniste, E.
 1956 "La nature des pronoms", *For Roman Jakobson*. M. Halle et al. (eds), 34-37. The Hague: Mouton.
 1966 *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Birkenmaier, W.
 1977 "Thema-Rhema Gliederung und Russischer Verbalaspekt", *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, XV, 3
- Björling, F.
 1981 "The Uses of the Present and Future Tenses in Pasternak's *Vozdušnye puti*", *The Slavic Verb*, P. Jacobsen (ed.), 14-25. Copenhagen.
- Bondarko, A.V.
 1958 "Nastojščee istoričeskoe (praesens historicum) glagolov nesoveršen-nogo i soveršen-nogo vidov v češskom jazyke", *Slavia* XXVII, 556-584.
 1959 "Nastojščee istoričeskoe v slavjanskix jazykax s točki zrenija glagol'nogo vida", *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie*, 48-58. Moscow.
 1971 *Vid i vremja russkogo glagola*. Moscow.
 1983 "Problemy i metody sopostavitel'nogo izučeniya grammatičeskix kate-gorij v slavjanskix jazykax", *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie*, 34-47.
 1990 "O značenijax vidov russkogo glagola". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4. 5-24.
 1991 "Predel'nost' i glagol'nyj vid (na materiale russkogo jazyka)", *Izvestija Akademii nauk, Serija Literatury i Jazyka* 50, 3, 195-206.
 1992 "K voprosu o funkcijax v grammatike", *Izvestija Akademii nauk, serija Literatury i Jazyka*, t. 5, no. 4, 14-27.

- Bondarko, A. & Bulanin, L.
1967 *Russkij glagol*. Leningrad.
- Brecht, R.D.
1979 "On the interrelationship of mood and tense: the syntax of *by* in Russian", *Folia Slavica* 3, 1/2, 80-100.
1985 "The Form and Function of Aspect in Russian", *Issues in Russian Morphosyntax*, M.S. Flier, R.D. Brecht (eds), 9-35. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Casparis, C.P.
1975 *Tense without Time. The Present Tense in Narration*. Bern: A. Francke AG Verlag
- Čeneva, V.
1978 "K strukturno-semantičkoj xarakteristike russkix i bolgarskix temporal'nyx složnopodčinennyx predloženíj so značením predšestvovanija", *Bolgarskaja rusistika* 3, 50-59.
- Chafe, W.
1970 "States, Processes, and Action", Chapter 9 in: *Meaning and the structure of language*. Chicago.
- Chung, S. & Timberlake, A.
1985 "Tense, Aspect, and Mood", *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. III, 202-258. Cambridge.
- Chvany, C.V.
1980 "The Role of Verbal Tense and Aspect in the Narration of the Tale of Igor's Campaign", *The Structural Analysis of Narrative Texts*, Kodjak et al. (eds), 7-24. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
1985 "Background Perfectives and Plot Line Imperfectives: Toward a Theory of Grounding in Text", *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*, Flier, M.S. & A. Timberlake (eds), 247-274. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Čmejrková, S.
1991 "Konfrontace, typologie, lingvistická charakteristika", *Slovo a slovesnost*, 216-221.
- Comrie, B.
1976 *Aspect. (An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems)*. Cambridge: UP
1981 "Aspect and Voice: some reflections on perfect and passive", *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 14., J.P. Tedeschi, A. Zaenen (eds), 65-78. New York: Academic Press.
1985 *Tense*. Cambridge: UP
- Contini-Morava, E.
1987 "Text Cohesion and the Sign: Connectedness Between Events in Swahili Narrative", *Current Approaches to African Linguistics* 4, Odden, D. (ed.) 107-122. Dordrecht: Foris.
1988 *Discourse pragmatics and semantic categorization: the case of negation and tense-aspect with special reference to Swahili*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cummings, G.
1983 "On the aspect of motion verbs in Czech and Russian", *Folia Slavica* 6, 1-2, 7-52.

- Dahl, Ö.
1981 "On the Definition of the Telic-Atelic (Bounded-Nonbounded) Distinction", *Tense and Aspect, Syntax and Semantics* vol. 14, J.P. Tedeschi, A. Zaenen (eds), 79-90. New York: Academic Press.
1985 *Tense and Aspect Systems*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Diver, W.
1969 "The system of relevance of the Homeric verb", *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 122, 45-68.
- Dokulil, M.
1953 "K překládání slovesného vidu", *Kniha o překládání (příspěvky k otázkám překladu z ruštiny)*, Trávníček, F. et al., 217-229, Praha.
1958 "K otázce morfologických protikladů. (Kritika předpokladu binárních korelací v morfologii češtiny)", *Slovo a slovesnost* XIX, 81-103.
- Dostál, A.
1954 *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnině*. Praha.
1967 "Problém slovanského slovesa", *Přednášky v X. běhu Letní školy slovanských studií v r. 1966*. 39-42. Praha.
- Durst-Andersen, P.
1992 *Mental Grammar. Russian Aspect and Related Issues*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Dry, H.
1981 "Sentence aspect and the movement of narrative time", *Text*, vol. 1-3, 233-241.
- Ebeling, C.L.
1956 "On the verbal predicate in Russian", *For Roman Jakobson*, 83-90. The Hague: Mouton.
- Eckert, E.
1984 *A Contrastive Study of Czech and Russian Aspect*. Dissertation. Berkeley.
1985 "Aspect in Repetitive contexts in Russian and Czech", *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*, Flier, M.S. & Timberlake, A. (eds.), 169-180. UCLA Slavic Studies vol. 12.
1988 "Motion Verbs and Motion Actions in Russian and Czech", *Russian Language Journal* XLII, nos. 141-143, 85-106.
1991 "Prefixed motion verbs of coming and leaving in standard and spoken Czech as compared to Russian", *Studies in West Slavic and Baltic Linguistics*, (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, vol. 16), Amsterdam: Rodopi
- Ferrell, J.
1951 "The Meaning of the Perfective Aspect in Russian", *Word* 7, 1, 104-135.
1953 "The tenses of the Russian verb", *SEER* 32, no. 78, 108-116.
- Fielder, G.E.
1990a "Aspect and lexical semantics: Russian verbs of ability", *Slavic and East European Journal*, 34, 2, 192-207.
1990b "Narrative context and Russian aspect", *Verbal Aspect In Discourse*, Thelin, N.B., (ed.), 263-284. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Filatova-Hellberg, E.
1975 "Vid glagola i širokij kontekst", *Scando-Slavica* 21, 85-98.

- Fleischman, S.
1985 "Discourse functions of tense-aspect oppositions in narrative: toward a theory of grounding", *Linguistics* 23, 6, 851-882.
- Forsyth, J.
1970 *A Grammar of Aspect. (Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb)*. Cambridge: UP.
1972 "The Nature and Development of the Aspectual Opposition in the Russian Verb", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. L, nr.121, 493-506.
- Galton, H.
1969 "Slovesný vid a čas", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXX, 1-10.
1976 *The Main Functions of the Slavic Verbal Aspect*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
1980 "Where 'completed action' for the perfective verb goes wrong", *Lingua* 52, 49-55.
1987 "The theory of verbal aspect and tense illustrated for Czech by Karel Čapek's 'Bajky a podpovídky'", *IJSLP*, vol. XXXV-XXXVI, 51-64.
- García, E.C.
1975 *The role of theory in linguistic analysis: the Spanish pronoun system*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- García, E.C., van Putte, F. & Tobin, Y.
1987 "Cross-linguistic equivalence, translatability, and contrastive analysis" *Folia Linguistica* 21, 2/4, 373-405.
- Gasparov, B.M.
1979 "O nekotoryx funkcijax vidovyx form v povestvovatel'nom tekste". *Kategorija vida i ee funkcional'nye svjazi. Voprosy russkoj aspektologii. (Učenyje zapiski tartuskogo universiteta 482)*, 112-126.
- Gerritsen, N.
1990 *Russian Reflexive Verbs. (In Search of Unity in Diversity)*. (= *Studies in Slavic and General linguistics* 15). Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Glovinskaja, M.J.
1982 *Semantičeskie tipy vidovyx protivopostavlenij russkogo glagola*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Gorup Jovanović, R.
1987 *The Semantic Organization of the Serbo-Croatian Verb*. Slavistische Beiträge 214. München.
- Grenoble, L.A.
1986 *A Contrastive Analysis of Verbs of Motion in Russian and Polish*. Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.
- Grice, H.P.
1975 "Logic and conversation". *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds), 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Groot C., de & H. Tommola (eds)
1984 *Aspect Bound. A voyage into the realm of Germanic, Slavonic and Finno-Ugrian aspectology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Guiraud-Weber, M.
1988 *L'aspect du verbe russe (Essais de présentation)*. Publications de l'Université de Provence.

- Gurevič, V.V.
 1971 "O značenijax glagol'nogo vida v russkom jazyke", *Russkij jazyk v škole* 5, 73-79.
 1979 "Vid i leksičeskoe značenie glagola", *Naučnye doklady vyššej školy. Filologičeskie nauki*, 5, 83-86.
- Gvozdev, A.N.
 1958 *Sovremennij russkij literaturnyj jazyk* II. Moscow.
- Haiman, J. (ed.)
 1985 *Iconicity in Syntax. Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax. Stanford, June 24-6, 1983*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Halthof, B.
 1968 "Ein semantisches Modell zur Aspekt determinierung im modernen Russischen", *Probleme der strukturellen Grammatik und Semantik*, Růžička, R. (ed.), 133-150, Leipzig.
- Hamburger, H.
 1983 "Conation and Aspect in Russian", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 3, 109-134. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
 1988 "The nature of the perfect and the aorist in Russian", *Dutch Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists, Sofia. Linguistics*. (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11), 235-252. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Hata, G.
 1989 "Aspects, Aktionsarten, and the time line", *Linguistics* 27, 487-516.
- Hausenblas, K.
 1963 "Slovesná kategorie výsledného stavu v dnešní češtině", *Naše řeč* 46, 13-28.
- Havránek, B.
 1928, 1937 *Genera Verbi v slovanských jazycích*. Vol. 1 and 2. Praha.
 1939 "Aspect et temps en vieux slave", *Mélanges Bally*, 223-230. Genève
 1958 "Charakter a úkoly srovnávacího studia spisovných jazyků slovanských", *Slavia* XXVIII, 153-160.
- Havránek, B. & Jedlička, A.
 1981 [1959] *Česká mluvnice*. Praha.
- Heltberg, K.
 1981 "On Aspect in Czech, Polish and Russian", *The Slavic Verb*, P. Jacobsen et al. (eds), 41-51, Copenhagen.
- Holt, J.
 1943 *Études d'aspect*. (= Acta Jutlandica 15.2.) København.
- Holvoet, A.
 1989 *Aspekt a modalność w języku polskim na tle ogólnosłowiańskim*. Prace Slawistyczne 77. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków: PAN.
- Hopper, P.J.
 1979 "Some Observations on the Typology of Focus and Aspect in Narrative Language", *Studies in Language* 3.1, 37-64.
 1982 "Aspect between Discourse and Grammar: an Introductory Essay for the volume", *Tense-Aspect: between Semantic and Pragmatics*, Hopper, P.J. (ed.), 3-18. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Hulanicki, L.
1973 "The Actional Perfect in Russian", *Slavic and East European Journal* 17, 2, 174-183.
- Isačenko, A.
1960 *Grammaticeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v 'sopostavlenii s slovackim. Morfologija II*. Bratislava.
1960a "La structure sémantique des temps en russe", *BSL* 55, 74-88.
- Ivančev, S.
1961 "Kontekstovo обусловлена ingresivna upotreba na glagolite ot nesvršen vid v češkija ezik", *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet* (Filologičeski fakultet 1959/60, t. 65, 3).
- Jacobsen, P. & H.L. Krag (eds)
1981 *The Slavic Verb. An Anthology Presented to Hans Christian Sørensen 16 December 1981*. Copenhagen.
- Jakobson, R.
1932 "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums", *Charisteria ... Mathesio ... oblata*, 74-83. Prague.
1936 "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre, Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus", *Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague* 6. [Reprinted in *Selected Writings*, 23-71, The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1971.]
1957 "Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb". Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Russian Language Project. [Reprinted in *Selected Writings*, 2.130-47. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.]
1971 [1967] "Linguistics in Relation to Other Sciences", *Selected Writings II*, 655-96, The Hague: Mouton.
1972 "Siftery, glagol'nye kategorii i russkij glagol", *Principy tipologičeskogo analiza jazykov različnogo stroja*. 95-113. Moscow.
- Janda, L. A.
1988 "The Mapping of Elements of Cognitive Space onto Grammatical Relations: An Example from Russian Verbal Prefixation", *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, B. Rudzka-Ostyn (ed.), 327-343, Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Jespersen, O.
1929 *A Modern English grammar on historical principles*. Heidelberg.
- Kabakčiev, K.
1984 "The article and the aorist/imperfect distinction in Bulgarian: an analysis based on cross-language 'aspect' parallelisms", *Linguistics* 22, 643-672.
- Kirsner, R.S.
1979 *The Problem of Presentative Sentences in Modern Dutch*. North Holland Linguistic series 43. Amsterdam/New York/Oxford.
- Konstantinová, T.I., Širokova, A.G. & A. Zatovkaňuk
1974 *Konfrontační studium ruské a české gramatiky a slovní zásoby*. Praha.
1983 *Konfrontační studium ruské a české gramatiky a slovní zásoby 2*. Praha.
- Kopečný, F.
1947 "Dva příspěvky k vidu a času v češtině", *Slovo a slovesnost* X, 151-8.
1948 "Morfologické prostředky vidové v nynější češtině", *Poeta Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmanovi*, 240-253, Brno.

- 1949 "K neaktuálnímu významu dokonavých sloves v češtině", *Slovo a slovesnost* XI, 2, 64
- 1962a *Slovesný vid v češtině*. (=Rozpravy československé akademie věd 72, 2). Praha.
- 1962b "Ke vzniku futurálního významu dokonavého prézentu", *Acta Universitatis Carolinae - Philologica. Slavic Pragensia* IV, 233-239.
- 1966 "Ještě ke gramatické "neaktualizaci" českého slovesa", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXVII, 258-262
- Koschmieder, E.
1934 *Nauka o aspektach czasownika polskiego w zarysie, Próba syntezy*. Wilno.
- Koschmieder-Schmid, K.
1967 *Vergleichende Griechisch-Slavische Aspektstudien*. (= *Slavistische Beiträge* Bd. 13.) München: Otto Sagner.
- Křížková, H.
1955 "K problematice praesentu historického v ruštině a češtině". *Sovětská jazykověda* V, 241-255.
- 1958 "K problematice aktuálního a neaktuálního užití časových a vidových forem v češtině a v ruštině", *Čs. rusistika* 4, 185-200.
- 1960 "Vývoj opisného futura v jazycích slovanských, zvláště v ruštině", *Acta Universitatis Pragensis, Philologica* II.
- 1961 "Ke konkurenci vidů v ruštině a češtině", *Čs. rusistika* 6, 32-39.
- 1962 "K ingresivnosti v češtině" (In margine Ivančevovy práce o videch v češtině), *Slovo a slovesnost* XXIII, 286-291.
- 1966 "Příslovečné určení s významem časové míry ve spojení s dokonavými slovesy", *Naše řeč* 49, 2, 65-72.
- Krzeszowski, T.P.
1967 "Fundamental principles of structural contrastive linguistics", *Glottodidactica* 2, 33-39.
- 1981 "The problem of equivalence revisited", *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 19, 2, 113-128
- Kučera, H.
1978 "Some Aspects of Aspect in Czech and English", *Folia Slavica* vol. 2, nr. 1-3, 196-210.
- 1981 "Aspect, Markedness, and t_0 ", *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 14, Tedeschi, P.J. & Zaenen, A. (eds.), 177-189. New York, London.
- 1983 "A Semantic Model of Verbal Aspect", *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists (Kiev 1983)*, vol. 1, *Linguistics*, Flier, M. (ed.), 171-184. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- 1984 "The Logical Basis of the Markedness Hypothesis", *Language and literary theory. In honor to Ladislav Matejka*, Stolz, B.A., Titunik, I.R. & Doležel, L. (eds.), 61-77.
- Kučera, H. & K. Trnka
1975 *Time in Language. (Temporal Adverbial Constructions in Czech, Russian and English)*. Michigan Slavic Materials 11.
- Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson
1980 *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lebedeva, G.F.
 1959a "Upotreblenie glagol'nyx form prošedšego vremeni soveršennogo vida v perfektom značenii v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke", *Voprosy istorii russkogo jazyka* (Kuznecov, P.S. ed.), 208-227. Moscow.
 1959b "Kačestvennyj i possessivnyj ottenki perfektного značeniija glagol'nyx form prošedšego soveršennogo", *Vestnik moskovskogo un-ta*, 3, 141-151.
- Lönngren, L.
 1973 "O protivopostavlenii aorističeskogo i perfektного značenij u russkogo glagola", *Scando-slavica*, XIX, 103-110.
- Lubensky, S.
 1985 "The Aspectual Properties of Verba Percipiendi", *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*, Flier, M.S. & A. Timberlake (eds), (*UCLA Slavic Studies* 12), 76-93. Columbus, Ohio.
- Manning, C. A.
 1939 "The historical use of the present imperfective and the present perfective in Russian", *Language* 15, 229-234.
- Mareš, F.V.
 1985 "Uwaga do teorii aspektu słowiańskiego", *Prace filologiczne*, Tom XXXII, 203-204.
- Maslov, J.S.
 1948 "Vid i leksičeskoe značenie glagola v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke", *Izvestija AN SSSR*, otd. lit. i jaz., 7, 4, 303-316.
 1958 "Rol' tak nazyvaemoj perfektivizacii i imperfektivizacii", Moscow. [Reprinted in: *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju*, 165-195. Moscow, 1961.]
 1959 "Glagol'nyj vid v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke (značenie i upotreblenie)", *Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Bernštejn, S.B. (ed.), 157-307. Moscow.
 1965 "Sistema osnovnyx ponjatij i terminov v slavjanskoj aspektologii", *Voprosy obščego jazykoznanija*, Maslov, J.S. & A.V. Fedorov (eds), 53-80, Leningrad.
 1974 "Zur Semantik der Perfektivitätsopposition", *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 20, 107-122.
 1978 "K osnovam sopostavitel'noj aspektologii", *Voprosy sopostavitel'noj aspektologii*, 4-43. Leningrad.
 1984 *Očerki po aspektologii*. Leningrad.
- Maslov, J.S. (ed.)
 1985 *Contrastive Studies in Verbal Aspect*. Studies in Descriptive Linguistics, vol. 14. Heidelberg.
- Mathesius, V.
 1947a "O konkurenci vidů v českém vyjadřování slovesném", *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt (soubor statí)*, 195-202, Praha.
 1947b "Slovesné časy typu perfektního v hovorové češtině", *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt (soubor statí)*, 190-194. Praha.
- Mazon, A.
 1914 *Emplois des aspects du verbe russe*. Paris.
 1921 *Grammaire de la langue tcheque*. Paris.
 1943 *Grammaire de la langue russe*. Paris.

- Muravyova, L.
1986 [1975] *Verbs of Motion in Russian*. Moscow: Russky Yazyk Publ.
- Nedjalkov, V.P. (ed.)
1983 *Tipologija rezul'tativnykh konstrukcij*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Němec, I.
1958a *Genese slovanského systému vidového*. (= *Rozpravy Čs. Akademie Věd*, roč. 68, řada SV, seš. 7.)
1958b "Iterativnost a vid", *Slovo a slovesnost* XIX, 189-200.
1964 "K vyjadřování opakovanosti slovesného děje v češtině", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXV, 3, 157-160.
- Nerad, A.
1940 "Významové funkce časových forem v soudobé spisovné češtině", *Slovo a slovesnost* VI, 188-193.
- Nickel, G. (ed.)
1971 *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*. Cambridge: UP.
- Nolte, G.
1987 "Zur Darstellung vergangener Geschehen mit nichtpräteritalen Verbalformen im Slowakischen und Russischen", *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 64, 29-36. Leipzig.
- Padučeva, E. V.
1986 "Semantika vida i točka otsčeta (V poiskax invarianta vidovogo značeniya), *Seriya literatury i jazyka*, t. 45, no. 5, 413-424.
1990 "Vid i leksičeskoe značenie glagola (ot leksičeskogo značeniya glagola k ego aspektual'noj xarakteristike), *Russian Linguistics*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1-18.
- Paillard, D.
1979 *Voix et aspect en russe contemporain*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
- Panevová, J. & Sgall, P.
1971 "Relativní čas", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXXII, 140-148.
1973 "Čas a vid českého a ruského slovesa", *Slavia* XLII, 1, 16-24.
- Panevová, J., Benešová, E. & Sgall, P.
1971 *Čas a modalita v češtině*. (= *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica Monographia* XXXIV.)
- Panzer, B.
1963 *Die Funktion des Verbalaspekts im Praesens historicum des Russischen*. *Slavistische Beiträge* 9. München: Otto Sagner
- Pauliny, E.
1948 "Slovesný čas v slovenčine", *Pocta Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmanovi*, 343-350. Brno.
- Petruxina, E.V.
1977 "Kategorija glagol'nogo vida i transpozicija morfoložičeskix form. (Na materiale češského jazyka v sravnenii s russkim)", *Vestnik Moskovskogo un-ta* 6.
1978 "O funkcionirovanii vidovogo protivopostavleniya v russkom jazyke v sopostavlenii s češskim (pri oboznačeenii povtorjajuščixsja dejstvij)", *Russkij jazyk za rubežom* 1, 57-60.
1983 "Funkcionirovanie prezentnyx form glagolov soveršennogo vida (s točki zreniya vzaimodejstvija grammatičeskix kategorij vida i

- vremeni) v češskom jazyke v sopostavlenii s ruskim", *Sopostavitel'noe izučenie grammatiki i leksiki ruskogo jazyka s češskim jazykom i drugimi slovjanskimi jazykami*, Širokova, A.G. (ed.), 152-172. Moscow: Izd. Moskovskogo un-ta.
- 1985 "Funkcional'no-sistemnoe sopostavlenie grammatičeskix kategorij glagola v ruskom i drugix slavjanskix jazykax (na materiale glagol'nogo vida i naklonenija). *Vestnik MGU, Serija 9, Filologija*, 6.
- Poldauf, I.
- 1949 "Atemporalnost jako gramatická kategorie českého slovesa?" (Diskusní poznámky ke Kopečného příspěvku k vidu a času v češtině). *Slovo a slovesnost* XI, 3, 121-132.
- 1964 "Souhrnný pohled na vid v nové češtině", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXV, 1, 46-56.
- 1966 "Neaktuálnost jako gramatická kategorie českého slovesa?", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXVII, 23-28.
- 1982 "Verbal aspect: A Slavonic-English Comparison", *Language Form and Linguistic Variation. (Papers dedicated to Angus McIntosh)*, Anderson, J. (ed.), 307-319, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Potebnja, A.A.
- 1941 [1988] *Iz zapisok po rusckoj grammatike*. Moskva.
- Proeme, H.
- 1991 *Studies over het Poolse, Nederlandse en Russische werkwoord. (Studies on the Verb in Polish, Dutch and Russian)*. Dissertation. Leiden University.
- Rappaport, G.
- 1991 "The Aspectual System of Russian", Chapter 10 in Smith, C.S., *The Parameter of Aspect*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rassudova, O.P.
- 1984 *Aspectual usage in modern Russian*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.
- Rathmayr, R.
- 1976 *Die perfektive Präsensform im russischen. (Eine multilaterale-kontrastive Funktionsanalyse der russischen Form anhand ihrer französischen und deutschen Entsprechungen)*. Wien.
- Reid, W.
- 1974 "The Saussurian sign as a control in linguistic analysis", *Semiotext* 1 (2), 31-53.
- Rijksbaron, A.
- 1989 *Aristotle and the classification of state of affairs in Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam.
- Russkaja grammatika*
- 1979 (Barnetová, V. et al. eds.), Prague: Academia.
- Sacker, U.
- 1983 *Aspektueller und resultativer Verbal Ausdruck im Französischen, Italienischen, Russischen und Deutschen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Sangster, R.B.
- 1982 *Roman Jakobson and Beyond*. Berlin.
- Saussure, F., de
- 1959/1916 *Course in General Linguistics*, Bally, C. & Sechehaye, A. (eds.). New York: The Philosophical Library.

- Schooneveld C.H., van
 1959 *A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System.* (Slavistic printings and reprintings VII), The Hague: Mouton.
- 1978 *Semantic transmutations: prolegomena to a calculus of meaning: the cardinal semantic structure of the prepositions, cases, and paratactic constructions in contemporary standard Russian.* Bloomington: Phys-sardt.
- 1983 "Contribution to the Systematic Comparison of Morphological and Lexical Semantic Structures in the Slavic Languages", *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, 321-349
- Schuyt, R.
 1983 "On Aspect, Aktionsart and Tense in Slavic. General remarks." *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 3, 405-425.
- Seidel, E.
 1936 "Zu den Funktionen des Verbalaspekts", *Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague* 6, 111-129.
- 1939 "Zur Futurbedeutung des Praesens perfectivum im Slavischen", *Slavia* 17, 1-32.
- 1960 "O problémech vidu", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXI, 249-256.
- Seiler, H.J.
 1952 *L'aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec.* (Collection de L'institut d'études byzantines et néo-helléniques de l'université de Paris, fasc. 14). Paris.
- Šeljakin, M.A.
 1975 "Osnovnye problemy sovremennoj russkoj aspektologii", *Voprosy russkoj aspektologii. Izvestija Voronežskogo gos. ped. in-ta. Tom 146.*, 5-27.
- Shiffrin, D.
 1981 "Tense variation in narrative", *Language* 57, 45-62.
- Silva Corvalán, C.
 1983 "Tense and aspect in oral Spanish narrative", *Language* 59, 4, 760-780.
- Širokova, A.G.
 1963a "O kategorii mnogokratnosti v češskom jazyke", *Issledovanija po češskomu jazyku*, Širokova, A.G. (ed.), 61-85. Moscow.
- 1963b "Ob upotreblenii glagolov soveršennoho vida dlja oboznačeniya mnogo-kratnogo dejstvija v češskom jazyke", *Slavjanskaja filologija* 4, 98-117.
- 1966 "Sposoby vyraženiya mnogokratnosti v češskom jazyke (v sravnenii s drugimi slavjanskimi jazykami)", *Vestnik MGU, Serija fil.* X 1, 39-58.
- 1971 "Nekotorye zamečaniya o funkcional'nyx granicax vida v russkom i češskom jazykax", *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju*, Bernštejn, S.B. (ed.), 292-298. Moscow.
- Šmilauer, V.
 1947 *Slovesný čas; Druhé hovory o českém jazyce.* Praha.
- Smirnov, L.N.
 1971 "Ob odnoj osobennosti funkcionirovanija glagolov soveršennoho vida v slovackom jazyke (sravnitel'no s russkim)", *Issledovanija po slavjan-skomu jazykoznaniju*, Bernštejn, S.B. (ed.), 236-241. Moscow.

- Smith, C.S.
1991 *The Parameter of Aspect*. (= *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* 43.) Dordrecht: Kluwer-Sørensen, H.C.
- 1949 *Aspect et temps en slave*. Aarhus.
- Soudakoff, D.
1987 *A semantic analysis of Polish and Russian prepositions: A contrastive study of PO, O, U and S/Z*. Dissertation. Indiana University.
- Stegu, M.
1985 *Konstrastive Untersuchungen zu den Vergangenheitstempora im russischen, französischen und bulgarischen*. Frankfurt/Bern/New York: Peter Lang.
- Štícha, F.
1986 "Systémový a funkční status konstrukci s *n/t*-ovými participii v současné češtině", *Slovo a slovesnost* 3, XLVII, 177-185.
- Stunová, A.
1986 "Aspect and Iteration in Russian and Czech. A contrastive study", *Dutch Studies in Russian Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 8, Barentsen, A.A., Groen, B.M. & Sprenger, R. eds.), 467-510. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- 1988 "Aspect and Sequence of Events in Russian and Czech. A contrastive study", *Dutch Contributions to the Tenth International congress of Slavists, Sofia, Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11), 507-534. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- 1991 "In Defence of Language-Specific Invariant Meanings of Aspect in Russian and Czech", *Studies in West Slavic and Baltic Linguistics* (*Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 16), 291-313. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 1992 "Meaning vs. Context: The Russian Imperfective Past in Sequence of Events", *Studies in Russian Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 17), 295-319. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- forthc. "Czech and Russian Aspect in the Historical Present", *Dutch Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists. Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi
- Swan, O.
1978 "A generative semantic description of Russian Tense and Aspect", *Slavic and East European Journal*, 22, 4, 519-525.
- Thelin, N.B.
1984a "Komposition, Perspektive und Aspekt in Puškina's Prosa: Entwurf einer poetisch-linguistischen Methode", *Signs of Friendship: To Honour A.G.F. van Holk*, J.J. van Baak (ed.), 257-295, Amsterdam.
- 1984b "Coherence, perspective and aspectual specification in Slavonic narrative discourse", *Aspect Bound*, Groot, C., de, Tommola, H. (eds), 225-239, Dordrecht: Foris.
- 1990 *Verbal Aspect in Discourse*. (Pragmatics & Beyond, vol.5). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Timberlake, A.
1982 "Invariance and the Syntax of Russian Aspect", *Tense-Aspect: between Semantics and Pragmatics*, 305-331. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Tobin, Y.
1987 "Three Sign-Oriented Theories: A Contrastive Approach", *Descriptio Linguistica*, Bluhme, H. & Hammarstrom, G. (eds.), 51-75.
1988 "Modern Hebrew tense: a study of objective temporal and subjective spatial and perceptual relations", *Temporalsemantik: Beitrage zur Linguistik der Zeitreferenz*, Ehrich, V. & Vater, H. (eds.), 52-81. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
1990 *Semiotics and Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Townsend, C. E.
1985 "Can Aspect Stand Prosperity?", *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*, M.S. Flier, & A. Timberlake (eds), 286-295, UCLA Slavic Studies, vol. 12.
- Trávníček, F.
1923 *Studie o českém vidu slovesném*.
Rozpravy české akademie věd a umění 53, Praha.
1939 "Pasivum ve spisovné češtině", *Slovo a slovesnost* V, 13-24.
1960 "K českým a ruským určitým tvarům slovesným", *Rusko-české studie, Sborník VŠP v Praze, Jazyk a literatura* II, 69-73.
- Trnková, K.
1969 "K užívání termínů opozice, neaktuálnost při popisu iterativních sloves", *Slovo a slovesnost* XXX, 34-40.
- Vendler, Z.
1967 *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca.
- Verkuyl, H.J.
1971 *On the compositional nature of the aspects*. Dissertation. University of Amsterdam.
- Veyrenc, J.
1980 *Études sur le verbe russe*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
- Vinogradov, V.V.
1947 *Russkij jazyk (Grammatičeskoe učenie o slove)*. Moscow: Vysšaja škola.
- Weinrich, H.
1964 *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
1970 "Tense and time", *Archivum Linguisticum* 1. (New series), 31-41.
- Whorf, B. L.
1956 *Language, Thought and Reality. Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, J.B. Carroll, (ed.), New York and London.
- Wierzbicka, A.
1967 "On the semantics of the verbal aspect in Polish", *To Honor Roman Jakobson* 3, 2231-2249.
- Wolfson, N.
1979 "The conversational historical present alternation", *Language* 55, 168-183.

CORPUS

Andreev, Leonid

1971 *Povesti i rasskazy o dvux tomax*. Tom 2. "Iuda Iskariot", "Rasskaz o semi povešennyx". Moskva.1979 *Satanův deník*. "Jidáš Iškariotský", "Povídka o sedmi oběšených" Praha.

Bulgakov, Michail

1967 *Master i Margarita*. Moskva: Xudožestvennaja literatura.1990 *Mistr a Markétka*. Praha: Odeon.

Čapek, Karel

1961 *Povídky z jedné kapsy. Povídky z druhé kapsy*. Praha: Čs. spisovatel.1963 *Válka s mloky*. Praha: Čs. spisovatel.1971 *Krakatit*. Praha: Naše vojsko.1986 *Vojna s salamandrami. Rasskazy*. Minsk: Narodnaja Asveta.1987 *Krakatit*. Alma-Ata: Nauka.

Ěrenburg, Ilja

1947 *Padenie Pariža*. Moskva.1950 *Pád Paříže*. Praha.

Gor'kij, Maksim

1946 *Mat'. Izbrannye sočinenija*. Moskva.1951 *Matka*. Praha: Svoboda.

Hašek, Jaroslav

1975 *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války*. Praha: Čs. spisovatel.

Gašek, Jaroslav

1958 *Poxoždenija bravogo soldata Švejka*. Kišinev: Škoala sovietiké.

Oleša, Jurij

1974 *Izbrannoe. Zavist'. Rasskazy*. Moskva.1975 *Závist a jiné prózy*. Praha: Odeon.

Rybakov, Anatolij

1988 *Deti Arbata*. Moskva: Knižnaja palata.1989 *Děti Arbatu*. Praha: Lidové nakladatelství.

SAMENVATTING

Het doel van dit onderzoek is om aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch die in concrete contexten voorkomen, te analyseren en verklaren. Het gaat om verschillen zowel in de distributie als in de interpretatie van de aspectuele vormen: de perfectieve en de imperfectieve. Sommige van deze verschillen zijn beschreven in een aantal contrastieve studies, cf. Bondarko (1959), Eckert (1984, 1985, 1988, 1991), Galton (1976), Isačenko (1960), Ivančev (1961), Křížková (1955), Petrušina (1978, 1983), Širokova (1963, 1971), Smirnov (1971) en Stunová (1986, 1988, 1991, *forthc.*). Deze publicaties leveren voldoende bewijs dat de aspectuele verschillen tussen de twee talen een systematisch karakter hebben en dat ze dus geen "kwestie van detail" zijn, zoals Maslov (1985: 31) beweert.

Buiten dit contrastief onderzoek is er echter weinig rekening gehouden met het feit dat aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch een systematisch karakter vertonen. Een weerspiegeling hiervan kan worden waargenomen in definities van het aspect. Er wordt namelijk over het algemeen een invariante betekenis van het aspect aangenomen die gemeenschappelijk voor alle Slavische talen zou zijn. Invariante betekenissen worden in de Slavische taalkundige traditie beschouwd als een machtig instrument om taalverschijnselen te verklaren. Invariante betekenis behoort tot het niveau van het taalsysteem en het vertegenwoordigt de semantische kern van een grammaticale form of categorie. Het dient gepostuleerd te worden op zo'n manier dat alle gebruiksgevallen van een bepaalde vorm verklaard kunnen worden. Het is onvermijdelijk dat invariante betekenissen worden geformuleerd in termen die in hoge mate algemeen; abstract en zelfs vaag genoemd kunnen worden.

Wat de verklaring van aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch betreft, moet een discrepantie geconstateerd worden tussen, aan de ene kant de theoretische benadering waarin een gemeenschappelijke invariante betekenis van het aspect voor Slavische talen aangenomen wordt, en, aan de andere kant de taalfeiten, nl. de aangetoonde systematische verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch. Het is evident dat door middel van een gemeenschappelijke invariante betekenis slechts de overeenkomsten tussen talen verklaard kunnen worden, maar geenzins de verschillen. Zelfs taalkundigen die anders het bestaan van invariante

betekenissen erkennen, grijpen noodzakelijkerwijs naar andere middelen in de taalanalyse. Aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch worden bij voorbeeld verklaard in termen van verschillen tussen de *functionele lading*, het *functioneel potentieel* of de *functionele grenzen* van de aspectuele vormen (cf. respectievelijk de *Russkaja grammatika* 1979, Petruxina 1985, Širokova 1971). Deze begrippen blijken echter te onduidelijk om met success toegepast te kunnen worden in een analyse van concrete taaldata. Een andere oplossing, in termen van de *verplichte neutralisatie* van de aspectuele oppositie in het Russisch vs. de *facultatieve neutralisatie* in het Tsjechisch (cf. *Russkaja grammatika* 1979), stuit onvermijdelijk op bezwaren, zeker wat het Tsjechisch betreft. De term *facultatief* suggereert nl. een vrije keuze van vorm alsof deze niet gebonden zou zijn aan regels.

De verklaring van de systematische aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch zou meer gezocht moeten worden in de richting van *discourse analysis* zoals gebezigd in de Amerikaanse studies van het Russisch (cf. Hopper 1979, Chvany 1980, 1985, Timberlake 1982 en Fielder 1990). Echter, niet alleen strikt tekstuele functies, zoals *foregrounding* and *backgrounding*, dienen te worden geanalyseerd maar ook de interactie van het aspect met verschillende elementen in de context, bij voorbeeld: typen van werkwoorden, typen situaties (cf. Eckert 1984), relaties tussen handelingen (*successiviteit*, *simultaneiteit*) en andere grammaticale categorieën, zoals *tempus* (cf. Bondarko 1992).

De *discourse* benadering toegepast in deze studie levert een verklaring op van de systematische aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch in termen van *taal-specifieke discourse strategieën*. Deze benadering is eerder bedoeld om de invariante benadering aan te vullen dan om deze compleet te vervangen. Een aantal deel-hypotheses zijn opgesteld en geverifieerd op data in specifieke contexten. Op grond van deze analyses kan de volgende algemene uitspraak geformuleerd worden: er kan aangenomen worden dat het Russische aspect opereert op het discourse niveau, m.a.w. op dit niveau vindt de keuze van de aspectuele vorm (perfectief of imperfectief) plaats. In het Tsjechisch blijkt niet het discourse niveau primair relevant te zijn voor de keuze van het aspect, maar gaat het vooral om factoren als de interne structuur van de handeling, de lexicale betekenis van het desbetreffende werkwoord e.d. Uitgedrukt in termen van perspectief: het Russische aspect heeft een meer globale oriëntatie (een bredere scope) dan het Tsjechische aspect, dat primair een lexicaal karakter heeft en lokaal georiënteerd is.

Deze dissertatie is gedeeltelijk gebaseerd op een aantal eerder verschenen publicaties (cf. Stunová 1986, 1988, 1991, 1992 en *forthc.*). In de loop van de tijd verschoof het onderzoek echter van de invariante benadering steeds meer richting discourse benadering die meer uitkomst bleek te bieden. De hele tekst is daarom herschreven en aangevuld met analyses van nieuwe data.

De indeling van het geheel is als volgt. De Inleiding vormt het exposé van het taalkundig probleem. In hoofdstuk 1 wordt voornamelijk theorie behandeld: In sectie 1 worden de invariante benadering en de discourse benadering besproken, in sectie 2 worden de voornaamste aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch in concrete contexten geïntroduceerd, en in sectie 3 wordt een aantal hypothesen opgesteld betreffende de taalspecifieke discourse strategieën, alsmede een aantal oplossingen voorgesteld, al of niet gerelateerd aan de invariante benadering. De overige hoofdstukken bevatten analyses van aspectuele verschillen tussen het Russisch en het Tsjechisch in de volgende contexten: iteratieve contexten (hoofdstuk 2), sekwenties van handelingen in narratieve teksten (hoofdstuk 3) en het praesens historicum (hoofdstuk 4). De verzameling data is gebaseerd op een corpus parallelle literaire teksten, Russische originelen met hun gepubliceerde Tsjechische vertalingen en *vice versa*. Om de aspectuele keuzes objectief te kunnen beoordelen zijn native speakers geraadpleegd.