

Ljiljana Šarić
GWZO – Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum
Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas e.V.
Luppenstraße 1B, D-04177 Leipzig

ASPECTUAL USAGE IN REPETITIVE CONTEXT IN CROATIAN, SERBIAN AND RUSSIAN

The article deals with the interaction of temporal quantifiers (adverbs of quantification) with aspect choice in Croatian, and some comparisons with Serbian, Russian and some other Slavic languages are given. The analysis is given for *rijetko* 'seldom', *ponekad* 'sometimes', *često* 'often', *uvijek* 'always', *svake godine* 'every year'; *dva puta / dva put* 'twice', *tri puta / triput* 'thrice', *nekoliko puta* 'few times', *više puta* 'several times', *puno / mnogo puta / nebrojeno puta* 'many times / innumerable times', and their counterparts in languages mentioned.

1. Introduction

The subject of this article is the interaction of temporal quantifiers (adverbs of quantification) with aspect choice in Croatian. For comparison, some data from Serbian and Russian are given; some other Slavic languages are included in the discussion to a smaller extent as well. The adverbials considered in this analysis are *rijetko* 'seldom', *ponekad* 'sometimes', *često* 'often', *uvijek* 'always', *svake godine* 'every year'; *dva puta / dva put* 'twice', *tri puta / triput* 'thrice', *nekoliko puta* 'a few times', *više puta* 'several times' and *puno / mnogo puta / nebrojeno puta* 'many times / innumerable times'. Generally, all of them refer to repeated actions. There exist of course important conceptual differences among them, which will be considered. In the description of the category of aspect, Croatian grammar books usually connect the notion of repeated action and the notion of imperfectivity. For each adverbial expression, this study will verify if and to what extent this connection exists and if the semantic differences between the analyzed adverbs are of importance.

The issue of the relation of quantification and aspect in Slavic has already been explicitly considered in Merrill (1985), Koseska-Toszewa (1997) and

Kresin (2000) – only to mention some of the discussions – but the nature of temporal quantification makes the topic implicitly existent in every work on aspect. However, the authors mentioned do not consider the issue of temporal quantification explicitly. Merrill addresses the issue of universal quantification expressed by *každyj* ‘each’ and *vse* ‘all’ and its relation to aspect in Russian, and Kresin compares the use of singularizing and pluralizing universal quantifiers in Russian and Czech and their influence on the aspect choice. Koseska-Toszewa addresses some universal questions connected with predication and quantification.

The issue of the relation of quantification and aspect includes many topics – not only the relation of temporal quantifiers and universal quantifiers to aspect choice, but also the relation between quantification and the semantics of the verb in general. However, most works on quantifiers treat this phenomenon at the level of noun phrase.¹ Furthermore, concerning the relation of quantification and verbal category, the notion of quantification of events is inherent in the perfective–imperfective opposition, when considering one component of their conceptual difference as contrast between a single instance of an event and multiple instances of an event. For example, (1a) presents the single instance of an event in the past (the quantity one is specified), whereas in (1b) the event of coming has been implicitly quantified (the multiple quantity is implied) through the use of the imperfective *dolaziti*:

- (1) a. Ivan im je *došao*_p u kuću.
b. Ivan im je *dolazio*_i u kuću.
‘Ivan came to their house.’

The repetition expressed by the imperfective itself is of an unspecified number of times. Adverbs of quantification are an overt means of expressing

¹ Quantification in the domain of the noun phrase is not the only domain of quantification. Explicitly or implicitly, quantifiers appear in many other language structures. There is an implicit quantification in the semantics of verbal tenses. Past tense in the sentence (i) contains existential quantification over the parts of temporal domain:

- (i) *Ivan je živio u Italiji.*
‘Ivan lived in Italy.’

Expressed in the modal semantics of (ii) is the implicit existential quantification over the situations that are in concord with Ivan’s possibilities and the situations in which he swims:

- (ii) *Ivan može plivati.*
‘Ivan can swim.’

At the lexical level, the expression *bivši zatvorenik* ‘former prisoner’ in (iii) includes implicit quantification over the parts of the past temporal domain that Ivan spent in prison:

- (iii) *Ivan je bivši zatvorenik.*
‘Ivan is a former prisoner.’

the quantification at the propositional level:

- (2) Ivan im je često dolazio_p u kuću.
»Ivan was coming often to their house.«

In (2), the repetition has been made explicit. Similar examples raise the question of interaction of the meaning of the imperfective and the quantificational adverb.

2. Temporal quantification/quantification of events

Explicit quantification exists not only in noun phrases. Some adverbial quantifiers quantify locations (*everywhere, somewhere, nowhere*), temporal segments (*always, sometimes, never, often*) or modalities (*necessarily, possibly*). Like universal quantifiers in the expressions *svi X* 'all X', *svaki X* 'every X', *neki X* 'some X', *nijedan X* 'no X' and *ne svi X* 'not all X', the adverbial expressions *uvijek* 'always', *ponekad* 'sometimes', *nikad* 'never' and *ne uvijek* 'not always' form the Aristotelian square of oppositions. As in the domain of the noun phrases, the later standard quantifiers have their non-standard relatives (*često* 'often', *rijetko* 'seldom', *bar pet puta* 'at least five times', *više no jednom* 'more than once', *točno dvaput* 'exactly twice' etc.). Adverbial quantifiers act similar to quantifiers of noun phrases. The main difference is in the domain of quantification. It is not always easy to define that domain. Contextual information is important in determining if an adverbial quantifier quantifies over temporal segments, events or situations. In the domain of temporal quantification it is also important to consider if the time is measured in seconds, days, years, and so on. In (3) the temporal expression stretches over days. That can be concluded from the meaning of the sentence:

- (3) Doručak se *uvijek* servira u 9 sati ujutro ovdje.
'The breakfast is *always* served at 9 am here.'

In the domain of temporal quantification, iterative adverbs and frequency adverbs² are temporal quantifiers with equivalent entities in the domain of determiners (*dvaput/dva* 'twice/two', *nekoliko puta / nekoliko* 'few times / few', *ponekad/neki* 'sometimes/some', *uvijek/svi* 'always/all'). It seems that in the domain of determiners there is no reason to divide *dva*, *nekoliko*, *neki*, and *svi* into separate groups, but it does seem to be necessary in the case of adverbs of quantification. There is a considerable difference between the examples in (4) and in (5), illustrating the difference between iteration and frequency in the terminology of some authors:

- (4) a. Prošle godine Jasna je *dvaput* svirala klavir.
'Jasna played the piano *twice* in the last year.'

² The two groups – termed iterative adverbs and frequency adverbs – are distinguished in Hoepelman & Rohrer 1980, among others.

- b. Prošloga mjeseca Jasna je *nekoliko puta* išla u kino.
'Jasna went to the cinema *a few times* in the last month.'
(iteration)
- (5) a. Prošle je godine Jasna *često* svirala klavir.
'Jasna played the piano *often* in the last year.'
- b. Prošloga je mjeseca Jasna *rijetko* išla u kino.
'Jasna *seldom* went to the cinema in the last month.' (frequency)

In (4a), it is implied that two situations existed in the last year in which Jasna played piano. Adverbs such as *doaput* count the events and designate the total sum of the situations. That sum is an absolute quantity; the adverb designates the totality of a specific event in a given temporal interval. Although in (4b) the set of situations in which Jasna went to the cinema in the last month is not specifically defined as in (4a), due to the ambiguity and elasticity of the expression *nekoliko puta*, the absolute quantity still exists.³ In (5a), it is not the sum of the situations in which Jasna played the piano that is important. This sum of situations is viewed in relation to the temporal unit (*prošla godina* »last year«). With *često*, it can be concluded that the frequency of the situations in which Jasna played the piano at the time was intensive in relation to some presupposed or contextually defined norm. It seems that adverbials of this type describe a relative quantity, so that their meaning can be paraphrased more exactly with 'x times in a temporal unit' than with 'x times' (where the value of x depends on the context/situation). In other words, *često* means not only that something happens many times, but that something happens many times with regard to the given temporal unit. A similar conclusion could be given for (5b). The regular distribution of events is a characteristic feature of adverbs of frequency.⁴ In (5a), it is presumed that Jasna played the piano in regular intervals in the last year (e.g., twice a week). The adverb implies these regular intervals. Regular distribution includes repetition – with regular distribution, the same type of event is necessarily repeated. Due to the very vague meaning of the adverb, a certain flexibility should be allowed concerning the number of situations and the length of temporal subunits, but that does not significantly change the basic idea. Repetitive adverbs do not necessarily have regular distribution across time. In order for utterance (4a) to be true, it must be only checked whether Jasna

³ Expressions such as *često* express a quantity that is dependent on the length of the time intervals between the events in question, and on the contextually given or presupposed norm. That is why that quantity is called relative quantity. It is possible to ask *How many times exactly?* and get an answer such as *nekoliko puta*. The possibility of counting still exists (that implies a notion of absolute quantity), although *nekoliko puta* is indeed ambiguous.

⁴ This is shown in the English examples in Stump (1981:225–231).

played the piano twice in the last year. It is not important if it was at the beginning, at the end or in the middle of the year. It seems that the two types of adverbs act differently in some contexts – adverbs such as *dvaput* ‘twice’ are not common in the present tense:

- (6) ?Jasna svira *dvaput* klavir.
‘Jasna plays piano *twice*.’

It is a side effect of the fact that adverbs such as *dvaput* need a temporal unit. So (6) would be acceptable with the expression *dvaput tjedno* ‘twice a week’. In the past, an explicit reference to a temporal unit is not necessary, because one could assume the unit to be ‘in her life’ if no unit is stated explicitly. Adverbs of the type *često* ‘often’ do not make any limitations to the verbal tense – that is, they do not need a temporal unit.

Temporal quantifiers establish a relation between two sets of events or situations. Besides the previously mentioned two groups of adverbs (*nekad, uvijek, ne uvijek, nikad, često, rijetko, uglavnom / dvaput, nekoliko puta*), generic⁵ adverbs (*općenito* ‘generally’, *normalno* ‘normally’), which are not included in the remaining analysis, also establish that relation.

Concerning adverbial expressions as *uvijek* and *svake godine*, the notion of habituality should be mentioned. Habitual sentences, such as (7), do not describe individual events:

- (7) Ana puši.
‘Ana smokes.’

They express the habits or inclinations of individuals to behave in a certain manner. This type of sentence evokes the same kind of problems as generic sentences.⁶ In aspectology the term habitual is used to describe expressions containing repeated events as in following example:

- (8) a. Ivan ljetuje *svake godine* u Italiji.
‘*Every year* Ivan spends his holidays in Italy.’
b. Ivan *uvijek* ljetuje u Italiji.
‘Ivan *always* spends his holidays in Italy.’

⁵»(...) the common semantic property of all generic expressions is that they are used to express law-like, or nomic, statements« (Dahl 1975:99).

⁶ The vagueness of the truth-value conditions of the generic expressions is also a characteristic of generic adverbs. As generic sentences, they include not only quantity, but also the notion of modality or the notion of unexpected quality. If generic sentences refer for example to (natural) kinds, the ontological structure of the kinds is different from the ontological structure of the concrete individuals. If they include some kind of irregular quantification over individuals, the truth conditions of the genericity operator cannot be defined in the same manner as for other quantifiers.

In similar cases of repetition, the number of repetitions is not limited. According to Langacker (1997:198), the term *habitual* emphasizes an action as characteristic of a subject. A more neutral term would be “unbounded repetition”.⁷ In contrast to habituals, Langacker names expressions that refer to a bounded set of repetitions of an event repetitives (*Sam kicked his dog five times.*). According to Langacker (1997:194–95), a habitual expression summarizes overly arbitrary instances of an event in the structural plane. The structural plane of one’s knowledge of the world (how the world is arranged so that various events happen in it) is separate from the actual plane (what actually happens in the world). The event instances in the structural plane are arbitrary and not anchored to any particular location in time or reality. Some authors include repetitives and habituals in the category of iteration (cf. Merrill 1985). Dickey (2000:50) claims that repetitives are conceptually distinct from habituals and generally must be distinguished from the latter in an analysis of aspect. Nevertheless, a general notion of repeatedness connects these two conceptually distinct categories.

3. Analysis of the Croatian examples with temporal quantifiers

This section will discuss the use of the perfective and imperfective in the description of repeated actions in Croatian. I will present the frequency relations of the perfective and imperfective and comment on the results. After the presentation the frequency relations in this section. Section 4 will compare some examples of aspect usage in Croatian with aspect usage in Russian on the basis of already existing analyses of Russian (mainly Merrill 1985, and also Eckert 1985, Rassudova 1968, Forsyth 1970 and Bondarko 1971). In further analysis in Section 5, I will also discuss some facts of aspect usage that eventually differ in Croatian (this topic has arisen on the basis of facts presented in Ivić 1983 and Dickey 2000).

Presentation of the frequency relations between the perfective and imperfective

I have extracted the examples from an Internet corpus of Croatian⁸ and

⁷ Some Slavic languages (for example, Czech) have a number of habitual verbs that explicitly assert that an action is a characteristic, that is, a habit of a subject.

⁸ *30-milijunski korpus hrvatskoga jezika* (“30-million corpus of Croatian”). It consists at present of about 9.000.000 lexical units. There were many examples in which the adverbial expression does not quantify events in the strict sense. These have not been taken into consideration. Examples with biaspectual verbs have been ignored, as well as examples with modal verbs. Only those examples for which both aspects would be acceptable were considered. The examples from this corpus are labeled later in the text with the abbreviation TKHJ.

divided them into two groups: one group with the frequency adverbs *rijetko*, *ponekad*, *često* and *uvijek* which denote relative quantity, and one group with the repetitive adverbs *dva puta / dvaput*, *tri puta / triput*, *nekoliko puta*, *više puta* and *puno/mnogo puta / nebrojeno puta*, which denote absolute quantity. The use of the perfective and imperfective are distinguished according to verbal tense (see Tables 1 and 2). Due to the small number of examples found for the other verbal tenses for some of the analyzed units, I will comment here only the results for the present and the past tenses.

Rijetko, ponekad, često, uvijek

First, I will comment on the group of frequency adverbs *rijetko*, *ponekad*, *često* and *uvijek*. They exist on a scale that shows a gradation of the degrees of repetition from the lowest to the highest degree: *rijetko* > *ponekad* > *često* > *uvijek*.

The results are presented in Table 1.⁹

Table 1

imperfective	perfective	imperfective	perfective
<i>rijetko</i> 'seldom' ip pres 217 (87.5%) ip pt 59 (93.65%) ip fut 3 (75.00%) ip plp 1	<i>Examples: 316</i> pf pres 31 (12.5%) pf pt 4 (6.34%) pf fut 1 (25.00%)	<i>ponekad</i> 'sometimes' ip pres 216 (69.68%) ip pt 100 (87.72%) ip cond 10 (23.80%) ip fut 2 (33.33%)	<i>Examples: 473</i> pf pres 94 (30.32%) pf pt 14 (12.28%) pf cond 32 (76.20%) pf fut 4 (66.67%) pf imp 1
<i>često</i> 'often' ip pres 181 (87.02%) ip pt 95 (98.96%) ip fut 1 (25.00%)	<i>Examples: 308</i> pf pres 27 (12.98%) pf pt 1 (1.04%) pf fut 3 (75.00%)	<i>uvijek</i> 'always' ip pres 73 (80.26%) ip pt 51 (87.94%) ip fut 4 (44.44%)	<i>Examples: 161</i> pf pres 21 (19.74%) pf pt 7 (12.06%) pf fut 5 (55.56%)

Rijetko clearly shows preference for the imperfective in the present tense, in the past tense, and in the future tense. This is also the case with *ponekad*. One might expect that the frequency of the use of imperfective is higher with

⁹ List of abbreviations in the Tables: ip = imperfective, pf = perfective, pres = present tense, pt = past tense, cond = conditional mood, fut = future tense, plp = pluperfect, imp = imperative, aor = aorist.

ponekad than with *rijetko*, because *ponekad* implies a higher degree of repetition than does *rijetko*. However, that does not happen to be the case. The percentage of the imperfective is higher for *rijetko* than for *ponekad* in the present and past tense. For the adverb *često*, the relation of the percentage of the imperfective and perfective in the present tense is similar to the same relation for *rijetko*. The values for the past tense are also more similar to the values for *rijetko* than to those for *ponekad*. In the case of *uvijek*,¹⁰ the percentage of the imperfective in the present tense is lower than the percentage of the imperfective for *rijetko* and *često*. Again, this is contrary to expectations. However, the relation of the percentage for the imperfective in the present tense for *uvijek* is higher than the percentage for the same category of *ponekad*, so that here the original expectations are fulfilled.

An interesting question in comparing the results for all four adverbs concerns the adverb triggering the perfective in the highest percentage. The presupposition that it could be *rijetko*, because the regularity of the expressed repetitions in utterances with *rijetko* is of the lowest degree, is not fulfilled. *Ponekad* shows the highest percentage of perfective verbs in the present tense and in the past tense. The next highest percentage of perfective verbs is shown by *uvijek*, and not by *rijetko* or *često*, which would be expected. Considering the high percentage of the perfective in the examples with *uvijek*, the broader context in which it appears could be important. Due to its meaning, *uvijek* tends to appear in complex sentences in which the inclusion of enabling conditions (Langacker 1997) is much more frequent than for other adverbs analyzed (for example, the formal *uvijek kad* ‘whenever’ appears in the examples very frequently). This topic will be further discussed in the Section 5.

Dvoaput / dva puta, triput / tri puta, više puta, mnogo/puno/nebrojeno puta

The next group considered entails the scale of repetitive adverbials. The scale begins with cases of restricted, specified, mathematically countable repetition (*dvoaput / dva puta – triput / tri puta*) and continues with cases of unspecified, mathematically uncountable repetition. The very small number of examples involving the adverbials *četiri puta, pet puta* ‘four times, five times’ and so on did not allow further conclusions, so they are not analyzed. Instead, the examples with *nekoliko puta* ‘a few times’, *više puta* ‘several times’ and *puno/mnogo/nebrojeno puta* ‘many times/innumerable times’ are considered. The scale shows a regular gradation of the degrees of repetition from the lowest to the highest degree:

dvoaput > triput > više puta > mnogo/puno/nebrojeno puta.

¹⁰ It is worth mentioning that a considerably smaller number of examples had been extracted than for the other adverbs of this group. A very large number of examples that contained the phrase *još uvijek* ‘still’ had to be neglected.

The results are presented in the Table 2.

Table 2

imperfective	perfective	imperfective	perfective
<i>dva puta / dvaput</i> 'twice' ip pres 22 (95.66%) ip pt 27 (30.00%) ip fut 1 ip cond 1	Examples: 115 pf pres 1 (4.34%) pf pt 63 (70.00%)	<i>tri puta / triput</i> 'thrice' ip pres 6 (60.00%) ip pt 14 (56.00%) ip cond 10 (23.80%) ip fut 2 (33.33%)	Examples: 37 pf pres 4 (40.00%) pf pt 11 (44.00%) pf aor 1 pf cond 1
<i>nekoliko puta</i> 'few times' ip pres 4 (66.67%) ip pt 10 (25.64%) ip fut 1	Examples: 47 pf pres 2 (33.33%) pf pt 29 (74.36%) pf plp 1	<i>više puta</i> 'several times' ip pres 2 (50.00%) ip pt 25 (54.35%)	Examples: 50 pf pres 2 (50.00%) pf pt 21 (45.65%)
<i>puno/mnogo puta</i> 'many times', <i>nebrojeno puta</i> 'innumerable times' ip pres 1 (50.00%) ip pt 8 (47.05%)	Examples: 19 pf pres 1 (50.00%) pf pt 9 (52.95%)		

What one expects is that the repetitive adverbials denoting a higher degree of repetition (*više puta*, *mnogo puta*) would trigger the imperfective in more cases than the repetitive adverbials with a lower cardinality (*dvaput*, *triput*). That is also Timberlake's (1982:316) suggestion. For the adverbial quantifiers of a limited/lower degree of frequency, preference for a perfective verb is expected. The examples from the corpus do not show such a straightforward regularity (see Table 2).

Considering the results for *dvaput* (*dva puta*), there is a very high preference for the imperfective in the present tense, and a high preference for the perfective in the past tense. For *triput*, the frequency of imperfective verbs is also higher in the present tense, but the difference between the frequency of the perfective and the frequency of the imperfective is not as significant as in the case of *dvaput*. Concerning the past tense, the situation is different in comparison to *dvaput*. The data show a preference for the imperfective to a slight degree. The results for *nekoliko puta* also show a preference for the

imperfective in the present tense and a significant preference for the perfective in the past tense. The results for the adverbials *više puta* and *puno/mnogo/nebrojeno puta* show equal preference for the imperfective and for the perfective in the present tense. However, the data here are inconclusive because the number of examples for the present tense is very restricted (due to the meaning of the adverbials). Concerning aspectual usage in the past tense, the adverbial *više puta* shows certain preference for the imperfective, whereas the adverbials *puno/mnogo/nebrojeno puta* show a slight preference for the perfective (although one would expect that *više puta*, due to the lower frequency in comparison to *puno/mnogo/nebrojeno puta*, shows greater preference for the perfective, it does not happen to be the case). The strongest preference for the perfective in the past tense is exhibited by *nekoliko puta*, with *dva puta* showing the next highest preference. Conclusions about present tense can only be vague due to the small number of examples in the corpus. The comparison of the results for the four units show that no regular gradation of the usage of imperfective verbs follows the gradation of the degree of repetition. The numerical analysis of the Croatian examples does not confirm Timberlake's suggestion (1982:316) that high cardinality positively triggers the imperfective (cf. the high percentage of the imperfective present for *dva puta* and the high percentage of the perfective for *više puta*, *puno/mnogo/nebrojeno puta*).

4. Some observations on quantification and aspect in Russian with comparison to Croatian

Merrill (1985:58) states that it is a common feature of Russian aspectology that repeated actions tend to be presented in the imperfective (according to the grammatical descriptions of repeated actions, and descriptions that are found in language manuals, this should be expected Croatian, too). Thus, according to the general rule, Russian adverbs such as *vseгда* 'always' and *обычно* 'usually' require the imperfective. This is relatively uncontroversial, but it is not always clear when a given action is to be considered as "repeated", and therefore whether to use the imperfective.¹¹

Aspectual usage in a context involving repetition could be connected with the conceptual structure of the repeated event. Chung and Timberlake (1985) suggest that repetition involves a macroevent, the overall context of repetition and subevents – the individual segments that are repeated. A

¹¹ The need for a maximally precise conception of repeatedness is particularly acute when the universal quantifiers *každyj* 'each' and *vse* 'all' are involved. Such quantifiers frequently indicate repetition of an action over members of a set, yet do not necessarily require the use of the imperfective (Merrill 1985: 58).

subevent is each instantiation of an event over a set of individuals or over a interval of time. In the domain of individuals, subevents are not always temporally discrete. They can be simultaneous or sequential. Like events in general, a complex event as a set of subevents can also be iterated (Merrill 1985). In the conceptualization of an event, one can focus one's view of repetition on the subevents or one can focus on the whole, that is, at the level of macroevent. If the focus is at the level of macroevent, the imperfective is used regardless of the telicity of the individual subevents, whereas focus at the level of the subevents means that aspect is determined on the basis of whether or not a telos is reached in any given subevent: a complete lack of telicity or unrealized telicity conditions the imperfective (Kresin 2000:394).

In analyzing iteration in Russian, Merrill (1985) uses the term restricted iteration¹² to cover those cases where the perfective is possible, and the term unrestricted iteration where it is not, although it is not clear what the restriction is. It appears to refer both to boundedness of the time interval over which the iterated event occurs and to the way that the number of repetitions of the iterated event is stated. In describing the distribution of the imperfective and perfective in Russian when iteration is involved, Rassudova (1968), Forsyth (1970) and Bondarko (1971) observe that the perfective can only be used when there is explicit mention of repetition; furthermore, the number of repetitions in such cases cannot be unrestricted, that is, the perfective is most acceptable with, for example, *дважды* 'twice' and *трижды* 'thrice' and is even possible with *много раз* 'many times', but not with *обычно* 'usually', *каждый раз* 'every time', or even *редко* 'rarely'. M. Ivić (1983:47) also states that Russian systematically excludes the appearance of the perfective present with frequency adverbials such as *často*: **on često skažet čto nibud' ne podumav*.¹³ In order for the perfective to be used, the period of time over which the events are repeated must be able to be viewed as a unit. As Merrill observes, the last restriction is fuzzy, because what counts as a "unit" varies with the context as well as with the semantics of the verb phrase. This analysis implies that in cases of restricted iteration the perfective is most acceptable, whereas it is not acceptable in cases of unrestricted iteration.

Merrill's analysis (1985:67) of Russian shows that unrestricted iteration clearly requires the imperfective. The repetition is of an unspecified, presumably large, number of times; hence there is no choice but to use the

¹² As already mentioned, Merrill (1985) includes terminologically repetitives and habituals in the category of iteration.

¹³ The equivalent Serbian/Croatian expression *on često rekne/kaže šta bilo ne razmislioviši prethodno* // *on često rekne/kaže bilo što ne razmislioviši prethodno* is perfectly acceptable.

imperfective. The repetition can be stated explicitly (with *obyčno* 'usually'), or must be understood from context and use of the imperfective. He claims that the semantics of the subevents is irrelevant to this choice:

- (9) a. *Obyčno* vmeste s nimi ja i A.F.Sobol' *besedovali_p* s každy_m sol-datom i mladšim komandiro_m, prežde čem opredelit' ego v raz-vedku (Birjukov)
'Together with them, A.F. Sobol' and I *would usually converse* with each soldier and noncom before assigning him to a recon-naissance party.'
- b. Posle raboty vse *sobiralis'*_i v dome, *eli*_i luk i boby, a potom žen-šćiny *sadilis'*_i plesti solomennye sandali dlja prodaži... (Voro-b'ev)
'After work everybody *would gather* in a home, eat onions and beans, and then the women *would sit* to weave straw sandals for sale...'

In the Croatian counterparts of these examples the perfective is also a possible choice:

- (10) a. *Obično* smo zajedno s njima A.F.Sobol' i ja *razgovarali_p/poraz-govarali_p* sa svakim vojnikom i dočasnikom...
- b. Poslije posla svi su se *sastajali_p/sastali_p* u kući, *jeli_p/pojeli_p* luk i grah, a onda su žene *sjedale_p/sjele_p* plesti slamnate sandale za pro-daju...

Furthermore, Merrill (1985:67–68) gives examples involving the perfective and says that the fact of repetition must be stated explicitly. It is also important that the use of the perfective is affected by the fact that the repetition is restricted, that is, expressed through *triždy* 'thrice' in the following examples:

- (11) a. Pravda, pojmannye na vsju žizn' *zapomnjat_p* uroki – *triždy dali_p* každy_m iz nix po sto palok – odnako èto *vrjad_p* li *naučit'_p* ostal'nyx. (Vorob'ev)
'True, the caught ones would remember the lesson all their lives – each of them *was given* 100 strokes *three times* – but this *would scarcely teach* the others.'
- b. Tebe ne stydno? Uže *triždy* vse studenty *rešili_p* zadaču bystree tebja.
'Aren't you ashamed? All the students have already solved the problem faster than you *three times*.'

Merrill claims that in the cited examples the structure of the subevents need not be considered in aspect choice. The examples also indicate that the traditional description of iterated non-complex events holds for iterated complex events as well.

Analyzing the examples that address universal quantification of the repetition of complex events¹⁴, that is, universal quantification at the propositional level (the examples with *každyj* 'every': *každyj raz*, *každyj večer* 'every time', 'every evening'), Merrill (1985:68) claims that only the imperfective can be used:

- (12) Na bol'šoj doroge na Xar'kov *každyj večer* kričali... (Makarenko)
'Every evening they would shout on the main road to Khar'kiv...'

The perfective in Croatian can also be used although, if the perfective verb is an inchoative verb, the meaning would be changed:

- (13) Na glavnoj cesti za Harkov *svaku su večer vikali*/*viknuli*/*zavikali*...

Even if the action is explicitly quantified by *dvaždy*, *dvaždy* allows either aspect to be used, depending, for example, on whether the two events are perceived as being a »single« event (perfective) or not (imperfective). Once *každyj* is used, only the imperfective is possible:

- (14) Vse èto proižišlo očen' bystro no četko zapomnilos' Ivanu Timofeeviču. Seryj volk *dvaždy napadal*/*napal*_p na staryx losej, i *každyj raz svalival*/**svalil*_p xilogo odnim udarom gromadnoj lapy.
'All this happened very quickly but Ivan Timofeevič remembered it very clearly. The gray wolf *twice fell* on the old elks, and *every time brought down* a sick one with one stroke of his enormous paw.' (Merrill 1985: 69)

Thus, universal quantification at the propositional level requires the imperfective.

In the equivalent Croatian example, the perfective is also possible. The likelihood of the imperfective *rušio* in the second sentence is higher if the imperfective *padao* is used in the first sentence:

- (15) Sve se je to dogodilo veoma brzo, ali Ivan Timofeevič jasno se toga sjećao. Sivi vuk *dvaput je padao*/*pao*_p na stare losove i *svaki je put rušio*/*srušio*_p bolesnoga jednim udarcem ogromne šape.

If the broader context is obviously iterative, the imperfective is required (the quantifier *každyj* is not a sentence-level operator):

- (16) Kogda pribyvala, novaja gruppa plennyx, u Antošina byl takoj režim; on (triždy) *peresprašival*, po neskol'ku raz každuju cifru,

¹⁴ The distinction between subevents and complex events is a significant one for an accurate description of aspect in that universally quantified subevents can occur with either aspect (Merrill 1985:68).

každuju familiju, i dlja kontrolja *povtorjal*_i. (Merill 1985:69–70)
'When a new group of prisoners would arrive, Antonšin's routine was thus: (thrice) he would *reask each* number and *each* surname several times, and as a check *would repeat* them.'

In that obviously iterative context, the imperfective and perfective coding are possible in Croatian:

- (17) Kada je *dolazila*_i/*došla*_p nova skupina vojnika, Antonšin je (*triput*) *preispitivao*_i/*preispitao*_p po nekoliko puta *svaki* broj, *svako* prezime, te ih *ponavljao*_i/*ponovio*_p radi kontrole.

If the part of the context that requires that the sentence occur with an imperfective is removed, the whole situation could be described with a perfective in Russian:

- (18) *Pribyla*_p novaja gruppа plenyx. Antonšin (triždy) *peresprosil*_p každuju cifru, *každuju* familiju po neskol'ku raz, i dlja kontrolja *povtoril*_p. (Merill 1985:70)
'A new group of captives *arrived*. Antonšin (thrice) *reasked each* number and *each* surname several times, and as a check *repeated* them.'

In this case, both aspects are possible in Croatian, although the likelihood of the perfective is higher because of the perfective coding in the first sentence (*došla*):

- (19) *Došla*_p je nova skupina zarobljenika. Antonšin je (tri puta) *preispitao*_p/*preispitivao*_i, *svaki* broj, *svako* prezime nekoliko puta, te ih *ponovio*_p/*ponavljao*_i radi kontrole.

Merrill's analysis shows that the aspect choice is generally independent of predicational level multiplicity, even if a complex event is iterated. The difference in the effect of propositional level and predicational level multiplicity is manifested most clearly when universal quantification of participants (predicational level) is contrasted with universal quantification of temporal occasions (propositional level). In the first case multiplicity can be treated as a "single event" and manipulated, that is, presented in either aspect, according to narrative needs. In the second the multiplicity cannot be treated as a unit and must be presented in the imperfective. In Croatian multiplicity can be presented in either aspect even in the case of universal quantification of temporal occasions at the propositional level. The frequency of the imperfective would be probably higher.¹⁵

¹⁵ I examined the relation of frequencies for the imperfective and perfective with the expression *svake godine* 'every year'. Of the 197 examples, 168 contain an imperfective and 29 a perfective verb.

Eckert (1985:169–179) addresses the use of aspect in Russian and Czech in repetitive temporal contexts. Her analysis shows that, whereas the use of the imperfective is nearly obligatory in Russian repetitive temporal contexts,¹⁶ Czech may use the perfective, depending primarily on the lexical properties of the verb. She suggests that Russian aspect is propositional, that is, the choice of aspect is determined by the sentential context of a verb form, whereas in Czech it is lexical – that is, the choice of aspect is determined by the type of verbal action. Concerning repetitive temporal contexts, the use of aspect in Croatian exhibits much more similarity with the use of aspect in Czech than in Russian. The lexical factors – verbal action types and verb classes – determine the choice of aspect, at least in part. Using the term verbal action, Eckert refers to seven types of actions that can be expressed by a verb in combination with its sentential context. These are: state, activity, process, iterative action, accomplishment, achievement and event. In Russian, the imperfective of some verbs may be ambiguous. The Russian sentence in (20) (Eckert 1985:173) can be translated into Czech as well as into Croatian in three different ways with three different meanings: the first renders both verbal actions as achievements, the second as a process and an achievement, and the third as two processes:

- (20) Ja iz plena tri raza bežal_i. I tri raza lovili_i.
a. *Tripūt sam pobjegao_p i tripūt su me uhvatili_p.*
Třikrát jsem utekl_p a třikrát me chytli_p.
'Three times I ran away and three times they caught up with me.'
b. *Tripūt sam bježao_p i tripūt su me uhvatili_p.*
Třikrát jsem utikal_i a třikrát me chytli_p.
'Three times I tried to run away and three times they caught up with me.'
c. *Tripūt sam bježao; i tripūt su me hvatali;*
Třikrát jsem utikal_i a trikrát me honili_i.
'I tried to run away three times and three times they came after me.'

Russian imperfectives render repetition regardless of the type of verb used, whereas Croatian and Czech perfectives are used in order to convey the repetition of achievements. Although Russian systematically uses the imperfective to signal repetition and only repetition, other meanings may be present. In order to render meanings besides repetition, Russian must use other means than just the aspectual forms. In example (21), the Russian imperfective *pisal* 'wrote' can be translated into Croatian by the imperfective *pisao*, in which case both verbal actions become simultaneous activities, or by

¹⁶ The term refers to contexts in which repetition is expressed overtly either by means of an iterative verb, or by an adverbial expression of repetition, or by both.

the perfective. In that case the meaning is that the writing was first brought to an end and only then the second action started. In Croatian the choice of aspect reflects whether or not the two actions formed a sequence:

- (21) Ja putalsja i često *roval*_i to, što *pisal*_i. (Eckert 1985:175)
Zbunjivao sam se i često *bih rastrgao*_p to što sam *pisao/napisao*_p.
'I was getting confused and often *tore into pieces* what I wrote.'

Although the context may be repetitive, Croatian still distinguishes processes from their achievements and activities from accomplishments by means of the two aspectual forms.

Once a Russian verb stands in a repetitive temporal context, the imperfective must be used. The internal properties of the subevents are opaque in repetitive contexts. Distinctions of verbal action types and verb classes are not expressed under repetition, and the imperfective of Russian is in this sense ambiguous. The aspect of a Croatian verb in a repetitive temporal context has two functions. It conveys not only repetition, but also iterative action versus event, process versus achievement or activity versus accomplishment (the imperfective refers to an iterative action, process, activity or state, whereas the perfective is used to reflect an event, achievement or accomplishment).

5. Further discussion: Adverbs of quantification and aspect in Croatian and Serbian

This section will concentrate on the analysis of aspect choice in repeated contexts in Croatian and include some observations that indicate possible differences in comparison with Serbian. Some valuable remarks in this direction can be found in Dickey (2000).

5.1. General remarks

In languages that generally allow both aspects in contexts of repetition as it is the case in Serbian and Croatian, various factors can influence this choice. This section will examine these factors taking into consideration some observations by Ivić (1983) and Dickey (2000) and the examples found in the corpus. Dickey establishes seven parameters of variation in aspectual usage, which are used as a basis for dividing the Slavic languages into a western and eastern group.¹⁷ Among these seven parameters are a habituality. In discussing aspect usage in habitual expressions, he states that Polish and Croatian are transitional zones, allowing the perfective to a greater

¹⁷ In the analysis of aspect usage, the traditional division of the Slavic languages into three groups does not appear to be so relevant.

extent than the eastern group (Russian, Ukrainian, Bulgarian) but less than the western group (Czech, Slovak, Slovenian).¹⁸ He distinguishes aspectual usage in the present and past tenses for the reason that it has been already observed that aspect use in habitual expressions varies according to tense in some Slavic languages. Discussing cases of aspectual usage in the present tense, Dickey states that Serbian/Croatian allows the perfective regularly in simple main clauses when totality is present at the microlevel of a single repetition and that the use of the perfective present in habitual contexts in Serbian/Croatian is nevertheless not as common as it is, for instance, in Czech.

Ivić (1983:41–42) suggests that in Serbian/Croatian the degree of frequency determines which aspect will be used: if a situation is repeated regularly, the imperfective is preferred; whereas, if the repetition is less regular and more episodic, the perfective becomes more acceptable. She contrasts examples (22a) with (22b), (22c) and (22d):

- (22) a. On nas *redovno obilazi*_i.
'He *regularly visits us.*'
- b. On nas *ponekad obiđe*_p.
'He *sometimes visits us.*'
- c. On nju *s vremena na vreme istučē*_p.
'He *beats her from time to time.*'
- d. On nju *svako večē tuče*_i.
'He *beats her every evening.*' (Ivić 1983:42)

Concerning these examples, Section 3 showed that the imperfective is not always preferred in contexts of highly regular repetition, that is, that the perfective has a higher frequency of appearance with some adverbs of quantification that indicate less regular, more episodic repetition. Furthermore, in Croatian the following versions of the examples in (22) are perfectly acceptable.

- (23) a. On nas *redovno obiđe*_p.
'He *regularly visits us.*'
- b. On nas *ponekad obilazi*_i.
'He *sometimes visits us.*'
- c. On nju *s vremena na vrijeme tuče*_i.
'He *beats her from time to time.*'
- d. On nju *svake večeri istučē*_p.
'He *beats her every evening.*'

¹⁸ Dickey (2000) argues that totality is the central semantic category of the western perfective, whereas temporal definiteness is the central semantic category of the eastern perfective.

Ivić (1983:42) states that in such cases the adverbial expression plays the main function of signaling the regularity or irregularity of an event. This is indeed the case and explains the acceptability of both aspects in the context with quantificational adverbs. As Dickey (2000: 83) observes, there is some sort of correspondence between regularity/irregularity and aspect usage, so that frequency could be a sort of aspectual primitive. But this is only one of several relevant factors: the emphasis on the totality of a single repetition conditions the perfective even in cases of regularity.

5.2. The influence of contextual factors on aspect choice in the present tense

Adverbials denoting high frequency do co-occur with the perfective in certain contexts. This is also affirmed by examples from the corpus:

- (24) a. *Uvijek se sjetim_p* »Evangelja po Mateju« i to ovoga njegova dijela...
'I *always* remember Matthew's Gospel, and actually this part of it...'
b. I tako; gospo, tete Lucija *dobije_p* uvijek ponešto za svoje ruke, i ja joj dam...
'And so, my lady, aunt Lucija *gets* always something for her work, I give her [something], too...'
c. ... kad je nađem kako leži, obuzme me tuga. Uvijek je *nađem_p* u istom položaju: spava, sanja...
'... when I find her lying down, I get sad. I *always* find her in the same position: she sleeps, dreams...' (TKHJ)

Not all the points of Dickey's (2000) analysis of aspect in Croatian and Serbian are applicable to Croatian, although they may hold for Serbian. One of them is connected with cases of correlated situations. According to Dickey, the perfective is the only natural choice in (25):

- (25) a. *Uvek se naljuti_p* kad mama počne da govori o tome.
'He *always* gets mad when mother begins to talk about that.'
(Dickey 2000:83)
b. Naša mačka *uvek skoči_p/*skače_i*, na kantu za đubre i *nađe_p/*nalazi_i* nešto za jelo.
'Our cat *always* jumps up on the trash bin and finds something to eat.' (Dickey 2000:84)

In (25a), a high frequency/regularity is expressed, but the first situation is correlated to another one. According to Dickey, the perfective is the only natural choice in (25b) where the described situations are correlated but independent events. However, in (25b) the imperfective would also be accep-

table, at least in Croatian. What seems to be important here for the possibility of choosing the imperfective in Croatian is the independence of the events which is grammatically signaled by the conjunction *i*: the imperfective would be quite unnatural in the correlated constructions where one situation is viewed as temporally or conditionally absolutely dependent on the other. In this last case the result would be a complex dependent temporal or conditional sentence:

- (26) a. *Uvijek* kada naša mačka skoči_p na kantu za smeće, *nađe*_p nešto za jelo.
'Whenever our cat jumps up on the trash bin, she finds something to eat.'
- b. *Ako* naša mačka skoči_p na kantu za smeće, *uvijek* *nađe*_p nešto za jelo.
'If our cat jumps up on the trash bin, she always finds something to eat.'

The next examples from the corpus show that the correlated situations expressed by the complex temporal sentence trigger the perfective:

- (27) a. *Oni uvijek* *priskoče*_p u pomoć kad nešto zatreba...
'They always come to help when something is needed...'
- b. *Kad* gledam ovog duhovnika, *uvijek* *se sjetim*_p P. Valeryja...
'When I look at this priest, I always remember P. Valery...'
- c. *Kad* pobjegnem plemenitoj gospođi Kameliji, *dosadnoj* *dadilji*, *uvijek* *dojašim*_p ovamo.
'When I run away from the noble Madam Kamelija, the boring nanny, I always ride to this place...' (TKHJ)

The overall meaning of the context also has an effect on aspect choice. There is an obvious parallelism between the use of the conjunctions and the implicit meaning of the context. The perfective is the preferred form in contexts in which the action of the subordinate clause is a necessary precondition for the action of the main clause. Modal connectedness favors a preference for the perfective. Some conjunctions (i.e., *čim* 'as soon as') presuppose temporal connectedness and imply modal connectedness, and thus overwhelmingly prefer the perfective. The action of the subordinate clause seems to be a necessary condition, or prerequisite, for the action of the main clause. *Ako* 'if' is an obviously modal connector and virtually demands the perfective.

The examples with the perfective in contexts with the temporal quantifiers *uvijek* and *često* from the corpus confirm Dickey's judgment that the perfective tends to occur in habitual expressions to denote relatively more definitely contextualized actions and that the degrees of the foregrounding or contingency upon other (contrasting) situations – for example, the inclusion

of enabling conditions – are very important in the choice of aspect in Serbian/Croatian, and not frequency or regularity *per se*:¹⁹

- (28) a. Kad govore o Cvetniću, kritičari često na kraju izraze_p svoj strah
– samo da ne prestane pisati...
'When they speak about Cvetnić, the critics often express their
fear at the end – only that he does not stop writing...'
b. Često prilikom našeg ocjenjivanja prevagne_p izgled...
'Often in our judgment the look prevails...' (TKHJ)

The aspect choice is dependent on the type of utterances. A simple main clause and a habitual pair construction do not have the same status. Thus the sense of repetition in *uvijek* 'always' or *često* 'often' is in each of them slightly different. In the case of simple main clauses, the regularity is independent, that is, not contingent on the occurrence of other situations. In the case of the two situations described in a complex sentence, one situation could be totally contingent on the occurrence of the another. *Uvijek* and *često* in this case assert the frequency of the implied relation between the two situations. Langacker (1997:205–207) labels such dependencies *enabling conditions* and emphasizes that they reflect the encyclopedic knowledge of event types. They include information about the expected temporal distribution of event instances, as well as the extent of their influence, that is, how reliably they allow someone to predict the occurrence of instances. They can be implicit or explicit, general or specific, salient or not salient, and so on (Langacker 1997:206). Considering the enabling conditions, it can be stated that the more explicit and specific they are in the sentence, the higher is the probability for the use of the perfective in the context of regular repetition. Generally, the possibility of the use of the perfective rises with the degree of contextualization, regardless of the high frequency/regularity. For example, the individuation of the object is also an instance of contextualization. Dickey (2000) mentions that the possibility of the use of the perfective rises with the degree of the individuation of the object. Actually, it raises with the individuation and specification of all components of a presented event. Compare the following example from the corpus with the perfective:

- (29) a. ... kao predsjednik Vrhovnoga suda, vrlo često sasluša_p savjet
"doktora" iz aneksa Predsjedničkih dvora... (TKHJ)
'... as the president of Supreme Court, he very often listens to
the advice of the "doctor" from the annex of the Presidential
House...'

¹⁹ Dickey states that in Czech no such contextualization with enabling conditions is needed to trigger the perfective. This confirms the status of Serbian/Croatian as a transitional zone in which temporal definiteness is more relevant for the perfective than in the west.

Without the specification of *doktor*, the possibility of the appearance of the imperfective would be higher, although the perfective would also be absolutely acceptable in that case:

- (29) b. ... vrlo često *sluša*/*sasluša*_p savjet doktora.
'... he *often listens* to the advice of the "doctor".'

Comparing the perfective in Serbian/Croatian and Czech in the contexts of habituality, Dickey states that Czech regularly allows the perfective without the specification of enabling conditions. In other words, the perfective in Serbian/Croatian has more episodic quality than the Czech perfective (Dickey 2000:84–85). A Czech example with the perfective and its Serbian counterpart in which the imperfective is more natural is given:

- (30) Čovekovo telo sadrži 70% vode; čak i ako ne radi fizički, čovek dnevno *izgubi/gubi* 2,5 litra tekućine. (Dickey 2000:85)
'The human body consists of 70% water; even without physical work, it loses 2.5 liters a day.'

However, the equivalent example in Croatian is equally acceptable with *izgubi*. Perhaps *izgubi* is even more acceptable than the imperfective *gubi*, although (30) is a generic sentence. But, as already mentioned, the possibility of the use of the imperfective is also connected with the high degree of dependency relation between the situations (indicated through *čak i ako*).

Concerning accomplishment predicates with some duration, Dickey's analysis shows that the perfective is preferred in simple main clauses only if there is some overt indicator of totality at the micro-level, such as *do kraja* 'to the end' in the next example:

- (31) *Svaki dan* Jovan *pročita*_p novine do kraja.
'Every day Jovan reads the newspaper to the end.' (Dickey 2000:69)

It can be said that the use of the perfective is almost obligatory in similar examples. The use of the imperfective would imply a context such as the following:

- (32) *Svaki dan* Jovan *čita*_i novine do kraja. A onda opet *pročita*_p najinteresantnije članke.
'Every day Jovan reads the newspaper to the end: And then he reads the most interesting articles again.'

The frequency relations of the imperfective and perfective (Section 3) does not show that a direct correlation exists between low frequency/regularity and the use of the perfective. It is also important that low frequency is connected with the presence of specific enabling conditions.

With regard to the example types in which the use of the imperfective is

most expected, one of Dickey's examples is indicative:

- (33) Sama suština glagolskog vida u jezicima u kojima je on istinski deo gramatičkog sistema **izade_p/izlazi_i*, na videlo kroz ispitivanje vidske konkurencije. (Dickey 2000:69–70)
'The true essence of verbal aspect in languages where aspect is a real part of the grammatical system *emerges* very clearly through an examination of aspectual concurrence.'

There is no overt adverbial quantification in such sentences, but they are statements about some "general scientific truths", which as such prefer the imperfective form as an "unmarked" one. Although (33) does not contain a temporal quantifier, it is conceptually very similar to a lot of examples that are found in the corpus, for example:

- (34) a. Tumor u svom širenju vrlo rijetko preskače, razinu limfnih čvorova.
'A tumor *extends* the level of the lymphatic knots very rarely when it spreads.'
b. Takva čista forma bajke rijetko se ostvaruje, ali je uvijek nevidljivo prisutna.
'That pure form of a fairy tale is *rarely realized*, but it is always invisibly present.' (TKHJ)

The text type from which they come from is very important here. Many of similar examples are from various textbooks or scientific texts. This sentence type is very similar to generic statements without a definite context, for which, as Dickey (2000:84) observes, the imperfective is the only possibility.

According to Dickey, sentences with lower frequency show the same clear preference for the imperfective in Serbian/Croatian, as long as there is no episodic context.²⁰ A Serbian example is given for illustration:

- (35) Košava često ??*dostigne_p/dostiže_i* brzinu od 15 metara u sekundi.
'The Košava-wind *often reaches* a speed of 15 meters per second.'
(Dickey 2000:85)

In Croatian the perfective *dostigne* is also absolutely acceptable. Many parts of Dickey's analysis have shown that the node of temporal definiteness is more salient in Serbian than in Croatian. Concerning the acceptability of the perfective in contexts of repetition, many examples from Serbian that Dickey's informants have judged as less acceptable or unacceptable with perfectives are acceptable in Croatian. For example:

²⁰ In episodic contexts, Serbian/Croatian habitual expressions employ the perfective (and therefore temporal definiteness) much more than Czech or Sorbian (Dickey 2000:85).

- (36) Posle večere *uvek* ?*pročitam_p/čitam_i*, novine.
'After dinner I *always* read the paper.' (Dickey 2000:69)

Dickeys informants clearly preferred the imperfective in the last example. However, the imperfective and perfective form seem to be perfectly common in Croatian:

- (37) Poslije večere *uvijek* *pročitam_p/čitam_i*, novine.

In similar contexts, Croatian distinguishes processes from their achievements and activities from accomplishments by means of the two aspectual forms.

5.3. Past tense

Concerning habituais in the past tense, Dickey (2000:74) states that the extreme western languages (Czech, Slovak, Slovenian) regularly accept the perfective in habitual contexts in the past. In the eastern languages, the perfective is strictly prohibited in single main clauses.²¹ Even in contexts of repeated sequences of situations (habitual-correlative constructions, etc.) the perfective past only rarely occurs: Unlike the present tense, in which repeated sequentiality is usually a sufficient condition for the acceptability of perfective forms, in the past it is not. That is shown by the following Russian example:

- (38) *Každyj raz* **primčalsja_p*, **našumel_p*, **nagovoril_p*, i opjat' **isčez_p*.
'Each time he *rushed up*, *made a lot of noise*, *talked a lot* and *disappeared* again.' (Dickey 2000:74).

In (38) it is also important that the quantifier *každyj* 'every' be used. Merrill's analysis (1985:68) has shown that in examples that address universal quantification of the repetition of complex events — that is, at the propositional level (the examples with *každyj*, such as *každyj raz*, *každyj večer* 'every time, every evening') — only the imperfective can be used.

For Serbian/Croatian, Dickey (2000:72–73) states that the imperfective is always preferable, whereas no distinction is made between simple main clauses and habitual-correlative constructions:

- (39) Za večeru sam obično **kupio_p/kupovao_i*, salamu.
'For dinner I usually bought salami.' (Dickey 2000:73)

However, the perfective is also perfectly acceptable in standard Croatian, not only in some dialects, as Ivić (1983:50) claims considering the example (40):

²¹ The exception where the perfective occurs in the past tense form is the Bulgarian imperfect. It occurs in dependent clauses of time or condition, that is, in habitual-pair constructions. The use of the perfective is sanctioned by the sequentiality of the context. It never occurs in single main clauses (Dickey 2000:76).

- (40) *Svaki je čas po jedan istupio_p iz dvoreda, stao_p u grabu, pa onda potrčao_p da stigne na svoje mjesto.*
'Every moment one of them stepped out of the line, stopped in the ditch and then ran back to his place.'

Ivić qualifies examples with the perfective in habitual contexts as individual examples of authors under the direct influence of Kajkavian dialect (where, as in Slovenian, the choice of the perfective perfect in such contexts is indeed possible). However, it cannot be said that such examples do not illustrate the standard situation. They indeed do – at least in modern standard Croatian. So the thesis of Běličkova-Křižková (1981:126) that the perfective past is common not only in West Slavic languages (excluding Polish) but also “in Serbocroatian” indeed holds for Croatian. This use is typical not only for the Kajkavian dialect, although it may be possible that the diachronic influence of Kajkavian caused it. It is also important that in (38) a succession of actions is presented; for this reason, too, it would be quite unusual to have the imperfective in such contexts. Ivić claims (1983:51) that the perfective past is systematically excluded from contexts such as (40) “especially in the eastern variant of the literary language”. It would be interesting to examine the contemporary situation using a larger corpus of modern Serbian. Dickey (2000) notes that in colloquial Serbian the perfective is occasionally acceptable, although seldom preferred. The first example that he cites is a very specific one: It contains an idiomatic expression that would be quite unusual with the imperfective (??*praskati u smeh* ‘burst into laughter’):

- (41) *U takvim trenucima smo uvek prasnuli_p u smeh.*
'At such moments we always burst into laughter.' (Dickey 2000: 73)

The use of the perfective in this particular case is connected more with the specificity of the particular expression than with the fact that the adverbial phrase *u takvim trenucima* ‘at such moments’ implies a correlation with the prior situation and that the verb is an achievement. In a similar sentence without an idiomatic expression, these factors would indeed be relevant in the aspectual choice. Concerning example (40), Dickey (2000:74) states that the verbs *upecati* ‘catch’ and *pecati* ‘fish’ have two different meanings, so that it too cannot be seen as a representative example of the use of the perfective past in Serbian:

- (42) *Svaki dan je upecao_p/??pecao_i po nekoliko riba.*
'Every day he caught a few fish.' (Dickey 2000:73)

Croatian allows the perfective and imperfective regularly in the conditio-

nal mood²² to express habituality in the past. Among the examples with the temporal quantifier *ponekad*, 42 examples with the conditional mood as an expression of habituality in the past were found. In the case of *ponekad*, the perfective occurs in a higher frequency (76,20% of the examples) than the imperfective (23,80% of the examples). Ivić (1983:44) considers the conditional mood in that function as an “evocative, stylistically and emotionally marked” possibility to express the repetition of actions in the past, which is contrasted to the “factual” possibility. The second possibility does not prejudice the non-existence of such a repetition in the present, whereas the possibility with the conditional mood prejudices the non-existence of the expressed action in the present tense. So (43a) and (43b) illustrate the “evocative” expressed action,²³ in contrast to their “factual” counterparts in (44a) and (44b):

- (43) a. Išao je lagano i mekano, s kamena na kamen, i samo *bi se ponekad okrenuo*_p da vidi je li sa mnom sve u redu...
'He went slowly and softly, from one stone to another, and only *sometimes would* he turn around to see if everything was all right with me...'
b. *Ponekad bismo* navečer u krevetu *pili* kuhano vino.
'*Sometimes* in the evening we *would drink* mulled wine in bed.'
(THKJ)
- (44) a. Išao je lagano i mekano, i samo *se je ponekad okrenuo*_p da vidi je li sa mnom sve u redu...
b. *Ponekad smo* navečer u krevetu *pili* kuhano vino.

According to Ivić (1983:44), it is not possible to continue the sentences in the conditional mood with the phrase “after all, that happens nowadays too”. However, it is not absolutely excluded that the conditional mood

²² Upper Sorbian is the only Slavic language aside from Croatian and Serbian that uses the conditional to denote habituality in the past (Běličkova-Křižková 1981: 132–33). A plausible possibility of explanation for this use of the conditional mood (also present in English) is offered by Dickey (2000:77–78): The function of counterfactuals in past-tense habituals is to refer specifically to a “non-actual” structural plane of the world at a past time as distinct from events that actually took place. It is unclear how “actual” past tense habituals are – whether they refer to actual events, or whether they refer to unlocated events in a structural plane of knowledge for a past world.

²³ Polish constructions with *bywalo* express such an “evocative” meaning, and it is impossible to continue those constructions with »and X does it even nowadays«. In Russian the evocative expression of an action can be realized with the combination of *byvalo* with the present (*čaj byvalo popivaem*) or with the specific iterative version of the past tense. In the second case the non-actuality is not implied, but accented, so that the sentence *Ja u nih sižival celymi časami* should be understood as ‘I had a habit of doing it – it was once, but IT IS NOT ANY MORE’ (Ivić 1983:44).

constructions could be followed with such a phrase. Even if continued with ‘after all, that happens nowadays too’, (43b) is still acceptable. The claim about the expressivity of the Serbian/Croatian conditional in the habitual constructions in the past is not convincing either. The conditional mood constructions as well as the past tense constructions are equally neutral, or equally expressive. The use of the conditional in the past tense habituals is more likely connected with the creation of habitual space (Cutrer 1994) or with the reference to the structural plane of our knowledge of the world (Langacker 1997) as opposed to the actual plane.

One additional possibility for referring to the “non-actual” structural plane of the world at a past time was seldom mentioned. This possibility, expressed by the verb *znati* ‘to know’ in the past tense plus a main verb, is semantically very close to the possibility expressed by the conditional mood:

- (45) a. ... oslobodila [sam se] te velike ljubavi koju smo znali ponekad pretvarati_i, u tragediju maltene nivoa Romea i Julije...
‘I got rid of that big love, which we would sometimes turn into a tragedy on the level of Romeo and Juliet...’
- b. Ponekad je ipak znala ostaviti_p mlijeka u posudi ispred kuće...
‘Sometimes she would leave some milk in a can in front of the house...’
- c. ... sastali bi se u kući Sorgovih, a ponekad su znali poći_p, i na selo, na posjed u Konavle...
‘... they would meet in Sorg’s house, and sometimes they would go to the village, to the property in Konavle...’
- d. Ponekad ranije znao je, kad bi došao u Zagreb, navraćati_i, k nama...
‘Earlier, sometimes he would come to visit us, when he was in Zagreb...’ (TKH)

The appearance of this construction implies a certain regularity and it would be unusual to use it with an adverbial of low frequency, for example, *rijetko* ‘seldom’:

- (46) ?*Vrlo rijetko je znala ostaviti_p mlijeka u posudi ispred kuće.*
‘She would rarely leave some milk in a can in front of the house.’

However, this possibility differs from the one with the conditional mood. It can appear in the present tense as well. In contexts with adverbs of quantification, it refers to regularly repeated events or to actions that are a habit of a subject. Compare the paraphrases of (45b) and (45c) in (47):

- (47) a. *Ponekad zna ostaviti_p mlijeka ispred kuće.*
‘Sometimes she leaves some milk in a can in front of the house.’
- b. *Sastaju se u kući Sorgovih, a ponekad znaju poći_p, i na selo, na posjed u Konavle.*

'They meet in Sorg's house, and *sometimes* they go to the village, to the property in Konavle.'

6. Conclusion

The notion of quantification of events is inherent in the perfective-imperfective opposition, when considering one component of their conceptual difference as contrast between a single instance of an event and multiple instances of an event. As has been already observed, there exists a sort of correspondence between regularity/irregularity and aspect usage, so that frequency could be a sort of aspectual primitive. Section 2 discussed some general questions concerning temporal quantification, that is, quantification of events. To examine the interaction of temporal quantifiers (adverbs of quantification) with aspect choice in Croatian, two groups of adverbials that refer to repeated actions were considered: one group with the frequency adverbs *rijetko*, *ponekad*, *često* and *uvijek*, which denote relative quantity, and one group with the repetitive adverbs *dva puta / dvaput*, *tri puta / triput*, *nekoliko puta*, *više puta* and *puno / mnogo puta / nebrojeno puta*, which denote absolute quantity. A numerical analysis of the aspect choice in the examples containing those expressions, which were extracted from a large corpus of Croatian, was presented in Section 3. The analysis of the examples shows that the frequency of the use of imperfective does not increase automatically with a higher degree of repetition. No regular gradation of the usage of the imperfective verbs follows the gradation of the degree of repetition. In Section 4, some observations on quantification of events and aspect in Russian and comparison to Croatian are given. In Section 5 the analysis of the aspect choice in repeated contexts in Croatian and in Serbian is given. The basis of the analysis are examples from the corpus and consideration of some conclusions by Ivić (1985) and Dickey (2000). Particular attention is paid to the contextual factors that may influence the use of the perfective in contexts of repetition. Some remarks by Dickey (2000) that Croatian and Serbian may differ with regard to the preference of the perfective in contexts of repetition – that is, in relation to the prototypical meaning of the perfective – are confirmed: in standard Croatian, the perfective is acceptable in many contexts in which the imperfective is highly preferred or the only possibility in standard Serbian.

References

- Běličkova-Křížková, Helena. 1981. Ke vztahu kategorie vidu a času v spisovných slovanských jazycích. *Slavia* 50:2, 121–134.
- Bondarko, A. V. 1971. *Vid i vremja ruskogo glagola*. Moscow : Prosvešćenie.
- Carlson, Lauri. 1981. Aspect and quantification. In: Philip J. Tedeschi and Annie Zaenen, eds. *Syntax and Semantics*. Volume 14. *Tense and aspect*. New York : Academic Press, 31–63.
- Chung, Sandra, and Alan Timberlake. 1985. Tense, aspect and mood. In: T. Shopen, ed. *Language Typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, v. 2, 205–258.
- Dahl, Østen. 1975. On generics. In: E. L. Keenan, ed. *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickey, Stephen M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic aspect. A cognitive approach*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Forsyth, J. 1970. *A grammar of aspect: Usage and meaning in the Russian verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert, Eva. 1985. Aspect in repetitive contexts in Russian and Czech. In: Michael S. Flier and Alan Timberlake, eds. *The scope of Slavic aspect*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 169–179.
- Fielder, Grace E. 1985. Aspect and modality in Bulgarian subordinate clauses. In: Michael S. Flier and Alan Timberlake, eds. *The scope of Slavic aspect*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 181–193.
- Hoepelman, J. and C. Rohrer. 1980. On the Mass-Count Distinction and the French Imparfait and Passe Simple. In: C. Rohrer, ed. *Time, Tense, and Quantifiers*. Tübingen : Niemeyer, 85–112.
- Ivić, Milka. 1983. Načini na koje slovenski glagol ovremenjuje ponavljaju radnju. In: Milka Ivić. *Lingvistički ogledi*. Beograd : Prosveta, 37–56.
- Koseska-Toševa, Violeta. 1997. Kvantifikacija i vid. In: Stanislav Karoljak, ed. *Semantika i struktura slavjanskoga vida*. Kraków : WSP, v. 2, 141–146.
- Kresin, Susan C. 2000 Aspect, singularization, and pluralization in Czech and Russian. *Slavic and East European Journal* 44:3, 393–412.
- Langacker, Roland W. 1997. Generics and habituals. In: Angeliki Athanasiadou and Rene Dirven, eds. *On conditionals again*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 191–222.
- Merrill, Peter. 1985. Universal quantification and aspect in Russian. In: Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht, eds. *Issues in Russian Morphosyntax*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 58–72.
- Rassudova, O. P. 1968. *Upotreblenie vidov glagola v ruskom jazyke*. Moskva : Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- Stump, G. 1981. The Interpretation of Frequency Adjectives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4, 221–257.
- Šarić, Ljiljana. 1999. *Kvantifikacija u hrvatskom jeziku*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Zagreb.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1982. Invariance and the syntax of Russian aspect. In: P. Hopper (ed.), *Tense and aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 305–331.

Vidska uporaba u kontekstima ponavljanih radnji u hrvatskome, srpskome i ruskome

Sažetak

Predmet je ovoga rada izbor glagolskoga vida u kontekstima s vremenskim kvantifikatorima u hrvatskome, srpskome i ruskome. Kvantifikacija događaja inherentna je u odnosu svršenih i nesvršenih glagola ako se opreka između jedne pojavnice događaja i višestrukih pojavnica događaja uzme kao jedan od čimbenika njihove semantičke različitosti. Nakon uvodnih napomena, u drugome dijelu rada razmatraju se neka opća pitanja vremenske kvantifikacije, odnosno kvantifikacije događaja. Da bi se ispitala međuuvjetovanost vremenskih kvantifikatora i izbora vida u hrvatskome, promatraju se dvije skupine priložnih izraza koje upućuju na ponavljane radnje: prva skupina (*rijetko, ponekad, često, uvijek*) upućuje na relativnu kvantitetu, a druga (*dva puta / dvaput, tri puta / triput, nekoliko puta, više puta, puno/mnogo puta / nebrojeno puta*) na apsolutnu kvantitetu. U trećem dijelu iznosi se brojčana analiza primjera s tim izrazima (primjeri su izdvojeni iz Tridesetmilijunskoga korpusa hrvatskoga jezika). Analiza pokazuje da viši postotak pojave nesvršenoga vida nije automatski povezan s priložnim izrazima koji upućuju na redovitije ponavljanje radnje, odnosno da porast redovitosti ponavljanja nužno ne prati porast uporabe nesvršenoga vida (primjerice, postotak nesvršenih glagola u prezentu u kontekstima s *uvijek* niži je od postotka za *rijetko* i *često*). U četvrtome dijelu uspoređuje se kvantifikacija događaja i vid u ruskome i hrvatskome, a u petome se analizira vidska uporaba u kontekstima ponavljanih radnji u hrvatskome i srpskome. Analizu su potaknuli primjeri iz korpusa te neki zaključci M. Ivić (1985) i S.M. Dickeya (2000) o toj problematici. Posebna se pozornost posvećuje kontekstnim čimbenicima koji utječu na uporabu svršenoga vida u kontekstima ponavljanih radnji. Neke naznake iz Dickeyove analize da bi se hrvatski i srpski mogli razlikovati u odnosu na prihvatljivost svršenoga vida u kontekstima ponavljanih radnji, tj. u odnosu na prototipno značenje svršenoga vida, potvrđuju se: u standardnome hrvatskome svršeni je vid prihvatljiv u mnogim kontekstima s ponavljanim radnjama u kojima je nesvršeni vid puno prihvatljivija ili jedina mogućnost u standardnome srpskome.

Ključne riječi: kvantifikacija vremena, vid u hrvatskome, srpskome i ruskome, priložni izrazi u kontekstima ponavljanih radnji

Key words: temporal quantification, aspect in Croatian, Serbian and Russian, repetitive adverbs, frequency adverbs