DOI: 10.11649/sm.2905

Slavia Meridionalis 23, 2023
Article No.: 2905

Citation:
Ivanović, M. (2023). Synthetic and analytical means of expressing aktionsart in the Ukrainian and Serbian languages. *Slavia Meridionalis*, *23*, Article 2905. https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.2905

Milena Ivanović
University of Belgrade
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6498-2790

Synthetic and Analytical Means of Expressing Aktionsart in the Ukrainian and Serbian Languages

Introduction

One of the parameters according to which verb action can be characterized is the "way an action flows over time". The specificity of Slavic languages that the verb lexeme itself, independent of its specific use, contains important information about the time flow of the action indicated by that lexeme (Петрухина, 1998; Сигалов, 1978) caused the occurrence of a separate grammatical category of aspect in Slavic languages, and later also the semantic or semantic-formation category of aktionsart. As a set of aspectual meanings different from those expressed by the category of aspect, aktionsart was first noted by the Swedish Slavicist S. Agrel in 1908 (Агрелль, 1962, p. 36).

After two papers key to the further development of learning about aktionsart appeared – the doctoral dissertation of J. S. Maslov (Маслов, 1957),

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Serbia.
Competing interests: no competing interests have been declared.
Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2023.

and the grammar of the Russian language (in comparison with Slovak) by A. V. Isačenko (Исаченко, 1960), the second half of the 20th century will be marked by numerous studies the subject of which will be the classification of aktionsart verb classes, their semantic and formal characteristics in Slavic languages (primarily Russian). However, only the functional approach to the category of aspectuality, which also includes aktionsart, will draw attention to the analytical means of expressing aktionsart's meaning as well. Thus, speaking about aspectuality, A. V. Bondarko (Бондарко, 1987, p. 40) points out that it refers to the sphere of the verb predicate, as well as the statement as a whole, more precisely, the predicative center that is made up of the predicate and the elements that determine it, and V. S. Hrakovski (Храковский, 1980, p. 8) will explicitly note that, in addition to synthetic ones, there is also "analytical aktionsart", and point out that in Slavic languages (as well as in languages of other families), there are many aktionsart meanings that are expressed analytically, and that have not been researched just because they are not expressed synthetically as well. V. S. Hrakovski (Храковский, 1980, 1987) illustrates this approach with phasal examples.

Aktionsart was the subject of several monographs or parts of monographs in Serbian and Ukrainian linguistics (Novakov, 2005; Вихованець & Городенська, 2004; Вихованець et al., 2017; Грубор, 1953; Поповић, 2008; Русановский et al., 1986; Соколова, 2003, 2021; Тошович, 2009), and certain aktionsart classes in the Ukrainian language were the subject of several dissertations and a number of scientific articles. However, none of these studies consider the analytical means of expressing aktionsart. The first such research is presented in our monograph "Aktionsart: semantics and form in Ukrainian and Serbian language" (Ивановић, 2016), which we will supplement and further specify herein, and consider the research from the perspective of the relationship between analytical and synthetic means in the analyzed languages and the possible typological implications.

By observing aktionsart as a semantic category, the basis of which is marking the way an action takes place in time, by applying a functional approach, and directing the analysis from content to form, we start, therefore, from the thesis that aktionsart meanings are, as additional features that indicate specific parameters of how the action flows over time, as a rule formally expressed not only synthetically, at the level of the verb lexeme, but also analytically, at the syntactic level – in a combination of the verb lexeme with other words (verbs, particles, adverbs, noun words) that function as a kind of aktionsart operator.

Aktionsart meanings are expressed primarily at the lexical-formation level, when the bearer of aktionsart meaning in the verb lexeme is a formative affix: *запевати*, *напевати се*, *певушити*, *попéвати*, *пропевати* / *виспівувати*, *відспівати*, *доспівати*, *заспівати*, *наспіватися*, *наспівувати*, *переспівати*, *підспівувати*, *поспівати*, *поспівувати*, etc. Verb lexemes joined by a specific aktionsart meaning, or a combination of aktionsart meanings, which have specific formative affixes as indicators of that meaning, make an aktionsart verb class (Rus. способы глагольного действия, Pol. rodzaje czynności (akcji)). Aktionsart classes (AC) of verbs are the basic bearers of aktionsart meanings in Slavic languages, which is why they are often what the category of aktionsart comes down to in research.

Aktionsart meanings can also be expressed through the connection between the verb and the words that are the lexical bearers of those meanings. In that case, we are talking about the lexical-syntactic level of expressing aktionsart, and we distinguish two types of means: those where aktionsart meanings are expressed as part of a (compound) predicate – analytical aktionsart constructions, comprised of a verb (rarely a particle) as the bearer of a specific aktionsart meaning, and a verb or a noun word as the bearer of lexical meaning: *почети певати*, *наставити певати*, *престати певати* / *почати співати*, *продовжити співати*, *перестати співати*, etc. The second type of means is predominantly lexical (various clauses that carry a specific meaning); they are less grammaticalized because the aktionsart meanings are expressed outside the predicate, that is, at the sentence level. This means of expression is typical, for example, for the aktionsart meaning of iterativeness, where the clause is combined with other indicators (such as the semantics of the verb, aspect-tense forms, etc.), but it is still precisely what indicates the iterative interpretation of the statement, cf. *Он је писао мајци* and *Он је често* / *редовно* / *ретко* / *сваког дана писао мајци* or *Он би написао мајци писмо (али нема папира)* and *Он би понекад написао мајци писмо*.

Although analytical means are generally not included in the description of aktionsart, even though the peculiarity of Slavic languages is that the verb lexeme itself can and does contain important aspectual and, even more narrowed down, aktionsart information, reducing the means of expressing aktionsart to formative, i.e. to the AC of verbs, represents a one-sided approach, and cannot be an adequate basis for a contrastive analysis of aktionsart, and including other means, primarily aktionsart constructions, in the description and analysis can yield results that would be of broader typological significance.

The material for our research was works of Ukrainian and Serbian 20th century literature[1] (about 3000 pages for each language). In this study, we used the results and materials collected as part of a doctoral dissertation, i.e., a monograph (Ивановић, 2016). The goal of this research is to observe the mutual relationship between these means, and the similarities and differences in the ways they function in the studied languages, based on an overview and brief description of synthetic and analytical means of expressing aktionsart in the Serbian and Ukrainian languages (which, again, are analyzed in detail in the monograph mentioned above).

We have divided the semantic zone of aktionsart into four typical complexes of meaning: phasal meaning complex, determinative meaning complex, plural meaning complex, and gradual meaning complex. Each of these complexes has its own semantic and formal features, occupying a specific place within aktionsart itself, but also within the framework of broader semantic categories. Phasal and determinative represent a type of qualitative aktionsart, while plural and gradual have a quantitative nature.

Phasal meaning complex

The phasal meaning complex includes the meanings of initiality, intraterminality, and completion with its sub-meanings, which are united in the phasal semantic category. Initial meaning in both the Ukrainian and the Serbian languages is expressed systematically at the formative level: the AC of initial verbs. In both languages, several word-formation models are present in our corpus with a representative number of examples. In the analyzed languages, these models match to a large extent; they involve equivalent prefixes *за-* (*заневати* / *заспівати*), *по-* (*почи* / *піти*) and *раз-*/ *роз-* (*расплакати се* / *розплакатися*), while the models with the prefix про- (проговорити) and the prefix *уз-* (*узбуркати се*) are characteristic only for the Serbian language.

In the Ukrainian and Serbian languages, initial meaning can also be expressed analytically within constructions with a wide range of verbs – as many

[1] Sources of examples are online libraries of Ukrainian (*Укрліб – Бібліотека української літератури*, n.d.) and Serbian literature (*Антологија српске књижевности*, n.d.; Вишњић, 1999), hence we only list the author's first name initial and last name in the examples.

as 23 in each language. The core of these constructions are verbs the primary meaning of which is initial, which are also the most frequent in our corpus: *почети* (and prefixal derivatives *започети*, *отпочети*) in Serbian, that is *почати(ся)* (with a prefix: *розпочати(ся)*) in Ukrainian, as well as the verb *стати* / *стати* in both languages. In both languages, we also distinguish numerous verbs where the initial meaning is secondary: *(по)кренути*, *ступити*, *поћи*, *приступити*, *бацити се*, *прећи*, *дати се*, *нàдати (се)*, *латити се*, *узети*, *ударити*, *заподенути*, *заметнути*, *прионути*, etc. in Serbian, that is *вступити*, *приступити*, *завести*, *повести*, *кинутися*, *метнутися*, *пуститися*, *заходитися*, *піти*, *перейти*, *взяти(ся)*, *заповзятися*, *ухопитися*, *вдаритися*, etc. in Ukrainian. Constructions with these verbs are less frequent in our corpus, some of the mentioned verbs in addition to the initial meaning also introduce the seme of increased intensity (e.g., *бацити се*, *дати се*, *ударити* / *заходитися*, *кинутися*, *пуститися*), while others have a limited, almost phraseological connectivity (e.g., the Serbian verbs *заподенути*, *заметнути*). In aktionsart constructions, the initial verbs are combined with a verb complement in the form of the infinitive of an IMPERF verb (in Serbian also in the form of the construction да + present): *почети певати*, *кренути помагати* / *почати співати*, *заходитися допомагати*, *пуститися тікати*, etc., and with a noun suffix, most often in the form of an accusative case without a preposition, but also in other cases: *почети песму*, *кренути у напад*, *приступити послу*, *латити се посла*, *бацити се на читање*, *прећи на шапат* / *почати пісню*, *приступити до праці*, *взятися до боротьби*, *перейти на шепіт*, etc. The verb *стати* in the Ukrainian language is also combined with so-called analytical verbs: *стало шкода*. In the Ukrainian language, we also distinguish constructions with the particles *(і/та) давай*, *(і/та) ну* and the IMPERF verb in the infinitive, which have an additional intensity seme as well: *Позіскакували вони із сідел, скрутили білі руки і давай нагаями шмагати* (Г. Тютюник). Synthetic and analytical means are almost equally represented in both languages (see Table 2 below).

Intraterminal meaning, which includes the middle phase – the unfolding of a situation that has begun but is not yet finished, is expressed primarily by unmarked (just as the middle phase itself is not marked) forms of the imperfective aspect in the current-durative use: *Аслан розповідає, а слідчий пише, аж-но піт йому виступає, сопе, прикусує язика й пише* (І. Багряний); *Грејало нас је пролећно сунце, около је све цветало и мирисало* (В. Стевановић). There are no aktionsart verb classes to express this phase in either of

the analyzed languages, and aktionsart constructions are used only in those cases where the development of a situation is indicated in relation to another situation, or despite external interferences. We distinguish two types of constructions: 1. with verbs that express the meaning of the end of the situation with a negation (negation of the end of the situation indicates that the given situation is still ongoing), where practically all verbs that express the final phase of a situation can function (see below), and 2. with verbs that have an intraterminal meaning as well (constructions with these verbs can also express resuming an interrupted action): *продовжувати(ся)* / *продовжити(ся)*, *тривати*, *(за)лишатися* / *(за)лишитися* in Ukrainian, and *настављати (се)* / *наставити (се)*, *трајати*, *остајати* / *остати* in Serbian. In these constructions, the same as in initial constructions, we can have (depending on the verb carrying the phase meaning) the IMPERF verb in the infinitive form (да + present, also the present participle in Serbian): *не престајати певати*, *настављати радити*, *остати седети (седећи)* / *не переставати боліти*, *продовжити мовчати*, *лишатися стояти* or a noun, most often in the accusative form: *не завршити песму*, *настављати разговор (са разговором)* / *не закінчити роботу*, *продовжувати розмову*, etc. Constructions with particles – *знай* and an IMPERF verb, which highlight the meaning of continuity with an additional intensity seme in Ukrainian and in Serbian with the particle *ли* and a repeated IMPERF verb in the present form, have a special place: *А ковалі знай кували, та не всі водне* (Ю. Мушкетик); *Кад, гле, чуда: што више змија јури, све већи бива размак… Лети ли, лети Варалица: слатки му ветар у уху хуји* (Г. Олујић). The proportion of these expressive constructions is relatively small in our corpus, so we can consider them peripheral in the expression of intraterminality; on the other hand, intraterminal constructions with verbs are present with a representative number of examples (see Table 2).

When it comes to the aktionsart meaning of ending a situation, the aspectual category of terminativeness/non-terminativeness plays an important role. Terminative situations (aimed at reaching a specific internal limit as a result) end "by themselves" when they reach that limit, that is, achieve a result. The aktionsart meaning of the end of a situation here merges with the terminative-aspectual meaning of resultativeness as its implication, and resultative perfective verbs can be considered the means of its expression.

When expressing the end of a terminative situation, attention can be focused on the entire final stage while emphasizing its definitive completion.

The meaning of completeness is expressed both through word-formation (prefix *до-* in both languages), i.e., by means of AC of complete verbs: *дочитати*, *дописати*, as well as by analytical – aktionsart constructions with verbs like *докінчити* / *довршити* and a noun in the accusative case without a preposition, and also by phraseological constructions like *довести – доводити щось до кінця*, *дійти – доходити до кінця* / *довести – доводити нешто до краја*, *доћи – долазити до краја*, *привести – приводити нешто крају*. Completeness is expressed analytically much more often in Serbian than in Ukrainian.[2] In the Ukrainian language, it is more typical to convey the meaning of completeness by employing word formation, while in the Serbian language, it is limited to a smaller number of verbs (see Table 2).

Situations that do not have an internal limit end either with an interruption or at a moment when, for some reason of an internal nature, it becomes impossible for them to continue. The meaning of finiteness as the ending of an aterminative situation is expressed only synthetically, through word formation, i.e., by means of the finite AC: verbs with the prefixes *од-*, *пре-* in the Serbian language: *одзвонити*, *преболети* and víd *від-*, *пере-*, and the confix *від-…-ся* in Ukrainian: *віддзвеніти*, *переболіти*. The finite AC of the verb is used twice as often in the Ukrainian language; on the other hand, in the Serbian language, many finitives recorded in dictionaries are not confirmed in the corpus (see Table 2). Aktionsart constructions do not function as a means of expressing this specific final meaning in either the Ukrainian or the Serbian language.

While aktionsart verb classes are used to express specific subtypes of the final meaning, in both languages, the most direct meaning of finality is expressed by aktionsart constructions in which the bearers of meaning are 26 verbs in the Ukrainian language and 14 in Serbian.[3] Aktionart constructions are represented in a vast number of examples (over 1000 for both languages), and the most frequent verbs in them are *закінчити* and *перестати* in Ukrainian, which are *престати* and *завршити* in Serbian. The majority of final verbs in the Serbian language function only with noun complements, mostly in the form of the accusative case without a preposition, except for the verb *престати*, which is most often used with a verb complement; in the Ukrainian language,

[2] Additionally, in most of the Ukrainian examples with analytical constructions we have speaking situations, while in the Serbian examples there are very diverse situations.

[3] The difference in the number of verbs is the result of, primarily, the large number of derivatives from the same root in the Ukrainian language that mutually differ only in prefix (*кінчити*, *закінчити*, *покінчити*, *скінчити*; *лишити*, *залишити*, *облишити*, *полишити*).

the verb complement is used more widely, parallel with the noun complement, and with the verb *перестати*, as in Serbian, only the verb complement is used: *престати смејати се*, *завршити читање (са читањем)*, *окончати посао* / *перестати сміятися*, *закінчити читати*, *лишити справу*, *закінчити суперечки (з суперечками)*, etc.

The meaning of interruption, which implies that the situation is not ending by itself, but is interrupted by a voluntary act of the performer or another participant in the situation, is expressed in both languages only by analytical means – constructions with the verbs *прекинути*, *зауставити* / *перервати*, *перебити*, *урвати*, *зупинити*, mostly with a noun complement: *прекинути рад*, *прекинути госте у разговору*, *зауставити свађу* / *перервати роботу*, *перебити мовчанку*, *урвати розповідь*, *припинити роботу*, etc.

Determinative meaning complex

The determinative meaning complex includes delimitative and perdurative modifications that denote the situation as a whole by indicating its duration in a limited time interval. Perdurative and delimitative meanings are distinguished based on the feature of definite/indefinite limitation. Delimitative indicates an action that occurred in a limited and indefinite time interval, after which the action stopped. The duration of the time interval is most often evaluated as short. Perdurative is used to express a situation that lasted for a specific limited time interval, spanning that entire interval. The duration of the interval is specified chiefly lexically and is usually evaluated as long or even too long.

The basic means of expressing delimitative meaning in both languages is the AC of verbs with the prefix *по-*. This word-formation model is represented in the Ukrainian language with a large number of derivatives. It has a broad derivative base, and in our corpus, more than 200 verbs were recorded in almost 700 examples: *посидіти*, *постояти*, *почекати*, *походити*, *поспати*, *помовчати*, *погуляти*, *пограти́ся*, etc. In the Serbian corpus, ten times fewer verbs were confirmed, that is, 20 in slightly fewer than 200 examples: *поседети*, *поразговарати*, *пођутати*, *постојати*, *поживети*, *поиграти се*, *помучити се*, *почекати*, etc. In the Serbian language, certain verbs with the prefix *при-*: *придржати*, *припазити*, *причекати*, *причувати*, etc., and with the prefix *про-*: *провеселити се*, *провозати (се)*, *продремати*, *прокупати се*,

проћаскати, also have a delimitative meaning. The delimitative meaning is not expressed through aktionsart constructions in either of the analyzed languages. In the Ukrainian language, the central means of expressing this meaning is the delimitative AC, and in Serbian, it is a combination of the IMPERF verb with clauses such as *неко време*, that is, the syntactic level.

Perdurativeness in both languages is expressed through the AC of verbs that are formed using several prefixes: *про-*, *пере-*, *від-*, *за-*, *ви-* in Ukrainian and the equivalent *про-*, *пре-*, *од-* and *за-* in Serbian: *промучитися*, *перележати*, *відсидіти*, *висидіти*, *заночувати* / *преседети*, *пробдети*, *одлежати*, *ноћити*, etc. As with delimitative meaning, the perdurative AC of verbs is more present in the Ukrainian corpus than in the Serbian one (see Table 2). However, unlike delimitativeness, perdurativeness can also be expressed with analytical constructions, which compensate for the low productivity of the means of word-formation in the Serbian language. This refers to constructions with the verb *провести* and a verb in the form of the present participle (*провести ноћ седећи*) or a noun in the locative case with the preposition *у* (*провести лето у путовањима*), which are represented in our corpus with a slightly higher number of examples than examples with the perdurative AC (almost 200). There are also equivalent constructions in the Ukrainian language; however, their frequency in the corpus is much lower (30 examples), whereby in most of them, the verb *провести* has the meaning "боравити", cf. *Й ту ніч провели під голим небом, тулячись навколо багаття* (І. Білик) and *Цілий день провела в садах Топкапи* (П. Загребельний).

Plural meaning complex

The plural meaning complex implies determining an action according to its divisibility and repetition. We highlight aktionsart modifications (additional features of the flow of the situation) distributiveness, cumulativeness, iterativeness, and aktionsart properties (permanent features of the flow of the situation) multiplicativeness / semelfactiveness.

Multiplicativeness is characterized by the internal division of a procedural situation that takes place in one period of time, and with completely identical participants. As an aktionsart property, i.e., the way a situation flows over time that is inherent to a specific type of situation, it is primarily

expressed lexically, that is contained in the meaning of the verb lexeme itself, although many multiplicatives are formally marked with the infinitive suffix *а-*: *куцати*, *махати*, *јаукати*, *бљескати*, *климати* / *стукати*, *махати*, *ојкати*, *блимати*, *кивати*, etc.

Formally and semantically, semelfactives correlate with multiplicatives. They denote an action where the moment of the beginning and the end coincide, that is, which takes place once. Semelfactives are constructed from multiplicatives using the suffix *-ну-*, and aspectologists usually distinguish them as a special AC even though they also do not represent aktionsart modifications but rather properties: *куцнути*, *махнути*, *јаукнути*, *бљеснути*, *климнути* / *стукнути*, *махнути*, *ојкнути*, *блимнути*, *кивнути*. In both languages, this AC is represented with a large number of verbs in an even larger number of examples, so we did not perform a statistical analysis. Neither multiplicativeness nor semelfactiveness are expressed analytically.

Distributiveness is characterized by the internal division of a procedural situation, which takes place in one period of time, but each micro-situation into which the macro-situation is divided differs by one actant, or by one actant and a sir-constant. In both analyzed languages, distributiveness is expressed through the corresponding AC of verbs formed using several word-formation models.

In the Ukrainian language, there are three mono-prefixal models: with the prefixes *по-*, *пере-* and *ви-*: *переламати*, *побудити*, *виловити* and several polyprefixal: *повиходити*, *повіддавати*, *поскидати*, *позабувати*, *понаносити*, *пообкидати*, *поприходити*, *порозкривати*, etc. The Serbian language also has several poly-prefixal models: *позаборављати*, *поразбијати*, *поубијати*, *подоносити*, *испреметати*, *испродавати*, *изотварати*, etc., and among the mono-prefixal, the most frequent are models with the prefixes *по-* and *из-*: *побацати*, *избудити*, etc. Distributiveness is not expressed through analytical means in neither the Ukrainian nor the Serbian language.

Cumulativeness is also not expressed analytically, the meaning of which also implies a multitude of situations encompassed in a single time period with different representatives of the collective actant in each micro-situation. In both languages, there is the same word-formation model with the prefix *на*: *нагомилати*, *накупити*, *напричати* / *наговорити*, *назбирати*, *натаскати*, etc.

Iterativeness is characterized by the internal division of a procedural situation that takes place in several different time periods, and whose participants are

the same. Iterativeness is primarily expressed at the syntactic level by combining a verb (most often IMPERF, which indicates a situation that can be subject to iterativeness) with clauses of cyclicity (such as *сваког дана* / *щодня*), interval (such as *редовно* / *регулярно*), and usuality (such as *обично* / *звичайно*). Clauses represent a central means since they unambiguously point to an iterative interpretation of a statement, while other means (aspectual and tense forms, the potential form in Serbian) have other functions besides the iterative, which are at the same time primary. The iterative verb class, which is small in numbers, and various constructions are also peripheral means of expressing iterativeness.

In both analyzed languages, there is a small number of verb suffixal derivatives that have this meaning: in Serbian, these are the verbs *виђати*, *ручавати*, *вечеравати*, *ноћивати*; in Ukrainian, several verbs with the suffix *-ува-*: *чувати*, *говорювати*, *знавати*, *живати*, *їдати*, *пивати*, only the first one of which is confirmed in our corpus, and also in both languages the verb *бивати* / *бувати* in certain meanings (the last one represented in about a hundred examples in each language). The iterative seme can also be distinguished in certain Ukrainian verbs with the prefix *попо-*, such as *попоходити*. Considering the small number of functional derivatives in both languages, we can only tentatively speak about the iterative AC of verbs. It should also be noted that the verbs of this AC are significantly more frequent in the Serbian corpus: they are recorded in 160 examples, the most being the verb *виђати* (128), compared to 15 examples (all with the verb *чувати*) in the Ukrainian corpus.

In the Ukrainian language, we observe constructions with the particle *бувало*, *буває*, *було*, in conjunction with IMPERF verbs in the present or perfect form, but also with PERF verbs in the future form, which are used to express iterativeness with an evocative tone: *Лисий тесть Марко не давав їй проходу. Ночами, бувало, гониться за нею по снігу до сусідів* (У. Самчук). Constructions with the particles – *ото* and, more rarely, *оце*, and a verb in the present or simple future form also have an iterative meaning in the Ukrainian language: *А що вже того Володька напестила – страх один. Сяде ото біля нього і починає щось оповідати про Залужжя, про своїх знайомих* (У. Самчук). In the Serbian language, we observe aktionsart constructions with the verb *дешавати се* + да + present (more often of PERF verbs) which have the meaning of episodicity: *Дешава се (…) да свратим ту и да заседнем за неки од столова између оних бреза и погледам, из те мале пустоши, преко кафанског крова у београдско небо* (М. Тешић). Constructions with the verb *умети* + infinitive / да + present of PERF verbs also express episodic, irregular repetition, but they can also

express qualitative or generic iterativeness: *Паметан човек тада седи у топлој соби, уз печење и врућу ракију… Уме да јурне у мрак, не штеди се, али опет није за дужа путовања* (М. Данојлић), and constructions with the verbs *знати*, *хтети* can express episodic and/or habitual iterativeness: *Ено, и она моја покојница* […] *знала ми је, брате, рондати и чантрати ка млинско чекетало* (Б. Ћопић); *Прсне неких пута за најмању ситницу грди, праска, па богме хоће и да удари* (Л. Лазаревић). Iterative aktionsart constructions are approximately equally represented in both corpora (see Table 2).

Gradual meaning complex

The gradual meaning complex also belongs to quantitative aktionsart, and the action is determined according to the degree of manifestation of the features of the procedural situation, often with the modification of other aspectual characteristics. Although the gradual semantics is typical primarily for word types such as adjectives and adverbs, in verbs, we can observe all types of gradation: selective (majorative verbs), normative (category of intensity through various intensive and attenuative ACs, category of excessiveness through the ACs of surplus and deficit excessives and saturatives), and a special place is occupied by dynamic gradation (with the development of a situation over time, the degree of manifestation of a feature also increases – evolutive AC).

The gradation of features of a procedural situation can be expressed within the verb – contained in the lexical meaning of the verb itself (e.g., in the case of lexical intensives and attenuatives such as *буктати* / *палати* that is *тињати* / жеврiти) or through the means of word-formation within different ACs, and it can also be expressed outside of it as well – through the syntactic connection of the predicate with lexical indicators of the corresponding gradual meaning (various adverbs and prepositional-case constructions with the meaning of increased intensity such as *јако* / *сильно*, weakened intensity such as *слабо*, excessiveness such as *сувише* / *надто*, etc.) or complex syntactic relations within the whole (compound) sentence.

Due to the limited scope of this paper, we will not consider here in detail all the numerous aktionsart classes and subclasses (e.g., within intensive, as many as six subclasses can be distinguished in the Ukrainian language, and 4 in the Serbian language) with gradual semantics, the bearers of which in both languages

are primarily prefixes: in the case of the majorative – *натпевати* / *переспівати*; intensive – *изгрдити*, *замазати*, *облепити*, *измолити*, *износити* / *вилаяти*, *натомитися*, *забруднити*, *обкласти*, *випросити*, *заносити*; attenuative – *нагристи*, *подгрејати*, *притворти*, *залечити* / *надкусити*, *підвеселити*, *прикрити*; excessive surplus – *прекувати* / *переварити*, excessive deficit – *потценити* / *недооцінити*, saturative – *најести се* / *наїстися*, etc. In the Serbian language, suffixes are the basic bearers of the meaning of reduced intensity – *грицкати*, *дрхтурити*, *певушити*, *сркутати*, and in Ukrainian they are found only as a sign of increased intensity, and only in combination with semelfactive semantics – *кидонути*. Finally, some meanings are expressed via confixes, which we find in the case of the intensive – *размахати се* / *розмахатися*, *добудитися*, *добрехатися*, *виспівувати*; attenuative – *подрхтавати*, *прибојавати се* / *поболювати*, *підштовхувати*, and saturative – *нагледати се* / *надивитися*. For most ACs, the number of confirmed verbs and excerpted examples in the corpus is approximately the same for both languages, with a slightly larger difference found only in different types of intensives (see Table 2).

Analytical constructions are not a characteristic means of expressing gradual meanings, with the exception of dynamic gradation in which evolutiveness (the process of acquiring a feature) is expressed both synthetically and analytically. The AC of evolutive verbs is primarily formed with the suffixes *е-*, *-и-*, *-а-*, *-ну-* in Serbian, that is *-і-*, *-а-*, *ну-* in Ukrainian from the positive or comparative forms of adjectives, less often nouns: *бледети*, *старити*, *јачати*, *рђати*, *трунути* / *бліднути*, *старіти*, *дужчати*, etc. Also, in both languages, there are numerous prefixal-suffixal, as well as reflexive derivatives with an evolutive meaning: *осиромашавати*, *поскупљивати*, *прљати се*, *подмлађивати се* / *висихати*, *обмокати*, *розкисати*, *стихати*, *бруднитися*, *омолоджуватися*, etc. Evolutiveness, however, is also expressed analytically through the phase-evolutive verb *постајати* / *ставати*, *робитися* and adjectives and adverbs in the positive or comparative form: *Глас учитељице постаје све тиши, губи се негде потпуно* (И. Андрић) / *Мекіт їхній під той час ставав також інакший, солодкий та прохальний* (В. Шевчук); *Улас робився ще мовчазнішим і замкнутішим* (Г. Тютюник) and, only in Serbia, the verb *бивати* and the comparative form of an adjective: *А дувански дим бивао је све гушћи док сам ја празнио чашу за чашом* (Д. Васић). Statistical analysis of this aktionsart class and corresponding constructions was not performed considering the large number of examples in both languages.

Aktionsart constructions also function as a means of expressing majorativeness in both languages. These are constructions with verbs such as *надмашити*,

превазићи / *перевершити*, *обігнати*, and a noun in the instrumental or locative case with the preposition *у*: *Јања је умела да додели своју ствар тако здушно и од срца, да је у томе погледу* [*додељиваньу* М. И.] *за три копља одскакала од свих жена које сам познавао* (Д. Ненадић); *Зар му нису звездочатци још при рођењу прорекли да ће памећу и величином надмашити сто и једног бившег Цара?* (Г. Олујић) / *Жінки, по-моєму, перевершують чоловіків відвагою почуття і його красою…* (О. Гончар); *Я знову випередила всіх свинарок: в роботі мене ніхто не обжене* (О. Корнійчук). The proportion of such constructions in our corpus, however, is very small (see Table 2). More often, corresponding verbs function as a lexical means of expressing majorativeness, while the situation they refer to is understood from the context.

The verbs *претерати* / *переборщити*, *перегнути* also mostly function independently as a lexical expression of excessive surplus: Иван је у својој наивности причао све што је с Турчином разговарао, па је – као кад некога хвалимо – мало и претерао (Ј. Веселиновић) / *– Ти, братику, те називаєш ладом, що витворяв цей лютий цар з киргизами? – Ну-у… він, як мовиться, тут перегнув… зарвався…* (Вл. Шевчук), however, they can also be bearers of aktionsart meaning in constructions with a noun in the instrumental case with the preposition *с* / *з* or the locative case with the preposition *у*: *Пио сам више но што треба, грешио, претеривао са јелом и лудоријама* (М. Капор) / *Народ дружно почав здогадуватися, що всі ми якось переборщили з успіхом, позитивним мисленням та іншими радощами життя* (Д. Шевченко. „Наодинці з підлітками", Дзеркало тижня, as cited in *Mova.info: Лингвістичний портал*, n.d.). However, in the Serbian corpus, in about 3000 pages, a very small number of examples were recorded: 10, while in the Ukrainian corpus, no examples of such constructions were recorded, [4] so the use of analytical means can rather be considered an exception.

Conclusions

A table presentation of the representation of synthetic and analytical means of expressing different aktionsart meanings allows us to generalize the research results and draw conclusions:

[4] A search in the online corpus *Mova.info: Лингвістичний портал* (n.d.) yielded 4 results in literature and 12 in non-fiction. The reasons may be the conversational nature of these constructions.

Table 1

Aktionsart meaning	Means of expression			
	Ukrainian language		Serbian language	
	Aktionsart verb class	Aktionsart construction	Aktionsart verb class	Aktionsart construction
Phasal				
Initial	+	+	+	+
Intraterminal	-	+	-	+
Final (in the narrower sense)	-	+	-	+
Complete	+	+	+	+
Finite	+	-	+	-
Determinative				
Delimitative	+	-	+	-
Perdurative	+	+	+	+
Plural				
Multiplicative	-	-	-	-
Semelfactive	+	-	+	-
Distributive	+	-	+	-
Cumulative	+	-	+	-
Iterative	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Gradual				
Evolutive	+	+	+	+
Majorative	+	(+)	+	(+)
Intensive	+	-	+	-
Attenuative	+	-	+	-
Excessive surplus	+	(+)	+	(+)
Excessive deficit	+	-	+	-
Saturative	+	-	+	-

We observe that, although almost half (8) of the highlighted aktionsart meanings are expressed both synthetically and analytically (initial, complete, perdurative, iterative, evolutive, majorative, excessive surplus – where in the last two, the functioning of aktionsart constructions is limited and in iterativeness both means are secondary, and the use of aktionsart verb classes is rare, especially in the Ukrainian language), the highest number (9) of meanings are

expressed only synthetically (finite, delimitative, semelfactive, distributive, cumulative, different types of intensive and attenuative, excessive deficit, saturative) and only one that is expressed only analytically (intraterminal), which confirms the well-known and recognized fact that aktionsart verb classes in Slavic languages, which include Ukrainian and Serbian, are the basic means of expressing aktionsart. However, the functioning of aktionsart constructions is also not negligible, and although they are not the central means of expressing aktionsart meanings, they are not entirely peripheral, either. Their position, closer to the center in relation to other means, is also conditioned by the fact that aktionsart expressed in this way remains in the domain of a predicate composed of a synsemantic verb (particle), and its complement in the form of a constituent verb or noun.

The role of aktionsart constructions is greater with central aktionsart meanings: in the sphere of the so-called qualitative aktionsart, especially when expressing different phasal meanings, while they are partially present within determinatives, as a means of expressing perdurativeness (and that is more dominant in the Serbian language). On the other hand, in quantitative aktionsart, which is at the intersection of two higher-ranking categories: aspectuality and quantitativeness, and thus occupies a more peripheral position within aktionsart, their role is much smaller (graduality) or minimal (plurality).

In another table, we present the statistics of the use of aktionsart verb classes, that is, aktionsart constructions in Ukrainian and Serbian. For verbs, we give the number of confirmed verbs / the total number of examples that include them in the corpus.

Table 2

Aktionsart meaning	Means of expression			
	Ukrainian language		Serbian language	
	Aktionsart verb class	Aktionsart construction	Aktionsart verb class	Aktionsart construction
Phasal				
Initial	359/1074	1063	314/886	901
Intraterminal	-	272 + 23	-	251 + 15
Final (in the narrower sense)	-	> 1000	-	>1000
Complete	56/134	42	19/42	93
Finite	69/164	-	33/80	-

Aktionsart meaning	Means of expression			
	Ukrainian language		Serbian language	
	Aktionsart verb class	Aktionsart construction	Aktionsart verb class	Aktionsart construction
Determinative				
Delimitative	209/694	-	20/196	-
Perdurative	55/341	30	25/164	177
Plural				
Multiplicative	-	-	-	-
Semelfactive	/	-	/	-
Distributive	622/2469	-	150/727	/
Cumulative	58/260	-	28/109	-
Iterative	1/15	88	4/160	75
Gradual				
Evolutive	/	/	/	/
Majorative	20/58	25	26/98	18
Intensive	231/827	-	154/417	-
Attenuative	149/754	-	145/776	-
Excessive surplus	32/90	0	40/83	10
Excessive deficit	14/43	-	7/34	-
Saturative	49/200	-	36/149	-

Based on the results presented in the second table, we observe that in cases where they both function, aktionsart verb classes and aktionsart constructions are completely equal means only within the phasal meaning of initiality. In other cases, we observe a mostly marked dominance of one or the other, whereby in the Ukrainian language, the synthetic way of expressing aktionsart is prevalent, while in Serbian – analytical (complete, perdurative, excessive surplus), with the exception of majorative where this relationship is relatively balanced with a certain dominance of synthetic means in Serbian, and a negligible difference with limitations in both languages in the functioning of analytical constructions for expressing majorative meaning. In other words, where there is a possibility of choosing between synthetic and analytical means, the Ukrainian language will rather choose the synthetic, while the Serbian language will choose the analytical. In the case of iterativeness, as previously noted, in both languages, both aktionsart verb classes and aktionsart constructions are peripheral means of expression.

As for the aktionsart verb classes, if we compare the number of verbs confirmed in the corpus and the total number of excerpted examples in which they are found, we notice that the number of lexemes representing separate aktionsart verb classes is almost in all cases (the exception is majorative and excessive surplus, although in both the difference is not pronounced) greater in Ukrainian than in Serbian, which is especially pronounced in the case of the qualitative aktionsart, where it is two times (finite, perdurative), three times (complete), and even ten times (delimitative) greater. Conversely, if we compare the number of examples in which, where they are used, aktionsart constructions are realized, their number is at least two times (complete) to many times (perdurative) higher in the Serbian language. We observe an approximately equal number of realizations for both types of means only with the initial meaning. With the plural meaning complex, we performed a statistical analysis on distributives and cumulatives, and it confirms the general tendency: the number of verb lexemes representing these classes is four (with distributives), that is, two times larger in Ukrainian than in Serbian (with cumulatives). The greatest similarities are observed in the case of gradual modifications, with a more pronounced difference only in the domain of the intensive class. From the above, a more general conclusion that could be of typological importance emerges: although in both languages there are developed word-formation models for all aktionsart meanings, the Serbian language does not sufficiently use its word-formation potential and is more prone to analytical means, and where such means are not available, the expression of aktionsart meanings outside the predicate, at the syntactic level (using different clauses or even within a compound sentence). The Ukrainian language, on the other hand, is more inclined to choose synthetic means.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mova.info: Лингвістичний портал. (n.d.). https://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx

Novakov, P. (2005). *Glagolski vid i tip glagolske situacije u engleskom i srpskom jeziku*. Futura publikacije.

Агрелль, С. (1962). О способах действия польского глагола. In Ю. Маслов (Ed.), *Вопросы глагольного вида* (pp. 35–38). Иностранная литература.

Антологија српске књижевности. (n.d.). Учитељски факултет Универзитет у Београду. https://www.antologijasrpskeknjizevnosti.rs/

Бондарко, А. (1987). Содержание и типы аспектуальных отношений. In А. Бондарко (Ed.), *Теория функциональной грамматики: Введение, аспектуальность, временная локализованность, таксис* (pp. 40–45). Наука.

Вихованець, І., & Городенська, К. (2004). *Теоретична морфологія української мови*. Університетське видавництво "Пульсари".

Вихованець, І., Городенська, К., Загнітко, А., & Соколова, С. (2017). *Граматика сучасної української літературної мови: Морфологія*. Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго.

Вишњић, М. Ј. (1999). *Антологија српских приповедача XIX и XX века* (Ј. Ђуретић, Ed.). Филип Вишњић. https://www.knjizara.com/pdf/8282.pdf

Грубор, Ђ. (1953). *Аспектна значења*. Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Ивановић, М. (2016). *Акционалност – семантика и форма: У савременом украјинском и српском језику*. Филолошки факултет Универзитета у Београду.

Исаченко, В. (1960). *Грамматический строй русского языка в сопоставлении с словацким: Морфология: Часть вторая*. Издательство Словацкой академии наук.

Маслов, Ю. (1957). *Глагольный вид в современном болгарском языке* [Summary of post-doctoral dissertation]. Институт славяноведения АН СССР.

Петрухина, Е. (1998). Грамматическая и лексическая категоризация действий и их параметров в славянских языках (сопоставительное исследование русского, западнославянских и болгарского языков). *Научные доклады филологического факультета МГУ*, *3*, 71–91.

Поповић, Љ. (2008). *Језичка слика стварности: Когнитивни аспект контрастивне анализе*. Филолошки факултет Универзитета у Београду.

Русановский, В., Жовтобрюх, М., Городенская, Е., & Грищенко, А. (1986). *Украинская грамматика*. Наукова думка.

Сигалов, П. (1978). Задачи и возможности сопоставительного и сравнительно-исторического изучения способов действия славянского глагола. In Ю. Маслов (Ed.), *Проблемы современного теоретического и синхронно-описательного языкознания: Выпуск 1: Вопросы сопоставительной аспектологии* (pp. 44–56). Издательство Ленинградского университета.

Соколова, С. (2003). *Префіксальний словотвір дієслів у сучасній українській мові*. Наукова думка.

Соколова, С. (2021). *Аспектуальні категорії українського дієслова*. Книга-плюс.

Тошович, Б. (2009). *Способы глагольного действия в сербском, хорватском и бошняцком языках*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Укрліб – Бібліотека української літератури. (n.d.). https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/

Храковский, В. (1980). Некоторые проблемы универсально-типологической характеристики аспектуальных значений. In С. Смирнов (Ed.), *Вопросы русской аспектологии: V. Аспектуальность и средства ее выражения* (pp. 3–24). Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

Храковский, В. (1987). Семантика фазовости и средства ее выражения. In А. Бондарко (Ed.), *Теория функциональной грамматики: Введение, аспектуальность, временная локализованность, таксис* (pp. 153–180). Наука.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(TRANSLITERATION)

Agrell′, S. (1962). O sposobakh deĭstviia pol′skogo glagola. In IU. Maslov (Ed.), *Voprosy glagol′nogo vida* (pp. 35–38). Inostrannaia literatura.

Antologija srpske književnosti. (n.d.). Učiteljski fakultet Univerzitet u Beogradu. https://www.antologijasrpskeknjizevnosti.rs/

Bondarko, A. (1987). Soderzhanie i tipy aspektual′nykh otnosheniĭ. In A. Bondarko (Ed.), *Teoriia funktsional′noĭ grammatiki: Vvedenie, aspektual′nost′, vremennaia lokalizovannost′, taksis* (pp. 40–45). Nauka.

Grubor, Đ. (1953). *Aspektna značenja*. Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Isachenko, V. (1960). *Grammaticheskiĭ stroĭ russkogo iazyka v sopostavlenii s slovatskim: Morfologiia: Chast′ vtoraia*. Izdatel′stvo Slovatskoĭ akademii nauk.

Ivanović, M. (2016). *Akcionalnost – semantika i forma: U savremenom ukrajinskom i srpskom jeziku*. Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Khrakovskiĭ, V. (1980). Nekotorye problemy universal′no-tipologicheskoĭ kharakteristiki aspektual′nykh znacheniĭ. In S. Smirnov (Ed.), *Voprosy russkoĭ aspektologii V: Aspektual′nost′ i sredstva ee vyrazheniia* (pp. 3–24). Izdatel′stvo Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

Khrakovskiĭ, V. (1987). Semantika fazovosti i sredstva ee vyrazheniia. In A. Bondarko (Ed.), *Teoriia funktsional′noĭ grammatiki: Vvedenie, aspektual′nost′, vremennaia lokalizovannost′, taksis* (pp. 153–180). Nauka.

Maslov, IU. (1957). *Glagol′nyĭ vid v sovremennom bolgarskom iazyke* [Summary of post-doctoral dissertation]. Institut slavianovedeniia AN SSSR.

Mova.info: Linhvistychnyĭ portal. (n.d.). https://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx

Novakov, P. (2005). *Glagolski vid i tip glagolske situacije u engleskom i srpskom jeziku*. Futura publikacije.

Petrukhina, E. (1998). Grammaticheskaia i leksicheskaia kategorizatsiia deĭstviĭ i ikh parametrov v slavianskikh iazykakh (sopostavitel′noe issledovanie russkogo, zapadnoslavianskikh i bolgarskogo iazykov). *Nauchnye doklady filologicheskogo fakul′teta MGU*, *3*, 71–91.

Popović, Lj. (2008). *Jezička slika stvarnosti: Kognitivni aspekt kontrastivne analize*. Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Rusanovskiĭ, V., Zhovtobriukh, M., Gorodenskaia, E., & Grishchenko, A. (1986). *Ukrainskaia grammatika*. Naukova dumka.

Sigalov, P. (1978). Zadachi i vozmozhnosti sopostavitel′nogo i sravnitel′no-istoricheskogo izucheniia sposobov deĭstviia slavianskogo glagola. In IU. Maslov (Ed.), *Problemy sovremennogo teoreticheskogo i sinkhronno-opisatel′nogo iazykoznaniia: Vypusk 1. Voprosy sopostavitel′noĭ aspektologii* (pp. 44–56). Izdatel′stvo Leningradskogo universiteta.

Sokolova, S. (2003). *Prefiksal′nyĭ slovotvir diiesliv u suchasniĭ ukraïns′kiĭ movi*. Naukova dumka.

Sokolova, S. (2021). *Aspektual′ni katehoriï ukraïns′kogo diieslova*. Knyha-plius.

Toshovich, B. (2009). *Sposoby glagol'nogo deĭstviia v serbskom, khorvatskom i boshniatskom iazykakh*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Ukrlib – Biblioteka ukraïns'koï literatury. (n.d.). https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/

Višnjić, M. J. (1999). *Antologija srpskih pripovedača XIX i XX veka* (J. Đuretić, Ed.). Filip Višnjić. https://www.knjizara.com/pdf/8282.pdf

Vykhovanets', I., & Horodens'ka, K. (2004). *Teoretychna morfolohiia ukraïns'koï movy*. Universytets'ke vydavnytstvo "Pul'sary".

Vykhovanets', I., Horodens'ka, K., Zahnitko, A., & Sokolova, S. (2017). *Hramatyka suchasnoï ukraïns'koï literaturnoï movy: Morfolohiia*. Vydavnychyĭ dim Dmytra Buraho.

Syntetyczne i analityczne środki wyrażania akcjonalności w języku ukraińskim i serbskim

W artykule przeanalizowano aktionsarten czasowników oraz konstrukcji jako sposoby wyrażania akcjonalności w językach ukraińskim i serbskim. Wyróżniamy cztery klasy znaczeń akcjonalnych – fazowość, determinatywność, mnogość i stopniowość – i dla każdego z nich ustalamy typ i skład środków wyrażania w celu zdefiniowania wzajemnych relacji między tymi środkami, jak też podobieństwa i różnice w ich funkcjonowaniu w analizowanych językach. Na podstawie przeprowadzonej analizy dochodzimy do wniosku, że środki analityczne, choć nie centralne, są stosunkowo często reprezentowane w obu językach, zwłaszcza w sferze jakościowej aktionsart, i że choć w obu językach istnieją odpowiednie modele słowotwórcze, to język serbski jest bardziej skłonny do analitycznych, a ukraiński do syntetycznych środków wyrażania aktionsarten.

Słowa kluczowe: rodzaj czynności; czasownik; konstrukcja analityczna; klasa znaczeniowa; fazowość; determinatywność; mnogość; stopniowalność; język ukraiński; język serbski

Synthetic and analytical means of expressing aktionsart in the Ukrainian and Serbian languages

The paper analyzes the aktionsart verb classes and aktionsart constructions as means of expressing aktionsart in the Ukrainian and Serbian languages. We single out four complexes of aktionsart meanings: phasal, determinative, plural, and gradual. For each of them, we determine the type and composition of the means of expression with the aim of observing the mutual relationship between these means and the similarities and differences in their func-

tioning in the analyzed languages. Based on the analysis, we conclude that analytical means, although not central, are relatively represented in both languages, especially in the sphere of qualitative aktionsart, and that, although there are appropriate word-formation models in both languages, the Serbian language favors analytical, and the Ukrainian synthetic means of expressing aktionsart.

Keywords: aktionsart; verb; semantic class; analytical construction; phasality; determinativity; plurality; graduality; Ukrainian language; Serbian language

Milena Ivanović (ivanovic.milena@gmail.com; m.ivanovic@fil.bg.ac.rs) – profesor nadzwyczajny w Katedrze Slawistyki Wydziału Filologicznego Uniwersytetu w Belgradzie. Autorka monografii: *Прелазност у украјинском и српском језику: функционални аспект* [Przechodniość w języku ukraińskim i serbskim: aspekt funkcjonalny, 2007]; *Акционалност: семантика и форма у савременом украјинском и српском језику* [Akcjonalność: semantyka i forma we współczesnych językach ukraińskim i serbskim, 2016]) oraz podręcznika uniwersyteckiego do nauki języka ukraińskiego. Zainteresowania badawcze: lingwistyka funkcjonalna, lingwistyka porównawcza, przekładoznawstwo.

Milena Ivanović (ivanovic.milena@gmail.com; m.ivanovic@fil.bg.ac.rs) – Associate Professor at the Department of Slavonic Studies, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade. Author of the books: *Прелазност у украјинском и српском језику: функционални аспект* [Transitivity in the Ukrainian and Serbian language: a functional aspect, 2007]; *Акционалност: семантика и форма у савременом украјинском и српском језику* [Aktionsart – semantics and form in Ukrainian and Serbian language, 2016], and one university textbook of Ukrainian language. Research interests: functional linguistics, comparative linguistics, translation studies.

Publication History: Received: 2022-09-22; Accepted: 2023-11-16; Published: 2023-12-31