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1. Introduction

The comparative aspectual study of differently structured languages, such as Russian and Japanese, shows the interpretational character of aspectual classes of Russian and Japanese verbs. As we have observed in the process of our research (Kaneko and Petrukhina 2004, Kaneko 2005), the similarities and differences in the structure of verbal classification, the semantic properties lying at the base of the former, and the grouping of verbs into different aspectual classes confirm Bondarko’s idea regarding the content of linguistic forms and categories as an amalgam of universal and idioethnic functions. It should be remembered that Bondarko, following Katznelson, separates in linguistic meaning the universal semantic basis and idioethnic interpretational component as the way of conveying meaning, determined by a given language form (Bondarko 2002: 108–109). One of the realizations of the universal approach to the idioethnic aspect of aspectual categories of different languages can be seen in the recent substantial work of Tatevosov (Tatevosov 2010), in which he proposes cross-linguistically applicable aspectual classes and actional types, deduced from and reflecting language-specific characters of different aspectual systems.

Grammatically relevant classifications of the verbal lexicon of different languages are, as a rule, based on analysis of syntactic combinability and morphology of verbal lexemes, for example, Vendler's well-known
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classification of English verbs (Vendler 1967), and a semantic typology of Russian predicates (Seliverstova (ed.) 1982). In this article, we would like to analyze a correlation between the universal ontological basis of distinguishing aspectual classes of verbs, which reflect characteristics of named actions in reality, and a language-specific interpretation of this basis in the Russian and Japanese languages. Here, we find it important to note that differences in semantically distinguished properties of verbal aspectual classes are systematically conditioned and related to the key ideas of the Russian and Japanese language world-construal, i.e., it appears also in contiguous fields of the language system—in morphology, word formation, semantics, and the usage of verbs.

2. Interpretation and fragmentation of reality in language world-construal

Differences in the way of interpreting dynamic situations between languages concern, first of all, different ways of separating a fragment of reality present in the sight of a speaker, the choice of different semantic properties for its nomination, and also linguistic devices for its expression. Let us illustrate our thesis by the following examples. In Russian, a characteristic of a “fat” person (tolstyi) can be expressed by (1) an adjective tolstyi, “fat,” as his qualitative characteristic; (2) an imperfective verb tolstet', “to become fat” (also its corresponding impersonal forms tolstetušij and tolstevšij), as the process of becoming the given characteristic; or (3) a perfective verb potolstet', “to have become fat” (potolstevšij, potolstev), as the result of a process. In Japanese, this characteristic cannot be presented as qualitative and atemporal without referring to the preceding process of “having become fat.” Thus, the Russian adjective tolstyi can be translated to Japanese only with a deverbative form futot-tebecome.fat-CNV iru-be—lit. “byt' potolstevšim/to be, having become fat” (it is a form of the Japanese verb futoru, “tolstet'—potolstet'”). Another comparative example illustrates how different stages of gaining knowledge are actualized in Russian and Japanese by using the forms of a verb znat'—siru, “know.” This mental process, expressed by the given verb, logically proceeds in four stages: (1) the absence of knowledge (On ne znaet—Kare-what-TOP sira-nat know-NEG.PRSFUT “He does not know”); (2) the process of obtaining information (uznavat', cf. Zdes' on
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uznáet mnogo novogo. "Here he is getting to know many new things"). In Japanese, there are some ways to express the process of obtaining knowledge: Kokode here kare-wa TOP atarasi new koto-thing ACC takusan many sit-te know-CN V iku be PRSFUT // siri-tsutsu-ar-u know-in.the.process-be PRSFUT (by using a verb of motion, iku “idti/to go” or a particle, -tsutsu-, meaning continuation of the actual process). All possible translations in Japanese, however, sound a little awkward without a proper broader pragmatic context since such combination of ideas is not characteristic for the Japanese language; (3) the result of obtaining information (knowledge) (On uznal, uznáet—Kare-wa TOP sit-ta know-PST, sir-u know-PRSFUT “He learned, will learn”); and (4) the state of possessing knowledge (On znae-Kare-wa TOP sit-te know-CN V ir-u be PRSFUT “He knows”). The Russian verb uznat’ (Perf.) lexicalizes the third stage, whereas the verb znat’ (Imperf.) lexicalizes the fourth. Besides, the verb znat’ does not contain information about the preceding process of acquiring knowledge. In Russian, it is also possible to denote the process or repetition of gaining knowledge by the derivative imperfective verb uznavat’, while in Japanese this actual process is difficult to express. The Japanese verb siru lexicalizes the third stage, while the fourth stage is expressed by its -te iru form as a resultative state (sit-te iru, “having learned, to be in a state of possessing knowledge”). Hence, in Japanese, the state of a subject’s possessing a certain knowledge can be manifested only as resultative (Kare wa sit-te ir-u—“Having learned, he knows”), whereas in Russian it can also be expressed regardless of the preceding situation (znat’).

Comparative studies of language world-construal show that differences in the interpretation of reality between languages also appear in a different “set of key ideas—some kind of semantic leitmotifs, each of which is expressed by various linguistic devices of the most different nature—morphological, word-formational, syntactic, lexical, and even prosodic” (Apresjan 2006: 35). Key concepts, which are important for organizing “the semantic universe” (Wierzbicka 1992: 395) of one language, may not have simple means of expression or do not appear frequently in another language. When representing dynamic phenomena proceeding in time, the idea of limit as a temporal delimitation of action (Petrukhina 2003) dominates in Russian, while it is the idea of the stability of situations (Kaneko and Petrukhina 2004, Kaneko 2005) that plays a dominant role in Japanese. The formation of
lexico-grammatical aspectual classes of verbs is connected with key concepts of a language worldview, and also with contiguous lexico-grammatical and grammatical verbal categories such as aspect and, in Japanese, the domain of voice, in particular, transitivity/intransitivity and diathesis.

3. A brief characterization of the Japanese aspectual system

Before proceeding further in our comparative analysis of Japanese and Russian aspectual classes of verbs, we need to briefly comment on Japanese aspectual categories. The word-formational system of Japanese is richly equipped with compound verbs, allowing expression of various aspectual and evaluative characteristics of action and its result: phasal, evaluative-intensive, evaluation of result (in particular, irreversibility of action), meaning of attempt, and so on (Kaneko 2010). Compound verbs differ from each other by the regularity of word formation and the degree to which the lexical meaning of the auxiliary verb is preserved, i.e., by the degree of grammaticalization. Based on the opinion of a number of researchers, simple verbal forms with $-u^{\text{PRSFUT}}$ ($-ta^{\text{PST}}$) and compound verbs with $V$-$te^{\text{CNV}}$ $ir$-$u^{\text{be-PRSFUT}}$ ($V$-$te^{\text{CNV}}$ $i$-$ta^{\text{be-PST}}$) are regarded as the most grammaticalized and are opposed to each other. In this respect, the grammatical aspectual system in Japanese is often represented as opposition between grammatical forms, namely, the “completive aspect” of the present-future tense $-u$ and of the past tense $-ta$, on one hand, and the “durative aspect” of the present-future tense $-te$ $ir$-$u$ and of the past tense $-te$ $i$-$ta$, on the other. Considering this temporal system consisting of the opposition between past and present-future tenses, we deal with four tense-aspect forms: $-u$, $-ta$, $-te$ $iru$, and $-te$ $ita$, which form the tense-aspect system of Japanese.

The treatment of the $-te$ $iru$ form—its potential for formation and its semantics—is the basic criterion for the classification of Japanese verbs. On this basis, all Japanese verbs are divided into three groups. One group consists of state verbs, which do not appear in the $-te$ $iru$ form, for example, $aru$ “to be (about inanimate objects)” and $iru$ “to be (about animate beings).” Two other groups of verbs can have the $-te$ $iru$ form, distinguished from each other by the semantics of the form. Verbs of the first group (such as $siru$ “znat’—uznat’/to know, to learn”) are traditionally called momentary$^3$ verbs,
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or verbs of change in Japanese aspectology (Kindaichi 1950/1976, Okuda 1977). Appearing in the -te iru form, they express state as a result of preceding action. Verbs such as sinu, “to die, to be dead”; kawaku, “to dry, to be dry”; nureru, “to become wet, to be wet”; futoru, “to get fat, to be fat”; and others fall into this group. Verbs of the second group are called process verbs because they, unlike the previous group, can express the process of the action itself in the -te iru form. Examples of this group include verbs such as yomu, “čitat'/to read,” kaku, “pisat'/to write,” warau, “smejat'sja/to laugh,” hanasu, “govorit'/to speak,” utau, “pet'/to sing,” taberu, “est'/to eat,” tateru, “stroit'/to build,” etc.

4. LIMIT and STABILITY—the key ideas of the Russian and Japanese aspectual systems

As we have already mentioned, the representation of dynamic phenomena in Russian and Japanese is influenced by different key ideas of Russian and Japanese language world-construal. In Russian, it is the idea of LIMIT as temporal delimitation. The concept of limit actualizes representations about the temporal structure of a situation, its temporal limits, and changes in the actants of action. It is reflected, in particular, in such aspectual notions as the telicity/atelicity (or, in other terminology, terminativity/non-terminativity) of the action of a verb and the categorical meaning of the marked perfective aspect. The idea of temporal delimitation plays a leading role in Russian deverbal modificative word-formation (compare the various types of verbal derivation expressing temporal limits of action: zašumet', “to begin rustling”; pošumet', “to rustle [for a short period]”; prošumet', “to rustle [for a long period]”; otšumet', “to cease rustling”; etc.); it becomes a dominant characteristic in narrative texts describing sequential events in the past. The notions of limit and delimitation are relatively irrelevant for the Japanese aspectual system. The completeness (end) of an action is expressed by the unmarked forms (-ul-ta), whereas what is marked in Japanese (in the -te iru-te ita forms) is the STABILITY of situation (the process of single or repeating actions, the resultative state, and also the characteristics or relation), synchronous with the moment of observation (Kaneko and Petrukhina 2004). In terms of interpreting denotative classes of actions, processes, and states, aspectual classifications of the verbal lexicon are especially illustrative.
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because both Russian and Japanese use similar properties and ideas for their formation, viz., a semantic opposition between telic and atelic verbs.

4.1. Russian and Japanese: language-specific approaches to the theories of telicity

Let us take a look at how aspectual classes of the Japanese (so-called) momentary and process verbs mentioned above correspond to a universal opposition between telic and atelic verbs. Kholodović, who studied the semantics of Japanese verbs in comparison to Russian, considered verbs denoting processes “with one degree of freedom” as telic, i.e., assuming in the result of an action a transition to “the only probable state.” Analyzing “the grammatical phenomena related to telic processes,” he saw the following moments in the semantic model: “the process itself with one degree of freedom (moment a)—the natural end of a process with one degree of freedom and the beginning of a resultative state (moment b)—resultative state S and only S (moment c)” (Kholodović 1979: 139). In Japanese, Kholodović regarded as telic momentary (according to the Japanese classification) verbs such as sinu, “umeret’/to die”; kuru, “prijti/to come”; and kiru, “odet’/to dress”; while atelic verbs (meaning actions with many possible subsequent states) are process verbs such as warau, “smejet’sja/to laugh”; hanasu, “govorit’/to speak”; and arukimawaru, “xodit’/to walk.” For example, the state of “xodit’” may be followed by other states such as “he walked up and down and left,” “he walked to and fro and finally sat down,” or “he walked up and down and started crying,” and many other possibilities (Kholodović 1979: 139).

Following Maslov’s definition, telic verbs “express actions, which by their nature assume, even in the case of the distant future, achievement of a specific limit putting an end to the action” (Maslov 1963: 7). Compare: stroit’—postroit’, “to build”; pisat’—napisat’ pis’mo, “to write a letter”; padat’—upast’, “to fall”; and zasypat’—zasnut’, “to fall asleep.” Accordingly, “telicity is an indication, encoded in the semantics of a verb, of an internal limit predicated on the nature of a given action. As a general rule, during its flow in time, an action moves toward this limit and, when it is achieved, should exhaust itself and terminate. Atelicity is an absence of an internal limit, which would delimit the course of an action even in the scope of
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perspective” (Maslov 2004: 29–30). Compare: rabotat', “to work”; sidet', “to sit”; smeja-t'sja, “to laugh”; and xodit', “to walk.”

A comparison of the two theories suggests that Kholodovič's understanding of telicity based on Japanese linguistic material differs, to some extent, from the understanding of this notion presented by Maslov (Maslov 1963: 7, 1978: 12–17) and Bondarko (Bondarko 1987: 45–63) in their studies of Slavic languages. What is actualized in Kholodovič’s definition is the predictability of one exclusive state following a given action, whereas Maslov, in his definition, puts the emphasis on the indication of limit inherent to the action itself, after which it cannot continue. Russian verbs such as padat'—upast', “to fall,” making an aspectual pair, are considered telic verbs because a falling object cannot continue falling after the completion of falling, i.e., after having achieved the limit of the action. The corresponding Japanese verb otiru, “to fall,” is also telic only because after the completion of the process otiru, the one and only possible state of oti-te iru, “having fallen, to lie,” comes about. Both theories coincide in their understanding of the given verb as telic, reflecting a denotative basis for the representation of the action in language. In this respect, it is much the same for many other Japanese and Russian verbal lexemes as mentioned above.

The difference between telicity as elaborated in Kholodovič's theory and in Russian aspectological studies becomes clear when we look into two groups of Japanese verbs: (1) siru, “uznat'—znat'/to learn, to know”; neru, “zasnut'—spat'/to fall asleep, to sleep”; or suwaru, “sust'—sidet'/to sit down, to sit”; and (2) yomu, “čitat'/to read”; kaku, “pisat'/to write”; taberu, “cest'/to eat”; or tateru, “stroiti'/to build.” The first group of verbs falls under the class of momentary (i.e., telic, according to Kholodovič) verbs along with such verbs as karu, “prixdot'/to come”; and kiru, “odevat'/to dress.” In Russian, verbs such as uznat', “to learn”; and znat', “to know”; zasnut', “to fall asleep”; and spat', “to sleep” do not make aspectual pairs and are classified in different aspectual classes; besides, imperfective verbs such as znat' and spat', being atelic, should not have aspectual pairs at all. Moreover, as has already been said, a number of Japanese verbs of this group (i.e., momentary verbs) correspond functionally to Russian adjectives in the -te iru form, for example, futoru, “tolstet'/to become fat” (verb); futot-te iru, “tolstij/fat” (adjective); yogoreru, “zagrijaznjat'sja/to become dirty” (verb); and yogore-te
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*iru,* "grjaznyj/dirty" (adjective). The second group of verbs such as *tateru-* *stroit*, "to build" labels actions transmitted to the object and having a limit in the development of an action, the nomination of which constitutes the core of telic verbs in Russian, while in Japanese, it is grouped in the class of process (Kholodovič’s atelic) verbs along with verbs such as *warau,* "smejat’sja/to laugh’; *hanasu,* “govorit’/to speak”; and *arukimawaru,* “xodit’/to walk around.”

The explanation of the revealed differences in the aspectual classification of Russian and Japanese verbs favors the definition of a universal category of telicity in typological research, *Tipologija rezultativnyx konstrukcij*/Typology of Resultative Constructions (abbreviated as TRK):

“Telic verbs are first of all (1) verbs expressing a transition from one state to another or acquisition of quality, for example, Russian *sset’,* ‘to sit down’; *upast’,* ‘to fall’; *zabyt’,* ‘to forget’; *sozret’,* ‘to ripen’; *pokrasnet’,* ‘to reddening’; *slomat’sja,* ‘to break’ (sset’ means ‘to make a transition from a state of *stojat’,
‘to stand’, to a state of *sidet’, ‘to sit’); and so on, and (2) their corresponding causatives, for example, *usadit’,* ‘to seat’; *povalit’,* ‘to tumble down’; and *slomat’, ‘to break’ (usadit’ means ‘to cause s.b. to sit’ and the like). Furthermore, (3) telic verbs also express goal-oriented actions, which cannot continue after the goal has been achieved, for example, *varit’, ‘to boil, to cook’; and *stroit’, ‘to build’ (it is pointless to continue cooking porridge after it has already been cooked). Verbs are atelic if they do not necessarily assume one definite goal (*rabotat’, ‘to work’; *bežat’, ‘to run’; *pet’, ‘to sing’; and *smotret’, ‘to look’), and, also, if they denote a state (*ležat’, ‘to lie’; *znat’, ‘to know’)) (numbering of groups—Y.K. and E.V.)” (TRK 1983: 6–7).

It seems that Kholodovič’s definition fits solely into the first group of verbs, whereas the essence of the notion of telic verbs accepted in Russian linguistics is expressed by the property of the third group, even though his definition can be applied to other groups of verbs as well. The Japanese momentary verbs of the first group in the *-te iru* form denote a new state of the subject as a result of the preceding action. Let us give some more examples of such Japanese verbs, the marked forms of which express the resultative state: *wasureru,* “zabyt’/to forget”—*wasure-te iru,* “zabyv, ne pomnit/having forgotten, not to remember”; *ureru,* “sozret’/to ripen”—*ure-te iru,* “byt’ sozrevšim/to be, having ripened”; *akakunaru,* “pokrasnet’/to
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redden"—akakunat-te iru, "byt' pokrasnevšim/to be, having reddened"; oreru, "slomat'sja/to break"—ore-te iru, "byt' slomannym/to be, having broken." In most cases, and in the minimum context, the Japanese verbs of the second and third groups convey the meaning of an actual process in the -te iru form, i.e., they do not pertain to momentary (telic) verbs.4

4.2. Correlation between aspect and voice in Japanese

The characteristic feature of the Japanese language is the fact that the verbal aspectual classification is directly correlated with transitivity/intransitivity and the syntactic category of diathesis. In Japanese, there are a number of diathetic pairs of verbs, the transitive verb of which often functions as a process verb, and the intransitive counterpart as a so-called "momentary" or resultative verb. Compare: oru—oreru, "lomat'-slomat'ajalto to break"; okosu—okiru, "budit'-probudit'sja/to wake s.b.—to wake up”; tsukeru—tsuku, “vključat'-vključit'sjalto turn on—to be turned on”; tokasu—tokeru, "rastvorjat'-rastivot'sja/to dissolve—to become dissolved”; wakasu—waku, "kipjatit'-vskipet7to boil s.t.—to boil”; and yaku—yakeru, "żarit'-stanovit'sja ţarennym/to grill—to become grilled.” In such diathetic verbal pairs, the transitive verb expresses an action of the subject, while the intransitive verb expresses a new state of the subject, in whose role the objective actant of the corresponding transitive verb emerges.

The transitivity/intransitivity of Japanese verbs determines their degree of telicity, i.e., the clearness of the expressed idea of limit in verbal semantics. In Russian sentences such as On sušil rubašku, no polnost'ju ne vysušil; "He dried the shirt, but he could not dry it completely,” the relation between the process (cause) and the result (effect) of an action expressed by an objective verb is denoted by the members of an aspectual pair—imperfective and perfective verbs, whereas in Japanese this distinction can be expressed only by a diathetic pair of verbs: Kare-wa he-TOP shatsu-0shirt-ACC kawakasi-ta dry. TR-PST (a transitive, process verb) keredo though, chanto properly kawaka-nakatata dry. ITR-NEG-PST (an intransitive, resultative verb) lit—"Even though he dried the shirt, [it] did not really get dry.” It is impossible in Japanese to use different aspectual forms of a verb with the same diathetic characteristics as the direct opposition because the sentence becomes inconsistent. (The
Inconsistency is of a similar nature as that in the Russian sentence *On sušil rubašku, no ne sušil; “He dried the shirt, but did not dry it”). In this respect, it is interesting to note that Tatevosov, introducing the analogical phenomena in Karachay-Balkar language (of the Turkic group), emphasizes that the causativization of a base intransitive verb brings about the differences of actional properties in a manner in which the causative counterpart allows atelic interpretation (Tatevosov 2010: 206–213).

The rather weak degree of telicity in such Japanese transitive causative verbs, based on a verbal semantic property of telicity as well as agentivity/non-agentivity encoded in sentences, has been discussed by a number of Japanese researchers in comparison with English verbs. In this regard, it is suggested that languages can be divided into two types: “DO-languages,” to which English and Russian belong, and “BECOME-languages,” of which Japanese is highly representative (Ikegami 1981, 1991; see also Kageyama 1990). It appears that in these two types of languages, different phases of a verb’s course of action are actualized in the notion of limit. In “DO-languages,” the limit of an action is terminative, i.e., it is an endpoint (see how Maslov comprehends a limit), whereas in “BECOME-languages,” a limit is perceived as the initial moment of a new state. Compare this with Kholodovič’s definition of limit.5

5. Types of limit expressed by Russian aspectual verbal pairs

As shown in research by Maslov, Bondarko, Glovinskaja, Padučeva, and others, the types of semantic relations in aspectual pairs of terminative verbs, which govern the use and combination of perfective and imperfective verbs in Russian, depend on how a limit is reached and what type of limit is concerned (thus, the transitivity/intransitivity of a verb does not play any role):

(1) a natural (assumed by the natural course of events, i.e., predictable) and absolute (after it is reached, the action ends) limit, the achievement of which occurs gradually (as an accumulation of a result): vstavat’—vstat’, “to stand up”; vykapyvat’—vykopat’ kartošku, “to dig out potatoes”; myt’—vymyt’ posudu, “to wash dishes”;

(2) a natural, absolute, but momentary limit (without the preliminary
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accumulation of a result): naxodit'—najti, “to find s.t. by accident”; vspyxivat'—vspyxnut', “to flash”;

(3) an unpredictable limit (the achievement of a limit-purpose is not predetermined by the natural development of a process as it depends on additional factors): postupat'—postupit' v universitet, “to enter a university”; ubeždat'—ubedit' kogo-libo, “to convince s.b.”;

(4) a relative limit (the process can be continued even after achievement of a certain limit): ulučšat'sja—ulučšit'sja, “to improve”; tolstet'—potolstet', “to get fat”;

(5) a communicative limit (a speech act that ends when the speaker thinks that his communicative purpose has been reached): blagodarit'—poblagodarit', “to thank”; prosit'—poprosit', “to ask a favor”; and others.

Let us describe some of the semantic and combinative characteristics of the groups of verbs outlined above that reflect distinctions in the expression of a limit of action.

(1) Among Russian telic (terminative) verbs, the central place is occupied by verbs expressing gradual accumulation of a result directed toward achievement of an absolute natural limit. It concerns, first of all, transitive objective verbs. “Each portion of an action directly places the corresponding portion of a result in the object” (Maslov 1984: 61), which leads to achievement of the limit, exhaustion and termination of the action, and, as a consequence, to a change of the object’s state and of the whole situation. This type includes verbs of creation, such as kleit'—skleit' [korobku], “to make [a box] with glue”; kopat'—vykopat' [kolodec], “to dig [a well]”; točit'—vytočit' [detal'], “to sharpen [a part]”; štit'—štšit' [plat'e], “to sew [a dress]”; stroit'—postroit' [dom], “to build [a house]”; and sozdat'—sozdat' [novuju teoriju], “to formulate [a new theory]”; verbs of transformation of an object: točit'—natočit' [nož], “to sharpen [a knife]”; belit'—pobelit' [stény], “to paint [walls] white”; grimirot'—zagrimirovat' [lico], “to make up [a face]”; okleivat'—okleit' [stény obojami], “to put up [wallpaper on walls]”; pilit'—raspilit' [dosku], “to saw [a board]”; čisti'—ocisti' [ovočši], “to peel [vegetables]”; myr'—vymytyt' [posudu], “to wash [dishes]”; promyvat'—promyt' [ranu], “to clean [a wound]”; perestroïvat'—perestroît' [dom], “to reconstruct [a house]”; zapissyt'—zapisat' [lekciju], “to take notes [in a lecture]”; and so on. In the same group, we can count both verbs of motion and verbs of
changing the position of a subject in space, such as \textit{sadit'\v{s}ja—s\v{e}st'}, "to sit down''; \textit{padat'—upast'}, "to fall''; as well as changing the state of a subject \textit{(varit'\v{s}ja—svarit'\v{s}ja, "to boil").}

In the minimum context, perfective verbs of this group express achievement of a limit as a result of an action, assuming creation or transformation of an object. Compare: \textit{On pokrasil stenu, "He painted the wall''}; \textit{Ona pomyl\v{a} posudu, "She washed dishes''}; \textit{On napisal stat'\v{j}u, "He wrote an article''}; \textit{On pro\v{c}ital etu knigu, "He read this book"). In order to express an action which has not yet completely ended, we can use perfective verbs with the prefix \textit{do-} together with negation, for example: \textit{On kraisil, no ne dokrasil stenu (do konca); "He painted the wall, but he has not finished (to the end)."} \textit{Ona myla, no ne domyla posudu; "She washed the dishes, but she has not finished."} \textit{On pisl, no ne dopisol etu stat'\v{j}u; "He wrote this article, but he has not finished."} \textit{On \v{c}ital, no ne do\v{c}ital etu knigu; "He read this book, but he has not finished."} Compare also: \textit{On pisl etu stat'\v{j}u, no ne dopisol ee do konca; "He wrote this article, but he has not finished it to the end."} Furthermore, if the object of an action and its characteristics actualize the meaning of the attempt, the direct opposite of the corresponding imperfective-perfective verbal pair is possible: \textit{On \v{c}ital, no ne pro\v{c}ital drevnjuju nadpis' na kamne; "He tried to read the ancient inscription on the stone, but was not able to."} Also, \textit{On perevodil, no ne perevel etot slo\v{z}nyj tekst; "He tried to translate this difficult text, but was not able to."}

Imperfective verbs of this group have a full set of particular meanings of the imperfective aspect.

(2) Achievement of a limit can be presented as \textsc{momentary}. In this case, the limit is reflected in the semantics not only of perfective verbs, but also of imperfective verbs. Accordingly, both verbs are equally resultative. The group of \textsc{momentary}	extsuperscript{8} verbs includes verbs such as \textit{naxodit'—najti, "to find''}; \textit{popada,—popast'}, "to get somewhere''; \textit{terjar—poterjar, "to lose''}; \textit{pa\v{c}kat' (sja)—vypa\v{c}kat' (sja), "to dirty''}; \textit{vspyxivat'—vspyxnut', "to flash''}; \textit{vstre\v{c}at'sja—vstre\v{c}it'sja [slu\v{c}ajno], "to meet [by accident]''}; \textit{zame\v{c}at'—zameti, "to notice''}; \textit{zastavat'—zastat', "to catch''}; \textit{slu\v{c}at'sja—slu\v{c}it'sja, "to happen''}; \textit{o\v{s}elomljat'—o\v{s}elomit', "to stun''}; and \textit{obnaru\v{z}ivat'—obnaru\v{z}it' [propav\v{s}ie ve\v{s}či], "to find [the lost items]." Many perfective verbs of this type convey a meaning of momentary or accidental action and point to its
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sudden, punctual transition to a new quality; thus, corresponding imperfective verbs do not denote the preceding stage of an action and cannot convey processual meanings (it is impossible to say: *On ešče naxodit knigu; “He is still finding the book.” *On dolgo naxodil knigu; “He had been finding the book for a long time.” *Kogda ja vošel, on naxodil galstuk; “When I entered, he was finding a tie”) (Maslov 1984: 64). A special subtype of this group consists of the aspectual pairs formed as a result of the secondary imperfectivation of prefixed perfective verbs already paired with unprefixed imperfective verbs: (čitat')—pročitat'—pročityvat', “to read”; (zubrit')—vyzubrit'—vyyzubrivat', “to cram”; (učit')—vyučit'—vyučivat', “to learn.” Such pairs are examples of the so-called “aspectual troika,” in which the secondary imperfectives also have no processual meanings; for further discussion, see Petrukhina (2000: 90–100).

(3) If “the achievement of a goal is not predetermined by the development of a process” (Padučeva 1996: 94), a perfective verb denotes the transition into a new qualitative state, and the corresponding imperfective verb expresses either ATTEMPT." rešat'—rešit' [zadaču], “to solve [a problem]”; sdavat'—sdat' [ekzamen], “to take—to pass [an examination]”; postupat'—postupit' [v universitet], “to enter [a university]”; dožidat'sja—doždat'sja [poezda], “to wait for [a train]”; vstrečat'—vstretit' [kogo-nibuđ v aeroportu], “to meet [s.b. at the airport]”; lovit'—pojmat', “to catch”; dogonjavat'—dognat', “to catch up”; ugovarivat'—ugovorit', “to persuade”; ubeždat'sja—ubedit'sja), “to convince (to be convinced)”; zainteresovvat'—začit' ‘zainteresovat', “to interest”; primirjavat'—primirit' [sosedj], “to reconcile [neighbors]”; vyjasnjat'—vyjasnit', “to clarify”; vdoxnovljat'—vdoxnovit', “to inspire”; vođušeševljat'—vođuševit', “to invigorate”; zapominavat'—zapis't', “to remember”; zaščit' 'zaščitit', “to defend”; utešat'—utešit', “to console”; uspokajat'—uspokojit', “to calm”; or TENDENCY (Maslov 1984: 59–61; Padučeva 1996: 111–115): opazjavat'—opozdat', “to be late”; vyigryvat'—vyigrat', “to win”; tonavit'—utočavat', “to sink”; operēžat'—operēžat', “to outstrip”; pobeždat'—pobedit', “to win”; ugasat'—ugasnut', “to die away”; or PROSPECT (Padučeva 1996: 115–116): rasstavljat'—rasstavljat', “to part”; uvol'javat'—uvolit', “to dismiss”; predostavljat'—predostavljat', “to provide”; vključat'—vključit' [v spisok], “include [on a list]”; and otstranjat'—otstranit' [ot dolžnosti], “to displace [from a post].”
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In these types of verbs, perfective and imperfective forms directly oppose each other. For example, in the following Russian sentences, ideas of attempt and result are expressed by imperfective and perfective forms, respectively, whereas in other languages (including Japanese), these senses are conveyed not grammatically, but lexically: On rešal, no ne rešil zadaču; “He tried to solve the problem, but was not able to.” Ja zapominala ego nový adres, no ne zapomnila; “I tried to remember his new address, but was unable to.” Similarly, imperfective verbs of prospect and tendency can imply the probability of result. Compare: Ego uvol‘njausat, nado čto-to predprinjat‘, čtoby ne uvolili; “They are going to fire him; something should be done so that he will not be fired) (lit. He will probably be dismissed.../They want to dismiss him...). My opazdyvaem, nado vzjat taksi, togda ne opozdaem; “We are running late (i.e., if nothing changes, we will most likely be late) and so need to take a taxi, then we will not be late.”

(4) Limit can have a relative character (Glovinskaja 1982: 86; Bondarko 1986; 1996: 126)—its achievement does not assume the exhaustion and ending of an action, for example: Ego sostojanie ulučšilos‘ i prodolžaet ulučšat’sja; “His condition has improved and continues to improve.” Ceny na benzin vyrosli i prodolžaet rasti; “The price of gasoline has risen and continues to rise.” In this type, we see paired imperfective/perfective verbs, both transitive and intransitive: start‘—postar‘, “to grow old”; slab‘—oslabet‘, “to weaken”; povys‘it’sja—povysit’(sja) (o cene), “to raise/rise (regarding price)”; ulučšat’(sja)—ulučšit’(sja), “to improve”; uveličivat’(sja)—uveličit’(sja), “increase”; rasti—vyrasti, “to grow”; sokraščat’(sja)—sokratit’(sja), “to decrease”; and others.

(5) Verbs of speech represent an interpretation of the speech act from the point of view of its communicative purpose. Imperfective verbs of speech (not in the first person form and not in a performative function) can also express the process of an action that has not yet concluded at the time of speech: for example, On blagodarit xozjaev za gostepriimstvo; “He is thanking his hosts for their hospitality.” Sejčas v sosednej komnate on prosit brata o pomoči; “Now in the next room he is asking his brother for his help.” In such usage, the limit of an action having a communicative nature is not yet reached. The speaker completes the action when he decides that the communicative purpose of his speech act is accomplished, and for this
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reason, we can name such a limit communicative. In a description of documents, verbs of speech can realize the perfect type of the aspectual opposition, as noted by Padučeva (Padučeva 1996: 96); in such cases, the use of the present form of imperfective verbs is synonymous with the past form of perfective verbs. For example: *V svoem pis'me ona pišet/napisala, soobščaet/soobščila, sprašivaet/sprosila o novom proekte*; “In the letter, she writes/wrote, informs/informed, asks/asked about the new project.”

6. Comparative analysis of Russian and Japanese verbs

For the Japanese language, the character of a limit is irrelevant to the aspectual classification of its lexicon as well as the semantics and combination of verbal forms. If verbs of different groups denote the action of a subject transmitted to an object, Japanese verbs (for example, *arau*, “to wash”; *horu*, “to dig out”; *toku*, “to solve”; *tsukamaeru*, “to catch”; *settokusuru*, “to persuade”; and *tanomu*, “to ask for a favor”) in the -te *iru* form express the processual meaning. Thus, the end limit of an action, which is, as a rule, expressed by the simple -u/-ta form, can be perceived in different ways depending on the lexical meaning. Many Japanese process verbs in this unmarked -u/-ta form often behave neutrally in relation to the achievement of an end limit/result, which is overtly expressed in Russian by the corresponding perfective verb. The resultative/non-resultative meaning of such Japanese verbs is, in many cases, determined by context; and if the context does not contain appropriate aspectual indicators, the meaning of achievement/non-achievement of a limit remains overtly unexpressed.

If Russian verbs in different groups denote a change in a subject’s state, including a change in his location, their Japanese equivalents (for example, *vstat’—tatsu*, “to stand up”; *vstrečat’ [v aeroportu]—*demukaeru*, “to meet [at the airport]”; *opazdyvat’—*okureru*, “to be late”; *tonut’—*sizumu, “to sink”; and *ugasmut’—*kieru, “to die away”) convey resultative meaning in their -te *iru* form, and resultative verbs in the simple -u/-ta form more clearly express achievement of the end limit. When diathetic pairs are possible to make, transitive verbs correspond to Russian imperfective verbs, whereas their intransitive resultative counterparts often become equivalent to Russian perfective verbs and denote the result of an action of the subject (they can be
translated to Russian using either transitive or intransitive perfective verbs. Compare: *tateru* - *tatsu* - *stavit’*/*postavit’*, *vstat’* (lit. *vstat’, postavit’sja*), “to stand”; *toku* - *tokeru* - *rešat’*/*rešit’* (lit. *rešit’sja*), “to solve/to be solved”; *ukeru* - *ukaru* - *sdavat’*/*sdat’* (lit. *sdat’sja*), “to take/to pass [exams]”; and *kesu* - *kieru* - *tušit’*/*potušit’*, *ugasnut’* (lit. *potušit’sja*, *ugasnut’*), “to extinguish/to die away.”

Corresponding to Russian verbs of the fourth group (those having a relative limit) are Japanese verbs which, regardless of the properties of transitivity/intransitivity, can have in the marked form both resultative and processual meaning as determined by context, as the idea of the process of changing state is already encoded in their lexical meanings. Compare: *Kare-no* - *jotai-wa* - *condition-TOP* *daihō* - *considerably* *yokunat-ta* - *improve-PST*/*yokunat-te* - *improve-CNV* *ir-/u-be* - *PRS Fut*. “Ego sostojanie dostatočno ulučšilos’. His condition has considerably improved”; and *Kare-no* - *jotai-wa* - *condition-TOP* *jojun* - *gradually* *yokunat-ta* - *improve-PST*/*yokunat-te* - *improve-CNV* *ir-/u-be* - *PRS Fut*. “Ego sostojanie postepenno ulučšalos’/ulučšaetsja. His condition has gradually improved/ is improving.” In addition, there appears to be a difference between Japanese transitive and intransitive verbs of the given type in combinabity with temporal adverbials. Intransitive verbs of diathetic pairs freely combine with adverbials that express a limited period of time (in *what time period*), but it is rather rare with adverbials that express a duration of process (for *how long*) (Kageyama 1996: 62), which corresponds to Russian perfective verbs. Compare: *Kare-no* - *jotai-wa* - *condition-TOP* *mikka* - *three.days de* - *yokunat-ta* - *improve-PST*. “Ego sostojanie ulučšilos’ za tri dnja. His condition improved in three days.” ? *Kare-no* - *jotai-wa* - *condition-TOP* *mikka* - *three.days kan* - *for* *yokunat-ta* - *improve-PST*. “Ego sostojanie ulučšalos’ (impossible to use *ulučšilos’) tri dnja. His condition improved for three days.” The paired transitive verbs are freely combined with both types of temporal adverbials and can be translated to Russian with imperfective and perfective verbs alike. For example: *Seifu-wa* - *government-TOP* *gasorin-no* - *gasoline-GEN* *kakaku-o* - *price-ACC hantosī* - *half.a.year de* - *age-ta* - *raise-PST*. “Pravitel’stvo povysilo cenu na benzin za polgoda. The government has raised the price of gasoline in the last half a year”; and *Koojoo-wa* - *factory-TOP* *jugyoo-in-no* - *worker-GEN* *kazu-o* - *number-ACC ninen* - *two.year de* - *herasi-ta* - *reduce-PST*. “Zavod umen’sil količestvo rabočix za dva goda. The factory has reduced the number of workers in the last two years.”
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In the presence of adverbials of duration, sentences can be understood in two ways: (1) without additional adverbials such as postepenno “gradually”; the duration concerns the period of maintenance of the result of an action, i.e., in the perfect aspect. Compare: Seifu-wa\textsuperscript{government-TOP} gasorin-no\textsuperscript{gasoline-GEN} kakaku-o\textsuperscript{price-ACC} hantos\textsuperscript{half-a-year} kan\textsuperscript{for} age-ta\textsuperscript{raise-PST}. “Pravitel’stvo povysilo cenu na benzin na polgoda. The government raised the price of gasoline for half a year.” The described situation corresponds to what is meant by the sentence Cena na benzin byla povyšennaja polgoda; “The price of gasoline was raised for half a year”; (2) with indicators such as postepenno, “gradually”—in the processual meaning (Seifu-wa\textsuperscript{government-TOP} gasorin-no\textsuperscript{gasoline-GEN} kakaku-o\textsuperscript{price-ACC} hantos\textsuperscript{half-a-year} kan\textsuperscript{for} jojony\textsuperscript{gradually} age-ta\textsuperscript{raise-PST}. “Pravitel’stvo v tečenie polugoda postepenno povyšalo cenu na benzin. The government gradually raised the price of gasoline over half a year”).

Considerable similarities in semantics and combinability are found between Russian verbs and their Japanese equivalents that express a momentary or accidental action (those of the second group). Such verbs in Japanese, just as in Russian, cannot express an actual process. In the simple form, they express a momentary resultative event, while in the -te iru form, they have the meaning of perfect aspect. For example: Kare-wa\textsuperscript{he-TOP} machi-de\textsuperscript{downtown-LOC} siriai-ni\textsuperscript{acquaintance-DAT} dekuwasi-ta\textsuperscript{bump.into-PST}. “On v centre (slučajno) vstrelitljja so znakomym (v tot moment). He bumped into an acquaintance downtown (at that moment).” Kare-wa\textsuperscript{he-TOP} machi-de\textsuperscript{downtown-LOC} siriai-ni\textsuperscript{acquaintance-DAT} dekuwasi-te\textsuperscript{bump.into-CNV} ir-u\textsuperscript{be-PRSFUT}. “On v centre (slučajno) vstrelitljja so znakomym. He bumped into an acquaintance downtown (at a certain moment in the past, having an effect on the subsequent period of time).”

Thus, the universal property of telicity as a temporal delimitation of a dynamic situation proceeding in time, signified by a verb, is important for aspectual characteristics of both Russian and Japanese verbs because it reflects an important property of situations in the real world. However, the concrete realization and interpretation of this property in the semantics of verbs and in the organization of aspectual classes essentially differ between the two compared languages. The notion of limit as a temporal delimitation of action itself plays a great role in the aspectual and, moreover, the verbal
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system of Russian as a whole; however, it is rather irrelevant to that of Japanese.

As we have seen, in the Japanese aspectual classification of the verbal lexicon, the subject of an action plays an important role: the action of a verb serves as a characteristic of the subject’s being; therefore, telicity is treated mainly in relation to the only probable state of the subject. If the action is transmitted to the object, it is impossible to judge a change in the subject by a change in the object. Therefore, in Japanese verbal aspectual classifications, such action is perceived, more likely, as atelic, and corresponding verbs enter into the class of process verbs, which cannot denote the only probable state of the subject. The limit in the Japanese language indicates not the end of change, not the terminative limit of action, but the beginning of a stable condition of the subject. It corresponds to the general meaning of the -te iru form, which is the marked and most grammaticalized aspectual form of Japanese verbs, and which expresses that a stable situation (process or state) is present at a given moment in time.

As we have shown above, the aspectual classification of Japanese verbs is closely connected to their division into categories of transitive and intransitive (and diathetic pairs of) verbs. This means that properties such as the agentivity/non-agentivity and controllability/non-controllability of an action also play important roles. The achievement of the result of action transmitted to the object can be expressed by another verbal lexeme like an intransitive verb denoting a change in the state of the subject of non-agentive, passive actions. See: wakasu—waku, “kipiatit’—vskipet’/to boil [water]”; okosu—okiru, “budit’—probudit’/ja/to wake up”; tsukeru—tsuku, “vključat’ [svet]—vključit’sja/to turn on [a light]—to be turned on”; yaku—yakeru, “žarit’—požarit’sja/to grill—to be grilled”; kawakasu—kawaku, “susit’—vysušit’sja/to dry.” Thus, the idea of the natural development of a terminative event, from the beginning to its natural end and result, and the idea of change and the transformation of an object, to which the action is passed over, are conveyed in Japanese less consistently than in Russian. In the words of Moriyama, in such diathetic pairs as yaku—yakeru, “peč’—ispeč’sja, vypeč’sja (o xlebe)/to bake—to be baked (regarding bread)”; the intransitive verb yakeru, “ispeč’sja, vypeč’sja,” univocally denotes that bread should become baked, whereas the transitive verb yaku, “to bake”, only means that
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the subject is engaged in bread-making for the purpose of baking it; it is also possible that as a result of the action, the bread may not be baked (Moriyama 1986: 90).

7. Conclusion

Comparing aspectual verbal classes in Russian and Japanese and understanding the aspectual opposition of Japanese verbs in diathetic pairs (from the point of view of Russian aspect and semantic relations between imperfective and perfective verbs in aspectual pairs) confirm the conclusion drawn from our previous joint work (Kaneko and Petrukhina 2004) conducted on other linguistic material and on a different level—the conclusion about the basic distinctions in aspectual interpretation of similar denotative situations in Japanese and Russian. What is important and relevant to the Russian aspectual system is the opposition of telic/atelic (terminative/non-terminative) actions, notions of a changing substance (both in subject and object), and the result and the end of an action. In the Japanese aspectual system, these oppositions and ideas are not of central importance. It is difficult to express the changing process of an object; however, in contrast, the Japanese aspect marks the expression of the resultative state of a subject being stable and synchronous with the moment of observation, which is often represented as if independent of a cause (or preceding heterogeneous process acting upon an object)-and-effect (or resulting state of this object) relationship.

The data of syntactic typology show, as Wierzbicka notes, “There are two different ways of viewing reality toward which different languages can gravitate: one can tend to view the world in terms of causes and their effects, and one tends to view it in a more subjective, impressionistic, phenomenological perspective.” In this regard, according to Wierzbicka, “Among European languages, Russian goes perhaps further than any other in the direction of the phenomenological tendency” (Wierzbicka 1992: 430). Our comparative analysis of Russian and Japanese aspectual systems suggests that the phenomenological view of the world is to a greater extent inherent in Japanese than in Russian.
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Abbreviations:

ACC accusative, CNV converb, DAT dative, GEN genitive, ITR intransitive, LOC locative, NEG negative, PRSFUT present-future, PST past, TOP topic, TR transitive
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Notes
1. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23720191.
2. The wide variety of actional classifications proposed by different researchers is summarized very clearly in Tatevosov’s work (Tatevosov 2002: 320–321).
3. Here, the term momentary verbs lays stress not on the momentary accomplishment of an action, but on the momentary transition of the subject from one state to another.
4. We must note that many Japanese causatives and transitive verbs of these groups can be understood in different aspectual meanings, depending on the context or adverbials. Compare: Kare wa obaasan o kurumaisu ni suwarase-te ir-u, “He is putting an elderly lady in a wheelchair”; Kare wa obaasan o sumi ni suwarase-te ir-u, “He has seated an elderly lady in a corner (= she sits in a corner)”; Kare wa ima eda o ot-te ir-u, “He is now breaking a branch”; Kare wa eda o hanbun ni ot-te ir-u, “He has broken a branch in half (= the branch is broken in half).”
5. It has been noted in some Slavistic literature that the invariant of the perfective in the Slavic languages, including Russian, is also related to the semantic element of “BEGIN” (Wierzbicka 1967; Glovsinskaja 1982: 107; 2001: 130).
6. In Vendler’s classification (Vendler 1967), these verbs are classified as accomplishments. In
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Glovinskaja's classification, they are treated as the first semantic type of the aspectual opposition (Glovinskaja 1982: 82–89).

7. The English translations in these examples are incorrect and do not make sense without referring to the object after the first verb; *He painted, but has not finished painting the wall.

8. Achievements, according to Vendler (Vendler 1967).

9. ATTEMPT is the third semantic type of the aspectual opposition, according to Glovinskaja (Glovinskaja 1982: 89–91).