

Andrey Shluinsky

Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of sciences (Moscow)  
ashl@yandex.ru

## Verb-verb complexes in Turkic languages

### 0. Turkic languages, the data, the phenomenon

A group of ca. 40 closely languages (< Altaic language family); mainly in Russia (though not only).  
Their internal classification is disputable.

No systematic intragenetic comparison, but an overview of ‘Standard Average Turkic’.

The data:

- field data of Tatar (Mishar dialect) (Tatar Yeltan, Tatarstan, 1999-2000), Chuvash (Anatri / Lower dialect) (Shimkusy, Chuvashia 2001), Khakas (Sagay dialect) (Kazanovka, Khakassia, 2002), Karachay-Balkar (Cherek patois of Balkar dialect) (Verkhnjaja Balkaria, Kabardino-Balkaria, 2002), Tubalar (Kebezen, Altai, 2006) (collective fieldtrips of Moscow State University and of Russian State University for Humanities)
- published grammars of (some) Turkic languages

Personal research was published in (Shluinsky 2006, 2009a), (Lyutikova et al. 2006), (Pazelskaya & Shluinsky 2007)

Bashkir

- (1)    šəp      kenə      ešl-əp      jat-a-lar  
      rather well      **work-CVB**      **lie-PRS-3PL**  
      ‘They work rather well.’ (Juldašev 1977: 122)

V-V complex, containing:

- a lexical verb in a converb form
- a semi-auxiliary (or a light verb) in any form depending on the syntactic and semantic context.

The verbs in the V-V complex are juxtaposed.

The semi-auxiliary does not pertain its lexical meaning.

### 1. Overview of Turkic V – V complexes

#### 1.1. Converbs used in V – V complexes

Converbs in Turkic languages:

a bunch of specialized converbs e.g. (2)

vs.

two contextual converbs (I use the terms of Nedjalkov 1995):

- *-p* converb (3)
- *-V / -j* converb (4) and its reduplicated form (5)

Bashkir

- (2)    haldat-ka      al-in-**yas**      hər    vakit    ber-gə      bul-di-k  
      soldier-DAT    take-REFL-CVB.ANT    all    time    one-DAT    be-PST-1PL  
      ‘When we became soldiers, we were together all the time.’ (Juldašev 1977: 74)

- (3) ul armija saf-i-nan kajt-**ip** nəşriət-tə eşlə-j  
 s/he army rank-3-ABL return-CVB publishing\_house-LOC work-CVB.IPFV

başla-ni  
 start-PST

‘Having returned from the army, he started working in a publishing house.’ (Juldašev 1977: 31)

- (4) ɣəjşə aşik-ma-j ɣina sisen-de  
 Gajsha hurry-NEG-CVB.IPFV only undress-PST  
 ‘Gajsha got undressed unhurriedly.’ (Juldašev 1977: 156)

- (5) rauil höjl-ən-ə-höjl-ən-ə sisen-de lə hiu-ɣa  
 Ravil speak-REFL-CVB.IPFV-speak-REFL-CVB.IPFV undress-PST and water-DAT

hiker-ðe  
 jump-PST

‘Ravil, speaking, got undressed and jumped into the water.’ (Juldašev 1977: 71)

Note. Chuvash and Yakut are the only two Turkic languages that lack *-p* converb. Chuvash *-sa* and Yakut *-n* are their functional analogues.

Turkic contextual converbs are a number of differences from specialized ones:

- contextual converbs are normally same-subject, cf. (6a-b); only in special ‘almost same-subject’ semantic contexts they may be structurally different-subject, cf. (7)-(8);
- contextual converbs may be transparent for the scope of mood (9)-(10) (cf. Jóhanson 1995) and, occasionally, negation (11);
- contextual converbs may be used for clause-chaining (12);
- contextual converbs may be used for tightly related verbs expressing sub-events of a macro-event (13)-(15).

Mishar Tatar

- (6) a. zefär kil-**gäč** rişat kit-te  
 Zufar come-CVB.ANT Rishat leave-PST  
 ‘Rishat left when Zufar came.’

- b. \*zefär kil-**ep** rişat kit-te  
 Zufar come-CVB Rishat leave-PST

- (7) käüsä-se sɣn-**ɣp** agač au-dɣ  
 trunk-3 break-CVB tree fall-PST  
 ‘When the trunk broke, the tree fell down.’

Bashkir

- (8) uki-j-uki-j küð-ðər-em tono-p böt-tö  
 read-CVB.IPFV-read-CVB.IPFV eye-PL-1SG go\_dark-CVB finish-PST  
 ‘While reading (for a long time), my eyes went dark.’ (Juldašev 1977: 71)

Mishar Tatar

- (9) a. kil-ep aša!  
 come-CVB eat.IMP  
 ‘Come and eat!’

- b. kil-ep aša-sɣn  
 come-CVB eat-JUSS  
 ‘Let him come and eat!’

Anatri Chuvash

- (10) vašš'a jaška ši-se čej iš-es-šën  
 Vasja soup eat-CVB tea drink-FUT-DESID  
 ‘Vasja wants to eat soup and to drink tea.’

Mishar Tatar

(11) ul ʒyr tɚŋla-p kitap ukɣ-ma-sɣn

s/he music listen-CVB book read-NEG-JUSS

a. 'Don't let him read the book while listening the music.'

b. 'Don't let him listen the music and read the book.'

(12) safjan čitek-lär-e-n **kij-ep**, tɚlɣm-nar-ɣ-n čulɣ-lar  
morocco boot-PL-3-ACC **put\_on-CVB** plait-PL-3-ACC chulpa-PL

belän **ür-ep**, zilkä-se-nä čiläk-kejäntä-lär-e-n  
with **braid-CVB** shoulder-3-DAT bucket-yoke-PL-3-ACC

**as-ɣp**, zexrä su-ga **kit-ä**

**hang-CVB** Zukhra water-DAT **leave-IPFV**

'... Zukhra puts on morocco boots, braids plaits with chulpas, puts a yoke with buckets on her shoulders and leaves for water.'

(13) at-nɣ **tuar-ɣ-p** **al-a** da, arba-nɣ  
horse-ACC unharness-CVB take-IPFV and waggon-ACC

**tart-ɣp** čɣga-r-a da «ii xajwan» di  
drag-CVB go\_out-CAUS-IPFV and eh beast say-IPFV

'He unharnesses the horse, takes out the waggon and says, 'oh, beast!''

(14) patša xekümät-e ... älege ʒir-lär-gä urɣs-lar-nɣ,  
tsar government-3 this land-PL-DAT Russian-PL-ACC

čuaš-lar-nɣ **küče-r-ep** **utɣr-t-a**  
Chuvash-PL-ACC move-CAUS-CVB sit-CAUS-IPFV

'The tsar's government ... settled Russians and Chuvashes in the same lands.'

(15) šul čak jugarɣ-dan mɣ-nɣŋ kul-ɣ-na ber jɣmgak  
that time height-ABL this-GEN hand-3- DAT one clew

**kil-ep** **teš-ä** dä **tägärä-p** **kit-ep** **bar-a**  
come-CVB fall-IPFV and roll-CVB leave-CVB go-IPFV

'At that time a clew fell down from above into her hands and rolled away further'.

The latter uses like (13)-(15) are the functional and semantic base for development of V – V complexes. Exactly the two contextual Turkic converbs with the markers *-p* (*-sa* in Chuvash, *-n* in Yakut) (more frequently) and *-V / -j* (less frequently) are used in V – V complexes like (1).

## 1.2. Semi-auxiliaries used in V – V complexes

The sets of semi-auxiliaries are, of course, different in different Turkic languages. No systematic study summarizing all the systems present in all the Turkic languages.

General semantic domains of meanings expressed by the auxiliaries in V – V complexes:

- directional meanings (16)-(17)
- actional meanings (18)-(19)
- valency-changing benefactive meanings (20)-(21)

Anatri Chuvash

(16) karap puxta-ran **věš<sup>j</sup>-se** **tux-r-ě**  
ship bay-ABL **swim-CVB** **go\_out-PST-3**

'The ship went out from the bay.'

Bashkir

(17) ul irtük **kajt-ip** **kit-te**  
s/he early **return-CVB** **leave-PST**

'He left home early in the morning.' (Juldašev 1977: 127)

Mishar Tatar

- (18) ä a-nɤŋ kaja kit-kän-e-n pränkä rafig-e **kür-ep**  
and s/he-GEN where leave-PRF-3-ACC Prjanik Rafik-3 **see-CVB**

**kal-a**

**stay-IPFV**

‘And Rafik Prjanik saw where she went.’

Bashkir

- (19) min bil kitap-ti **uk-ip** **sik-ti-m**  
I this book-ACC **read-CVB** **exit-PST-1SG**  
‘I read this book completely.’ (Juldašev 1977: 129)

Sagay Khakas

- (20) ulax mäč **tut** **pir-gen**  
boy ball **catch.CVB** **give-PST**  
‘The boy caught the ball for someone.’

Uzbek

- (21) bu lazzat-li taom-ni **je-b** **ol-di-m**  
this taste-ADJ food-ACC **eat-CVB** **take-PST-1SG**  
‘I ate myself this tasty food.’ (Kononov 1960: 265)

The same auxiliary may be used for meanings of different groups, also in the same language.

Tubalar

- (22) wasʃa ežik **ač-ip** **ber-di**  
Vasja door **open-CVB** **give-PST**  
a. ‘Vasja started opening the door.’  
b. ‘Vasja opened the door to someone.’

Different degrees of grammaticalization of different (semi-)auxiliaries. E.g. in Sagay Khakas *sal-* ‘< put’ morphologically is still an independent verb (23a) and *\*-is* ‘< send’ is, altogether with the converb marker reanalyzed as a derivational suffix (23b). The suffix *-ibis-* (i) is more regular than auxiliaries, (ii) is convergent to the vowel harmony and (iii) morphologically fills the slot of the derivational suffixes, e.g. precedes the negation marker.

Sagay Khakas

- (23) a. ajdo pičik-ti pas **sal-yan**  
Ajdo paper-ACC write.CVB **put-PST**  
‘Ajdo wrote the letter.’ {a=b}  
b. ajdo pičik-ti paz-**ibis-xan**  
Ajdo paper-ACC write-**PFV-PST**

In contrast to standard converbial constructions, in V – V complexes a converb of a lexical verb cannot be linearly separated from the auxiliary (24), (25a-b). An auxiliary cannot have its own complements or adjuncts (25c-d). Constructed sentences breaking these rules are not always ungrammatical, but contain standard converbial constructions, not V – V complexes.

Anatri Chuvash

- (24) a. ivan vil-se kaj-r-ě  
Ivan die-CVB leave-PST-3  
‘Ivan died.’

- b. ?? vil-se ivan kaj-r-ě  
die-CVB Ivan leave-PST-3

Cherek Karachay-Balkar

- (25) a. sabij-le zij-il-ip tur-a-di-la  
child-PL gather-PASS-CVB stand-IPFV-3-PL  
'The children have already gathered.'
- b. sabij-le zij-il-ip entda tur-a-di-la  
child-PL gather-PASS-CVB again stand-IPFV-3-PL  
b'. 'The children, having gathered, are standing again.'  
b". \*'The children have already gathered again.'
- c. sabij-le zij-il-ip baxca-da tur-a-di-la  
child-PL gather-PASS-CVB garden-LOC stand-IPFV-3-PL  
'The children, having gathered, are standing in the garden.' {c=d}
- d. sabij-le zij-il-ip tur-a-di-la baxca-da  
child-PL gather-PASS-CVB stand-IPFV-3-PL garden-LOC

Special case that may be analyzed in different ways: (some) phasal verbs are always combined with converbs (26).

Mishar Tatar

- (26) pečän čab-ɣp beter-ä-m  
hay mow-CVB finish-IPFV-1SG  
'I finish mowing the hay.'

## 2. Case studies of semi-auxiliaries in a V – V complex as productive actional modifiers: *Karachay-Balkar, Chuvash*

### 2.0. Describing the parameter of actionality

The method proposed by Sergei Tatevosov (2002).

Actionality of a verb is defined by actional meanings of (a) its perfective and (b) its imperfective form.

There are five actional meaning in the method:

- state (S)
- process (P)
- multiplicative process (MP)
- entry into a state (ES)
- entry into a process (EP)

S, P and MP are accessible both for perfective and imperfective forms, and ES and EP are accessible only for perfective forms.

E.g. in Chuvash the verb *tavrăna* 'return' is telic and has the actional meaning <ES; P>, cf. (27a-b); the verb *čirle* 'be ill' is weak inceptive, since has the actional meaning <ES, S; S>, cf. (28a-b).

Anatri Chuvash

- (27) a. pětěr tavrăn-č-ě  
Peter return-PST-3  
'Peter returned (in time X / \* for time X).'
- b. pětěr tavrăna-t<sup>i</sup>  
Peter return-PRS.3SG  
'Peter is returning.'

- (28) a. ivan cirle-r-ě  
 Ivan be\_ill-PST-3  
 a'. 'Ivan fell ill.'  
 a". 'Ivan was ill (for time X).'
- b. ivan čirle-tʲ  
 Ivan be\_ill-PRS.3SG  
 'Ivan is ill.'

For Karachay-Balkar and Tubalar their actional systems are described in these terms in more detail in (Lyutikova et al. 2006) and (Pazelskaya & Rybinceva 2009). For Chuvash the same method is used.

### 2.1. Cherek Karachay-Balkar: *V – V complexes with tur-* 'stand' as ~ resultative actional operator

*-p tur* construction in Karachay-Balkar (and many other Turkic languages) generally is described as having a resultative meaning. I.e., it refers to the resulting state that takes place when a telic event reaches its natural endpoint, cf. (29a-c): as shows (29b) the reference point is inside the period of the resulting state. I elaborate the results, formerly published by Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov (1987).

- (29) a. inna šöndü šorpa bişir-ip tur-a-di  
 grandmother now soup cook-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
 'The grandmother has cooked the soup.'
- b. min üj-ge kel-gen-de, inna xar kün-den  
 I home-DAT come-PRF-LOC grandmother every day-ABL  
 šorpa bişir-ip tur-a-di  
 soup cook-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
 'When I come home, the grandmother has already the soup cooked every day.'
- c. min üj-ge kel-gen-de, inna xar kün-den  
 I home-DAT come-PRF-LOC grandmother every day-ABL  
 šorpa bişir-e-di  
 soup cook-IPFV-3SG  
 'When I come home, the grandmother cooks the soup every day.'

However in fact *-p tur* construction can express different phases of the event expressed by the lexical verb. It is defined by its actionality.

#### (weak) telic <ES, P; P> lexical verbs

two subclasses of lexical verbs, corresponding to result vs. manner verbs in terms of (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998)

- with result verbs *-p tur* has only the meaning of the resulting state (30)
- with manner verb *-p tur* has two meanings: the meaning of the resulting state and the meaning of the ongoing process (31)

- (30) fatima qartoş sat-ip tur-a-di  
 Fatima potatoes sell-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
 'Fatima has sold the potatoes.'
- (31) fatima qofta eş-ip tur-a-di  
 Fatima jersey knit-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
 a. 'Fatima is knitting the jersey.'  
 b. 'Fatima has knit the jersey.'

telic <ES; P> and punctual <ES; —> lexical verbs

*-p tur* has the meaning of the resulting state (32), (33)

- (32) alim öl-üp tur-a-dî  
Alim die-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Alim is dead.'
- (33) alim kitap-ni tab-ip tur-a-dî  
Alim book-ACC find-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Alim has found the book.'

(weak) inceptive-stative <ES, S; S> lexical verbs

*-p tur* has the meaning of the lexical state; the construction is synonymous to the lexical verb in its imperfective form; since the verbs also have an inceptive meaning, the lexical state can be also described as a resulting one

- (34) kerim şöndü fatima-ni kör-üp tur-a-dî  
Kerim now Fatima-ACC see-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Kerim is seeing Fatima now.'
- (35) kerim asijat-ni süj-üp tur-a-dî  
Kerim Asijat-ACC love-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Kerim loves Asijat.'

stative-process lexical verbs <ES, S; P, S> and <ES, P, S; P, S> (mainly, posture verbs)

*-p tur* has the meaning of the lexical state, but not one of the lexical process, cf. *olturadî* 'is sitting || is sitting down'.

- (36) kerim oltur-up tur-a-dî  
Kerim sit-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Kerim is sitting || \*is sitting down.'
- (37) kerim zat-ip tur-a-dî  
Kerim lie-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Kerim is lying || \* is lying down.'

telic-stative lexical verbs <ES, P, S; P> and <ES, S; P>

*-p tur* has the meaning of the resulting state that can be also expressed by a perfective (but not imperfective) form of the lexical verbs, cf. *batxandî* 'drowned (for time X) || drowned (in time X) || was under the water (for time X)'.

- (38) kerim bat-ip tur-a-dî  
Kerim drown-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Kerim has drowned.'
- (39) alim ustaz bol-up tur-a-dî  
Alim teacher become-CVB stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Alim has become a teacher.'

two-endpoint telic <ES, EP, P; P> lexical verbs (mainly movement verbs)

*-p tur* has the meaning of the resulting state

- (40) üj            zan-ip            tur-a-di  
house    burn-CVB    stand-IPFV-3SG  
'The house has burnt down || \*is burning.'

(weak) ingressive-process <EP, P; P> lexical verbs

*-p tur* has the meaning of the lexical process (!); the construction is synonymous to the lexical verb in its imperfective form

- (41) alim    kül-üp            tur-a-di  
Alim    laugh-CVB    stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Alim is laughing (now).'

multiplicative <ES, MP; MP> and multiplicative-process <ES, P, MP; P, MP> lexical verbs

*-p tur* has the meaning of the resulting state of a single quantum of the multiplicative process (42), (43)

- (42) asijat    qol-u    bla    bulka-p    tur-a-di  
Asijat    hand-3    with    wave-CVB    stand-IPFV-3SG  
a. 'Asijat has waved with her hand.'  
b. \*'Asijat is waving with her hand.'
- (43) kerim    top-nu    at-ip            tur-a-di  
Kerim    ball-ACC    throw-CVB    stand-IPFV-3SG  
a. 'Kerim has thrown the ball.'  
2. \*'Kerim is throwing the ball.'

stative <S; S> lexical verbs

*-p tur* has the meaning of the lexical state; the construction is synonymous to the lexical verb in its imperfective form

- (44) kerim    nalčik-ta            zaša-p    tur-a-di  
Kerim    Nalchik-LOC    live-CVB    stand-IPFV-3SG  
'Kerim lives in Nalchik.'

process <P; P> lexical verbs

no episodic uses of *-p tur*

- (45) kerim    kitap-ni    izle-p            tur-a-di  
Kerim    book-ACC    look\_for-CVB    stand-IPFV-3SG  
a. 'Kerim (regularly) looks for the book.'  
b. \*'Kerim is looking for the book (now).'

Summarizing, it is true that the resultative meaning of the *-p tur* construction in Karachay-Balkar is the main one both synchronically and diachronically. However if the actional structure of a verb contains no resulting state, *-p tur* can express both a lexical state and a resulting process, though not a lexical process.



## 2.2. *Anatri Chuvash: V – V complexes with il- ‘take’ as ~ limitative actional operator*

-*se il* construction in Chuvash (and many other Turkic languages) generally is described as having a limitative meaning. In fact it can have three types of uses: limitative (an event is restricted in time) (46), cancelled result (the result reached in the endpoint is cancelled) (47), semelfactive (a quantum of an event) (48).

- (46) pětěr jurla-sa il-č-ě  
Peter sing-CVB take-PST-3  
‘Peter sang for a while.’
- (47) š<sup>h</sup>uta sün-se il-č-ě  
light go\_out-CVB take-PST-3  
‘The light went out and lit again.’
- (48) šiv tumla-sa il-č-ě  
water drip-CVB take-PST-3  
‘The water dropped once.’

The choice of a meaning is defined by actionality.

### telic <ES; P> and punctual <ES; —> lexical verbs

-*se il* has the meaning of the cancelled result

- (49) pětěr tavrän-sa il-č-ě  
Peter return-CVB take-PST-3  
‘Peter returned and left again.’
- (50) ača š<sup>h</sup>uxal-sa il-č-ě  
child get\_lost-CVB take-PST-3  
‘The child got lost and was found again.’

### weak telic <ES, P; P> lexical verbs

two subclasses of lexical verbs, corresponding to result vs. manner verbs in terms of (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998)

- with result verbs -*se il* has the meaning of cancelled result (51)
- with manner verb -*se il* has the limitative meaning (52)

- (51) ivan kil-se il-č-ě  
Ivan come-CVB take-PST-3  
‘Ivan came and left again.’
- (52) xer kofta-na šix-sa il-č-ě  
girl jersey-ACC knit-CVB take-PST-3  
‘The girl knit the jersey for a while.’

### inceptive-stative <ES; S> and weak inceptive-stative <ES, S; S> lexical verbs

-*se il* has the limitative meaning

- (53) ača pravila-na änlän-sa il-č-ě  
child rule-ACC understand-CVB take-PST-3  
‘The child understood the rule for a while.’

- (54) ivan čirle-se il-č-ě  
 Ivan be\_ill-CVB take-PST-3  
 ‘Ivan was ill for a while.’

stative-process <ES, S; P, S> lexical verbs (mainly, posture verbs)

-se *il* has the limitative meaning of the state (but not of the process)

- (55) pětěr vřt-sa il-č-ě  
 Peter lie-CVB take-PST-3  
 ‘Peter was lying for a while.’

(weak) ingressive-process <EP, P; P> lexical verbs

-se *il* has the limitative meaning

- (56) šiv vřě-se il-č-ě  
 water boil-CVB take-PST-3  
 ‘The water boiled for a while.’

stative <S; S> lexical verbs

-se *il* has the limitative meaning

- (57) ivan šivār-sa il-č-ě  
 Ivan sleep-CVB take-PST-3  
 ‘Ivan slept for a while.’

process <P; P> lexical verbs

-se *il* has the limitative meaning

- (58) kupāsta šer-se il-č-e  
 cabbage rot-CVB take-PST-3  
 ‘The cabbage rotted for a while.’

multiplicative <ES, MP; MP> lexical verbs

-se *il* has the limitative and semelfactive meanings (59a-b)

- (59) ivan avtamāt-ran per-se il-č-ě  
 Ivan tommy\_gun-ABL shoot-CVB take-PST-3  
 a. ‘Ivan shot once with the tommy-gun.’  
 b. ‘Ivan shot shot for a while with the tommy-gun.’

Summarizing, Chuvash -se *il* construction has the limitative meaning with atelic (including inceptive / ingressive atelic) verbs and the meaning of the cancelled result with the telic verbs; the semelfactive meaning is one of the possibilities for the multiplicative verbs.

### 3. Case study of semantic and syntactic restrictions on the lexical verb in a V – V complex: *Tubalar*

An overview of the whole system of the auxiliaries in V – V complexes, their lexical restrictions and meanings.

When auxiliaries serve as actional modifiers, the main clue to their semantics and lexical restriction is again the actionality of the lexical verb in the same way as in 2.

When auxiliaries have other meanings, their restrictions may be defined by other lexical features.

#### 3.1. *al* ‘take’: limitative and self-benefactive constructions

##### 3.1.1. limitative *al* ‘take’

In Tubalar, a less productive meaning. It is regular with atelic verbs of e.g. <S; S>, <P; P>, <EP, P; P> actional classes.

- (60) wasʃa qattir-ip al-di  
Vasja laugh-CVB take-PST  
‘Vasja laughed for a while.’

(Weak) telic lexical verbs <ES, P; P> normally are not grammatical with the limitative meaning of *al* (61). Limitative meaning is occasionally possible with such verbs only if they have an incremental cumulative Theme (in terms of Dowty 1991 and Krifka 1992), cf. (62).

- (61) wasʃa eʒik aç-ip al-di  
Vasja door open-CVB take-PST  
\* ‘Vasja opened the door for a while.’
- (62) maša ajaq-qoʒıq nün-üp al-di  
Masha cup-spoon wash-CVB take-PST  
‘Masha washed the dishes for a while.’

##### 3.1.2. self-benefactive *al* ‘take’

The role of a Beneficiary is introduced into the event structure, and the Beneficiary is coreferential with the subject (63). Note that the semantic Beneficiary introduced by *al* is not obligatorily the same as the Beneficiary that may be optionally expressed by a NP in Dative, cf. (64a-b).

- (63) maša uçıq-tı üz-üp al-di  
Masha thread-ACC tear-CVB take-PST  
‘Masha tore the thread for herself.’
- (64) a. wasʃa u ed-ip al-di  
Vasja house make-CVB take-PST  
Vasja built a house for himself.’
- b. wasʃa ana-zi-na u ed-ip al-di  
Vasja mother-3SG-DAT house make-CVB take-PST  
Vasja built house his mother with a profit for himself.’

Introducing the role of the Beneficiary influences the actional structure too. An atelic event frequently is reinterpreted as a telic one, since the ‘profit’ of the Beneficiary presupposes a kind of a resulting state, cf. (65)-(66). However, this effect is not obligatory, cf. (67).

- (65) a. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a oč-up al-di  
 Vasja sit-CVB take-PST  
 ‘Vasja got something hor himself via sitting.’ {e.g. one sits in offices of different institutuions}
- b. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a oč-ti  
 Vasja sit-PST  
 a'. ‘Vasja was sitting.’  
 a". \*‘Vasja got something via sitting.’
- (66) a. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a uxta-p al-di  
 Vasja sleep-CVB take-PST  
 ‘Vasja slept his fill.’
- b. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a uxta-di  
 Vasja sleep-PST  
 b'. ‘Vasja slept.’  
 b". \*‘Vasja slept his fill.’
- (67) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a ište-p al-di  
 Vasja work-CVB take-PST  
 ‘Vasja worked for himself.’

Normally, there is a lexical restriction for *al* self-benefactives: they are grammatical with volitive / controlled verbs; otherwise the construction is interpreted as a pun, cf. (68).

- (68) toš qajil-ip al-di  
 ice melt-CVB take-PST  
 ‘The ice melted on purpose for itself.’

However there is a group of uncontrolled verbs that are possible in (lexicalized) *al* constructions with a general telicizing meaning.

- (69) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a maša-ni süj-üp al-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC love-CVB take-PST  
 ‘Vasja fell in love with Masha.’
- (70) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a tül-üp al-di  
 Vasja fall-CVB take-PST  
 ‘Vasja fell down.’

### 3.2. *ber* ‘give’: inchoative and -benefactive constructions

#### 3.2.1. inchoative *ber* ‘give’

*ber* functions as an actional modifier that creates a beginning point of an event that is, in case of the telic verbs, primarily absent in its actional structure and, in the imperfective form, a preliminary process.

- (71) a. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a pičik š<sup>ʎ</sup>i-ip ber-di  
 Vasja paper write-CVB give-PST  
 ‘Vasja began writing a letter.’
- b. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a pičik š<sup>ʎ</sup>i-ip ber-bit  
 Vasja paper write-CVB give-PRS  
 ‘Vasja is beginning writing a letter.’

The only lexical restriction includes punctual <ES; —> lexical verbs which have no process that could have the preliminary beginning point.

- (72) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a ključ-ti tab-ip ber-di  
 Vasja key-ACC find-CVB give-PST  
 \*‘Vasja started finding the key.’

With (weak) inceptive-stative <ES, S; S> and ingressive-process <EP, P; P> lexical verbs *ber* refers to the culmination point that is also present in the actional structure of the lexical verb.

- (73) a. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a maša-ni süj-üp ber-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC love-CVB give-PST  
 ‘Vasja fell in love with Masha.’  
 b. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a maša-ni süj-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC love-PST  
 b'. ‘Vasja fell in love with Masha.’  
 b''. ‘Vasja loved Masha.’
- (74) a. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a qattir-ip ber-di  
 Vasja laugh-CVB give-PST  
 ‘Vasja began to laugh.’  
 b. was<sup>ʎ</sup>a qattir-di  
 Vasja laugh-PST  
 b'. ‘Vasja began to laugh.’  
 b''. ‘Vasja laughed.’

### 3.2.2. benefactive *ber* ‘give’

The role of a Beneficiary is introduced into the event structure, and the Beneficiary is non-coreferential with the subject.

- (75) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a qožiq-ti sal-ip ber-di  
 Vasja spoon-ACC put-CVB give-PST  
 ‘Vasja put the spoon for someone.’

Lexical restriction for *ber* benefactives is the same as for *al* self-benefactives: they are grammatical only with volitive / controlled verbs.

- (76) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a maša-ni süj-üp ber-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC love-CVB give-PST  
 \*‘Vasja loved Masha for someone.’
- (77) toš qajil-ip ber-di  
 ice melt-CVB give-PST  
 \*‘The ice melted for someone.’

There are also pragmatic constraints that are not so strict.

- (78) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a uxta-p ber-di  
 Vasja sleep-CVB give-PST  
 ‘Vasja slept for someone.’ {e.g. he did not want to disturb them}
- (79) was<sup>ʎ</sup>a töš-üp ber-di  
 Vasja cough-PST give-PST  
 Vasja coughed for someone.’ {e.g. the doctor asked him}

- (80) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a te-p ber-di  
 Vasja eat-CVB give-PST  
 ??‘Vasja ate for someone.’ {my consultants failed to invent an appropriate context ⊗}

### 3.3. *kör* ‘see’: conative construction

-*p kör* construction typically is used to express an attempt to fulfil an event expressed by the lexical verb. The matter of such an attempt is not defined neither by the semantics of the lexical verb nor by the semantics of the construction.

- (81) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a ežik ač-ip kör-di  
 Vasja door open-CVB see-PST  
 ‘Vasja tried to open the door.’
- (82) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a qožiq-ti stol-tiŋ al-ip kör-di  
 Vasja spoon-ACC table-ABL take-CVB see-PST  
 ‘Vasja tried to take the spoon from the table.’ {e.g. he is ill}
- (83) maša čaška nün-üp kör-di  
 Masha cup wash-CVB see-PST  
 ‘Masha tried to wash the cup.’

With inceptive-stative <ES, S; S> and ingressive-process <EP, P; P> verbs -*p kör* construction is used to express an attempt to reach the relevant culmination point starting the state or the process.

- (84) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a maša-ni kör-üp kör-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC see-CVB see-PST  
 ‘Vasja tried to see Masha.’
- (85) it ür-üp kör-di  
 dog bark-CVB see-PST  
 ‘The dog tried to bark’. {e.g. a puppy}

With stative <S; S> and process <P; P> verbs -*p kör* construction is used to express the case when the relevant state or process takes place for a relatively short time and pragmatically has a low estimate.

- (86) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a kebezen-de tʃad-ip kör-di  
 Vasja Kebezen-LOC live-CVB see-PST  
 ‘Vasja tried to live in Kebezen.’
- (87) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a ište-p kör-di  
 Vasja work-CVB see-PST  
 ‘Vasja tried to work.’

As a strong tendency, -*p kör* construction presupposes the control of the subject. If a verb may be used to express a controlled event, the construction is not possible with a subject that has no controlling potential (88b). A controlled reading is applied where possible (88a), (89).

- (88) a. was<sup>ʃ</sup>a tül-üp kör-di  
 Vasja fall-CVB see-PST  
 a'. ‘Vasja tried to fall down (on purpose).’  
 a". ?? ‘Vasja almost fell down.’
- b. ??č<sup>ʃ</sup>aška tül-üp kör-di  
 cup fall-CVB see-PST  
 ‘The cup almost fell down.’

- (89) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a ül-üp kör-di  
 Vasja die-CVB see-PST  
 a. ‘Vasja tried to die (on purpose).’ {e.g. he attempted suicide}  
 b. \*‘Vasja almost died.’

However with the verbs which never have a subject with controlling potential *-p kör* construction has a proximative meaning: the event expressed by the lexical verb is close to its endpoint, but does not reach it.

- (90) toš qajıl-ıp kör-di  
 ice melt-CVB see-PST  
 ‘The ice almost melted.’
- (91) čaj qajna-p kör-di  
 tea boil-CVB see-PST  
 ‘The tea almost boiled.’

With ‘ingestive’ verbs *-p kör* construction has both the standard meaning of an attempt and a lexicalized meaning of tasting smth.

- (92) pala jablaka te-p kör-di  
 child apple eat-CVB see-PST  
 a. ‘The child tasted the apple.’  
 b. ‘The child tried eating the apple.’

#### 3.4. *tur* ‘stand’: imperfective construction

In contrast to Karachay-Balkar, in Tubalar *-p tur* construction has no resultative meaning, but has an imperfective meaning. In the standard terms of the viewpoint aspect, it is used to present an event as ongoing. Resultative meaning is attested only with a couple of telic verbs as a marginal secondary meaning.

- (93) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a eski u-ni od-ıp tur-di  
 Vasja old house-ACC break-CVB stand-PST  
 a. ‘(When I came,) Vasja was breaking the old house.’  
 b. \* ‘Vasja broke the old house.’
- (94) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a ajaq-ti al-ıp tur-di  
 Vasja cup-ACC take-CVB stand-PST  
 a. ‘(When I came,) Vasja was taking the cup.’  
 b. ‘(When I came,) Vasja had the cup taken.’

There are no lexical restrictions on this imperfective construction. With lexical verbs of actional classes with a single durated phase. e.g. <P; P>, <S; S>, <ES, S; S> its is used to express this phase.

- (95) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a işte-p tur-di  
 Vasja work-PST stand-PST  
 ‘(When I came,) Vasja was working.’
- (96) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a maşa-ni kör-üp tur-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC see-CVB stand-PST  
 ‘(When I came,) Vasja was seeing Masha.’

With stative-process lexical verbs <ES, P, S; P, S> *-p tur* construction can refer only to the stative phase.

- (97) was<sup>ɟ</sup>a jablaka tut-up tur-di  
 Vasja apple hold-CVB stand-PST  
 a. ‘(When I came,) Vasja was holding an apple.’  
 b. \* (When I came,) Vasja was catching an apple.’

With atelic verbs – both stative and process – *-p tur* construction has an additional semantic component of an extended duration.

- (98) a. was<sup>ɟ</sup>a kebezen-de t<sup>ʃ</sup>at-ti  
 Vasja Kebezen-LOC live-PST  
 ‘Vasja lived in Kebezen.’  
 b. was<sup>ɟ</sup>a kebezen-de t<sup>ʃ</sup>ad-ip tur-di  
 Vasja Kebezen-LOC live-CVB stand-PST  
 ‘Vasja lived in Kebezen for a long time.’  
 (99) a. was<sup>ɟ</sup>a qattir-di  
 Vasja laugh-PST  
 ‘Vasja laughed.’  
 b. was<sup>ɟ</sup>a qattir-ip tur-di  
 Vasja laugh-CVB stand-PST  
 ‘Vasja laughed for a long time.’

If combined with individual-level predicates in sense of (Carlson 1977) which are a subclass of stative verbs *-p tur* construction has an additional semantic component of ‘framepast’ in sense of (Dahl 1985).

- (100) a. was<sup>ɟ</sup>a maša-ni süj-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC love-PST  
 ‘Vasja loved Masha.’  
 b. was<sup>ɟ</sup>a maša-ni süj-üp tur-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC love-CVB stand-PST  
 ‘(Formerly,) Vasja used to love Masha.’

### 3.5. *oŋo* ‘know’: capacitive construction

*-p oŋo* construction is used to express the meaning of capacity (and is, therefore, more related with modality than with actionality and valency in contrast to other Turkic V – V complexes).

(Shluinsky 2009b): cross-linguistically inherent vs. acquired capacitives are distinguished.

*-p oŋo* construction is used only for the acquired capacitive: it is used to express a capacity that an animate Agent has acquired during his life.

Note. A synonymous construction with *oŋo* and infinitive is also present in Tubalar.

- (101) maša čočko-ni taqšin čer-ip oŋo-bit  
 Masha piglet-ACC outdoors drive\_out-CVB know-PRS  
 ‘Masha can drive out a piglet.’  
 (102) it ür-üp oŋo-bit  
 dog bark-CVB know-PRS  
 ‘The dog can bark.’ {e.g. a puppy}  
 (103) was<sup>ɟ</sup>a ključ-ti tab-ip oŋo-bit  
 Vasja key-ACC find-CVB know-PRS  
 ‘Vasja can find the key.’ {i.e. he know where to look for}



Lexical restrictions require the subject to be an Agent (and, therefore, animate). Therefore, patientive processed and states are not possible with *oŋo*.

- (104) \*suu qajna-p oŋo-bit  
 water boil-CVB know-PRS  
 exp. ‘The water can boil.’
- (105) \*was<sup>ja</sup> tül-üp oŋo-bit  
 Vasja fall-CVB know-PRS  
 exp. ‘Vasja can fall down.’
- (106) \*was<sup>ja</sup> t<sup>ad</sup>-ip oŋo-bit  
 Vasja live-CVB know-PRS  
 exp. ‘Vasja can live.’
- (107) \*was<sup>ja</sup> maša-ni kör-üp oŋo-bit  
 Vasja Masha-ACC see-CVB know-PRS  
 exp. ‘Vasja can see Masha.’

### 3.6. *ij*‘send’: punctual construction

*-p ij* construction fixes and emphasizes a culmination point in the actional structure of the lexical verb. This culmination point may be unexpected, may happen earlier than expected, may take more efforts than expected.

- (108) maša uçuq-ti üz-üp ij-di  
 Masha thread-ACC tear-CVB send-PST  
 ‘Masha (suddenly || already || hardly) tore the thread.’

All the V – V complex as a whole behaves as a punctual <ES; —> verb: it has no episodic uses in Present (109), it has no durated phase meaning in Past (110).

- (109) a. was<sup>ja</sup> u ed-ip ij-di  
 Vasja house make-CVB send-PST  
 ‘Vasja (hardly || quickly || already) built the house.’
- b. was<sup>ja</sup> u ed-ip ij-bit  
 Vasja house make-CVB send-PRS  
 b'. ‘Vasja already (hardly || quickly) builds houses.’  
 b". \*Vasja is (hardly || quickly) building a house now.’
- (110) a. was<sup>ja</sup> eki minut-xa ajaq-ti stol-a sal-ip ij-di  
 Vasja two minute-DAT cup-ACC table-DAT put-CVB send-PST  
 ‘Vasja (already || quickly || hardly) put the cup on the table in two minutes.’
- b. \*was<sup>ja</sup> eki minut ajaq-ti stol-a sal-ip ij-di  
 Vasja two minute cup-ACC table-DAT put-CVB send-PST  
 ‘Vasja (quickly || hardly) put the cup on the table for two minutes.’

There are no lexical restrictions on the punctual construction. The emphasized culmination point may be both taken from the actional structure of the verb and created.

#### (weak) telic <ES, P; P> lexical verbs

Normally the lexical inceptive point is taken (111). For some verbs creating the beginning point is attested as a secondary meaning (112).

- (111) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a öl-üp ij-di  
 Vasja die-CVB send-PST  
 ‘Vasja (already || suddenly) died.’
- (112) a. was<sup>ʃ</sup>a eski u-ni od-ip ij-di  
 Vasja old house-ACC break-CVB send-PST  
 a'. ‘Vasja (already || suddenly || hardly) broke the old house.’  
 a". ‘Vasja (already || suddenly) started breaking the old house.’
- b. was<sup>ʃ</sup>a eski u-ni ot-ti  
 Vasja old house-ACC break-PST  
 b'. ‘Vasja broke the old house.’  
 b". \*‘Vasja started breaking the old house.’

(weak) inceptive-stative <ES, S; S> lexical verbs

The lexical inceptive point is taken.

- (113) was<sup>ʃ</sup>a maša-ni kör-üp ij-di  
 Vasja Masha-ACC see-CVB send-PST  
 ‘Vasja (suddenly || already) saw Masha.’

stative < S; S> lexical verbs

The inceptive point is created.

- (114) a. was<sup>ʃ</sup>a kebezen-de tʰad-ip ij-di  
 Vasja Kebezen-LOC live-CVB send-PST  
 ‘Vasja (suddenly || already) settled in Kebezen.’
- b. was<sup>ʃ</sup>a kebezen-de tʰat-ti  
 Vasja Kebezen-LOC live-PST  
 b'. ‘Vasja lived in Kebezen.’  
 b". \*‘Vasja settled in Kebezen.’

(weak) ingressive-process <EP, P; P> lexical verbs

The lexical ingressive point is taken or an endpoint is created (such an endpoint is defined pragmatically).

- (115) a. was<sup>ʃ</sup>a qattir-ip ij-di  
 Vasja laugh-CVB send-PST  
 a'. ‘Vasja (already || finally) began to laugh.’  
 a". ‘Vasja (already || finally) laughed enough.’

process < P; P> lexical verbs

An ingressive point or an endpoint is created.

- (116) a. was<sup>ʃ</sup>a işte-p ij-di  
 Vasja work-CVB send-PST  
 a'. ‘Vasja (already || finally) started working.’  
 a". ‘Vasja (already || finally) worked enough / did his work.’

### multiplicative <ES, MP; MP> lexical verbs

An ingressive point is created.

- (117) was<sup>ja</sup>    töš-üp            ij-di  
Vasja    cough-PST    send-PST  
‘Vasja (suddenly || abruptly) had a fit of coughing.’

### stative-process <ES, P, S; P, S> lexical verbs

The lexical inceptive point is taken or an endpoint is created (in the latter case the stative phase is reanalyzed as a dynamic one).

- (118) was<sup>ja</sup>    sumka-ni    tud-up            ij-di  
Vasja    bag-ACC    hold-CVB    send-PST  
a. ‘Vasja (suddenly || hardly || akready) started holding the bag.’  
b. ‘Vasja (already) finished holding the bag (the necessary time).’

### **3.6. *sal* ‘put’, *qoj* ‘place’, *qal* ‘stay’: telicizing constructions**

In contrast to *-p ij* construction these constructions have no emphasizing semantics; they simply fix a culmination point or create it.

*sal*, *qoj* and *qal* are concurring. All the three of them are less productive than the other constructions.

Creating a culmination point may be illustrated with the class of process <P; P> verbs. *qal* and *qoj* create an ingressive point, and *sal* creates an endpoint.

- (119) was<sup>ja</sup>    ište-p            qal-di  
Vasja    work-CVB    stay-PST  
‘Vasja started working.’
- (120) was<sup>ja</sup>    ište-p            qoj-di  
Vasja    work-CVB    place-PST  
‘Vasja started working.’
- (121) was<sup>ja</sup>    ište-p            sal-di  
Vasja    work-CVB    put-PST  
‘Vasja worked enough / did his work.’

### **Conclusion**

In Turkic V – V complexes the verbs are syntactically and semantically very tight, though morphologically (with exceptions) still are two verbs. One of the verbs is lexical and has the form of a contextual converb (which has a wide range of other uses), the other one is auxiliary. Auxiliary verbs do not pertain their lexical meanings and functionally serve as verbal derivation with actional (or Aktionsart) or valency-increasing meaning or, more rarely, modal meaning.

The meaning of the auxiliary interacts with the meaning of the lexical verb. For actional auxiliaries the main lexical parameter is the actional class of the lexical verb. For other auxiliaries role parameters (volition, agentiveness) may be in play. A particular case of an interaction may be a lexical restriction.

Presumably, in the same way the interaction of the open class V with a restricted class V may be studied in V – V complexes of other morphosyntactic types.

## Abbreviations

1, 3 – 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> person; ABL – ablative; ACC – accusative; ADJ – adjectivizer; CAUS – causative; CVB – converb; CVB.ANT – anterior converb; CVB.IPFV – imperfective converb; DAT – dative; DESID – desiderative; FUT – future; GEN – genitive; IMP – imperative; IPFV – imperfective; JUSS – jussive; LOC – locative; NEG – negation; PASS – passive; PL – plural; PRS – present; PRF – perfect; PST – past; REFL – reflexive; SG – singular  
EP – entry into a process; ES – entry into a state; MP – multiplicative process; P – process; S – state

## References

- Carlson, Gregory. 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English*. Ph. D. dissertation. Amherst.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dowty, David R. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67. 547-619.
- Jóhanson, Lars. 1995. On Turkic converb clauses. In: Haspelmath, Martin, & Ekkehard König. (eds.). *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 313-347.
- Juldašev, Axnef A. 1977. *Sootnošenje deepričastnyx i ličnyx form glagola v tjurkskix jazykax*. [Correlation of converbial and finite verbal forms in Turkic languages] Moscow: Nauka.
- Kononov, Andrej N. 1960. *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. [A grammar of contemporary literary Uzbek] Moscow – Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1992. Thematic Relations as Links between Nominal Reference and Temporal Construction. In: Sag, Ivan, & Anna Szabolsci (eds.). *Lexical Matters*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago press. 30-52.
- Levin, Beth, & Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 1998. Building verb meanings. In: Butt, Miriam, & Wilhelm Geuder (eds.). *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, Stanford.: CSLI publications. 97-134.
- Ljutikova [Ljutikova], Ekaterina A., Tatevosov, Sergei G., Pazelskaya [Pazel'skaja], Anna G., Ivanov, Mikhail Ju., & Andrey B. Shluinsky [Šluinskij]. 2006. *Struktura sobytija i semantika glagola v karačaevo-balkarskom jazyke*. [Event structure and verb semantics in Karachay-Balkar] Moscow: Imli RAN.
- Nedjalkov, Igor V., & Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. 1987. Karačaevo-balkarskaja forma na =b/=p tura so značenijami nastojaščego i prošedšego vremeni [Karachay-Balkar form on =b/=p tura with present and past tense meaning]. In: Muxin, A.M., et al. (eds.). *Lingvističeskie issledovanija 1987. Funkcional'no-semantičeskie aspekty grammatiki*. Moscow. 113-121.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1995. Some typological parameters of converbs In: Haspelmath, Martin, & Ekkehard König. (eds.). *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 97-136.
- Pazelskaya [Pazel'skaja], Anna G., & Andrey B. Shluinsky [Šluinskij]. 2007. *Obstoitel'stvennye predloženiya [Adverbial clauses]*. In: Ljutikova [Ljutikova], Ekaterina A., et al. (eds.). *Mišarskij dialekt tatarzkogo jazyka: očerki po sintaksisu i semantike*. [Mishar dialect of Tatar: essays on syntax and semantics]. Kazan: Magarif. 38-82.
- Pazelskaya [Pazel'skaja], Anna G., & Natalija V. Rybinceva. 2009. *Akcional'nye klassy glagolov i smežnye voprosy*. [Actional classes of verbs and related issues]. In: Tatevosov, Sergei G. (ed.). *Tubalarskie ètjudy*. [Essays on Tubalar] Moscow: Imli RAN. 54-77.
- Shluinsky [Šluinskij], Andrey B. 2006. *Akcional'nost' i aspektual'nyj pokazatel': konstrukcija so vspomogatel'nym glagolom il- v čuvašskom jazyke*. [Actionality and aspectual marker: construction with the *il-* auxiliary in Chuvash] *Vestnik MGU, serija 9 Filologija* 1. 32-47.
- Shluinsky [Šluinskij], Andrey B. 2009a. *Biverbal'nye konstrukcii i ix leksičeskie ograničeniya*. [Two-verb constructions and their lexical restrictions]. In: Tatevosov, Sergei G. (ed.). *Tubalarskie ètjudy*. [Essays on Tubalar] Moscow: Imli RAN. 6-53.
- Shluinsky, Andrey. 2009b. Individual-level meanings in the semantic domain of pluractionality In: Epps, Patience, & Alexandre Arkhipov (eds.). *New Challenges in Typology: Transcending the Borders and Refining the Distinctions*. Berlin – New York : Mouton de Gruyter. 175-197.
- Tatevosov, Sergej. 2002. The Parameter of Actionality *Linguistic Typology* 6(3). 317-401.