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Introduction

On behalf of the editorial team of the Russian Language Journal, and with apologies for its slightly tardy release, is with great pleasure that we present Volume 65. This number of RLJ sees four articles received through our regular, double-blind peer review process, one review article and a response, and seven shorter reviews. Our delay in publication for Volume 65 derives from the very high standards for RLJ, upheld by our Editorial team, reviewers, and the American Council of Teachers of Russian. Our acceptance rate remains below 30%, and in a year without a special focus, it took somewhat longer for us to assemble this volume.

In our first section, Pedagogy and Practice, Kate White discusses the effects of teaching vocabulary in semantically linked groups; Marika Kalyuga presents a study on a cognitive grammar approach to the teaching of prepositions.

The Linguistics section features one article on aspect: Oscar Swan’s analysis of aspectual prefixes. Swan also provides a review article of Janda et al., and we have invited the authors to respond in this volume; their consideration of Professor Swan’s review is included as well. The editorial team welcomes this kind of scholarly colloquy, and we hope to see this line of engagement continue in future volumes.

In the Language Policy section, Altynbekova describes new empirical work on language shift in the context of the Kazakh educational system. RLJ continues to focus on the contact of the Russophone world with other languages, throughout the CIS and in the far abroad.

In closing, I commend to you the work of our colleagues as collected here in Volume 65 of the Russian Language Journal.

William P. Rivers, Ph.D.
Editor, Russian Language Journal
Executive Director, Joint National Committee for Languages – National Council for Languages and International Studies
wrivers@languagepolicy.org
The Effect of Teaching Vocabulary in Semantic Groups: A Study in the Russian Language Classroom

KATE WHITE

A long-standing assumption in the field of second language acquisition research is that learning new vocabulary items in semantic groupings has a positive effect on acquisition and retention (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003). This assumption is common among researchers and instructors of second languages, as it seems to fit intuitively with the most popular current communicative approaches to teaching. However, researchers have begun to question this assumption, as it has not been supported by empirical evidence (Altarriba and Mathis 1997; Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003; Papathanasiou 2009). Previous research is not conclusive on the topic due to differences in methodology and design. In this study this issue is explored in more detail and with a language not previously investigated: Russian.

Definitions
For the purposes of this study and for the previous research that is reviewed below, word learning refers to initial learning of novel vocabulary items by second-language (L2) learners. Also, for this study, semantic and mixed groups were defined as follows: Semantic groups were defined according to the standards used in the studies of Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003), Tinkham (1997), and Hoshino (2010). Finkbeiner and Nicol do not articulate a definition for a semantic group, but provide the examples of animals, kitchen utensils, furniture, family members, body parts, items in a classroom, and places in the community. Thus, their definition of a semantic group seems to be the following: words that are related to a single context of a similar syntactic type. Tinkham seems to agree, as he defines a semantic cluster as a set “of semantically and syntactically similar words” which fall under “a common superordinate or covering concept... and are consequently gathered together as a result” of these shared characteristics (1997, 138–39). Tinkham relates these
clusters to the idea of semantic fields and provides the examples of colors, fruits, and professions. Hoshino (2010) used picture dictionaries to determine both semantic and thematic groupings. The definition used here and proposed for semantic groupings is a set of words of the same part of speech that refer to the same segment of reality; this set consists of hyponyms of a larger category, or hypernym. For example, whale, shark, crab, and jellyfish are all hyponyms of sea creature, their hypernym (or category/segment of reality).

In this study, mixed groups were defined according to the groupings used by Tinkham (1997), Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003), and Papathanasiou (2009). Papathanasiou (2009) defines these groups as those containing words that are not semantically related. Tinkham defines mixed groups as linguistically unrelated sets, in which words “of the same form-class... do not directly descend from a common superordinate concept” (143). Tinkham provides an example of such a set: “cigar, wolf, lace, stone, chain, fuel, paint, funeral, recipe, market, uncle, ice” (151). Finkbeiner and Nicol created unrelated groups by taking an item from each of their semantic sets that were unrelated to each other (animals, kitchen utensils, body parts, and furniture). For this study, items in the mixed group were chosen from words that are not semantically related and that could not be considered hyponyms.

Review of Previous Research

The body of literature that is devoted to asking why instructors may not question this method of using semantically-related groupings in vocabulary presentation is small. In their review of researchers’ and instructors’ reasons for adopting this approach, Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003) cite assertions that grouping words by meaning provides precision for learners; in other words, having words presented in a semantic group helps learners to define the boundaries between the related words with specificity. Learning words that have been grouped semantically may also help to reinforce the overall meaning and helps learners notice fine-grained meaning distinctions (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003; Papathanasiou 2009). To a language instructor, this practice seems common, as many current language textbooks use this method for vocabulary instruction.
(Tinkham 1997). While these reasons seem sound, a question remains: Is this method supported by empirical research?

**Where is the evidence?**

In their study, Altarriba and Mathis (1997) asked to what extent bilinguals are sensitive to semantic information in a translation decision task. The participants were English monolinguals (ML) and English-speaking second-language (L2) learners of Spanish (or bilinguals, BL). In the experiment, the authors introduced both groups of participants to new words on a computer with translation equivalents. The training tests required the participants to produce English translations of Spanish words, to fill in blanks in sentences with Spanish words, and to write Spanish words that best fit a given definition. The training phase was production-based and the post-test involved recognition in a translation decision post-test.

The authors found that the BLs at low and high levels of proficiency responded more slowly in the semantically-related condition, or when the translation prompt was semantically similar to the target word. Even the MLs were sensitive to the semantic information. Their results show that language learners and bilinguals are sensitive to the meaning, and not just the form, of a word from even initial stages of learning (Altarriba and Mathis 1997). Also, the authors showed that semantically-related items interfered with each other in recognition. This is supported by the findings of Isurin and McDonald (2001), who found that recalling words from a list was more difficult when the words were translation equivalents for a second list presented afterwards. In other words, the semantic similarity of the items on the second list interfered with retention and recall in memorization of the first list (Isurin and McDonald 2001).

Tinkham (1997) explored the effect of semantic and thematic clustering on word learning in learners of English as a second language. In his study, Tinkham separates groupings into two areas – semantic and thematic. Semantic groupings usually include lexical items that are one part of speech, as in nouns or verbs (i.e. peach, pear, plum, etc.). Thematic groupings may include a mixture and be more loosely related, such as lexical items relating to one specific place, schema, situation, or idea (i.e. pond, slimy, frog, lily pads, etc.). Tinkham used artificial words that he
created based on English phonotactics and his participants were firstlanguage (L1) English speakers.

Tinkham found that new L2 vocabulary was learned with more difficulty when words were arranged in semantic groups. It is unclear what the effect of thematic groupings was, as it was detrimental for some but beneficial for others; however, it seemed to be beneficial rather than detrimental in more instances. The students also reported that learning the words in semantic groups was more difficult. In a replication study, Waring (1997) found the same effect with Japanese non-words. Tinkham points out some issues in applying the conclusions of the study, including the lack of a late post-test and the issue of lack of context for the words. Tinkham asserts that his results contradict the general assumption that semantic grouping is better for word learning, but concludes that more research is needed to determine why this is true (Tinkham 1997).

In a similar study, Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003) created 32 novel words based on English phonotactics (Ex. birk, ‘cat’; gorp, ‘cow’). These novel words fell into four semantic categories: animals, kitchen utensils, furniture, and body parts. The study took place over a two-day period and the participants were L1 speakers of English. The tasks included training and post-tests requiring production (translation) and recognition (word-decision). The words were presented aurally and images corresponding to the words were shown on a computer screen (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003, 373). The word form was also given visually. The results of the post-tests showed that semantic groupings caused slower processing of new words. They tested word learning through measuring reaction time only.

Papathanasiou (2009) performed a study similar to that of Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003), but she used real English words with Greek learners of English as a foreign language. She administered the test to two different age groups, and the teaching and testing took place in the classroom. While her design was somewhat confounding due to conflation of age and proficiency, she found that the adults performed better with unrelated vocabulary. Children showed no significant difference in their performance for each group of vocabulary. She asserted that while semantic groupings may be more useful for instructors when planning classroom activities, there is no evidence that presentation of words in these groupings is beneficial (Papathanasiou 2009). The author
suggests that in previous studies, it has not been clear what would happen with a real language in a classroom setting.

Each of these studies has shown that semantic groupings are not significantly helpful to L2 vocabulary learning. Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003) assert that the source of this assumption about semantic groups lies in memory studies. Proponents of using semantic groupings often cite memory studies that require the participants to memorize lists of words (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003; Erten and Tekin 2008). These studies have caused researchers to conclude that semantic groupings facilitate word learning, as the results of the studies show that participants who memorized semantically-grouped words recalled more items in the post-test (Bousfield 1953; Cofer 1966; Cohen 1963; Lewis 1971; Tulving and Pearlstone 1966; Tulving and Psotka 1971).

However, there are two issues with this approach. First, these studies used monolingual speakers. Most researchers in second language acquisition accept that monolinguals and bilinguals cannot be compared in this way (Cook 2002; Grosjean 1998) because of differences in their cognitive structure. Even low-proficiency L2 learners exhibit cognitive differences from monolinguals, such as semantic sensitivity (Altarriba and Mathis 1997) and processing speed (Kroll and Stewart 1994). The second issue is that monolinguals in the above studies were not learning new words; rather, they were memorizing lists of words they already knew. There is little evidence to support the idea that a meaningful comparison can be made between novel-word learning by bilinguals and word memorization by monolinguals of already-known words (Barcroft, 2002), especially as these are separate cognitive processes (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003, 371). Overall, as shown in the studies summarized above, there is little empirical evidence to support the assumption that presenting novel vocabulary words in semantically-related groups is beneficial for learning.

**Processing Depth**

Though the studies above have shown that semantic groups may not facilitate word learning, there are some remaining questions. First, none of those studies used late post-tests, and as a result, the issue of processing depth might have been overlooked. When learning new words, attention is not infinite, and one type of information dominating the resources
available will detract from other aspects. For example, attention to meaning and form are in direct opposition, as any attention given to form will diminish resources available for attention to meaning, and vice versa (Barcroft 2002; Barcroft 2004; Lee and VanPatten 2003). In order to fully acquire a new word, processing resources must be devoted to encoding the word form in memory, activating appropriate semantic information (including collocational, syntactic, and other information), and creating a connection between the form and the meaning (Barcroft 2012). Also, as stated in the TOPRA, or “type of processing-resource allocation”, model, an overload of one type of information (e.g., semantic elaboration) will result in a lack of resources available for other aspects of word learning (Barcroft 2004).

In terms of word groupings, the results of some previous studies show that it takes longer for participants to learn labels for new words when these words are grouped semantically, as discussed above (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003; Higa 1963; Kintsch and Kintsch 1969; Kroll and Stewart 1994; Nation 2000; Tinkham 1993; Tinkham 1997; Underwood, Ekstrand, and Keppel 1965; Waring 1997). As Craik and Lockhart (1972) argue, presenting words in semantic groupings may cause the participants to use deeper processing because of the need to distinguish each item’s semantic area and because of increased semantic elaboration (Craik and Lockhart 1972; Craik and Tulving 1975; Schneider, Healy, and Bourne 2002). Semantic elaboration is the process of increasing focus on the semantic value of a word (Craik and Lockhart 1972). They argue that this causes the words to be learned more fully, and that this fuller learning will be evident in slower learning.

However, semantic elaboration may also result in inhibition in novel-word learning (Barcroft 2004). It is possible that it simply takes participants longer to encode the words because grouping them semantically makes it more difficult for learners to process them, or to separate semantic distinctions, quickly. It may also result in too much focus on semantic information in the input to the exclusion of structural information, inhibiting the learner’s acquisition of the novel word (Barcroft 2004). In 2002, Barcroft found that increasing the amount of semantic processing by requiring more elaborate manipulation of information (on multiple levels, including semantic, syntactic, and lexical) can inhibit a learner’s ability to encode the formal properties of a new
word, supporting the TOPRA model. Learners have limited ability to use various processing resources at once (Barcroft 2002, 353), and there are limited available processing resources for language (de Groot 2011; Robinson 2003; Schmitt 2008). Robinson 2003; Schmitt 2008).

In other words, the deeper processing involved in learning semantically-grouped words may be used for distinguishing semantic relations between the words rather than contributing to their better retention. This means that the processor is busy with the semantics and does not have enough space left to encode the novel word form, as predicted in the TOPRA model (Barcroft 2004; Erten and Tekin 2008). Conversely, the distinctiveness of unrelated words could allow better retention due to the deeper processing, as less processing is taken up by the need to distinguish semantic areas. If deeper processing is used for analyzing the differences between semantically-related items, the words could be more difficult to retrieve later due to lack of encoding (Barcroft 2004; Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003).

Overall, there is a consensus that learners have limited processing resources for language learning, and that these are depleted in various ways by attending to portions of input (de Groot 2011). Between these limitations, there are many questions that must be answered regarding how instruction can be effective for vocabulary acquisition when learner cognition is taken into account. As these and other researchers assert, the question remains: Does slower learning mean deeper processing and better retention?

Proficiency Level
As mentioned above, Altarriba and Mathis (1997) explored the availability of semantic information in word learning. They also introduced an important variable that may relate to ease of word learning: proficiency level. From the part of their experiment regarding semantic groupings, the authors suggested that conceptual information plays a role in L2 word learning (Altarriba and Mathis 1997, 558). They concluded that new words in an L2 are connected very early with their corresponding concepts, as well as with translation equivalents in the L1. Both levels of participants (beginners and higher-proficiency L2 learners) showed semantic interference in the post-tests, though the amount of semantic interference diminished as proficiency increased (Altarriba and Mathis
The important question remains: What is the exact effect of semantic groupings for participants at different proficiency levels?

To summarize, in previous studies authors have shown that the idea that semantic groupings facilitate word learning is misguided (Altarriba and Mathis 1997; Erten and Tekin 2008; Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003; Papathanasiou 2009). While results from previous studies may be contradictory due to issues with methodological design, what is important is that such a basic assumption regarding language instruction should be supported empirically. Previous research in this area has a few weaknesses that the current study attempts to address. The first weakness is the confusion in previous studies’ post-tests; it is difficult to understand what conclusions can be made when there is no consistency in testing approaches and some studies lack late post-tests, which could be used to investigate processing depth (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003; Papathanasiou 2009). Second, few researchers have investigated the possible effects of proficiency levels (Altarriba and Mathis 1997). Third, as Papathanasiou (2009) asserts, few researchers have used a real language or conducted this research in the classroom. Overall, previous studies have shown important findings about semantic groupings in vocabulary learning, but there have been inconsistencies in design (Papathanasiou 2009) and results (see, for example, Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003; Tinkham 1997).

The Current Study

The present study was designed to investigate the problem of the effect of semantic groupings on word learning while taking previous methodological inconsistencies into account. The overall design was based on that of Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003). A late post-test was added in order to investigate the idea of processing depth. In addition, the study used real Russian words rather than non-words based on English phonotactics (Finkbeiner and Nicol 2003). Third, the procedure simulated classroom L2 vocabulary learning by placing the study in a classroom setting. Finally, in this study, the variable of proficiency level was included. The questions posed in the pilot study were as follows:

1. Does grouping words semantically facilitate or hinder L2 vocabulary learning?
2. Does the effect of semantic groupings diminish as L2 proficiency level increases?
3. Is there evidence of slower learning, and therefore deeper processing, on the late post-tests for semantic groupings?

It was predicted that, in line with previous results, semantic groupings would hinder initial L2 vocabulary learning due to semantic interference. Third-year participants were predicted to be less affected, or unaffected, by semantic interference. Finally, if semantic groupings encourage deeper processing, this would be revealed on the late post-tests, when words that are processed more deeply would be better retained. In that case, there may be no difference between groupings on the immediate post-test.

Methodology

The methodology for this study was based on that of Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003), with a few changes. In their study, they created 32 novel words based on English phonotactics and taught them to L2 speakers of English. They included only an immediate post-test, which included a translation task, and they measured only reaction time. The changes include the target participants (students enrolled in Russian language courses), the use of a real language for the vocabulary items (Russian), the inclusion of proficiency levels as a variable, and the exclusion of the translation task. The procedure and focus of the analysis were also altered. Proficiency level and condition (i.e., whether or not the participant learns the words in semantic groups) were independent variables, while accuracy was a dependent variable. Other independent variables, such as study abroad and previous language study, were taken from the pre-study questionnaire as appropriate for each participant group.

Because the learning phase took place in the participants’ Russian language classrooms, the learning phase was structured differently as well. Instruction was based on the format typically used at the students’ university and used recommendations on vocabulary instruction given by Barcroft (2012). Throughout the study the words were presented aurally and without orthographic stimuli due to possible confounding, cross-linguistic effects (Hoshino and Kroll 2008). Previous research shows that there may be confounding effects from introducing orthography in initial stages of vocabulary learning (Barcroft 2012); learning the orthographic form of the word may be considered a different stage of word learning.
Participants and materials

The participants were students learning Russian at two levels, the first-year (n=8) and third-year (n=8) of language study. While the students in the respective levels were not tested for proficiency with any tasks during the study, it was assumed that they were of similar levels as their classmates. Therefore, their classification depended on their class placement; the first-year students had been enrolled in the same courses for almost three quarters, and the third-year students had been enrolled in the same courses for at least three quarters. The curriculum at the students’ university follows strict descriptors for proficiency levels developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and uses them as guidelines for placement in Russian courses. The students were offered extra credit for involvement in the study. At the beginning of the study, before the learning phase, the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire. Topics included previous language-study, grades in Russian courses, study abroad experience, exposure to Russian outside of class, and total years studying Russian.

The following information was taken from the questionnaires. All of the participants earned either B- or A-averages in their Russian courses. All 16 had studied another language; 7 had studied more than one other language. These languages included: Spanish (12); Latin (3); French (3); German (2); Arabic (2); Czech (1); Italian (1); and Chinese (1). At the third-year level, half (4) of the participants had studied abroad. The average amount of time per week spent on studying Russian was 7.6 hours. All participants were asked to report what area they found most difficult in learning Russian; their responses included: cases (6); grammar (7); vocabulary (4); listening (1); reading (1); syntax (1); and speaking (1). 14 of the 16 participants reported that it was difficult for them to learn the words in the task. They were also asked to report which strategies they used at home to learn vocabulary words. These strategies included: flashcards (7); rewriting (6); using the vocabulary words in sentences (4); repetition aloud (3); and seeing the vocabulary words in use (2).

The stimuli were black and white images depicting the words chosen in three semantic sets: kitchen utensils, sea creatures, and tools (see Appendix for word lists). These items are unlikely to be mentioned in the classes leading up to the third-year; this assertion is based on an analysis.
of the books used in first-year, second-year, and third-year Russian courses at the university where the participants study. On the questionnaire, the participants were asked to indicate if they knew any of the words before the task by providing a Russian translation of a given English word. None of the participants included in the final analysis could produce any of the words prior to the experimental part of the study. The words were not included in the participants’ other lessons during the time in between the learning phase and the post-tests. In the learning phase the images appeared in a PowerPoint presentation and were accompanied by the aural form of the word. On the post-tests the same images appeared in tests delivered by the computer program, SuperLab.

Procedure
The researcher, who was not an instructor for any of the participants at the time of the study, personally conducted the entire data collection, which required four weeks of contact with the participants. First, the participants completed consent forms and pre-study questionnaires. Second, they performed the learning task over two sessions (two weeks apart) in their Russian classes. This task required the participants to learn words presented to them in class in a manner similar to other classroom vocabulary sessions—from a PowerPoint presentation. They were asked to concentrate on learning all of the items presented to them in the task and not to study the words at home between tests.

An image for each word was shown four times total while the researcher pronounced each word twice every time the image was shown. This format is a close approximation of a classroom lesson at this university, as students in this program are accustomed to learning vocabulary in this way from a variety of teachers. This change from the study of Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003) was incorporated in order to reflect typical classroom learning at the participants’ university. There were four trials of each block of words in the learning task. The participants were not asked to repeat the words aloud for the first two trials. This change from the Finkbeiner and Nicol study was made in line with previous studies that show a negative effect of immediate production for novel words (Barcroft 2012). The participants were asked to produce the words during the last two trials (of four) for each block of words.
Each of the participants learned one portion of each set of words (i.e., five of the sea creatures, five of the utensils, five of the tools) in a semantically-related condition during Session 1 (Table 1). These sub-groupings were counterbalanced for length and gender. They learned the other words (4 more of each set) in a mixed condition during Session 2 (Table 2), which also included filler words of similar length to the target words. The filler words were not tested in the post-tests. Words were grouped into blocks of five words each. Each block appeared four times, though never twice in a row. The block design was based on that of Finkbeiner and Nicol (2003).

Table 1. Shows “Condition 1” from Session 1 of the experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sea creatures 1</td>
<td>5 sea creatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utensils 1</td>
<td>5 utensils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools 1</td>
<td>5 tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>Repeat above set of three blocks three more times; on the last two times ask the participants to repeat the words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Shows “Condition 2” from Session 2 of the experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed block 1</td>
<td>These blocks contain 5 words each. 1 from each of the groups (sea creatures, utensils, tools) and 2 filler words. Ex. whale, filler word 1, hammer, spatula, filler word 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed block 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed block 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed block 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>Repeat above set of four blocks three more times, on the last two times ask the participants to repeat the words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were fifteen words in the semantic condition, and twenty words in the mixed condition, though the fillers were not tested. This discrepancy is due to the need to add fillers to the second group, along with one word from each of the semantic groups, in order to maintain the same block size in both conditions. While it is possible that having two different numbers of words in the learning phases may skew the results
(especially since learning more words requires more processing effort),
this was not the case, as will be discussed in the results section.

Each participant performed the same immediate post-test, which
included a production-based task and a recognition-based task, in that
order. The test was administered individually to each student in a room
where only the researcher was present. The same images used in the
training task appeared on the screen in the program SuperLab. None of
the participants could recall the words well enough to produce more than
one or two in the picture-naming task at either the early or late post-test;
because of this, the results of the production task are not reported here.
This is not an unexpected result, as passive (recognition) knowledge of
vocabulary often precedes active (productive) knowledge (Barcroft 2004).
On the recognition task, their responses were recorded for accuracy in
SuperLab. All of the items for each group were tested in each task. For the
recognition task, the participants heard a word over their headphones and
were asked to indicate by pressing one of two keys (i.e., incorrect (L) or
correct (S)) whether the word matched the image on the screen. The aural
forms of the words for the task were recorded by the same researcher who
taught the words in the learning session in order to avoid the possible
confounding effect of an unfamiliar voice and accent.

There were three possibilities for word assignment in the
recognition task: words assigned correctly to their corresponding images
(i.e. “whale” to a whale); words assigned incorrectly to a word within the
same semantic grouping (i.e. “walrus” to a whale); or words assigned to
an unrelated image from a different grouping (i.e. “spatula” to a whale).
The same post-tests were used as late post-tests one week later, with the
order of the items used in each test flipped. The order was flipped to avoid
possible confounding effects from task familiarity.

The same procedure was used for the second task one week later,
when the participants learned the words in mixed groups. After the
learning phase, which was the same as the semantic learning phase but
with the mixed group of words, the participants performed an identical
immediate post-test using the mixed group. All participants then
completed the late post-test for the semantically-grouped words. The
second session therefore included a learning phase, an immediate post-
test for the new set of words, and a late post-test for the first set of words.
All participants were then asked to meet with the researcher one week later for a late post-test on the second, mixed group of words.

**Data Analysis**

The accuracy of the participants on the recognition task was recorded in all of the post-tests in order to analyze retention. A logistic mixed-effects model (Jaeger 2008) was used to analyze accuracy in the recognition post-tests. It was intended to concentrate on accuracy as a change from previous studies, where the concentration was on latency to the exclusion of accuracy.

For accuracy analysis, a logistic mixed-effects model (Jaeger 2008) was fit to the participants’ accuracy data between conditions at both proficiency levels. The model structure is given in Table 3, as well as the output, which is discussed below. Fixed effects include post-test (early or late), manner of word grouping in instruction (semantic or mixed), and year of study (first or third). Other fixed effects included number of other languages studied (one or more), exposure to Russian outside of class (fewer or more than 8 hours, the average amount), and the three possibilities for word assignment in the recognition task (correct (1), semantically related (2), and unrelated (3)). Mixed-effects models are the optimal way to analyze these data because they allow for the analysis of random effects of multiple variables at once. The within-group analysis for the third-year group did not yield significant results and is therefore not reported in the table.

A logistic mixed-effects model was fit to the accuracy data for both groupings and all three conditions in the receptive task at both proficiency levels in R8. Within the first-year group of participants, there was a significant negative effect of the second condition (Table 3, A, Condition 2: \( B = -0.949, z = 2.074, p < 0.05 \)). The second condition was the semantic interference condition, when the participants heard a word that was semantically related to the target image. This suggests a negative effect on accuracy due to semantic interference in the recognition task. This result was also found in the analysis of both proficiency levels across groupings (for both groups of words, mixed and semantic), again for only the first-year participants, and was significant (Table 3, B, Condition 2: \( B = 0.936, z = 2.655, p < 0.05 \)). There was also a significant positive effect of the interaction of grouping and condition 3 (Table 3, B, \( B = 1.926, z = 3.025, \))
This indicates that for words learned in mixed groupings, participants were more accurate in the third condition (unrelated to target image) on the recognition task. At the third-year level, there were no significant effects in the results for accuracy in either learning condition (semantic or mixed groups) or across conditions.

To summarize, at the first-year level, participants performed significantly less accurately on the semantically-grouped words in the semantic interference condition on the recognition task. This shows that when the first-year participants learned the words in semantic groups, they performed less accurately in the semantic interference condition for those items. For words learned in the mixed condition, there was a
significant positive effect in the unrelated interference condition. This shows that when the first-year participants learned the words in mixed groups, they performed more accurately on the unrelated condition in the post-test. There were no significant effects of the groupings on the third year participants’ performance. There were also no significant effects for late post-tests.

Discussion
The first question was, how does grouping words semantically affect vocabulary learning in the L2? The participants in this study at the first-year level performed significantly less accurately in the semantic interference condition when the words were learned in semantic groups. The participants also performed significantly more accurately in the unrelated interference condition when the words were learned in mixed groups. These results show that semantic groups did not facilitate the word learning; in fact, it negatively affected the learning of the first-year participants and had no effect on the third-year participants’ performance. Also, learning words in a mixed group positively affected the first-year students’ ability to distinguish between unrelated items on the post-tests.

For the second question on proficiency level, the picture is not as clear. Proficiency level did not significantly predict performance in either condition. Effects were found at the first-year level, but the third-year students did not show any significant effects in the analysis, positive or negative. Therefore, higher-level students may be less susceptible to semantic interference in recognition. This study includes 16 participants; in the future, a replication study with more participants of a higher proficiency level is recommended.

The third question considered processing depth. As stated above, the results show that grouping words semantically negatively affected the accuracy of the first-year responses on those words on post-tests. The first-year participants performed better on the mixed groups of words. These results do not support the idea that semantically-grouped words are processed more deeply because the learner is provided with a large amount of semantic information. This deeper processing should lead to slower learning and longer retention as evidenced by their performance on the late post-tests. The participants performed more accurately on the
items in the mixed group as compared to the items in the semantic group, and there was no significant effect for the late post-tests. If deeper processing facilitated the learning of semantically-grouped items over time, this would not be the case; in fact, these results support the idea that processing may be overloaded by the learner’s need to distinguish between semantically related items (Barcroft 2004). The encoding and retention of these items may be negatively impacted due to lack of processing resources.

Finally, further results included those for the performance of the participants on the specific conditions in the recognition tests. There were three conditions: correct word assignment (i.e. “whale” to the image of a whale); semantic interference (i.e. “walrus” to the image of a whale); and unrelated interference (i.e. “spatula” to the image of a whale). Grouping words semantically did not just negatively affect the performance of the first-year students—it negatively affected their performance on the semantic interference condition. Conversely, the first-year participants were more accurate on the unrelated condition for the words they had learned in mixed groups. The implication is that learning words in mixed groups increases the ability of the learner to distinguish between unrelated items, while learning words in semantic groups decreases their ability to distinguish between those semantically related items. This finding supports the idea that learners may use more processing resources to distinguish between semantically-grouped items, lowering their overall level of retention.

These results have important implications for methods of vocabulary instruction in the second-language classroom. This study was conducted in the classroom, with methods that more closely mirror what occurs in the classroom than in typical laboratory studies. First, when new vocabulary items are presented in a semantically related group, it may be more difficult for learners’ to encode and distinguish between items in initial stages. In fact, initial receptive knowledge is encouraged when vocabulary items are unrelated. Students may be more able to distinguish between items in initial stages if those items are presented in mixed groupings, or at least in groupings that are not entirely related semantically. Second-language instructors may consider using vocabulary items from more than one semantic category when presenting new words in class—this recommendation is generally applicable across
tasks and topics, as it concerns the method of presentation of vocabulary. At the very least, instructors can be aware of the possible interference and confusion that may occur among semantically-related items if they are first presented at the same time. In the future groupings that fall between related and unrelated, such as the thematic groupings used in Tinkham’s study (1997), deserve further research.

Second, a few exposures (e.g., four exposures in the current study) to a target item may not be enough for productive knowledge, but it appears to be enough for initial receptive knowledge of vocabulary. Four exposures were enough for the participants to be able to perform the recognition task in this study, which supports the findings of Barcroft (2012). Multiple and varied presentations of the target word may be necessary for different types of word knowledge. This result can inform instructors’ expectations in terms of what learners can be expected to do with new words following initial exposures.

In the future, it is recommended that more participants are included in such research. Students at the third-year level of proficiency were not affected by learning words in semantic groups, showing that this issue needs further investigation at more levels of proficiency. Because the effect of other types of word groups, such as thematic groups, was unclear in previous studies (Tinkham 1997), future research could investigate more types of groups. Also, future research on this topic should be conducted in the classroom rather than the laboratory. By closely mirroring actual classroom methods in empirical research, learning gains and outcomes can be better understood. This study contributes to the existing literature by supporting the findings of previous studies regarding the negative effects of semantic groups on vocabulary learning, and also contributes these data from a new L2: Russian.

Notes
1. In the study Hoshino states “words were selected from within the same theme, according to various picture dictionaries” (Hoshino 2010, 304). They list the following dictionaries: Goodman’s (1991) *Let’s Learn English Picture Dictionary*; Rosenthal & Freeman’s (1987) *Longman Photo Dictionary*; Klevberg’s (2005) *The Heinle Picture Dictionary*; Ashworth and Clark’s (1997) *The Longman Picture Dictionary American
English; and Shapiro and Adelson-Goldstein’s (1998) *The Oxford Picture Dictionary.*

2. Hyponyms are words whose semantic field is included within another word, their hypernym (Gao and X, 2013).

3. *Golosa* (Robin, Henry, and Robin 1994); *Nachalo* (Lubensky, Ervin, and Jarvis 1996); and *Troika* (Nummikooski 1996), to name a few. It must also be noted that some studies have differentiated between semantic groupings, where all words are the same part of speech (e.g., nouns), and other types of groupings, where this is not the case.

4. The initial number of participants was higher, but over the two week period of the study some participants trickled out for a variety of reasons, including: non-attendance at the second in-class session, exclusion to avoid confounding variables (ex. non-English first language), and inability to attend the third session. There were no heritage speakers of Russian among the participants.

5. For more information on ACTFL guidelines, see: www.actfl.org.

6. The majority pictures were selected from a standardized set of 520 pictures used in the International Picture Naming Project (IPNP) and available for download at http://crl.ucsd.edu/~aszekely/ipnp/1stimuli.html. Those not available from that list were chosen from internet sources and were similar in style and size.

7. In the first and second years, the textbooks used were *Nachalo* Book 1 and *Nachalo* Book 2. In the third year the textbook used is V Puti (see References for more information).

8. For more information see: www.r-project.org. Version used: 3.1.1.

### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen utensils:</th>
<th>Tools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatula – <em>lopatka</em></td>
<td>Drill – <em>bur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisk – <em>venchik</em></td>
<td>Hammer – <em>molot</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frying pan – <em>skovoroda</em></td>
<td>Nail – <em>gvozd’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladle – <em>kovsh</em></td>
<td>Plow – <em>plug</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongs – <em>shchiptsy</em></td>
<td>Sledgehammer – <em>trambovka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apron – <em>perednik</em></td>
<td>Screwdriver – <em>otverka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potholder – <em>rukavitsa</em></td>
<td>Saw – <em>pila</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewer – <em>vertel</em></td>
<td>Pliers – <em>shchipchiki</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling pin - <em>skalka</em></td>
<td>Tape measure – <em>ruletka</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sea creatures:</th>
<th>Filler words:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whale – <em>kit</em></td>
<td>Iron – <em>utiyug</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Effect of Teaching Vocabulary in Semantic Groups

KATE WHITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octopus – sprut</th>
<th>Ivy – pliushch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sting ray – skat</td>
<td>Hairbrush – rascheska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel – ugor’</td>
<td>Ship – korabl’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab – rak</td>
<td>Vest – zhilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark – akula</td>
<td>Collar – osheinik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellyfish – meduza</td>
<td>Caterpillar – gusenica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walrus – morzh</td>
<td>Shopping cart – telezhka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal – tiulen’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Russian Prepositions перед, против and напротив: a Cognitive Linguistic Approach

MARIIA KALYUGA

Introduction
There is an assumption in cognitive linguistics that most non-spatial senses of a preposition and a case are derived from a common (usually spatial) sense through metaphoric extensions. The metaphoric extensions involve the understanding of a concept, the so-called “target,” in terms of a more simple, concrete concept called the “source” (Lakoff 1987; Boers 1996; Boers & Demecheleer 1998). For this reason, prepositions and cases with a similar spatial sense frequently develop similar non-spatial senses. For example, the Ancient Greek prepositions πρό ‘before’ and ἀντί ‘opposite’ are associated with nearly the same proto-scenario or idealized mental representation of events linked to the prepositional phrases. Consider figure 1 that represents a proto-scenario with which these prepositions are associated.

As these Ancient Greek prepositions are associated with nearly the same proto-scenario, they have also developed the same non-spatial senses that follow: ‘instead of,’ ‘on behalf of’ and ‘rather than’ (see Bortone 2010). However, their modern Russian equivalents перед + the instrumental (Instr) ‘in front of’ and против + the genitive (Gen) ‘opposite to, against’ share only one non-spatial sense. Both перед + Instr and против + Gen refer to criteria of comparison or evaluation, as for example, in expressions...
reflecting the conceptual mapping IN COMPARISON or IN CONTRAST is IN FRONT or OPPOSITE¹:

1. **она перед тобой дура дурой**
   ‘she is really stupid in comparison to you,’ lit. ‘before you перед +Instr’;

2. **всё казалось мелким и ничтожным перед разъярённой вселенной**
   ‘everything seemed small and trifling in such close juxtaposition with an infuriated universe,’ lit. ‘before an infuriated universe перед +Instr’;

3. **его любовь ко мне ничто перед любовью, которой она пылает к тебе**
   ‘the love he has for me is nothing to that, which she entertains for you,’ lit. ‘before love перед +Instr that she entertains for you’;

4. **против моей эта идея никуда не годится**
   ‘this is a lousy idea in comparison to mine,’ lit. ‘against mine против +Gen’;

5. **этот ужас был ничто против негодования, которое овладело его супругою**
   ‘this horror was nothing in comparison to the anger that seized his wife,’ lit. ‘against the anger против +Gen that seized his wife’;

6. **моё красноречие – ничто против его витиеватого слога**
   ‘my eloquence is nothing in comparison to his rhetorical style,’ lit. ‘against his rhetorical style против +Gen’;

7. **против других домов этот казался гораздо новее**
   ‘against other houses против +Gen this one looked much newer’².

The other senses of these prepositions and cases are different. For example, in Sintaksicheskij slovar’ prepositional phrases with перед+Instr are described as designating the time of an action or an event (перед полнечьно ‘before midnight перед +Instr’) and an object or a person that is the focus of an action (преступление перед человечеством ‘a crime before humanity перед +Instr’) (Zolotova 2011, 268-278). In the same book,

---

¹ Target and source domains are represented in capitals.

² Consider similar conceptual mapping reflected in the etymology of the English contrast (from the Latin contra- ‘against’ + stāre ‘to stand’) and confront (from the medieval Latin con- ‘with’ + front- ‘face’). Confront had the meaning ‘to contrast’ (e.g. *the old order of things makes so poor a figure when confronted with the new*), which is now obsolete (Oxford English Dictionary).
prepositional phrases with против+Gen are defined as indicating an opposition to someone or something (выступать против войны ‘to speak out against war против Ген’) (Zolotova 2011, 86-90).

Why did перед+Instr and против+Gen develop different non-spatial senses? This paper aims to answer this question and to explain how the similarities and differences between the spatial proto-scenarios associated with these prepositions and cases are linked to the similarities and differences in their non-spatial use. The data have been collected from the main (основной) sub-corpus of the Russian National Corpus (RNC), which covers the period from the middle of the 18th to the early 21st centuries. Due to space restrictions, the original sentences from the Corpus are not used. Most examples presented in the paper are constructed by the author based on the data. In this paper, the comparison of the spatial meanings of prepositional phrases (section 2) is followed by an analysis of their non-spatial, metaphoric extensions (section 3).

The Spatial Use of перед + Instr and напротив / против + Gen
In Modern Russian expressions with перед+Instr and напротив+Gen / против+Gen are used to describe very similar scenarios, albeit highlighting their various aspects (стоять перед его столом ‘to stand in front of his desk перед +Instr ‘; стоять напротив / против его стола ‘to stand opposite his desk напротив / против Ген’). Consider figure 1. However, expressions with перед +Instr feature CLOSE SPATIAL PROXIMITY and even a CONTACT or attachment of X to Y (веранда перед домом ‘‘the front veranda of the house,’ lit. ‘a veranda in front of the house перед +Instr’), while in the expressions with напротив/ против+Gen X is understood as being SEPARATED and situated across some (interfering) space from Y. That is why, for example, перед+Instr (and not напротив/ против+Gen) are used in the idiomatic expression for being close: перед носом ‘right under one’s nose, close, lit. in front of one’s nose перед +Instr.’ For the same reason перед+Instr, rather than напротив +Gen, are used in a similar expression for being close and being visible: перед глазами ‘before one’s eyes перед +Instr.’

Против+Gen can be used interchangeably with напротив+Gen only in expressions that describe a situation where X and Y are both static.

---

3 Russian is traditionally divided into 3 historical periods: Old Russian (1100 с – 1500 с), Middle Russian (1500 с -1700 с) and Modern Russian (since 1700 с).
(остановиться напротив / против управления порта ‘to stop opposite the harbour office напротив/ противGen’; находиться напротив / против выхода ‘to be located opposite the exit напротив/противGen’), although expressions featuring напротив+Gen are more common. However, only напротив +Gen, as well as перед+Instr, can be used in expressions that describe a situation where Y is static and X moves in front of it (напротив нас / перед нами двигалась длинная колона грузовиков ‘a long line of trucks was passing in front of us напротив/ перед +Instr’).

Перед +Instr can also describe a scenario where X and Y move in the same direction (идти перед другом ‘to walk in front of a friend перед +Instr’; бежать перед нами ‘to run before us перед +Instr’; лететь перед лодкой ‘to be flying before the boat перед +Instr’), Consider figure 2.

![Figure 2](image)

On the contrary, a dictionary of 11th to 17th century Russian shows that против could refer to a very different spatial scenario and could be combined not only with Gen but also with the dative (Dat). In addition to a static location ‘opposite, in front, near’ (не ставил противъ воды ‘did not put near water’), prepositional phrases with против referred to the direction ‘towards’ (изидошя противу жениху ‘went towards the groom’) (Bogatova 1995, vol. 16, 249-250). Some similar prepositional phrases exist in the present day language. In the following examples против+Gen describe a scenario where X and Y move against each other and exert force on each other (идти против ветра ‘to walk against the wind противGen’; греби против течения ‘to row against the stream противGen’). Consider figure 3.

Thus, перед +Instr coincides in meaning with против+Gen in one particular scenario (consider figure 1) and differs in the other (consider figures 2 and 3). Various aspects of the prototypical spatial scenarios associated with these prepositions and cases serve as source domains for their derived non-spatial senses.
Non-Spatial Uses of перед + Instr and против + Gen

What is SEEN is LOCATED BEFORE ONE’S EYES (перед моей лежала маленькая деревня; before me lies a small village; перед моей расстилалась каменистая равнина ‘before me перед +Instr lay a rocky plain’) or is MOVING BEFORE ONE’S EYES (перед глазами всё поплыло ‘everything was swimming before her eyes перед +Instr; город бесчисленными картинками замелькал перед глазами ‘the city, in a thousand pictures, began flashing before his eyes перед +Instr’). Accordingly, a MENTAL IMAGE is also conceptualised as LOCATED BEFORE ONE’S EYES (ужасное зрелище все еще стояло у него перед глазами ‘the horrible image still hung before his eyes; перед его мысленным взором разливалось ослепительное сияние ‘behind his thoughtful gaze shone a great glory, lit. before his eyes перед +Instr’).

BEING VISIBLE or UNCOVERED are common source domains for BEING UNPROTECTED and VULNERABLE. That is why expressions that reflect the conceptualisation of BEING UNPROTECTED and VULNERABLE as BEING UNCOVERED contain перед+Instr (быть беззащитным перед человеческими страстями ‘to be influenced by human passions,’ lit. ‘to be vulnerable in front of human passions перед +Instr’; оказаться бессильным перед всеми этими кораблями ‘to be helpless in the face of all of these ships,’ lit. ‘before all of these ships перед +Instr’; чувствовать себя совершенно беспомощным перед лицом врага ‘to feel completely powerless in the face of the enemy’, lit. ‘before the face перед +Instr of the enemy’).

Various emotions are associated with being UNPROTECTED and VULNERABLE and, therefore, words for these emotions govern

---

4 Consider also opposite expressions that reflect the conceptual mapping BEING LOCATED BEHIND A COVER is BEING PROTECTED (книга за семью печатями ‘a closed book,’ lit. ‘a book behind seven seals перед +Instr and страна за семью замками ‘double-bolted land, lit. a country behind seven locks перед +Instr’).
перед+Instr. For example, words for FEAR are used with this preposition and case (страх перед будущим ‘fear in the face of the future,’ lit. ‘before the future перед +Instr’; ужас перед неведомой глубиной ‘the dread of the unknown depths,’ lit. ‘before the unknown depths перед +Instr’; робеть перед ним ‘to feel a little overawed before him перед +Instr’; пасовать перед ней ‘to quail before her перед +Instr’; трепетать перед своим господином ‘to tremble before one’s master перед +Instr’; робость перед профессором ‘shyness in the presence of their professor,’ lit. ‘before their professor перед +Instr’).

The other emotion that is associated with BEING VULNERABLE is SHAME (стыдиться перед братом ‘to be ashamed to face one’s brother перед +Instr’; стыдно перед гостями ‘to feel ashamed before visitors перед +Instr’; краснеть перед учителем ‘to blush before a teacher перед +Instr’; стушеваться перед представителями новой литературы ‘to shy away from the representatives of new literature, lit before the representatives перед +Instr of new literature’; чувствовать неловко перед этими ребятами ‘to feel uneasy before these children перед +Instr’).

Shame is also frequently associated with the fear of being DISGRACED, HUMILIATED or LAUGHED AT. Semantic differences between the words for shame and disgrace (e.g. стыд and позор and their derivatives) were not distinctive until the 19th century (Bulygina and Shmelev 2000, 233). It is no wonder that words for disgrace, as well as words for shame, govern перед+Instr (опозорить их перед всеми ‘to disgrace them before everyone перед +Instr’; срамить меня перед людьми ‘to embarrass me before folks перед +Instr’; высмеять его перед всеми ссобравшимися ‘to humiliate him in front of the whole meeting перед +Instr’).

TO MAKE KNOWN is understood as TO DISPLAY or TO PUT IN FRONT (открыть сердце перед вами ‘to open my heart before you перед +Instr’; обещать перед лицом всей страны ‘to promise in front of the entire country,’ lit. ‘in the face перед +Instr of the entire country’; раскрыть перед

Moreover, the origin of позор also reflects the conceptual link between being disgraced and being exposed. Позор is related to позорный столб “a pillar of shame” and the verb наказать “to punish”, which is related to показать “to show”. The origin of these words goes back to the time when punishment was a public spectacle. This explains why words for disgrace govern перед+Instr.
The other expressions that are based on the source domain of DISPLAYING refer to SHOWING OFF (гордиться перед людьми своим положением ‘to boast before people перед +Instr of one’s condition’; пышиться перед другим адвокатом ‘to strut before the other lawyer перед +Instr’; задирать нос перед другом ‘to turn up his nose at his friend,’ lit. ‘before his friend перед +Instr’; расхвастаться перед ним ‘to boast to him, lit. before him перед +Instr’; расхвастаться перед женой ‘to show off for his wife,’ lit. ‘before his wife перед +Instr’).

The origin of the words for ‘condemn,’ разоблачить and обличать, reflect the related conceptual mapping TO CONDEMN is TO UNMASK, which explains their use with перед+Instr (разоблачить ваши трюки перед зрителями ‘to expose your tricks to the spectators,’ lit. ‘before the spectators перед +Instr’; обличать перед судом ‘to expose before the jury перед +Instr’). One of the obsolete meanings of разоблачить was ‘to undress’ and that of обличать was ‘to open’ (Sreznevsky 2003, vol. 2, 523; Shansky 1971, 298; 381).

BEING LOOKED AT is a source domain for BEING JUDGED and SHOWING or EXPOSING is a source domain for EXPLAINING or JUSTIFYING (представить перед прокуратором ‘to present oneself before the prosecutor перед +Instr’; оправдаться перед людьми ‘to justify oneself to people,’ lit. ‘before people перед +Instr’; отчитываться перед менеджером ‘to report to a manager,’ lit. ‘before a manager перед +Instr’; быть ответственным перед богом за свои действия ‘to be accountable to God for your actions,’ lit. ‘before God перед +Instr’; отвечать перед больничным советом ‘to answer to the medical board,’ lit. ‘before the medical board перед +Instr’).

The source domain of BEING IN FRONT (and, therefore, in a vulnerable position) is close to the other source domain for vulnerability and submissiveness – BEING DOWN –and can be combined with it. Likewise, the source domain of BEING OPPOSITE is often combined with the source domain for opposition and aggression – BEING UP. For example, expressions with перед+Instr may contain such verbs as преклонить ‘to bow’ (преклонить перед ней колени ‘to bow the knee before her перед +Instr’), emphasising that X is lower than Y, whereas...
expressions with против +Gen include such verbs as восстать ‘to arise’ (восстать против бессмысленной жестокости ‘to arise against needless cruelty’) highlighting that X is higher than Y.

DISPLAYING WORSHIP or BEING OBEDIENT TO SOMEBODY is viewed as BOWING, KNEELING or LOWERING ONESELF BEFORE SOMEBODY (преклонить колени перед святыми дарами ‘to genuflect before the Sacrament’; стоять на коленях перед иконой ‘to go on their knees before the icon’; приступить перед ней колени ‘to bow the knee before her’; бухнуть перед доктором в ноги ‘to fall on one’s knees before the doctor’; присмыкаться перед начальством ‘to crouch before authority’; упасть перед ней ‘to get down in the dirt for her’, lit. ‘before her’; подхалимничать перед менеджером ‘to fawn over a manager’, lit. ‘before a manager’; заискивать перед ними ‘to fawn on them’, lit. ‘before them’).

FEELING or ACKNOWLEDGING ONE’S GUILT TOWARDS SOMEBODY is also conceptualised as BOWING BEFORE SOMEBODY. Consider явиться с повинной головой ‘to come with a bent head.’ Other synonymous expressions for acknowledging guilt also use перед+Instr since, apart from metaphoric and metonymic extensions, many other factors influence the use of prepositions and cases, including the syntactic structures of expressions with similar and opposite meanings (мы виноваты перед тобой ‘we have wronged you’, lit. ‘before you’; чувствовать себя виноватым перед ним ‘to feel guilty toward him’, lit. ‘before him’; грешен перед нею ‘to have sinned against her’, lit. ‘before her’; извиниться перед этим человеком ‘to excuse oneself to this man’, lit. ‘before this man’).

Moreover, expressions for ADMIRING SOMEBODY are associated with BOWING BEFORE SOMEBODY and contain перед+Instr (преклонение перед традициями ‘bowing to traditions, lit. before traditions’). Преклонение is akin to поклон ‘bow.’ Near-synonyms of преклонение also collocate with перед+Instr (восхищение перед его твердостью ‘admiration of his fortitude’, lit. ‘before his fortitude’; в восторге перед ней ‘admiration of her’, lit. ‘before her’; удивлении перед их изобретательностью ‘to be astonished at their resourcefulness’, lit. ‘before their resourcefulness’).

If DISPLAYING WORSHIP or BEING OBEDIENT TO SOMEBODY is viewed as BOWING, KNEELING or LOWERING
ONESELF BEFORE SOMEBODY, BEING RESISTANT is conceptualised as RISING AGAINST (восстать против нас ‘to rise up against us против+Gen’). Восстать was borrowed from Church Slavonic, where it had the meaning ‘to rise, to stand up’ (Shansky 1971, 94). Consider also встать на борьбу с врагами ‘to stand up to our enemies против+Gen.’

AGGRESSION is often conceptualised as MOVEMENT AGAINST some (opposing) force. For example, пойти против них ‘to move against them’; идти против царя ‘to go against the tsar’; движение против ядерной бомбы ‘the movement against the H-bomb.’

Против +Gen is commonly employed in many synonymous expressions for RESISTANCE, AGGRESSION and FIGHT (выступать против войны ‘to speak out against the war против+Gen’; голосовать против неё ‘to vote against her против+Gen’; предупреждать против этого ‘to warn against it против+Gen’; протестовать против этой затеи ‘to protest against the idea против+Gen’; сражаться против них ‘to fight against them’; атака против врага ‘attack against an enemy против+Gen’; война против врагов ‘war against the enemies против+Gen’; сражение против мятежников ‘battle against the rebels против+Gen’; агрессия против этой страны ‘aggression against this country против+Gen’).

In turn, FIGHTING AGAINST is a source domain of TREATING ILLNESS and, therefore, MEDICINE is conceptualised as A WEAPON (лекарство против кашля ‘medicine for the cough,’ л.т. medicine against the cough против+Gen’; средство против морской болезни ‘treatment against sea-sickness против+Gen’; прививка против гриппа ‘vaccination against influenza против+Gen’). Consider also other expressions based on the source domain of WEAPON (гарантия против всех последствий ‘a guarantee against the consequences против+Gen’; заклинания против его проклятий ‘spells for his curses,’ л.т. ‘against his curses против+Gen’; защиты против посягательств ‘protection from annoyance,’ л.т. ‘against annoyance против+Gen’). 6

6 Compare to the expressions with за +Acc that are based on the opposite conceptual mapping: TO SUPPORT is TO STEP or MOVE BEHIND (вступиться за незнакомого ‘to stand up for a stranger,’ л.т. ‘behind a stranger за+Acc’; заступиться за себя ‘to stand up for oneself,’ л.т. ‘behind oneself за+Acc’; выступить за преобразования ‘to promote changes,’ л.т. ‘to stand up behind the changers за+Acc’).

7 Some of the expressions mentioned in this paper are more common with different prepositions and cases. For example, the source domain of MOVEMENT AWAY (from something unpleasant or dangerous) is more common for such expression as защита от...
Moreover, HATING is associated with BEING OPPOSITE and, as a result, contains про́тив+Gen (бы́ть озлобленным про́тив всего рода человеческого ‘to be embittered against the whole human race про́тив+Gen’; зла́ба про́тив его брата ‘anger against his brother про́тив+Gen’; негодовани́е про́тив всево́л ‘resentment against the whole world про́тив+Gen’; приступ страшного гнева про́тив неё ‘an impulse of fury against her про́тив+Gen’; возмутиться против собственного уничижение ‘to become indignant at one’s own self-depreciation,’ lit. ‘against one’s own self-depreciation про́тив+Gen’; раздражение про́тив неё ‘irritation against her про́тив+Gen’; ярость про́тив судьбы ‘rage against fate про́тив+Gen’).

Spatial PROXIMITY is a common source domain for HAVING. Since in expressions with перед +Gen X is viewed as being located in close spatial proximately to Y and in expressions with про́тив+Gen – as being located across some (interfering) space from Y, only expressions with перед +Gen or за+Instr can refer to HAVING or similar concepts. For example, HAVING A PROBLEM or DILEMMA is BEING IN FRONT OF IT (стоя́ть перед выборо́м ‘to face a choice,’ lit. ‘to stand in front of a choice перед +Instr’; оказыва́ться перед проблемой ‘to find oneself confronted with a problem,’ lit. ‘to find oneself in front of a problem перед +Instr’; быть поставленным перед необходимостью принять немедленное решение ‘to be faced with the need to make a fast decision,’ lit. ‘to be put in front of the need to make a fast decision перед +Instr’; главный вопро́с, стоя́щий перед всево́л союзниками ‘the central question facing all Allies,’ lit. ‘the central question standing in front of all Allies перед +Instr’).

8 While BEING AGAINST someone or something is understood as BEING OPPOSITE, BEING SUPPORTIVE or LOYAL is conceptualised as BEING ON THE SAME SIDE or STANDING BEHIND (по разные сто́роны баррика́д ‘on opposite sides of the barricades’; ты либо с нами, либо про́тив нас ‘you are either with us or against us’; принять чью-то сто́рону ‘to take someone’s side’; прикры́вать их спину́ ‘to back them up’).

9 The conceptualisation of having as being near the object of possession is very distinctive for Russian where ‘to have’ is commonly expressed by means of the preposition у (‘to,’ lit. ‘near’), with a genitive case marker on the possessor and the verb ‘to be’, as in (у меня была машина ‘I had a car, lit. to me у +Gen there was a car.’

пося́гательств ‘protection from annoyance от+Gen,’ which explains its frequent use with от+Gen. RNC gives 149 examples of защи́та with про́тив+Gen and 359 examples with от+Gen.
As перед+Gen are employed in the spatial expressions for PRECEDING IN THE SEQUENCE or SUCCESSION, this preposition and case are also employed in metaphorical expressions grounded in this domain. For example, ONE PERIOD OF TIME or AN EVENT CAN PRECEDE THE OTHER (оставить все дела в полном порядке перед наступающим праздником ‘to leave all in order for the intervening holiday,’ lit. ‘before the intervening holiday перед Инст’; это случилось перед наступлением ночи ‘it happened at the coming of the night,’ lit. ‘before the coming of the night перед Инст’; перед наступлением ночи они остановились ‘before the fall перед +Instr of night they halted’).

Conclusion
The cognitive linguistic approach demonstrates that a variety of applications of prepositions and cases are linked to a few prototypical, usually spatial, scenarios. The analysis conducted in this paper suggests that Russian prepositional expressions with перед + Instr, напротив + Gen and против + Gen are associated with similar, as well as very dissimilar proto-scenarios. For example, all of these prepositions and cases are associated with the spatial proto-scenario where X is located facing Y. However, expressions with перед +Instr highlight that X and Y are located in close proximity or even in contact with each other, while in the expressions with напротив +Gen and против+Gen X is viewed as being located across some intervening space or on the opposite side from Y.

Перед+Instr and против+Gen are linked to very different proto-scenarios when both X and Y are moving entities. In the proto-scenario for перед+Instr X moves before Y in the same direction, while in the proto-scenario for против+Gen X and Y move towards each other.

The similarities and differences in the spatial proto-scenarios explain the overlap and differences in the use of these prepositions and cases in non-spatial expressions that appeared as a result of metaphorical transfer.
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Aspect and the Russian Verbal Base Form

Oscar E. Swan

Introduction
Roman Jakobson’s 1948 single-stem analysis of the Russian verb inspired many imitations and applications around the Slavic world, especially in American Russian pedagogy, where the names Alexander Lipson, Charles Townsend, and Maurice Levin come most readily to mind (see References). The first is a by-now dated two-part textbook series, grammatically innovative for its time, that is still available on the internet (although as far as I know it is not actually used anywhere), while the applied linguistic works by Townsend and Levin are still in print and are commonly used in graduate courses on the structure of Russian. It is the admittedly small group of participants in such courses that is the intended target audience of this paper, although I hope it will also be of interest to those who are interested in Russian structural linguistic issues generally, whether or not these issues are of relevance to the undergraduate teaching/learning situation. In further discussion it will be assumed that the reader is generally conversant with Jakobson’s system in either Townsend’s or Levin’s slightly varying treatments of it. We will not be concerned here with minor details or with any textbooks that apply the single-stem approach to lower levels of teaching, among which Russian Stage One: Live from Russia! (Lekić et al.) is prominent.

At one point in time, it seemed as though almost every other issue of Slavic and East European Journal (SEEJ) or Russian Language Journal (RLJ) one opened had an article about the “single-stem system of the Russian verb,” based one way or another on Jakobson 1948, and about how it provided the key to presenting the Russian verb to American learners—or exactly the opposite, i.e., how it did not. I once took part in that discussion (Swan 1986), and I want to preface this discussion by stating that the present article does not participate in that by-now largely historical polemic, referring the reader instead to Gerald Mayer’s highly readable SEEJ article of 1993, together with its bibliography. In my opinion, Mayer says everything that needs to be said on the pedagogical
side of this issue, and says it as well as anyone could.\(^1\) Instead, I want to address a problem that I think has yet to be specifically raised in this regard, namely, that the Jakobsonian verb description is concerned primarily with the single dimension of tense-form prediction, whereas the verbal lexeme comprises the two more or less equally important cross-cutting dimensions of tense and aspect. Indeed, many would say, and have said, along with Cubberley in his *A Linguistic Tradition*, that “Modern Russian has ended up with a system in which aspect dominates over tense” (2002, 146). Raible (1990, 197) describes the system as an "aspect system by priority, combined with a tense system." A verbal base-form system that concentrates almost exclusively on predicting tense forms is, therefore, largely missing the point of what is needed in a Russian verbal presentational strategy.

**Base Forms**

*Base form*, as used here, means a single annotated compact form containing the inflectional and stress information needed to produce all the word-forms of a nominal, adjectival, or, in the instance of the present paper, verbal lexemes. By nature, all base forms are, to a greater or lesser extent, abstractions, requiring various kinds of rules for their implementation. Jakobson himself, with his 1948 article, was influential in injecting the idea of the base form of inflected words into Slavic morphological description. Although the jury may still be out as to the pedagogical utility, at early stages of language instruction, of the base form of inflected words, its use in scientific writing and at advanced stages of pedagogy—say, at the graduate level—can hardly be doubted.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Although I hesitate to become involved in that old debate, I do side with Mayer (1993) in his conclusion that the verbal base form is of questionable utilitarian value on the elementary language-learning level, when there are so many other things to learn. As he shows, the traditional “three-form” approach of verb presentation (e.g., писа’ть пишу’ пи’шет; чита’ть чита’ю чита’ешь, etc.) seems perfectly adequate, and provides in a different way, and with concrete verb forms, exactly the same information as the Jakobsonian base form.

\(^2\) This having been said, Davidson’s 2010 review, reflecting on fifteen years of experience sending students to ACTFL/ACCELS Russian study-abroad immersion programs incontrovertibly shows that structural proficiency in Russian is an especially strong predictor for making progress in both speaking and listening once in the country. I simply do not wish to sidetrack discussion here by injecting that issue into it.
At that stage, it is at the very least a heuristic construct that is useful when the need arises to explain why a given form is as it is, and to demonstrate to advanced learners that the majority of complex inflectional processes in Russian are largely systematic. By definition in the one-stem approach, a verb can be considered, in one way or another, irregular within the system when a base form cannot be generated for an inflected word. Most users of the idea of the base form view it as a purely utilitarian construct, without any accompanying philosophical-semiotic claims or imputations, and the present author shares that view.

As noted, a limitation of the base-form strategy as it has been traditionally applied to Russian verbs is that, unlike with nouns and adjectives, it has not been applied to the entire lexeme which, in the case of the verb, presides over a verbal pair, differentiated as to aspect and, within each aspect pair, as to tense. Although the dominant of these two verbal categories is aspect, the base-form strategy has mainly been applied to the tense dimension of individual aspect partners of an aspect pair, greatly limiting (more or less by half) the descriptive power of base forms as far as verbs are concerned. It is the purpose of the present study to investigate just how successfully (or unsuccessfully) the base-form strategy can be oriented around and applied to the entire verbal lexeme, better incorporating tense and aspect together, arriving at a base from which all of the finite verb forms falling beneath a particular verbal lexeme can be derived with reliable and consistent morphological and phonological rules, i.e., rules that do not conflict either with one another or with the morphological and phonological rules that one finds elsewhere in Russian word formation.³

³ A major criticism, voiced by many, is that many of the Jakobsonian rules of single-stem word composition lack generality; they are good only for describing verb conjugation and for nothing else; for a good discussion, see Mayer’s (1998) lengthy note 2. Phonological rule here means a rule that describes sound changes that are motivated by the phonological environment in which sound units fall, irrespective of the morphological environment. The units that participate in phonological rules in the present description are somewhat abstract, i.e., they are more like symbols than concrete units consisting of bundles of phonetic features, but they could be amenable to historical-phonological interpretation if the need should arise.
A Quick Review of Jakobson 1948
Reviewing a bit, Jakobson’s base-form system treats verb-stems (infinitive/past vs. non-past/imperative) as phonologically conditioned allomorphs derived from the same underlying base. For simplicity, in further discussion we will refer to these two stems as the past stem and the non-past stem. Some of Jakobson’s base forms end in consonants and others end in vowels. They are joined to endings, beginning either with consonants (past-tense endings) or with vowels (non-past tense endings). Rules of combination usually result in different past and non-past stem allomorphs in accordance with how the base stem either changes, or does not change, in response to rules governing different kinds of vowel+consonant, vowel+vowel, consonant+vowel, and consonant+consonant combinations at the stem-ending juncture. Jakobson’s 1948 description did not (a) distinguish verbal suffixes or any other structure within verb-stems; (b) recognize the morphological or psychological reality of the different verb-stems (i.e., past vs. non-past); (c) concern itself with the derivation of aspect or with the derivation of gerunds, participles, or verbal nouns; or (d) concern itself with conjugational stress patterns. Townsend (1981) and Levin (1978) achieved considerable success both in describing stress patterns in the verb and in specifying how the participle and derived imperfective aspect suffixes are distributed according to the inflectional classes of verbs that emerge from Jakobson’s base-form, as long as one is allowed to identify morphological units (suffixes) that exist within the verb stem and use them as classifiers (this seems to have been originally Lipson’s (1981) innovation). There are around a dozen such verb classes. Under the revised Jakobsonian system former писа- becomes пис-а-; former читай- becomes чит-ай-; and so on. Proponents of the expanded system apparently have never been bothered by the fact that introducing the morphological structure into the verb stem fundamentally undermined Jakobson’s original vision of the verb as having a single underlying psychologically unitary, phonologically defined, morphologically undifferentiated stem. In my opinion, this fact should have been of concern to followers of Townsend’s and Levin’s systems. Once the door has been opened to morphological rules and structures in finite conjugation, such rules and structures may be used alongside phonological rules anywhere they might conceivably facilitate
overall descriptive uniformity and simplicity, including the production not just of tense forms, but of aspect forms as well.

**Problems Posed by Aspect Formation under the Single-Stem**

A problem emerges when one attempts to add aspect formants to Jakobson’s phonologically defined base, or even to its now morphologically segmented base, as both Townsend and Levin attempt to do. In both instances the description of aspect formation based on the single-stem base becomes an add-on construct, requiring its own specially adduced rules and procedures. Many of the rules of sound combination on which Jakobson’s original system relies have to be replaced with other rules of combination, at times openly conflicting with Jakobson’s original rules, while still living alongside them in an expanded and now rather rickety system. For example, Jakobson’s base stem писа-, when added to a conjugational vowel ending, yields пишу, see писа-+у → пишу, whereas adding выписа- to the imperfective aspect suffix -ывай- merely results in the chopping off (truncation) of the а: выписа-+ывай- → выписывай-, with no accompanying mutation. By contrast, adding the same suffix -ывай- to, say, подсуд-и- produces both truncation and mutation: подсуживай-. Adding the same suffix to the base прочит-ай- should logically, under Jakobson’s rules of combination, produce *прочитаивай-, but the actual result is прочитывай-. The aforementioned authors only partially attempt to reconcile the rules of aspect formation with Jakobson’s rules of stem-ending combination, because that is all that is possible. Taking Levin as an example, when describing imperfective aspect derivation he asks the user of his version of the system to truncate the entire suffix -аи- before imperfective suffixes (whereas truncation under Jakobson was a purely phonological process, blind to morphological structure and applying only to final vowels or consonants), and then lists which kinds of suffixal truncation prompt mutation of the preceding consonant and which ones do not. As a result, a sizable gap in Levin’s description opens up between verb conjugation in its dimension of tense on the one hand and in its dimension of aspect on the other without the nature of that gap ever being made explicit: namely, one has shifted from phonologically stated rules in present and past-tense conjugation, which are not permitted to look at morphological structure, to rules for aspect formation that depend on morphological
structure and, in addition, often stand in violation of the phonologically stated rules needed for past and non-past tense formation. While it might be defensible to treat gerunds, participles, and verbal nouns as subsidiary categories belonging to verbal derivational morphology, thereby justifying their descriptive treatment as appendices to the main conjugational system with their own sui generis rules, aspect is a different matter. Aspect partners of a verb—perfective and imperfective—fall under the same verbal lexeme as tense partners—past and non-past—and hence belong equally to the narrow subject of finite verb conjugation, as Jakobson himself describes elsewhere (1932-1971). Leaving aside the derivation of gerunds, participles, and verbal nouns, it seems inarguable that finite verb conjugation, comprising the cross-cutting categories of tense and aspect, should be governed by rules that are (a) non-conflicting, i.e., consistent and compatible with one another and with Russian word structure generally; and (b) explicitly either phonological or morphological, instead of being neither clearly one nor the other.

**Distinguishing Real Phonological Rules from Rules of Thumb**
A start on a solution to the problem just described is to distinguish in Jakobson’s system those rules that are truly phonological (non-suffixed verb rules, sound-changes which, like \( A \rightarrow C/\_\_T \) in \( \text{вёд} + \text{-ти} \rightarrow \text{вести} \), have been inherited from Common Slavic and which can be found exhibited elsewhere in Russian morphophonology), \(^4\) and weed out those that are merely quasi-phonological, i.e., rules of thumb that have been invented for the verb by Jakobson and devised by him to operate only within the system of past vs. non-past verb conjugation as he narrowly circumscribes it in 1948. The quasi-phonological rules of thumb, of which in fact there are very few, turn out to be phonological-morphological hybrids in disguise, whose hidden purpose is to reference the past and non-past stems, an observation that has already been made by many commentators, especially well by Chvany (1990). It seems preferable to replace such hybrid rules, that are neither clearly phonological nor morphological, with explicit rules of morpheme substitution and stem-referencing, making it possible to meld aspect derivation into finite conjugation more seamlessly. Jakobson’s system can be made more

\(^4\) For example, the same rule \( A \rightarrow C/\_\_T \) can be found underlying the noun весть.
compatible with aspect, and more internally logical within tense-form production itself, if some of the burden in the system is moved out of the phonology and back into the morphology, where it historically operated.

The system to be described recognizes the morphological and psychological reality of the two verb stems, past and non-past. Either one stem or the other, depending on the class to which the verb belongs, is used as the verbal base and to predict the other stem from it, making use of the same predictive power that is inherent in the 1948 system and in much the same way, i.e., one stem predicts the other, as long as one recognizes which stem it is, past or non-past. This turns out to be an easy task: only base forms in the suffixes -й- and -н- represent non-past stems, and the past stem is derived from them by dropping the -й- or -н. All other base forms either represent the past stem or, with bases ending in consonants, the two stems are the same: for example, вёд-. Here we will give only a couple of orientational examples of the modified system, adding others in further narrative as needed. The most prominent changes affect verbs of the пис-а-, кол-о-, крик-ну-, and чит-а-й- classes. Verbs of the пис-а- class (which, since they do not end in -й- or -н-, are recognizably past stems) replace -а- with the non-past-forming suffix -й-

5 For example, the a+y rule mentioned above is internally inconsistent with the y+y rule one sees in двин-+у → двину. With no evident motivation, mutation occurs in one instance (писа+-у → пишу), but not in the other. It seems pointless to attempt to handle such discrepancies with phonological rules alone. The ending -y is obviously not added to двину- but to двин-, and the same ending -y is not added to писа- but to пиш-, which comes from пис-й-.

6 Agreeing with Mayer (1998), and also following Townsend (1981) and Levin (1978), I strongly prefer to use the Russian letters rather than roman-letter transcription, both here and in my own instruction. This may result in a certain amount of estrangement for those not used to seeing в and б used as mobile-vowel operators, and в also used as the abstract glide w. In the latter role, the rules for в are as follows: в → ƅ /__V, ƅ → у and в → ъ /__C, otherwise в is dropped. The operators в and ъ are placed in italics to distinguish them as such.

7 As seen throughout Russian morphology; see дух-й-а → душа, зем-й-а → земля-а (spelled земля), etc.
of the чит-а-й- class, whose stem we segment in this way in order to separate the non-past suffix -й- from the stem formant -а-, drop the suffix -й- in order to obtain the past stem, hence чит-а-й- : чита-. Seen as stem-referencing bases, then, the formписать contains the instructions: “replace the past-stem suffix -а- with -й- in order to obtain the non-past stem,” while the form чит-а-й- contains the instructions: “replace the non-past stem suffix -й- with 0 in order to obtain the past stem.” In this way, and by applying the same reasoning *mutatis mutandis* to other verb classes, base forms maintain basically the same appearance as under Jakobson (1948) (as modified by Lipson in 1981, Townsend in 1981, and Levin in 1978), but have a different interpretation, with different instructions attached to them. Without bothering with minor details, one can accept Jakobson’s presentation of the non-suffixed consonant stems (like вести, веду, вёл, etc.), together with their accompanying rules, most of which reflect history (or at least do not openly clash with history).

**Simplex Imperfective Verbs**

The simplest challenge is to compose base forms for simplex (unprefixed) verbs that form their perfective counterparts via empty prefixation: one lists the verb under its perfective form, with its perfectivizing prefix set off in some way. In this way, the base form for the lexeme READ becomes (про)чит-а-й-; similarly: WRITE (на)писать; DO (с)дел-а-й-; GLADDEN (об)рад-оъ-а-; PAY (за)плат-и-; BREAK (с)лом-а-й-; DRINK (вы)пьй-; (при)готов-и-; and so on. These base forms carry the instructions:

---

8 I am aware that some deny that there is such a thing as empty aspectual prefixation (e.g., Janda et. al. 2013), but to me that is more or less the same as denying that the verb system tends toward one consisting of perfective and imperfective partners, availing itself of whatever morphological resources it has at its disposal, which is manifestly true, and the way that the verb system developed historically. The perfectivization of simplex imperfective verbs via one prefix or another was always a less-than-perfect device, because certain semantic nuances, however slight, always adhere to the prefixes.

9 There are about as many different notational interpretations of this class of five verb roots as there are descriptions of it. I prefer to use the surface non-past stem as verbal base, producing и in the infinitive-past stem with the rule йй → и /_C. Similarly, ъй → и /_C, as in мъйть → мыть.

10 For the sake of simplicity and typological exigency, stress notation is not illustrated here for base forms. Stress is indicated, however, in derived imperfectivization, since stress assignment is an intrinsic component of imperfective derivation. Eventually one may follow a system like that of Townsend (1981, 35-37) or (Levin 1978, 84-86).
“subtract the prefix to form the imperfective aspect partner.” Prefixes that are not set off from the root with parentheses will be considered not to be detachable, but melded to the verb in the given meaning, e.g., подсуд-и- ‘favor (in sports judging)’.

Suffixally Derived Imperfectives
Prefixed perfectives with prefixes that are not detachable utilize imperfectivizing suffixes to produce imperfective partners. Primarily because of the number of imperfective suffixes and the complexity of their distribution, these verbs present more of a challenge. There are three main imperfective-forming suffixes: -а’-й-, ва’-й-, and -ъва-й-; two minor ones: -в-а’- and -а’-; and one unique one: -об-а’. An additional special suffix -а-й-, without intrinsic stress characteristics, needs to be discussed in connection with simplex perfectives in -ну-. Imperfective suffixes are added to the past stem of both prefixed perfective verbs in new meanings and to simplex (unprefixed) perfective verbs. NB: imperfective suffixes are not added to the base but to the past stem; if the base is based on the non-past stem, the past stem must first be derived from it for it then to serve as the base for imperfective suffixation. Imperfective suffixes are inherently stressed; that is, they attract stress onto themselves, except for the suffix -ъва-й-, which requires stress one syllable to its left, and except for the special suffix -а-й-, which is stress-neutral. Before adding the suffixes to the past stem, the base stem usually undergoes root-vowel “ablaut” (b → и, v → ы, o → a). Additionally, except for prefixed verbs in -и-, before adding the imperfective suffix, the base drops the right-most suffix of the past stem. In other words, the imperfective suffix takes the place of the right-most past-stem suffix. After possible ablaut, and after the right-most suffix of the past stem has been removed (except for

---

11 In an English-to-Russian glossary, English ‘read’ will point to (про)чит-а-й-. In a Russian to-English glossary, the form чит-а-й- will direct the user to (про)чит-а-й-, instead of the other way around, as is current common practice. One way or another, a cross-reference is needed.

12 These suffixes are not my invention, although their precise representations here may be. Along with the rules for their distribution, they are contained in all detailed descriptions of imperfective aspect formation. The suffixes -ва’-й-, and -ъва-й- obviously represent extensions of the suffix -а-й-, one preceded by -в-, the other by -ъв-. Likewise, the suffixal combinations -в-а’- and -об-а’- are varieties of the suffix -а’-, one preceded by the stem extension -в- and the other by -об-. For rules governing об, see note 6.
prefixed verbs in -и-, like подсуй-и-), the rules for the distribution of the suffixes are as follows:

1. The suffix -а'ий- is added to: (a) obstruent stems other than verbs of motion (e.g., застряг-, выгреб-); (b) н, м, and р stems (начьи-, нажьм-, умьр-); (c) most simplex perfective verbs in -и- (брос-и-); (d) syllabic roots with suffix in -а (выбьр-а-); (e) dropping -ну- verbs (исчез-[ну]-); (f) Church-Slavonic (ChSl) verbs in -и- (загру-и-) and in -ну- (задвий-ну-). ChSl verbs in -и- show consonant mutations т → щ, д → жд, сла → шп instead of regular Russian т → ч, д → ж, сла → сль.\(^{13}\)

2. The suffix -ва'ий- is added to (a) historical glide stems, i.e., verbs of the запьй-, вымьй-, and прожьй- types (with surface past stems ending in и or ы); (b) most verbs of any class whose surface past stem ends in е, although verbs of the second conjugation in -е- are, in practice, quite messy; see the appendix Exceptional Imperfective Derivation.

3. The minor suffix -о'а- is added to three verbs whose surface past stem ends in root-final а- (да[а]-irreg., узна-й-, доста-н-, past stems да-, узна-, доста-).

4. The minor suffix -а' is added to simplex perfective roots ending in ов- or ев- preceding -ну- (in practice, соев-ну-, клев-ну-, плев-ну-).\(^{14}\)

5. The unique imperfective suffix -ов'а- is added to the non-past stem of ми[г]-ну-, yielding мин-ов'а-.

6. The suffix -'ыв'а-й- is the most productive; it is added to the past stem of verbs of most other types, including prefixed perfectives with bases ending in -а-, -а-й-, -и-, -ну-, -ов'а-, -о-, and -а-preceded by a hushing consonant or ый (meaning second-conjugation verbs like пролеж-а-, заостр-а-сЯ).

7. The suffix -а-й- is used with simplex perfectives in -ну-. In the instance of an aspect pair based on a simplex verb in -ну- like

\(^{13}\) Stem mutation in the second conjugation is motivated by ordered phonological rules and the fact that prefixed perfectives in -и- do not drop this suffix; see ChSl воображ-и-а-тъ → воображ-ий-а-тъ → воображ-а-тъ, replicating a historical progression.

\(^{14}\) See note 6 for the relevant sound-changes. To illustrate, remembering that the non-past stem exchanges -й- for -а- in the past: клев-ну-тъ → клюнуть, клев-а-тъ → клевать, клев-ый-у → клею.
дви[г]-ну- : двиг-а-й- (alternatively, двиг-а-), the question arises as to whether the perfective partner is derived from the imperfective or the imperfective from the perfective, sometimes one and sometimes the other, or neither, i.e., the verbs are not derivationally directional. Here the suffix -а-й-, unlike the other imperfectivizing suffixes, is not inherently stressed, and the imperfective usually matches the stress of the perfective in -ну\(^{15}\) (see root stressed прыг-ну- : прыг-а-й- vs. post-root-stressed руг-ну'-: руг-а'-й-). Infrequently, stress is assigned independently, as with root-stressed ки[д]-ну- vs. post-root-stressed кида'-й-. Because of the \(v \rightarrow ы\) ablaut in the root, the pair тък-ну- : тък-а-й- suggests that this pair at least, operates in the following direction: perfective in -ну- \(\rightarrow\) imperfective in -а-й-. The following rule covers most cases: simplex perfectives in -ну- derive imperfectives in -а-й-, which copy their stress, whether root stress or post-root stress, from the stress of the verb in -ну-. For exceptions, including the use of the suffix -а- instead of -а-й- with simplex perfectives in -ну-, see the appendix * Exceptional Imperfective Derivation*, c.

**Illustrations**

Following are some representative base forms for various verbal lexemes showing imperfective suffixation. The output form under the imperfective-derivation column represents the base used for obtaining the imperfective tense-forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexeme:</th>
<th>General base:</th>
<th>Imperfective derivation:</th>
<th>Explanation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>СПРОС-И-</td>
<td>спрас-и-</td>
<td>(о (\rightarrow) a ablaut; -и- is not dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>спра’с-и-ъва-й-</td>
<td>(-ъва-й- is added by rule 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>спра’с-и-ъва-й-</td>
<td>(и (\rightarrow) ĭ / __V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>спра’ш-ъва-й-</td>
<td>(C_plain (\rightarrow) Cmutated / __ ĭ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) The implication is that the suffix -а-й- here is by origin not really an imperfectivizing suffix but just a suffix that is imperfective, although this may be a distinction without an important difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Base Form</th>
<th>Derived Form</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAKE</td>
<td>ВЫПЕК-</td>
<td>выпек-</td>
<td>(no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>выпек-а’-й-</td>
<td>(-а’-й- is added by rule 1.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>НАЧЫН-</td>
<td>начин-</td>
<td>(b → и ablaut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>начин-а’-й-</td>
<td>(-а’-й- is added by rule 1.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESEECH</td>
<td>УМОЛ-И- ChSl</td>
<td>умол-и-</td>
<td>(ChSl, therefore no o → a ablaut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>умол-и-а’-й-</td>
<td>(-а’-й- is added by rule 1.f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>умол-й-а’-й-</td>
<td>(и → й / __V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>умолб’-а’-й-</td>
<td>(Cplain → Cmutated / __й)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEWITCH</td>
<td>ЗАКОЛД-ОЪ-А-</td>
<td>заколд-оъ-</td>
<td>(right-hand suffix -а- drops; no ablaut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>заколд-оъ-ыва-й-</td>
<td>(-ъва-й- is added by rule 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>заколд-оъ-ыва-й-</td>
<td>(b → в / __V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIE</td>
<td>УМЪР-</td>
<td>умир-</td>
<td>(b → и ablaut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>умир-а’-й-</td>
<td>(-а’-й- is added by rule 1.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCHANT</td>
<td>ВОСХИТ-И- ChSl</td>
<td>восхит-и-</td>
<td>(the suffix -и- does not drop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>восхит-и-а’-й-</td>
<td>(ChSl: add -а’-й- by rule 1.f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>восхит-й-а’-й-</td>
<td>(и → й / __V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>восхищ-а’-й-</td>
<td>(ChSl: т → щ / __й)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDURE</td>
<td>ПРЕТЕРП-Е-</td>
<td>претерп-е-</td>
<td>(-е does not drop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>претерп-е-ва’-й-</td>
<td>(-ва’-й- is added by rule 2.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTER</td>
<td>ОВЛАД-Е-Й-</td>
<td>овлад-е-</td>
<td>(derive the past stem: drop –й-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>овлад-е-ва’-й-</td>
<td>(-ва’-й- is added by rule 2.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECK</td>
<td>КЛЪНУ-</td>
<td>кльн-</td>
<td>(right-most suffix, -ну-, is dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>кльн-а’-</td>
<td>(-а’- is added by rule 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Possibly, a ё → e ablaut occurs, but it is impossible to tell from the spelling or pronunciation.
17 Possibly, an o → a ablaut occurs, but it is impossible to tell from the spelling or pronunciation.
18 Roots of the соъ- and -оъ-а- types (i.e., root оъ and suffixal оъ) are immune to root ablaut.
PRODUCE  выдел-а-й- (derive the past stem: drop -й-)
           выдел-а-й- (right-most suffix -а- is dropped)
           выдеъ-выва-й- (-ъва-й- is added by rule 6)

PROTRUDE  высоко-ну- (the suffix, -ну-, is dropped)\(^{19}\)
           высоко-выва-й- (-ъва-й- is added by rule 6)

REACH      достиг-[ну]- (the right-most suffix, -ну-, is dropped)
           достиг-а'-й- (-а'-й- is added by rule 1.e)

RECOGNIZE  узна-й- (derive past stem: drop -й-)
           узна-в-а'- (в-а'- added by rule 3)\(^{20}\)

RECALL     помин-ну-\(^{21}\) (в → и ablaut; the suffix -ну- drops)
           помин-а'-й- (-а'-й- is added by rule 1.b)

ROT THRU   прогни-и- (derive past stem: drop -й-)
           прогни-ва-й- (-ва-й- is added by rule 2.a)

SHUT       замък-ну- ChSl замык-а'-й- (в → ы ablaut; suffix -ны- drops)
           замък-а'-й- (ChSl: -а'-й- is added by rule 1.f.)

SIGN       подпис-а- (suffix -а- drops)
           подписыв-а'-й- (-ъва-й- is added by rule 6)

THROW      брос-и- (suffix -и- is dropped)\(^{22}\)
           брос-а'-й- (-а'-й- is added by rule 1.c.)

THRUST     соъ-ну- (suffix -ну- is dropped)
           соъ-а'- (-а'- is added by rule 4)

TOSS       ки[д]-ну- (the suffix -ну- is dropped, revealing д)
           кид-а'-й- (-а'-й- is added by rule 1.c)

---

\(^{19}\) No ablaut: see note 18.

\(^{20}\) According to rules for в (note 6), узна-ъ-а-тъ → узнавать, узна-ъ-й-у → знаюю.

\(^{21}\) помнить is produced from помн-ну- by the rule н/м → я /___C, which also produces,
for example, начать-ъ → начать (with я being spelled а after ч).

\(^{22}\) Unlike prefixed perfective verbs in -и-, simplex perfective verbs in -и- usually do drop -и-, hence there is no accompanying stem-mutation, although there are exceptions (see appendix Exceptional Imperfective Derivation, d).
Conclusion

Under the present proposal, a verb’s main entry in a glossary will contain only one form (the base form), and that form is presumed to be the perfective base unless otherwise noted. In this way, Russian verbal citation becomes associated with a single, stable place in the morphology, i.e., that of the perfective form of the verb. To be sure, some verbs, like им-е-й-impf, have no perfective partner, and will have to be listed as such. Verbs for which both aspect forms need to be listed because they cannot be predicted from a single base are, by virtue of that fact, irregular. Still, the perfective form would be listed first. A further project would be to survey a large corpus of verbs in order to obtain a precise estimate of how many verbs are regular under this proposal, and how many are irregular, but it is clear that by far most are regular within the rules given.

The aims of the changes recommended here are two-fold. The first aim is to more seamlessly incorporate aspect—which is, alongside tense, one of the two cross-cutting categories comprising the Russian finite conjugational system into the description of individual verbal lexemes. The second is to take the opportunity, while so doing, to eliminate conjugational rules deriving from Jakobson 1948 that openly conflict with the rules needed for aspect formation.

In specialized courses in the structure of Russian, the Russian verbal base is a useful, even indispensable, heuristic construct for casting light on inflectional patterns in order to identify what in Russian conjugation is truly regular and systematic, and also—perhaps of equal importance—in order to point to exactly where lack of systematic uniformity lies. For example, as the present analysis perhaps surprisingly brings out, the aspect pair встретить : встреча’ть is not regular, since it shows the ChSl imperfective suffixal type, but Russian-type stem mutation.
It seems clear that most of the complexity in the morphology of the verb system comes from the variety of imperfective suffixes and their rules of distribution. Given this complexity, the great majority of verbs form imperfective aspect pairs regularly. This happens as long as one introduces the distinction between ‘Church Slavonic’ and traditional Russian formation, a distinction which determines the formation of the derived imperfective by -а’-й- instead of -ъва’-й-, and, in a few instances, regulates the outcome of stem mutation. The formation of the participles, gerunds, and verbal nouns is as equally compatible with the present description as is the formation of the imperfective aspect form. In fact, participle, gerund, and verbal noun formation are considerably less complicated than imperfective aspect formation because the suffixes involved are much simpler in their form and distribution.

Are there lessons to be learned here for lower-level Russian language pedagogy? Possibly, but that is not the issue that is primarily in play here. As in many areas of Russian grammar, it may be the case that verb rules begin to make sense only ex post facto, after the verb forms have already been learned (which does not mean that the rules are less valid, but simply that they are not pedagogically helpful). On the other hand, the awareness that one is not really teaching/learning the Russian verb until one is integrally teaching/learning tense and aspect alongside one another might well stimulate more logical presentational approaches to the verb in elementary textbooks.

Appendix

Exceptional Imperfective Derivations
Essentially, all verbs of motion derive the prefixed imperfective form with exceptions. Additionally, suppletive aspect pairs like TALK сказа- : говор-и-, PUT положи- : клад-, etc. are also exceptions. A few verbs require listing in two stem-forms, like NAME, with perfective past stem называ- and perfective non-past stem назов- (imperfective derivation here is regular). Aside from such instances, the described rules hold for the vast majority of prefixed perfective verbs for which a single base form

23 Here the difference derives from a difference in zero vs. o Indo-European ablaut grade, a few traces of which may still be found in Russian.
can be established. The following overview of exceptions to aspect-formation is offered. A slightly more complete list of exceptions can be found in Levin (1978, 128-137).

a. Despite rule 2.d., second-conjugation verbs in -e- must be treated individually; almost anything is possible; see, for example:
   - Truncation and no stem mutation, with suffixal -ъва-й-: за-вид-е-: за-ви’д-ъва-й-, под-гля-д-е-: под-гля’д-ъва-й-.
   - Truncation, possible ablaut, and stem mutation, with the suffix -ъв-а-й-: заси-д-е- -ся: заси’ж-ъва-й- -ся, рассмотр-е-: рассма’тръва-й-.
   - Truncation without stem mutation and no evident ablaut, with suffixal –а’-й-: выгор-е-: выгор-а’-й-.
   - Without truncation, stem mutation, or evident ablaut; suffixal -ва’-й-: претерп-е-: претерп-е-ва’-й-, забол-е-й-: забол-е-ва’-й-.
   - With truncation, ablaut, and stem mutation; suffixal -ъва-й-: выздоров-е-й-: въздора’влъва-й-.

b. Some prefixed perfective verbs in -и- do undergo suffixal truncation of the -и- and hence fail to show imperfective stem mutation, even when, as sometimes happens, mutation is present in the perfective passive participle; a sample: вонъз-и-: вонъз-а’-й-, вско-ч-и-: вска’к-ъва-й-, выброс-и-: выбира’с-ъва-й- (выброшен), выруб-и-: выруб-а’-й- (вырублен), выступ-и-: выступ-а’-й, закус-и-: заку’с-ъва-й- (закушен), перекрич-а-: перекри’к-ъва-й, проглот-и-: прогла’т-ъва-й (пролочен), схват-и-: схват-ъв-а-й- (схватен).


Some simplex perfective verbs in -ну- are related to second-conjugation

---

24 As this pair and pairs such as пере-крич-а- : перекрич-ъва-й- show, the latent velar consonant in some verbs of the second-conjugation needs somehow to be taken into account. One way to do this is to derive крич-а- from крик-б-, with ã first causing the mutation of к to ч, and then changing to a after ч.

25 More usual perfectives of рез-а- are за-рез-а- or с-рез-а-.

d. Among simplex perfectives in -и- that do not truncate -и- in the imperfective (and hence do undergo mutation) are прост-и- (imf. пропш-а-й-), яв-и- -ся (imf. явл-а-й- -ся).


Works Cited

26 As the last two groups of exceptions show, many verbs that today comprise aspect pairs were historically formed before the aspect opposition became firmly crystalized and these pairs became subordinated to it.


Языковые сдвиги в сфере образования Республики Казахстан

ОЛЫГА АЛТЫНБЕКОВА

Введение
Общеизвестно, что в советский период в коммуникативно-языковом пространстве Казахстана доминирующее положение занимал русский язык, который «должен был обслуживать наиболее важные сферы: государственную, хозяйственную, правоохранительную, военную, общественно-политическую и в особенности партийную деятельность в союзном, республиканском, областном и районном масштабе» [Сулейменова 2011: 62]. Язык титульной нации – казахский – оказался фактически вытесненным за рамки политической и общественной жизни в республике.

После дезинтеграции Советского Союза в результате новой языковой политики, а также крупнейших миграционных процессов – значительного оттока русскоязычного населения и репатриации этнических казахов из стран ближнего и дальнего зарубежья – этноязыковая ситуация в Казахстане резко изменилась. Меры по реализации принятых Государственных программ функционирования и развития языков, осуществление языкового планирования в суверенном Казахстане, изменение демографических пропорций основных этносов в стране и многое другое в существенной мере повлияли на значительное расширение функций и сфер применения государственного казахского языка.

Тем не менее, накопленная коммуникативная мощность русского языка, который в течение длительного исторического периода являлся основным средством не только межэтнического, но и зачастую внутриэтнического общения в республике, еще продолжает сохраняться в казахстанском обществе. Кроме того, в соответствии с современными требованиями, интеграцией в мировое пространство, а также поэтапной реализацией в Республике Казахстан (РК) культурного проекта «Триединство языков»,
возрастает престиж и расширяется объем функционирования английского языка.

Таблица 1
Распределение численности учащихся школ по языкам обучения в Республике Казахстан

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Учебный год</th>
<th>Всего учащихся (тыс. чел.)</th>
<th>Обучаются на казахском языке (%)</th>
<th>Обучаются на русском языке (%)</th>
<th>Обучаются на ЯНГ** (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>3062,5</td>
<td>30,7</td>
<td>66,8</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>3116,0</td>
<td>32,35</td>
<td>65,05</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>3101,4</td>
<td>37,2</td>
<td>60,15</td>
<td>2,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>3089,3</td>
<td>39,9</td>
<td>57,4</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>3048,0</td>
<td>42,7</td>
<td>54,3</td>
<td>3,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>3036,6</td>
<td>44,7</td>
<td>52,2</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>3078,0</td>
<td>46,2</td>
<td>50,6</td>
<td>3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>3073,9</td>
<td>48,0</td>
<td>48,75</td>
<td>3,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>3095,2</td>
<td>49,4</td>
<td>47,2</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>3097,1</td>
<td>50,7</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>3247,4</td>
<td>52,1</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>3066,2</td>
<td>53,2</td>
<td>43,3</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>3096,4</td>
<td>54,4</td>
<td>42,0</td>
<td>3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>3025,8</td>
<td>55,25</td>
<td>41,1</td>
<td>3,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2917,4</td>
<td>56,0</td>
<td>40,3</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2824,6</td>
<td>56,8</td>
<td>39,5</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>2715,9</td>
<td>57,9</td>
<td>38,3</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>2627,3</td>
<td>59,1</td>
<td>37,1</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>2561,6</td>
<td>59,3</td>
<td>36,8</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>2534,0</td>
<td>61,4</td>
<td>34,7</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>2516,1</td>
<td>62,5</td>
<td>33,5</td>
<td>4,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>2508,2</td>
<td>63,4</td>
<td>32,7</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2519,4</td>
<td>64,2</td>
<td>32,0</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2567,3</td>
<td>64,7</td>
<td>31,5</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Данные не включают учащихся специальных коррекционных организаций
**ЯНГ – языки национальных групп
В связи с этим очень важным является исследование динамики изменения темпов распространения и сфер использования казахского и русского языков в первую очередь – как двух наиболее мощных партнеров в коммуникативном пространстве республики, а также других языков – в образовательной сфере, где установление языковых приоритетов при выборе языка обучения учащимися школ, студентами колледжей и вузов является важнейшим показателем и прогнозом дальнейшего расширения vs. сужения сфер применения того или иного языка.

Динамика языковых сдвигов в сфере школьного образования РК. Рассматривая положение языков в сфере школьного образования РК, можно констатировать, что в дневных общеобразовательных школах численность обучающихся на государственном казахском языке постоянно возрастает: за двадцатилетний период независимости она увеличилась (на начало 2011/12 уч. года) на 57,8%, а количество обучающихся в школах на русском языке резко снизилось – на 59,6% по сравнению с 1990/91 уч. годом (таблица 1). Возрастает численность обучающихся на языках национальных групп (ЯНГ), в том числе на узбекском, уйгурском, таджикском, а также на иностранных языках.

Следует отметить, что численность школьников в разные годы во многом обусловливается демографическими сдвигами в структуре населения, связанными с рождаемостью и миграционными процессами. Из данных таблицы 1 видно, что наибольшее число учащихся школ отмечалось в 2000/01 учебном году, а в последующие годы количество школьников оказалось меньше на 15–25%.

Языковые изменения в период «перестройки». Интересно сравнить данные о распространении языков обучения в дневных общеобразовательных школах с 1985/86 учебного года, когда начался так называемый период перестройки. За 5 лет, с 1985 по 1990 гг., в Казахстане уже наметилась тенденция к увеличению числа обучающихся на казахском языке (на 1,65%), снижению численности школьников, получающих школьное образование на русском языке (на 1,75%), и возрастанию количества обучающихся на ЯНГ (на 0,1%): за 20-летний период (с 1985 по 2006 гг.) численность школьников-узбеков, выбравших свой этнический язык обучения, возросла более
Языковые сдвиги в сфере образования Республики Казахстан
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чем на 30%, уйгуров – более чем на 20%, таджиков – в 2,2 раза. В 2008/09 учебном году, например, на родном языке обучались 76,9% узбеков, 50,6% таджиков, 35,6% уйгуров, однако в 2009/10 учебном году произошло небольшое снижение доли школьников этих национальностей, обучающихся на родном языке: соответственно 75,2% узбеков, 49,8% таджиков, 34,3% уйгуров [Образование 2010].

Если в 1985 году на казахском языке учились 939,5 тыс. чел., то на начало 2009/10 учебного года обучающиеся на государственном языке насчитывали 1551,0 тыс. школьников, т.е., несмотря на демографический спад, увеличение составило 165,1%.

На русском языке в 1985/86 учебном году в школах обучались 2047,1 тыс. чел., а в 2009/10 учебном году их число составило 868,5 тыс. чел., т.е. численность школьников, обучающихся на русском языке, снизилась в 2,36 раза.

В последние годы количество школ с казахским языком обучения в 2,5 раза превышает число школ с русским языком обучения, численность учащихся казахских школ также выше – более чем в 2 раза.

Анализ данных позволяет прогнозировать дальнейший языковой сдвиг в пользу государственного языка в школьном образовании. В то же время следует отметить, что национальный состав школ с казахским языком обучения остается моноэтничным: в школах с казахским языком обучения казахи составляют более 98,5%.

Региональные особенности приоритетного выбора языка обучения. Необходимо подчеркнуть, насколько важно при проведении в республике научных исследований любого рода учитывать исторически сложившиеся на огромной территории страны региональные социально-экономические, демографические и этноязыковые условия, порой диаметрально противоположные, в различных областях Казахстана [Алтынбекова 2006]. Это напрямую относится и к выбору языка обучения в разных регионах республики: в северных и центральных областях Казахстана, где сосредоточено русскоязычное население, до сих пор доминирует русский язык, в западных и южных – приоритет традиционно принадлежит казахскому языку, в том числе в сфере образования. Так, в северных регионах в целом в 2 раза больше школьников,
обучающихся на русском языке, чем на казахском, однако численное распределение учащихся по языкам обучения в пределах даже одного региона – Северного Казахстана – существенно различается. Например, в Акмолинской и Павлодарской областях обучающихся на русском языке больше в 1,5 раза, чем учащихся казахских школ и классов, а в Костанайской и Северо-Казахстанской областях – почти в 2,7 раза.

На западе республики, в Мангистауской области, в 6 раз больше обучающихся на казахском языке, чем на русском, в Атырауской – в 3,75 раза, в Актюбинской – в 2,7 раза, в Западно-Казахстанской – в 1,94 раза. В целом в Западном Казахстане выбор казахского языка обучения при получении школьного образования в 3,1 раза больше, чем выбор русского языка.

Самое значительное различие между численностью обучающихся на казахском и русском языках наблюдается в Кызылординской области – более чем в 11,5 раза, в Южно-Казахстанской – в 6,45 раза, в Алматинской и Жамбылской – в среднем в 2,5 раза. Таким образом, в Южном Казахстане государственный язык превалирует в 4,13 раза.

В Карагандинской области (Центральный Казахстан) число обучающихся в школах на русском языке несколько больше, чем на государственном языке, в то время как в Восточно-Казахстанской области (Восточный Казахстан) казахский язык обучения выбирали в 1,23 раза больше учащихся, чем русский язык.

В столице республики г. Астане пока наблюдается паритет между численностью обучающихся на государственном и русском языках в общеобразовательных школах.

В мегаполисе г. Алматы, крупнейшем образовательном центре республики, на начало 2009/10 учебного года школьников, обучающихся на русском языке, было в 1,37 раза больше, чем обучающихся на казахском языке [Информация 2010].

Интересно, к примеру, что в городских школах доля обучающихся на русском языке значительно превышает численность учащихся русских классов в сельских школах. Так, в 20011/12 учебном году эта доля составила: 64% (город) vs. 36% (село), в то время как обучение на казахском языке в городах значительно уступает выбору
государственного языка обучения в сельской местности: 41,5% vs. 58,5%.

В 20013/14 учебном году численность учащихся в общеобразовательных школах, где обучение велось на одном языке, распределялась следующим образом: всего – 1 505 865 школьников, из них обучались на казахском языке 1 117 391 человек, на русском языке – 344 224 ученика, на узбекском – 45 249, на уйгурском – 5 620, на английском – 1 801, на таджикском языке обучения – 1 578 учащихся.


Отметим, что в 2014/15 учебном году в общеобразовательных школах с классами, где обучение ведется на русском языке, из общего числа учащихся (338 787 человек) казахи составляли 92 646 (или 27,35%), русские – 185 143 (54,65%), другие этносы – соответственно 80 995 человек (23,9%). В школах с несколькими языками обучения из общего числа учащихся (521 244 человек) школьники казахской национальности составляли 184 787 учеников (или 35,45%), русские – 157 138 (30,15%), другие национальности – 111 340 (21,4%).

Из общего числа учащихся в 2014/2015 учебном году в количестве 2 615 898 школьников в общеобразовательных государственных школах с казахским языком обучались 1 271 844 ученика [Бюллетень 2015].

Выводы: Таким образом, в сфере школьного образования в целом превалирует обучение на государственном языке и планомерно происходит смена языковых приоритетов в пользу обучения на нем.
Динамика языковых сдвигов в сфере среднего профессионального образования РК. Большой интерес представляют языковые изменения в сфере среднего профессионального образования Казахстана (таблица 2).

Как видим, в 1990/91 учебном году более 90% студентов колледжей обучались на русском языке и только 8,65% – на казахском языке. Затем, в период с 1994/95 по 1997/98 учебные годы, в сфере среднего профессионального образования приоритет также оставался за русским языком и соотношение обучающихся на казахском или русском языках практически не изменялось: 1/4 учащихся колледжей получала образование на казахском языке, 3/4 учащихся – на русском языке.

Изменилась ситуация с 2007/08 учебного года, когда уже более половины учащихся колледжей стали обучаться на государственном языке, и эта тенденция возрастает.

Численность учащихся русских отделений колледжей за это время фактически не изменилась, в то время как количество учащихся казахских отделений колледжей увеличилось более чем в 12,3 раза – с 21,4 тыс. до 264,4 тыс. чел.

В 2011/2012 учебном году в целом в организациях технического и профессионального образования обучалось 601,8 тыс. человек: на казахском языке – 53%, на русском языке – 46,8%, на узбекском и уйгурском языках – лишь 0,2% учащихся.

Таким образом, в сфере среднего профессионального образования также наблюдается четкая тенденция возрастания численности обучающихся на казахском языке, однако позиции русского языка остаются сильными в северных регионах республики, в Восточном и Центральном Казахстане, а также в гг. Астана и Алматы.

Так, в Северо-Казахстанской области в 2010/2011 учебном году установлен наибольший в республике процент обучающихся на русском языке – 90,5%, на казахском языке обучались всего 9,5%.

В то же время в Западном и Южном Казахстане ситуация с распределением по языкам обучения численности молодежи, получающей среднее профессиональное образование в колледжах, была прямо противоположной. Так, в одной из западных областей – Актюбинской – 67,2% обучались в колледже на казахском языке, 32,8% – на русском языке.
Таблица 2
Распределение численности студентов колледжей по языкам обучения в Республике Казахстан*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Учебный год</th>
<th>Всего студентов (тыс. чел.)</th>
<th>Обучаются на казахском языке (%)</th>
<th>Обучаются на русском языке (%)</th>
<th>Обучаются на других языках (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990/1991</td>
<td>247,65</td>
<td>8,65</td>
<td>91,2</td>
<td>0,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/1992</td>
<td>238,3</td>
<td>12,6</td>
<td>87,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>214,3</td>
<td>24,15</td>
<td>75,6</td>
<td>0,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>199,0</td>
<td>24,7</td>
<td>75,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/1997</td>
<td>174,9</td>
<td>25,9</td>
<td>73,6</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/1998</td>
<td>148,2</td>
<td>25,4</td>
<td>74,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/1999</td>
<td>141,3</td>
<td>27,3</td>
<td>72,1</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>142,6</td>
<td>29,8</td>
<td>69,9</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/2001</td>
<td>168,2</td>
<td>32,7</td>
<td>66,9</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2002</td>
<td>196,3</td>
<td>34,2</td>
<td>65,5</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td>211,3</td>
<td>34,6</td>
<td>65,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>250,9</td>
<td>36,6</td>
<td>63,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>336,7</td>
<td>41,8</td>
<td>58,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2006</td>
<td>397,6</td>
<td>45,6</td>
<td>54,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>452,2</td>
<td>48,9</td>
<td>51,0</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2008</td>
<td>499,5</td>
<td>51,1</td>
<td>48,8</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>504,7</td>
<td>52,7</td>
<td>47,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>495,2</td>
<td>53,4</td>
<td>46,5</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>434,2</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>44,9</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>428,2</td>
<td>55,8</td>
<td>44,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013**</td>
<td>588,2</td>
<td>54,75</td>
<td>45,05</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>561,2</td>
<td>56,3</td>
<td>43,5</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>532,9</td>
<td>57,5</td>
<td>42,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Сведения Агентства РК по статистике. Учет статистических данных за 1992/93 и 1993/94 уч. гг. был возложен на Министерство образования РК. ** Согласно изменениям, внесенными в Закон Республики Казахстан «Об образовании», профессиональные лицеи преобразованы в колледжи.

В южных регионах Казахстана так же, как и в западных, доминировал выбор учащимися колледжей государственного языка обучения. В Кызылординской области, где казахское население
составляет наиболее высокую демографическую пропорцию по отношению к общему числу жителей, учащиеся казахской национальности в колледжах закономерно представляли абсолютное большинство – 96,8%. На отделениях с государственным языком соответственно обучались 82,4% учащихся, на русских отделениях – 17,6%.

Выводы: Таким образом, важнейшей особенностью приоритетного выбора языка обучения в сфере профессионального и технического образования является региональный фактор, обусловленный исторически сложившейся в разных областях Казахстана этноязыковой ситуацией.

По данным Агентства статистики РК, сохраняется тенденция роста числа обучающихся на государственном языке, в результате чего количество учащихся, выбравших казахский язык обучения в колледже, начиная с 2007 года впервые превысило численность обучающихся на русском языке, и этот разрыв увеличивается [Агентство 2011].

Особенности выбора языка обучения учащимися школ и студентами колледжей РК. Если сравнивать данные о функционировании языков в сферах школьного и среднего профессионального образования, то в целом по республике отмечен больший процент обучающихся на русском языке среди учащихся колледжей по сравнению с учащимися школ. По-видимому, это можно объяснить целенаправленной и большей, чем у школьников, ориентацией учащихся колледжей на приобретение профессии, что напрямую связано с изучением специальной литературы, которая до сих пор издается на государственном языке в недостаточной степени. Кроме того, колледжи сосредоточены в городах, где в основном (за исключением южных городов республики) исторически сложилась русскоязычная среда, в разной степени (в зависимости от региона) сохраняющаяся и в настоящее время.

Следует отметить, что согласно Закону Республики Казахстан «Об образовании» профессиональные лицеи были преобразованы в колледжи, в связи с чем число колледжей увеличилось. Общая численность учащихся составила на начало 2014/2015 учебного года 532,9 тысяч человек. В настоящее время в Казахстане техническое и
профессиональное образование осуществляется в училищах, колледжах и высших колледжах на базе основного среднего и (или) общего среднего образования.

На начало 2014/2015 учебного года из 532 910 студентов колледжей 306 251 человек обучались на казахском языке, 225 027 человек — на русском языке, 600 — на английском, 933 — на узбекском и 99 — на уйгурском языке. Из общего числа учащихся в колледжах обучается 99,2% (528 411 чел.), в высших технических школах — 0,7% (3 552 чел.), а в училищах — только 847 учащихся, или 0,1%.

В городах в 2014/2015 учебном году обучались 480 414 учащихся, в том числе на казахском языке — 271 971 (или 56,6%), на русском языке — 207 014 (43,1%), на английском — 600 (0,12%), на узбекском — 730 (0,15%) и на уйгурском языке — 99 человек (0,02%).

В сельской местности из 52 496 учащихся на государственном языке получали образование 34 280 человек (или 65,3%), на русском языке — 18 013 (34,3%) и на узбекском языке — 203 (0,4%).

Национальный состав учащихся на начало 2014/2015 учебного года был распределен следующим образом: казахи — 74,1% (или 394 923 чел.), русские — 15,6% (83 283 чел.), узбеки — 2,7% (14 495 чел.), украинцы — 1,4% (7 502 чел.), уйгуры — 1,4% (7 266), немцы — 1,0% (5 459), татары — 0,9% (4 668), азербайджанцы — 0,5% (2 655), корейцы — 0,4% (1 969), белорусы — 0,3% (1 567), турки — 0,2% (1 270), другие национальности — 1,5% [Бюллетень 2015].

Динамика языковых сдвигов в сфере высшего образования РК.
Долгое время в сфере школьного и среднего профессионального образования, сохранялся приоритет русского языка в высшем образовании Республики. Тем не менее, и здесь произошли большие изменения как с численностью студентов, так и с их выбором языка обучения в вузе. Представляет интерес анализ динамики распределения по языкам обучения численности студентов вузов Казахстана, наглядно свидетельствующий о тенденциях изменения языковых предпочтений студенческой молодежи (таблица 3).

Если, по данным на 1 октября 1990 года, на казахском языке обучались только 39,2 тыс. студентов, то в 2009/10 учебном году их количество составило уже 300,9 тыс. чел., т.е. число молодежи, выбравшей казахский язык для получения высшего образования,
увеличилось в 7,8 раза, хотя наибольшая численность была зафиксирована в 2006/07 учебном году – 337,7 тыс. человек. Число студентов, обучающихся на русском языке, тоже возросло: в 1990/91 учебном году на русских отделениях вузов учились 247,9 тыс. чел., в 2006/07 учебном году – 421,8 тыс., т.е. увеличение составило 1,7 раза, однако в 2009/10 учебном году произошло снижение численности обучающихся на русском языке до 296,6 тыс. студентов.

Таблица 3
Распределение численности студентов вузов по языкам обучения в Республике Казахстан

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Учебный год</th>
<th>Численность студентов (тыс. чел.)</th>
<th>Обучаются на казахском языке (%)</th>
<th>Обучаются на русском языке (%)</th>
<th>Обучаются на других языках (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990/1991</td>
<td>287,3</td>
<td>13,65</td>
<td>86,3</td>
<td>0,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/1992</td>
<td>283,3</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>82,0</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>266,7</td>
<td>29,0</td>
<td>71,0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>260,0</td>
<td>30,9</td>
<td>68,9</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/1997</td>
<td>255,8</td>
<td>30,4</td>
<td>69,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/1998</td>
<td>293,5</td>
<td>27,3</td>
<td>72,2</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/1999</td>
<td>318,8</td>
<td>26,9</td>
<td>72,4</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>365,4</td>
<td>28,0</td>
<td>71,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/2001</td>
<td>440,7</td>
<td>30,1</td>
<td>69,3</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2002</td>
<td>514,7</td>
<td>31,5</td>
<td>67,75</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td>597,5</td>
<td>36,2</td>
<td>62,9</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>658,1</td>
<td>38,6</td>
<td>60,5</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>747,1</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>58,8</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2006</td>
<td>775,8</td>
<td>42,6</td>
<td>56,5</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>768,4</td>
<td>43,95</td>
<td>54,9</td>
<td>1,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2008</td>
<td>717,1</td>
<td>46,7</td>
<td>52,2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>633,8</td>
<td>47,6</td>
<td>51,3</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>610,3</td>
<td>49,8</td>
<td>48,6</td>
<td>1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>620,4</td>
<td>51,6</td>
<td>46,8</td>
<td>1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>629,5</td>
<td>54,4</td>
<td>44,1</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>571,7</td>
<td>56,3</td>
<td>41,7</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>527,2</td>
<td>57,9</td>
<td>40,1</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>477,4</td>
<td>60,4</td>
<td>37,0</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Значительно изменилось процентное соотношение численности студентов, проходивших обучение на казахском или русском языках: в 1990/91 учебном году число студентов, получавших образование на русском языке, превышало количество студентов казахских отделений вузов в 6,3 раза, а в 2009/10 учебном году впервые численность студентов, обучающихся на государственном языке, превысило долю обучающихся на русском языке (на 1,2%). Особенно за это время выросло число студентов, обучающихся на английском языке (Информационный справочник 2010).

Отметим, что в 2011/2012 учебном году численность студентов вузов Казахстана составила 630 тыс. человек, из них получали образование на казахском языке уже 54,4%, на русском языке – 44,1%, на английском языке – 1,4%. Этнический состав студенчества представлял следующее соотношение: казахи – 78,35%, русские – 14,6%, другие этносы – 7%.

Языковые предпочтения студентов вузов в разных регионах РК.
Численность студентов стала заметно увеличиваться одновременно с экономическим ростом республики – с 1999 года: за 10 лет число студентов возросло почти в 2 раза. На фоне значительного увеличения количества студентов, выбирающих для обучения в вузе государственный язык, и возрастающей приоритетности обучения на английском языке, тем не менее, в сфере высшего образования в целом русский язык до 2009 года превалировал.

Так, в северных областях республики – Акмолинской, Костанайской, Павлодарской и Северо-Казахстанской – число студентов отделений с русским языком обучения многократно превышало число обучающихся на казахском языке. В этих регионах Казахстана, как отмечалось, издавна в общественной жизни и межэтнических отношениях доминировал русский язык, поскольку они граничат с Российской Федерацией, сюда же в различное время осуществлялась значительная миграция русских, украинцев, белорусов и иных этнических групп из России и других республик Советского Союза для подъема промышленности и сельского хозяйства Казахстана. Несмотря на эмиграцию значительной части русскоязычного населения в первые постсоветские годы, его процент среди жителей Северного Казахстана продолжает оставаться высоким, что видно и
по этническому составу студенческой молодежи этих регионов, в котором превалирует суммарное количество русских, украинцев, немцев, белорусов.

В Восточно-Казахстанской области (Восточный Казахстан) тоже доминирует русский язык обучения в вузах: на русских отделениях в начале 2006/07 учебного года было 66,2% студентов, на казахских – почти в 2 раза меньше (33,2%). В Карагандинской области (Центральный Казахстан) также высокий процент студентов выбрал русский язык при получении высшего образования – 73,95%, на казахском языке обучались соответственно 25,6% студентов.

Как отмечалось, в западных и южных регионах Казахстана, напротив, бесспорен приоритет казахского языка в различных сферах общественной жизни (в том числе в образовательном пространстве) и межэтнической коммуникации, что связано с национальным составом населения, в котором значительно преобладает титульная нация. Так, в Западном Казахстане, в состав которого входят Актюбинская, Атырауская, Западно-Казахстанская и Мангистауская области, абсолютное большинство студентов обучается на казахском языке.

Тем не менее, интересно отметить, что в западных регионах Казахстана — один из самых высоких процентов обучения на казахском языке в школах, однако в сфере высшего образования значительно возрастает численность студентов русских отделений вузов (Алтынбекова 2006: 206-231). По всей видимости, это связано с тем, что в нефтегазовых западных районах республики, где идет интенсивная разработка месторождений энергетического сырья, необходимость приобретения молодежью технических специальностей очень высока, а обучение этим профессиям в Казахстане издавна проводилось на русском языке. В связи с этим многие выпускники школ, даже из мононациональных сельских районов, имеющие зачастую невысокую степень владения русским языком, в вузе обучаются именно на нем из-за нехватки специальной литературы на казахском языке и др.

В Южном Казахстане, к которому относятся Алматинская, Жамбылская, Кызылординская и Южно-Казахстанская области, также, как и в западных, преобладает обучение на государственном языке.
Языковая ситуация в г. Алматы. Интересно, что если в 2006/07 учебном году в г. Алматы более приоритетным еще было обучение на русском языке, который выбрали 57,2% студентов, казахский язык – 39,1%, на английском языке обучались 3,7% студентов, то уже в 2009/10 учебном году ситуация с языковыми предпочтениями студентов г. Алматы при выборе языка образования изменилась: из 187,2 тыс. студентов на казахском языке в вузах обучались уже 46,3%, на русском языке – 49,2%, на английском – 4,5%. Как видим, у студентов значительно возрос престиж обучения на английском языке, в большей мере студенты стали выбирать государственный язык для получения высшего образования, тем не менее, обучение на русском языке достаточно распространено.

Существующая в крупнейшем городе республики языковая ситуация с сильной позицией русского языка имеет свои глубокие корни в прошлом и вполне объяснима – достаточно, не затрагивая известных исторических и политических причин, проанализировать демографические.

По данным переписи населения 1970 г. (а ранее – и того меньше), в г. Алматы казахи составляли всего 13,6% в численном составе жителей города, в 1979 году – 17,7%, последняя всесоюзная перепись 1989 года зафиксировала 23,8% казахов в общей численности алматинцев. Перепись 1999 года, проведенная уже в суверенном Казахстане, показала увеличение числа представителей титульной нации среди горожан, тем не менее, их количество составило чуть более трети населения Алматы – 38,5%. На начало 2006 года численность казахов – постоянных жителей города – также еще не достигла половины населения и равнялась 46,5%. На начало 2009 года количество зарегистрированных жителей г. Алматы составляло 1365,1 тыс. чел., из которых казахи представляли уже большее половины – 50,11%, русские – 33,98%, уйгуры – 5,71%, корейцы – 1,89%, татары – 1,85%, украинцы – 1,29%, азербайджанцы – 0,68%, немцы – 0,57%, узбеки – 0,47%, дунгане – 0,46%, турки – 0,39%, чеченцы – 0,22%, белорусы – 0,20%, курды – 0,15%, таджики – 0,11%, поляки – 0,09%, башкиры – 0,05%, другие этносы – 1,8% [Бюллетень 2009].

Нужно подчеркнуть, что в г. Алматы в течение многих десятков лет складывалась языковая среда, в которой лидирующее
положение практически во всех сферах общественной жизни и в межэтническом общении занимал русский язык. По всей видимости, и сейчас языковая ситуация Алматы во многом определяется не только и не столько нынешним этническим составом населения, а исторически сложившимися на протяжении более полувека особенностями языковой среды, в которой в большинстве сфер, в том числе в образовательном пространстве, приоритет в те времена принадлежал русскому языку, позиции которого и сейчас достаточно сильны.

Языковая ситуация в г. Астане. Особый интерес к городу Астане как объекту социолингвистического исследования определяется двумя крупнейшими в его истории социально-политическими преобразованиями, произошедшими во второй половине XX века. Первый этап политического переустройства города относится к периоду освоения целинных земель в советском Казахстане, когда областной центр Акмолинск стал центром Целинного края, объединившего несколько северных областей, – г. Целиноградом. В это время в регион из России, Украины, Белоруссии прибыли сотни тысяч специалистов, и это кардинальным образом повлияло на этнический состав населения города и его языковую среду.

Второй этап связан с периодом независимости РК, когда город Акмола стал столицей Казахстана, в связи с чем был переименован в Астану. Этот исторический факт вызвал огромный приток населения, на этот раз в результате внутриреспубликанской миграции. Произошла и завершилась передислокация основных государственных органов управления из Алматы в новую столицу. Кроме того, этот период сопровождался исключительно высокими темпами строительства города, что вызвало значительную миграцию не только госслужащих и их семей, но и инженерно-технических работников, строителей, бизнесменов и др. С 1999 по 2006 годы население Астаны увеличилось на 231,1 тыс. чел., или на 72,4%. Возросла численность почти всех этносов, за исключением немцев, белорусов, мордвы и чувашей, количество которых незначительно уменьшилось. Численность казахов за 7 лет стала больше на 189,4 тыс. чел., т.е. на 141,8%. Количество русских увеличилось на 28,8 тыс. чел.
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(22,2%), украинцев – на 7,1%, корейцев – на 85,1%, поляков – на 16,1%, азербайджанцев – на 81,8% [Демографический 2006] и т. д.

Отметим, что для студенческой молодежи Астаны более предпочтительным долгое время оставалось обучение на русском языке, но сдвиг в пользу казахского языка неуклонно растет: если в 2006-2007 учебном году в Астане 68,8% от всей студенческой молодежи составили студенты русских отделений вузов города, 31,2% – казахских отделений, то в 2009/10 учебном году из 39,3 тыс. студентов города Астаны на государственном языке уже обучались 41,5%, на русском языке – 58,5%.

Особенности выбора языка обучения студентами вузов разных областей РК. Рассматривая в динамике региональный аспект при изучении изменения языковых приоритетов в сфере высшего образования, необходимо отметить и здесь языковой сдвиг в пользу государственного языка, особенно за последние годы. Так, и в северных областях Казахстана значительно увеличилась численность студентов, обучающихся на государственном языке: если на начало 2006/07 учебного года число студентов русских отделений превышало количество студентов казахских отделений в 5,1 раза, то в 2009/10 учебном году это превышение составило уже 3,6 раза. В Западном Казахстане количество студентов отделений с казахским языком обучения превышает число обучающихся на русском языке в 1,3 раза, в то время как этот показатель в 2006/07 учебном году составлял 1,1 раза. В Южном Казахстане доля студентов, обучающихся на казахском языке, также заметно увеличилась: превышение по сравнению с русским языком обучения было в 3,9 раза и возросло до 4,9 раза.

За этот период также стала больше численность студентов, обучающихся на казахском языке, в Карагандинской (с 25,6 до 31,9%), Восточно-Казахстанской (с 33,2 до 39,6%) областях, а также в гг. Астана (31,2 vs. 41,5%) и Алматы (39,1 vs. 46,3%).

Наибольшая численность студентов, выбравших государственный язык обучения при получении высшего образования, установлена в Кызылординской (90,1% от численности студентов), Южно-Казахстанской (85,5%), Жамбылской (78,5%), Алматинской, Актюбинской и Атырауской (почти по 64%) областях.
Тем не менее, несмотря на полиэтнический состав казахстанского студенчества в целом, на отделениях вузов с государственным языком образования обучаются в основном студенты казахской национальности. Одновременно следует заметить, что определенная часть казахов, как и представители диаспор, продолжает получать высшее образование на русском языке.

Данные на начало 2014/2015 учебного года показывают, что из 477 387 студентов на казахском языке обучались 288 479 человек (или 60,4%), на русском языке – 176 764 (37,0%), на английском языке – 12 107 (2,5%), на немецком – 37 студентов (0,1%).

Важен региональный аспект распределения процента студентов вузов. Так, в северных регионах Казахстана численность студентов составила 10,22% от общего числа: в Акмолинской области – 2,16% (в том числе на казахском языке – 43,76%, на русском языке – 56,24%), Костанайской области – 4,16% (на казахском языке – 23,68%, на русском языке – 75,6%, на английском языке – 0,72%), Павлодарской области – 2,88% (на казахском языке – 31,73%, на русском языке – 68,27%), Северо-Казахстанской области – 1,02% (на казахском языке – 24,04%, на русском языке – 75,96%).

В западных регионах Казахстана на начало 2014/2015 учебного года обучалось 13,31% студентов, в том числе в Актюбинской области – 4,36% (на казахском языке – 70,8%, на русском языке – 29,12%, на английском языке – 0,08%), в Атырауской области – 2,21% (на казахском языке – 72,24%, на русском языке – 27,76%), в Западно-Казахстанской области – 5,94% (на казахском языке – 66,8%, на русском языке – 33,2%), в Мангистауской области – 0,8% (на казахском языке – 76,1%, на русском языке – 23,9%).

В южных регионах Казахстана в это же время обучалось 23,2% студентов от общего числа, в том числе в Алматинской области – 2,04% (в том числе на казахском языке – 63,4%, на русском языке – 18,85%, на английском языке – 17,75%), в Жамбылской области – 4,1% (на казахском языке – 83,6%, на русском языке – 16,4%), в Кызылординской области – 2,37% (на казахском языке – 98,1%, на русском языке – 56,24%), в Южно-Казахстанской области – 1,9% (на казахском языке – 89,4%, на русском языке – 9,76%, на английском – 0,86%).
В Центральном Казахстане, в Карагандинской области, в этот период обучалось 8,61% (в том числе на казахском языке – 45,84%, на русском языке – 52,86%, на английском – 1,3%), и в Восточном Казахстане, в Восточно-Казахстанской области, – соответственно 5,56% (на казахском языке – 24,04%, на русском языке – 75,96%).

В городе Алматы на начало 2014/2015 учебного года обучалось 28,01% студентов от общего числа (в том числе на казахском языке – 54,67%, на русском языке – 40,58%, на английском – 4,72%, на немецком языке – 0,03%), а в столице Казахстана городе Астане – 11,09% (на казахском языке – 50,2%, на русском языке – 44,97%, на английском – 4,82%).

Распределение студентов по национальностям в целом по Республике Казахстан выглядело следующим образом: казахи – 398 180 человек (или 83,4%), русские – 46 697 человек (9,8%), узбеки – 9 270 человек (1,94%), украинцы – 3 379 человек (0,7%), уйгуры – 3 177 человек (0,66%), татары – 2 976 человек (0,62%), корейцы – 2 734 человек (0,57%), немцы – 1 913 человек (0,4%), азербайджанцы – 1 427 человек (0,3%), киргизы – 962 человека (0,2%), таджики – 812 человек (0,17%), белорусы – 718 человек (0,15%), другие этносы – 5 142 человека (1,09%).

Отметим, что государство стимулирует обучение на казахском языке путем предоставления участникам Единого национального тестирования грантов на обучение в вузах.

Заключение
За период независимости Казахстана, в связи с принятыми законодательными актами о новой языковой политике и проведением мероприятий по ее реализации, крупной миграцией населения, процессами гражданской и этнической идентификации, изменением ментальности молодых граждан и многим другим, произошли большие изменения в образовательном пространстве Казахстана: значительно возросла роль казахского языка в образовательном пространстве республики, в том числе в сфере высшего образования, где позиции русского языка традиционно оставались высокими.

Данные позволяют прогнозировать дальнейшее распространение государственного языка и расширение сфер его использо-
вания, коль скоро наиболее молодое поколение в большей мере обучается на казахском языке.

Интересно: сведения о выборе языка обучения молодым поколением казахстанцев разной национальной принадлежности свидетельствуют о том, что представители наиболее крупных этносов республики – казахи и русские – преимущественно обучаются на своих этнических языках, в то время как представители многочисленных диаспор Казахстана до сих пор преимущественно выбирают для получения образования, особенно высшего, русский язык.

В целом динамика изменения языковых приоритетов при выборе языка обучения учащимися общеобразовательных школ и колледжей и студентов высших учебных заведений Казахстана неоспоримо доказывает укрепление и расширение позиций государственного языка в образовательном пространстве республики на фоне сужения объема использования русского языка.

Литература
Алтынбекова, О. Б. (2006) Этноязыковые процессы в Казахстане. – Алматы: Экономика
Бюллетень (2009) Бюллетень Агентства РК по статистике. – Серия 15. Демография. – Астана
Демографический (2006) Демографический ежегодник регионов Казахстана. Статистический сборник / Под ред. Б. Султанова. – Алматы
Информационный справочник (2010). Система высшего и послевузовского образования: Информационный справочник. – Астана //


Закон Республики Казахстан «Об образовании» (2007, с изменениями и дополнениями на 03.12.2015 года),
//http://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=30118747#sub_id=320000

Образование (2010) Образование в Республике Казахстан. Статистический сборник / Под ред. Б. Султанова – Алматы

Сулейменова, Э. Д. (2011) Языковые процессы и политика. – Алматы: Казак университеті
Are Russian Aspectual Prefixes Empty Or Full (And Does It Matter)?

OSCAR E. SWAN


Overview
The book Why Russian Aspectual Prefixes Aren’t Empty (in further discussion, Why) interprets material contained in an online trove of information assembled by the seven authors on Russian verbal aspect pairs, whether of the so-called empty-prefix type, like писать : написать ‘write’ (called by them “natural” perfectives) or of the meaning-changing type, like переписать : переписывать ‘rewrite’ (called by them “specialized” perfectives). We will adopt that terminology here. The sites (http://emptyprefixes.uit.no), along with supplementary material adduced in regard to individual book chapters on http://emptyprefixes.uit.no/book.htm, are impressive for the amount and variety of information they contain. They list practically every Russian simplex (unprefixed) imperfective verb (1,429 in all, said to form 1,981 aspect pairs—because some of them are said to take more than one natural prefix), together with related morphological, semantic, and classificatory information. Both websites are important reference sources with which everyone interested in the morphology of Russian aspect will want to become familiar. The book is intended more for language teachers and pedagogical materials-developers than for linguists, but both will find it thought-provoking; and Why is easy to read. The book was reviewed in SEEJ (2014, 58.3, 565–66) by Irina Ivliyeva, and those wishing a quick rundown of the book’s contents according to its chapter-by-chapter organization, from 1 to 7, may consult that review. Although the present review will also go through the book mostly chapter by
chapter, this reviewer felt that a work proposing that the field has been looking at formal aspect derivation for the past two hundred years or so incorrectly, as Why does, deserves a more thorough discussion of the ideas it contains than one can give in a quick run-through of its contents.

As one may deduce from the full title, Why attempts to demonstrate two main theses: (a) that prefixes of the natural type are not semantically empty, but instead mostly overlap semantically (are mostly redundant in meaning) with the lexical meaning of their base verb; and (b) verbs may be classified into action-types by the “natural” prefix or prefixes that occur with them. A corollary of (a) is that verbs can be viewed not as forming aspect pairs but aspect clusters, consisting of simplex verbs plus both the “natural” perfectivizing prefix(es) and the “specialized” ones that go with them—and that the boundary between natural and specialized perfectives is not rigid. A corollary of (b) is that the proclivity of given natural prefixes for verbs of given action-types, and vice versa, can be converted into a useful pedagogical methodology for teaching the Russian verb’s formal aspect system to learners of Russian. A major theme in the book is the notion of aspectual triplets, and the idea that most or maybe even all prefixed perfective verbs of whatever type form them. Trying not to be sidetracked by the book’s voluminous accompanying online databases and statistical analyses, this reviewer wishes to address some of the main ideas the book raises from the point of view of a member of its intended pedagogically-oriented audience. This will allow the discussion to remain simple and focused on issues with classroom relevance which is, in any case, also Why’s ostensive concern. Of course, Why also raises various questions of a linguistic-interpretive nature, and these will be addressed to an extent here as well.

The Empty Prefix Hypothesis
The authors of Why devote considerable space, beginning in Chapter 1 and continuing through Chapter 7, to polemicizing with what they call the “empty prefix hypothesis” and the corollaries they attribute to it, according to which natural aspectual prefixes signal nothing more than perfectivity, to which they oppose their own “overlap hypothesis” and its corollaries, according to which natural prefixes do not lose their meaning when attached to a simplex verb but rather bury their meaning
in it, as it were, becoming all but redundant with it, while still persisting in it (and also while still signaling perfectivity). This is an old question in Russian linguistics; according to Tixonov (1964, 42), it goes back as far as Lomonosov. The empty-prefix hypothesis is the easier to argue against today in that, as Why’s own history of the issue in Chapter 1 (6–9) suggests, the doctrinaire version of it that Why’s authors methodically attack throughout the book appears to be dying off of its own accord.

The present reviewer has always taken the idea of the “empty aspectual prefix” as a primarily heuristic notion, useful for sketching the broad outline of the Russian aspect system to beginning students and non-specialists in an introductory kind of way. Townsend says as much in 1975, and I think that most aspectologists today would agree (117). Prefixation in Russian verbal stock, inherited from Common Slavic, was certainly originally semantically motivated (it could hardly have been otherwise), and the inherited system still resonates to a degree in the modern system, as different as that system has become over the centuries. After all, prefixal meanings live on in their specialized combination with other verbs and, often enough, in the form of independent prepositions. The system of aspectual prefixation has always been, and remains, a semantically fuzzy means of simplex imperfective → prefixed perfective derivation, as compared to the more crisply delineated process of prefixed perfective → prefixed imperfective derivation achieved by suffixation. Not all verbs fit neatly into the system in the form of aspect pairs achieved by prefixation/suffixation (there are hundreds of aspect pairs formed by suffixation alone, and still more, like иметь 'to have', that do not form aspect pairs),1 but in general outline that is the dominant formal system of aspect expression in Russian that has evolved. At least, most scholars other than the authors of Why believe so.

In their opening chapter, Why poses the rhetorical question of how reasonable it is to believe that a system based on a simple binary aspect distinction, i.e., +/- perfective, has sixteen different empty ways (by which they mean natural perfectivizing prefixes) of expressing perfectivity—prefixes that maintain their own independent meanings in

---

1 As far as I can tell, the authors do not address the matter of purely suffixal aspect formation and what problems it might pose for their analysis and proposals, which focus on prefixation/suffixation as if it were the only important aspect-derivation mechanism.
other contexts (10). That is hardly an argument. Languages are not designed by efficiency experts, but evolve over time, using the material they have at their disposal. One could just as easily ask how reasonable it is to have seven different suffixes for expressing imperfectivity, which there are; see Swan in this issue. The difference between the two processes, prefixation and suffixation, is not that one is more or less numerous than the other, but that suffixation is absent of non-aspectual nuance, whereas prefixation is not entirely.

The variety of imperfective suffixes among other things reflects how the Russian system of aspect in its formal dimension was cobbled together over time from a multi-suffixal inheritance from competing East and South Slavic morpheme stock. The situation with prefixes is complicated by lexical borrowings from Old Church Slavonic, whose heavily Greek-influenced vocabulary left a trace on Russian among other places in the form of calques on Greek verbal prefixes, a matter to which one feels the authors of a work on Russian verbal prefixes owe more attention. One does not want to put beginning students in the position of learning two different prefixal subsystems, Russian vs. Greek-inspired Slavonic, in order to learn verbs. For more on this matter, see the discussion of пригласить in the section The Maslov Test and the Withering Away of the Aspect Pair below.

The modern Russian aspect system may have become fully crystalized in its current state as late as the sixteenth or seventeenth century (see Dickey 2007, 341); Klimonov (2010) actually places it as late as the eighteenth century. During the course of aspect creation and its consolidation, it is not surprising that the prefixes that did, in effect, “blend in” most unobtrusively with the meaning of host simplex verbs, modifying their meaning the least, would eventually become coopted as markers of “natural” perfectivity with them, working in concert with the suffixes that derive imperfectivity for prefixed verbs in changed meanings (“specialized” prefixed verbs). The classic example of a

---

2 Many Slavonic verbs can be recognized by the prefix they take: воз-, из-, пре-, пред-, со-.
3 Dickey thinks that a crucial moment was loss no- of the spatial or path meaning associated with the prefix no- in combination with иду ‘go’, sometime in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Klimonov traces the onset of the modern system to the acquisition of the ability of the historically iterative suffix -ива(и) to express durativity and progressivity.
“blending” prefix is *на–‘on’* in its combination with *писать ‘write’* and other verbs naming activities performed on surfaces. However, at the point that the grammaticalization of aspect definitively occurs, i.e., at the historical moment when a “natural” prefix acquires the status of a marker of perfectivity, the original semantic meaning of the natural prefix becomes not so much erased, backgrounded, or “bleached”, as Dickey (2007, 341) puts it, as it becomes largely irrelevant for that verb; i.e., it may be there but, for all practical purposes, one can ignore it. In the end, *я напишу* is how one says “I will get something written” in Russian.

Arguing against Why’s questioning of the idea of de facto empty aspectual prefixes is the fact that speakers do seem perfectly aware, as is evidenced by their everyday language use, of the purpose of prefixation as a means of expressing the simple perfective future or perfective past meanings of simplex imperfective verbs, preserving, to the extent possible, the lexical meaning of the base verb, a point made particularly effectively by Forsyth (1970, 39). Perhaps one can best illustrate the point with the example of newly introduced verbs like *гуглить ‘to Google,’* a verb not registered by Why. If one asks Russian speakers how to fill in the blank *Я сейчас ______гуглю его фамилию ‘I’ll Google his last name right away,’* some speakers will choose *про-,* others *за-,* others *по-,* and others something else. As a search in Google shows, almost every major perfectivizing prefix is currently used in combination with this verb in what amounts to the simple future-perfective sense. The evidence from Google suggests that speakers choose what they think is the semantically most neutral way of putting this verb into the simple perfective future tense, no doubt relying both on their own intuition and on what they have heard other speakers say. Probably no choice is ideal,

---

4 Along with every other language teacher I know, I never fail to point out to students that it makes logical sense for *на–‘on’* to be chosen as the perfectivizing prefix for *писать ‘write’* that *про–‘through’* is the logical prefix for perfectivizing *читать ‘read,’* and analogously for other “natural” prefixed : unprefixed aspect pairs. It seems to me that the authors are addressing a less controversial issue than they consider it to be. The notions that aspectual prefixes retain some slight meaning while simultaneously functioning as markers of simple perfectivity are not mutually exclusive.

5 Although *гуглить* (with end-fixed stress) is relatively new, it has become quickly accommodated to Russian morphology and morphophonology; cf. the gerund *гугля,* past passive participle *прогуглен,* and so on.
just the best among the choices available, since all prefixes do convey a certain amount of collateral meaning. The fact that speakers do not automatically agree as to what choice of prefix is semantically the most neutral for this verb calls into question the idea, put forth by Why, that every verb, because of its meaning, will have a single logical “natural” perfectivizing prefix on which speakers will agree. Eventually, one assumes, majority usage will lead to the stabilization of one main perfectivizing prefix with грузить, but the negotiative process among speakers can take years to be complete, not just a moment of reflection, as these authors’ suggest.

Verbs that have entered the language in recent times tend to draw on a narrower range of prefixes in order to achieve perfectivization (Čertkova 1996, 110), suggesting that the principle of the semantic overlapping of any of sixteen prefixes’ meaning with the meaning of the base verb died out a long time ago as a productive means of forming perfective verbs from simplex imperfective verbs. Today what one sees in the gamut of simplex : prefixed aspect pairs reflects to a large extent aspectual history, a reality consolidated over the course of centuries. It is increasingly becoming the specialized function of a rather small group of prefixes—five, not sixteen—to perfectivize new verbs, essentially emptily. Such prefixes largely equate to the authors’ so-called “big” (most frequently used) prefixes: вы-, за-, по-, про-, с-, discussed by them in Chapter 3. To an extent these “big” prefixes do seem to gravitate toward a few general action-types, as seems only natural, as the authors demonstrate in Chapter 3, but whether any practical use can be made of such a proclivity in beginning Russian classes, as is these authors’ main claim, remains to be demonstrated, and it needs to be demonstrated before one can take Why’s proposals seriously.

Sometimes a verb seems to combine with more than one natural prefix, in which case the original prefixal meanings can be detected in the form of slightly different semantic nuances and syntactic patternings, demonstrating that prefixation is not entirely empty of semantic content. At least, the authors propose to illustrate this idea in Chapter 4 by applying an impressive array of statistical tools to a case study of what they say are the three natural perfectives of the verb грузить ‘load:’ погрузить, загрузить, and нагрузить. However, this chapter reveals a major methodological shortcoming that permeates the entire book.
Why’s two dictionaries of reference for purposes of identifying multiple natural prefixed perfectives are Ožegov & Švedova (2001) and Evgen’eva (1999). However, these dictionaries do not exactly say, or rather they say considerably more, than that погрузить, загрузить, and нагрузить are the natural perfectives of грузить; that is just the authors’ interpretation of what these dictionaries say, an interpretation that grows out of and supports their own line of reasoning. Additionally, these two dictionaries do not always agree with each other. Using these two dictionaries, and vetting their interpretation of them with a “panel of native speakers” (15), who, circularly, turn out to be four of Why’s own authors, they identify more than 500 verbs taking multiple natural prefixes, among them the verb грузить.

All scholarly dictionaries, ranging from Dal’ (1861) through Evgen’eva (1999) to Ušakov (2000/1947–48) list (a) грузить: погрузить, (b) нагрузить : накружать, and (c) загрузить : загружать, in one way or another, as three separate verbs. The authors’ chosen dictionaries, besides listing (b) and (c), also list either нагрузить or нагрузить (Ožegov & Švedova 2001) or only нагрузить (Evgen’eva 1999) as perfectives of грузить, and they list погрузить as its “complex act” perfective. The easiest things to conclude from all scholarly dictionaries combined, from the nineteenth century to the present, are that (a) загрузить : загружать and нагрузить : накружать are two independent verbs, differing slightly in meaning; that (b) the simplex verb грузить is in essence an aspectual orphan which, for purposes of forming a “complex-act” perfective, makes use of the prefix по--; and that (c) for expressing certain telic (goal-directed) senses of грузить, it borrows the perfective partner of either нагрузить : накружать or загрузить : загружать, each with a slightly different nuance. That is one interpretation; the authors, without discussing what seems to this reviewer to be the most straightforward interpretation, have their own, differing one, on which they base many conclusions. However, for their conclusions to be persuasive, the authors need to identify more explicit and rigorous dictionary-independent discovery procedures that take into consideration the full range of complexity of the matter they are examining, procedures that are

---

6 Bulygina and Šmelev (1999, 104) refer to aspectual orphans as “imperfectiva tantum,” and it seems to me that that is what грузить is.
understood and replicable by persons other than themselves. Until they do, their description of both multiple natural prefixation and secondary natural-perfective imperfectivization to form what they refer to as aspectual triplets (see discussion in Continuing Issues with Verbs Showing Multiple Natural Prefixes and Aspectual Triplets and Secondary Imperfectives below) lacks the rigor necessary for supporting meaningful statistical analyses of the sort they undertake, or for drawing the kind of broad conclusions at which they arrive. The authors of Why might consider accepting what their own dictionaries of reference are telling them that: 

gрузить : погрузить, загрузить : загружать, and нагрузить : нагружать are three different verbs.

In the end, the “empty prefix hypothesis” and the “overlap hypothesis” do not seem that far apart. They are mostly the same hypothesis, expressed in different ways. The first hypothesis holds that, as far as aspect is concerned, с- in сделать ‘do’ is for all intents and purposes lexically irrelevant, the second that с- is for all intents and purposes lexically invisible. It is difficult to see an important practical distinction between one view and the other, certainly not one that is of any great moment for students of the language.

The One-Form, One-Meaning Hypothesis and Radial Profiling

The authors do not explicitly invoke in their work the one-form, one-meaning hypothesis, which can be traced in Slavic especially to Roman Jakobson (1936), but this venerable theory drives their undertaking from beginning to end. For example, it is inherent in their insistence that, even though the meaning of prefixes like за- in заасфальтовать ‘to asphalt-pf’ cannot easily be detected, it is still there (11). Taking as axiomatic that a given aspectual prefix has to exhibit an underlying unitary meaning in all of its occurrences, in Chapter 2 the authors employ what they call radial profiling to derive the particular meanings (Jakobson’s Sonderbedeutungen)7 of what they call the “small” (less common) prefixes from an imputed “general meaning” (Jakobson’s Gesamtbedeutung), via mostly logical-looking metaphorical extensions of it. Later, in Chapter 3, they analyze the “big” (most common) prefixes according to how, on a

---

7 The authors do not use these terms, which come from Jakobson’s (1936) analysis of Russian case.
statistical basis, they relate to the semantic tags used in the Russian National Corpus (RNC), resulting in what they call a semantic profile for each prefix, also suggestive of a Gesamtbegriff. Both related webpages reflect gargantuan efforts aimed at an exhaustive listing of supporting evidence, consisting of all simplex verbs with their prefixes of whichever type. Nevertheless, the problem remains that the semantic derivational chains they describe in Chapter 2 emerge only in retrospect and upon deep reflection. For the present reviewer, at least, there always comes a point in a derivational chain at which the logic of an imputed figurative extension, based on a preceding link, begins to elude him even in retrospect. As a teacher, I cannot require students to perform tasks that I am not able to do myself.

For a simple example (there are much more complex ones than this), I find it difficult to follow how the general meaning ARRIVE claimed for the prefix при- ends up producing by figurative extension the particular meaning ATTACH, ADD (so far, so good), and then, from it, ATTENUATE (that eludes me). Unfortunately for Why, one’s acceptance of its conclusions depends crucially on one’s being able to follow their particular metaphorical linkages everywhere without difficulty and, not only that, but productively and independently, and some semantic linkages are more difficult to follow than others—not surprisingly, since association through metaphor is as idiosyncratic and unpredictable as the impulse for it is universal. One cannot help noticing that the meanings that Van Schooneveld (1958, 160) attributes to the “big” prefixes на-, по-, про-, с- and those given to them by the authors of Why in Chapter 3 are rather far apart; and these are scholars who share the same aim of demonstrating the non-emptiness and the unitary meaning of “natural” aspectual prefixes. Why’s position is that anyone, regardless of methodological orientation, should be able without difficulty both to follow and to arrive independently at the same conclusions they do, but that is demonstrably not the case.

**Continuing Issues with Verbs Showing Multiple Natural Prefixes**

Chapter 5 of Why treats verbs that the authors claim display more than one natural perfectivizing prefix; mostly they describe verbs that take two such prefixes. This chapter raises the same question as Chapter 4: how does one know when a perfective prefix, say за-, forms a “natural”
perfective with, say, грузить, and is not instead an independent “specialized” perfective, paired with its own derived imperfective загружать? Traditionally, a prefixed perfective is “natural” when it does not form a suffixally derived imperfective, or forms one with such difficulty that a dictionary does not list it, but leaves its formation up to a speaker’s individual initiative; see further discussion in the section, Aspectual Triplets and Secondary Imperfectives, below. However, in Why’s Chapter 6, devoted specifically to the issue of aspectual triplets, it is claimed that essentially all prefixed perfectives, including ones they consider to be “natural,” are capable of deriving secondary imperfectives. The question then becomes: how does one know when a derived imperfective (say, загружать) is not so much the derived imperfective of a specialized prefixed perfective verb (загрузить) as it is a secondarily derived imperfective based on the natural aspectual pair грузить : загрузить, forming the aspectual triplet грузить : загрузить : загружать, as is claimed (176)? The authors’ position appears to be that in the end there are no such things as aspect pairs, only aspectual triplets. However, closer examination of the matter calls this idea into question.

One more-or-less reliable definition of a “natural” prefix is an operational one: negate the imperative of the prefixed perfective and see whether the prefix falls off, as in: напиши ему ‘write him’… не пиши ему ‘don’t write him’ (hence на- here is a natural perfective prefix). This test works mainly for volitional acts, so it cannot be applied to many or most of the verbs considered by Why to be multiply prefixed. Nevertheless, the verb LOAD is volitional, so this test may be applied to it.

One of the commonest uses of загрузить : загружать is ‘upload,’ as a computer file. The overwhelming evidence of Google is that the negative of загрузи фото ‘upload a photo’ is не загружай фото ‘don’t upload a photo.’ In other words, the prefix does not drop, suggesting the independent verb загрузить : загружать. These facts do not point in the direction of concluding that загрузить is an alternate natural perfective of грузить instead of being the perfective partner in the pair загрузить : загружать.

On the other hand, some senses of ‘load’ do seem to confirm the authors’ analysis, i.e., that загрузить can be used as a natural perfective of грузить. For example, the best negation of загрузи меня работой ‘load
me down with work’ is не грузи меня работой ‘don’t load me down with work,’ i.e., not не загружай меня работой; in other words, the prefix here drops when the sentence is under negation, suggesting that загрузить can, on occasion, be used as a natural perfective of грузить. It makes sense to conclude that the pair грузить : загрузить is an ad hoc aspectual pair, based on the borrowing of загрузить from загружать in order to help the verb грузить express perfectivity in this particular figurative sense. Nothing at all, at least nothing that I can think of, suggests that загружать is a derivational formation on грузить : загрузить, forming a triplet, as the authors claim. Maybe it sometimes can be used that way, but that question would need to be investigated separately.

I did not consider it necessary to undertake a massive critique of all the verbs cited in Chapter 5 as examples of multiply naturally prefixed verbs. However, many verbs in Why’s lists raise the same questions as LOAD. For example, how can one be certain that вызубрить and зазубрить are alternate natural perfectives of зубрить ‘cram learning material mindlessly,’ as is claimed, instead of being their own independent verbs, paired respectively with вызубривать and зазубривать which, by superficial appearances, they appear to be? Page after page of Google results address the verb вызубривать, taken as the head word for the aspect pair вызубрить : вызубривать,8 i.e., not as part of Why’s proposed triplet зубрить : вызубрить : вызубривать. I am willing to be persuaded by argumentation that these Google pages are misguided, and that вызубривать is being used in these Google listings as an essentially dummy headword for вызубрить, which actually is better understood to be a natural perfective for зубрить (and that вызубривать is that verb’s triplet), as these authors say, but it is disconcerting that Why cites Google results uncritically one moment to demonstrate a point, only to turn around the next moment and not

8 Increasingly, dictionaries tend to use the imperfective partner as the citation form, whether it is primary or secondary. Ожегов & Švedova (2001), based on Ожегов (1949), consider вызубрить to be the natural perfective of зубрить, while the more recent Evgen’eva (1999) apparently considers that вызубрить : вызубривать is a separate verb, but also lists вызубрить as the perfective of зубрить. Comparison of Ожегов to Evgen’eva might reveal a trend toward the elimination of triplets through the spinning off of independent verbs.
address evidence from Google when it seems to contradict their preferred interpretation of facts. Each verb in their list of aspectual triplets needs to be examined carefully and individually, using discovery procedures anyone can understand, agree upon, and apply independently.

A simple test is to ask oneself whether it is logical to answer Чего ты делаешь? ‘what are you doing?’ with Я выучиваю стихотворение. ‘I’m rote-memorizing a poem.’ Most speakers will interpret that answer to that question to be infelicitous, the better answer being Я зубрю стихотворение. The use of зубрить is highly restricted, suggesting that it is part of a triplet, as the authors of Why suggest. In general, if a secondary imperfective fails the Чего ты делаешь? test, or other such tests, showing that it is highly constrained in use, then it is a good candidate for the secondary imperfective in a triplet. If not, then not. The point is, until more satisfactory and explicitly described and consistent discovery procedures can be worked out for identifying (a) natural prefixed perfectives; (b) secondarily derived imperfectives belonging to aspectual triplets, and (c) independent prefixed perfective : prefixed imperfective pairs, procedures that do not rely only on dictionaries and, especially, not on the authors’ own interpretation of what particular dictionaries intend by their often differing verb-citation strategies, one is entitled to put the conclusions, statistical and otherwise, of Why’s Chapters 4, 5, and 6 on indefinite hold.

Aspectual Triplets and Secondary Imperfectives
In support of the claim that natural perfectivizing prefixes retain their meaning by folding it into the meaning of the simplex verb, the authors devote attention in Chapter 6 to a kind of aspectual triplet that consists of (a) a simplex verb, (b) the simplex verb’s natural perfective, and (c) a secondary imperfective, suffixally derived from (b). As they argue, despite what is sometimes written or implied by elementary textbooks, some verbs (they suggest all verbs) of the traditional natural-prefix type can derive secondary imperfectives by retaining the prefix and deriving a secondary imperfective from it via suffixation. For example, писать:

---

9 After all, the authors of dictionaries have not necessarily written their verb descriptions while being attentive to the issues that interest the authors of Why.
написать ‘write’ can, barely, derive написывать; or делать : сделать ‘do’ can marginally derive сделать. The existence of such aspectual triplets highlights the inherently less-than-ideal nature of the process of prefixation as a means of would-be “empty” perfectivization, and it arises as a compensatory mechanism for dealing with that imperfection. Namely, deprefixation (removing a natural prefix from its base) results in losing the overt telic (goal-attaining) marking of the verb embedded in the prefix, so an understandable impulse arises at times not to lose that overt telicity, while keeping the verb imperfective. Forming secondary написывать from писать : написать, сделать from делать: сделать, etc., solves that problem by producing imperfective verbs that are still marked for telicity, usually in the meaning ‘get something done repeatedly;’ see Why’s example (167), taken from the RNC:

(1) и всё равно можно делать и сделать, важно делать ‘and all the same it is necessary to do things and to get things done; the important thing is to do things.’

Why’s methodology excludes the RNC or Google from commenting on the question of natural vs. specialized perfectives; that task is assigned to their dictionaries and their native-speaking panel’s interpretation of them. By contrast, Why makes generous use of the evidence of both the RNC and Google to identify aspectual triplets, a decision that is fraught with problems. Some of their cited secondary imperfectives in triplets, like сделать, have no more than a couple of hits in the RNC or in Google, while others, like выучивать, can have thousands. Some, like сделать, are not listed in standard dictionaries, while others, like выучивать, are. A word’s not being listed in a dictionary might suggest that the lexicographer considers the word to be substandard or illiterate (as the native speakers I consulted consider написывать and сделать to be). Whether they are or not can be debated, but it is not debatable that forms like сделать and загружать are not analogous. The former, сделать, is exceedingly rare and of

---

10 All native speakers consulted in connection with this review (some five in all) categorically reject написывать and сделать as being possible in grammatical Russian but, for the sake of discussion, let us assume that they are possible.

11 Seemingly, so do Why’s two dictionaries of reference, neither of which lists написывать or сделать. Here as in other instances, the authors readily accept evidence from their dictionaries that supports their thesis, but not evidence that does not.
limited applicability; the latter, загружать, is common, can be used to answer Что ты делаешь? and, arguably (I would say, inarguably), in contemporary Russian is its own verb-half, pairing with загрузить.

The authors present the occurrence of secondary imperfectives with natural aspect pairs as though it were irrefutable proof that the prefix of the natural aspect pair retains a detectable lexical meaning and thus disconfirms the “empty prefix hypothesis,” but it is not self-evident that it does. What the prefixed imperfective in an aspectual triplet retains is the prefix’s telicity, not necessarily its lexical meaning, which is a separate question that could be independently investigated. Secondary imperfectives like сделать are stylistically highly marked, and they are most often used iteratively, conatively, duratively, and in the historical present, i.e., not progressively (see also Soboleva 2014 passim). When used in the historical present, the secondary imperfective in a triplet is often used picturesquely, self-consciously, and ironically (hence, above all, colloquially), as a paraphrase of an action that could have been stated stylistically neutrally in the normal present tense; see Kuznetsova & Sokolova’s example (2010, 13–14):

(2) “Карлик” (сожитель Мандельштамов) в не-брежном тоне (вчера) рассказывает, что в №4 “Знамени” новые стихи Пастернака. О. взволновывается/ волнуется. Умоляет меня купить. “‘Karlik’ (Mandelštams’ neighbor) in casual tone (yesterday) is saying that there are new verses by Pasternak in issue 4 of “Znamja.” O. gets excited. [He] begs me to buy [it].’

The form взволновывается here is a more vivid and time-stretching historical present paraphrase of past perfective взволновался than волнуется would have been, since взволновывается preserves the perfectivizing and telic-emphasizing prefix вз- (whose power to make the verb perfective is over-ridden by the imperfective suffix -ва(и)-). One can easily detect the conscious word-play and intentional irony\(^{12}\) inherent in the verb choice. The distinctness of meaning conveyed by

\(^{12}\) In other words, what Kuznetsova and Sokolova’s example of взволновывается appears to illustrate is the purposeful breaking of a commonly accepted grammatical principle to achieve stylistic effect. It is not clearly appropriate to pay attention to such examples of ad hoc, speaker-dependent rule-breaking in formulating one’s description of Contemporary Standard Russian (CSR).
взволновывается as compared to волнуется or взболтался is subaspectual and stylistic, not lexical, hence the existence of aspectual triplets like this in no way impugns the empty-prefix hypothesis. It seems to me that it rather supports it, but the most one can say is that it says nothing about it whatsoever.

Despite what Why attempts to demonstrate, aspectual triplets of the волноваться : взболтался : взболтался type are a relatively minor phenomenon in Russian and of limited productivity. Beginning students do not need to be taught them any more than they need to be taught slang, for even an advanced non-native speaker will hardly ever succeed in using them appropriately. In a sense, dictionaries already make that decision for students by not listing forms like взболтался. If a derived prefixed imperfective verb is productive and can be used without stylistic restraint in any sub-aspectual imperfective meaning (which is not the case with взболтался), then it is not part of a triplet: it is its own independent verb-half. In any case, until better discovery procedures are elaborated, one feels inclined for the time being to decertify entire swathes of proposed aspectual triplets in Why’s lists.

Referring to the authors’ clustering idea (discussed in Overview above), only if pairs like написать : написывать or сделать : сдеывать were ever to develop into regular aspectual pairs, such that написывать, сдеывать, взболтался, etc., could be used without difficulty in all subaspectual meanings of present imperfective ‘write,’ ‘do,’ ‘be agitated,’ etc., leaving verbs like писать, делать, and волноваться as orphan imperfectives, would one be able appropriately to speak of a set of prefixed perfective verbs “clustering” or “orbiting” around a simplex base verb. For all one knows, this is where things are headed in Russian, consolidating the centuries-old process of the acquisition of all possible imperfective aspectual submeanings by the suffix –ыва(й)-, but until that should happen, the traditional view of a system consisting of de facto empty prefixed perfectives and meaning-changing prefixed perfectives,

13 One is reminded here of equally marginal formations like iteratives делывать, писывать, and читывать, which can be found in Google, but which cannot be formed productively; which standard dictionaries do not list; and which many or most speakers reject as belonging to CSR. Like aspectual triplets, they are probably not something on which one should build a theory of aspect formation in CSR.
each type with its own means of deriving imperfectives (deprefixation or suffixation, respectively; see below), describes the system currently in effect and, consequently, the one that should be taught in the classroom.

The Maslov Test and the Withering Away of the Aspect Pair

Many or most professional discussions of Russian aspect pairs are introduced by discussion of the Maslov (1948, 307) test, according to which the imperfective partner of a verb is defined operationally, from the point of view of the perfective aspect partner. The Maslov test probably owes its longevity to the fact that it takes a pragmatic approach to the matter, specifying a procedure anyone can apply. Taking a past perfective verb used in context, one asks oneself what the historical present paraphrase of it would be; see Zaliznjak, Mikaëljan, and Šmelev’s (2010, 5) illustration of this test:

(3a) Тут он почувствовал острую боль, схватился за сердце и упал. ‘here he felt-pf. a sharp pain, grabbed-pf. at his heart and fell-pf’.

(3b) Тут он чувствует острую боль, хватается за сердце и падает. ‘here he feels-impf. a sharp pain, grabs-impf. at his heart and falls-impf’.

Forsyth (1970, 35) analyzes the Maslov test in detail. By its nature the Maslov test suggests that the first form of aspectually paired verbs is not the imperfective form but the perfective; that the imperfective form is derived from the perfective form either by deprefixation or by suffixation, depending on whether the verb is a natural perfective or a specialized one. Accordingly, under Maslov the topic of “aspect partners” becomes turned into a matter of describing finite forms of the same lexical verb. In both instances—imperfective deprefixation and imperfective suffixation—one is dealing with historically derivational processes which, in modern Russian, have become a means for producing not different verbs, but different inflectional forms of the same verb.

14 A number of people have made this suggestion over the years; see discussion in Why, 7–8.

15 The question of whether aspect derivational processes in Russian are word-formative (словообразовательные) or word-inflectional (словоизменительные) is, of course, one of long standing in Russian linguistics, and was stated explicitly as long ago as 1948 by...
The authors of *Why* repeatedly stress (10, 113, 200) the inefficiency of having to memorize, in connection with each simplex verb, first the verb and then, later and seemingly randomly, the natural prefix—one out of their pool of sixteen potential ones—that goes with it. To the extent that this is a major pedagogical concern, and it either may or may not be,\(^\text{16}\) it can be addressed by introducing simplex verbs as the Maslov test suggests, together with their natural perfectivizing prefix from the beginning. In this way, the problem, if in fact it exists, will automatically disappear. I see nothing wrong with representing, for example, that the Russian word for ‘write’ is (на)писать, for ‘read’ (про)читать, for ‘do’ (с)делать, and so on. This is certainly easier than assigning 1,429 simplex verbs to twenty-seven RNC action-types (which are far from being the simple pigeon-holes one might expect them to be), and then deducing on logical-semantic-metaphorical reasoning which aspectual prefixes combine with them, whether natural or specialized, as is these authors’ alternative proposal; see *Prefixes as Verb Classifiers* below.

**Prefixes as Verb Classifiers**

Chapter 7 of *Why* is devoted to the proposition that aspectual prefixes function in Russian as verb classifiers. Based among other things on drawing parallels between Russian verbal prefixes and numerical noun-classifiers in Mayan languages (which classify nouns, when quantified, according to the physical substance or shape of which their referents are constituted, see Hopkins 2012), the idea seems to be this: perfectivization is a kind of quantification of the verbal act, in the sense that it reduces or sums up an action to a single performance of it. In order to quantify (i.e., perfectivize) an unprefixed verb, one needs to choose from among sixteen potential prefixes. The appropriate natural aspectual prefix “homes in” on the verb, as it were, according to its action-type. Prefixes can be used,

---

\(^{16}\) This is a question that should be resolved experimentally, not rhetorically. Personally, I have not noticed that students have inordinate difficulty remembering which ‘natural’ prefixes go with verbs like делать, писать, читать, просить, and so forth, once they are shown what the prefixes are.

Vinogradov (*Why* 7). See also discussion in Percov (1998). The question ultimately depends on whether native speakers look upon pairs like писать : написать, or переписать : переписывать, as being different forms of the same verb, and in my estimation they do. This is ultimately a question for psycholinguists to answer.
therefore, to classify verbs into different action-types; conversely, the action-type of a simplex verb can be used to predict which natural perfectivizing prefix it will take. This is an attractive idea, and many imaginative arguments are adduced by Why in support of it, but as a teaching method it remains a hypothesis waiting for someone to put it to a practical test in the Russian language classroom, by experimentally examining whether it is a preferable or even a possible way to teach Russian verbs.

Interestingly, almost the exact same study as Why, with the same organizational principles, pedagogical orientation, interests, concerns, and methodology (including a special interest in aspectual triplets and a chi-square statistical analysis of “big” prefixes vis-à-vis semantic classes of verbs) was already conducted in 2005 by Martelle, a study that is not cited in Why. Martelle’s somewhat less ambitious corpus of perfectivizable simplex verbs came to only 900 (as compared to Why’s 1,429), and her semantic classes were based not on the RNC, but on Talmy (1985), and she assigned semantic tags to the Russian verbs herself (at the time, those of the RNC were probably not available). For the meanings of the aspectual prefixes, she relied on Townsend (1975, 123–133). Her conclusion was that “the association [of prefixes and action-types] is statistically significant, but not very strong” (Martelle 2005, 1). By contrast, the authors of Why find that their own statistical analysis of essentially the same material, relying on tags from the RNC in combination with their own suggested prefixal meanings and their own self-designed figurative interpretation of them, yields results that are both significant and strong—strong enough, in their estimation, to warrant a theory that aspectual prefixes are verb classifiers. The fact that two essentially like-minded sets of scholars applying the same orientation and statistical methodology to the same set of facts to answer the same questions arrive at opposing conclusions should make one pause before attempting to adopt the conclusions of Why as a teaching strategy.

The average person, one suspects, would find that Mayan nouns are much easier to classify according to the substance or shape of which their referents are composed (for example, wax is easily distinguishable from wood or water) than they would find Russian verbs to classify according to their action-type—twenty-seven different ones. The logic of
a classification of verbs according to the perfectivizing prefix(es) they naturally take could work only if one could demonstrate that native speakers of Russian share the authors’ sense of what the aspectual prefixes mean in both their basic and extended senses, and that speakers actually do, “in their head,” classify verbs according to the perfectivizing prefix they take. The best laboratory would be provided by new verbs entering the language (like гуглить), of which there is no lack. What is needed is not a statistical demonstration of affinity between verbal prefixes and action-types. Statistics are intrinsically unable to distinguish between what is fossilized history and what is synchrony. Without a demonstration that their model reflects psychological reality, it is difficult to argue that Why’s statistics reflect the contemporary state of Russian rather than the history of aspect development up through the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth century.

One gathers from Why’s description of Mayan that in order to become a competent speaker of that language, one must perforce master its system of nominal classifiers. The analogous thing is just not true of Russian aspectual prefixes, as one sees every day in the Russian language classroom. For example, it is perfectly possible to approach the verb пригласить : приглашать ‘invite’ by saying that it means “to request to attend or participate,” and that it is the effective Russian equivalent of English invite, French inviter, German einladen, Polish zaprosić : zapraszać, Slovak pozvať : pozývať, Hungarian meghívni, and so on (note, by the way, the variety of prefixes used by the different languages), and then move on. Actually, with this particular verb, there seems to be no other choice, for Why’s list of simplex verbs does not include the Slavonic-derived imperfective verb гласить ‘assert, state, proclaim’; these two clearly related verbs, гласить and пригласить (the second apparently a calque on Greek προσκαλεω), are mutually unassociable in their system. In Chapter 2 (26–27) the authors list the various kinds of verbs with prefixes to which their analysis does not extend, such as verbs formed on prefixed nouns, adjectives, and numerals, as well as on contemporaneously non-existing simplex verbs, like разуть, ‘unshoe.’ To these may be added not only pairs like гласить

17 That task may not be that difficult, as most Mayan noun classifiers are transparently cognate with some generic noun. For example, in Chuj, the classifier for animals is nok, which also means ‘animal’; see Hopkins (2012, 413).
and привлекать, but also verbs that derive aspect purely suffixally, of which there are hundreds, like скользнуть : скользить, as well as suppletive aspect pairs, like сказать : говорить. It would have been helpful if, among their other exhaustive lists, the authors had included a list of all verbs that fall outside their system for any number of formal, semantic, or historical reasons. From the pedagogical point of view, one requires such a list in order to determine how many verbs would need to be taught in a different, non-classifier way, greatly adding to the challenge and complexity of teaching Russian aspect according to their suggested method. It makes a difference whether one is talking about hundreds of exceptional verbs or only a few dozen.

The authors recommend a wholesale revision of Russian pedagogy and teaching materials so as to reflect their view that natural perfectivizing prefixes classify verbs according to their action-type, and this recommendation is presented in Chapter 7 as this book’s ultimate conclusion. The next logical step would be to design a teaching module and test it in the classroom. The authors seem to think that there will be a rush to rewrite textbooks based on their suggestions, but it seems to this reviewer that that is rather their responsibility.18

Conclusion
The idea of using a book as a key to online sites that back up its conclusions with examples and statistics is a novel and welcome idea, and one would like to see more such books and articles written along this line. The authors of Why are to be commended for their generosity in making their data open and accessible to other researchers; and the reader is further grateful for the clarity with which they lay out their theses and arguments. The book unquestionably causes the reader to examine and re-examine his or her understanding of the role of aspectual prefixation/suffixation in Russian. However, authorial enthusiasm, strength of conviction, clarity of exposition, and a wealth of supportive data is not enough, for reasons mentioned, to persuade this reviewer that Why’s description of Russian aspect formation, even if here and there it rings true, is an overall improvement over the traditional

18 On their book-dedicated website they do offer some prefix-analysis exercises for students, but they seem to be aimed more at advanced-level learners than at beginners.
description and classroom presentation the authors hope to replace. The main problem is that, since their system hypothesizes uniformity of semantic association across speakers and languages, it is in practice weak on predictability and replicability. The contribution most likely to be of value to scholars and teachers, besides the extensive and well-done bibliography, and the typological compendium of prefixed verbs attached via the Internet to Chapter 2, is the account in Chapter 3, also linked to online resources, of the distribution of the “big” aspectual prefixes over the semantic tags assigned to verbs by the RNC. While that chapter is interesting, and the demonstrated correspondences between prefixes and verb-types are greater than one might have expected, one is ultimately not persuaded that “Russian prefixes are in effect a verb-classifier system analogous to those proposed for Mandarin Chinese, Hindi-Urdu, and a number of Australian languages” (199–200).

The final chapter on this subject undoubtedly has not been written. In the meantime, what beginning learners of the language need to know about the Russian verb system is that, one way or another, by utilizing the devices of prefixation, suffixation, and suppletivity, (a) for most verbal lexemes the system shows aspect combining with tense in a way that produces, for any given verbal notion, five main tense-aspect meanings: past-imperfective, past-perfective, present-imperfective, future-perfective, and future-imperfective; and (b) it expresses these tense-aspect meanings with forms which, for pedagogical purposes, are traditionally presented as a matched pair of verbs, one perfective and the other imperfective.19
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19 To be sure, the traditional classroom presentational model is not without its problems. It encourages students, for example, to expect that the logical future-tense version of an ‘achievement’ verb (as per Vendler 1957) like я приглашаю will be я буду приглашать, whereas a better choice in most instances will be я приглашу.
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Introduction
I offer this response to Oscar Swan’s review of our book (Janda et al. 2013) on behalf of the CLEAR (Cognitive Linguistics: Empirical Approaches to Russian) research group, in particular those members who authored and co-authored relevant publications: Anna Endresen, Julia Kuznetsova, Olga Lyashevskaya, Anastasia Makarova, Tore Nesset, and Svetlana Sokolova.¹

I would like to thank Swan for the energy and expanse of his critique. We are gratified to receive the attention of a prominent US Slavist who has led a long career and authored numerous articles as well as important textbooks of Polish and Old Church Slavonic.

I would also like to thank the editors of Russian Language Journal for offering me the honor of publishing a response.

In his review, Swan raises a number of interesting points, most of which I will also comment on here. It is, however, my task in this response to address the issues in which our perspective differs from Swan’s, so I will focus mainly on those differences.

The most important difference involves our views on what language is. Swan’s view makes a number of assumptions that we do not share, such as that there are unitary underlying forms from which all specific items are generated, and that there are crisp criteria that yield perfect separation of categories according to absolute rules. We follow the framework of cognitive linguistics, which makes fewer assumptions and views language as a complexly nuanced system more often characterized by statistical tendencies than by absolute rules. As I will detail below,

¹ In addition to the book’s co-authors, I would like to thank Aleksandrs Berdicevskis and Maria Nordrum for their comments on an earlier draft of this response. I would also like to thank my employer, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, and the Norwegian Research Council (grant number 222506) for support of our research.
Swan consistently projects his assumptions onto our analysis, creating characterizations of our work in which we ourselves often cannot recognize it (see examples in Claims that We Never Made below).

We and Swan also differ in our specific understanding of the Russian aspect system. Swan has a vested interest in claiming that the prefixes present in Natural Perfectives are indeed empty and that simplex verbs are formed via “deprefixation” (cf. Aspectual Triplets and Secondary Imperfectives of Swan’s article in this issue). I provide a rebuttal to deprefixation in Critiques of Methods below.

Most importantly, Swan makes it clear that his own convictions are so strong that no amount of evidence or argumentation would change his mind. He himself states in his conclusion that “clarity of exposition, and a wealth of supportive data is not enough, for reasons mentioned, to persuade this reviewer that Why’s description of Russian aspect formation, even if here and there it rings true, is an overall improvement over the traditional description and classroom presentation.” I wonder what kind of case could be brought that Swan would find convincing.

Claims that We Never Made
Swan consistently refers to “natural prefixes” (i.e., those used to form perfective partner verbs, as in на-писать ‘write’) and “specialized prefixes” (i.e., those used to form perfectives with distinct meanings as in пере-писать ‘rewrite’) in reference to our work, but these terms never appear in our book and are incorrect. “Natural” and “Specialized” are terms that characterize types of perfective verbs in Russian, or more accurately different parts of the continuum of perfective verbs in Russian. Most prefixes can form both Natural and Specialized Perfectives, as we see with раз- which forms a Natural Perfective раз-быть from быть, both meaning ‘break’, but a Specialized Perfective раз-нести ‘deliver to various places’ from нести ‘carry’. There is, for example, the prefix до- which only forms Specialized Perfectives such as до-делать ‘finish up’ from делать ‘do’, but no prefix that forms only Natural Perfectives. It is important to separate the results of prefixation (namely the types of perfective verbs that arise) from the morphological means for achieving these results (in this case prefixes).

In the opening of Swan’s section titled The One-Form, One-Meaning Hypothesis and Radial Profiling, we find the following passage supposedly
characterizing our position: “Taking as axiomatic that a given aspectual prefix has to exhibit an underlying unitary meaning in all of its occurrences...” We do not take anything as axiomatic. On the contrary, we view the semantic structure of the prefixes as an empirical question for which we have endeavored to find empirical evidence. We also do not assume any underlying unitary meaning, but rather expect to find a structured network of related meanings since most linguistic units are indeed polysemous (Langacker 2008, 37). While Swan acknowledges that we do not claim to build our model on Jakobson’s one-form, one-meaning hypothesis, he insists that “this venerable theory drives [our] undertaking from beginning to end.” We did not cite Jakobson in this connection because our model is not Jakobson’s model. Here Swan is projecting that model upon ours and then claiming that we “derive the particular meanings ... of ... prefixes” from “an imputed ‘general meaning’.” By contrast, we model prefixal semantics in terms of radially structured polysemous networks of related meanings (Lakoff 1987, Chapter 6). We are not generating specific meanings from a general one, but instead exploring the structure of relationships among meanings, which is a different enterprise altogether.

Swan’s insistence on projecting a rule-based generation method upon our radial networks leads him to present further claims that we never made, for example that our “system hypothesizes uniformity of semantic associations across speakers and languages” and that our proposal is that learners should, based on “general meanings” of prefixes, be able to deduce “on logical-semantic-metaphorical reasoning which aspectual prefixes combine with them”. We never made any such proposal. We are instead pointing out systematic patterns that are supported by empirical evidence and that can be useful in providing coherence to the task of learning the combinations of prefix + verb in Russian. There is no need to assume that language learners or users must rely on only the strategy of (abstracting and) following rules or only on the strategy of memorization. As Dąbrowska (2012, 2013) has shown, speakers can use both strategies, and can vary in how their internal grammars are structured. It is certainly the case that individual native speakers may differ in some details of their conceptualization of the semantics of prefixes, particularly in regard to peripheral uses. An
advantage of our model is that it aims to capture tendencies and is flexible enough to accommodate variation as well.

Swan states that the “main claim” of our book is that our model for Russian aspect should be implemented in “beginning Russian classes.” This is not quite accurate since we do not mention beginning Russian anywhere, though we do mention advanced learners. We do suggest that textbooks might “organize the presentation of verbs according to the meanings of prefixes and verb stems” and that “[m]aterials for more advanced learners could guide them through the distinctions made among Natural Perfectives via prefix variation and explain the use of secondary imperfectives of Natural Perfectives” (Janda et al. 2013, 200). The presentation of verbs could highlight the semantic groupings in a consistent fashion in order to facilitate the memorization of prefix + verb combinations. If one has to memorize something, it is easier to do so when one has some patterns to follow.

Swan brings up the example of newly coined verbs such as гуглить ‘to Google’ and states correctly that such verbs often go through a period of years before the use of a perfectivizing prefix becomes stabilized. However, Swan then turns around and says that we suggest that this process is automatic and takes “just a moment of reflection,” a claim we never made.

Swan states that our book “is intended more for language teachers and pedagogical materials-developers than for linguists.” The only relevant statement that we make in our book appears in our Preface (xi): “The target audience includes Slavic linguists and general linguists, as well as teachers and advanced learners of Russian.” In other words, we wrote this book for linguists, but took care to make it accessible to teachers and learners as well.

The Verb Classifier Hypothesis is central to our book. Swan recasts this hypothesis as “a teaching method“, again a claim we never made. We focus on a systematic typological comparison between numeral classifiers (commonly found in Central American and East Asian languages) and Russian perfectivizing prefixes, as a useful parallel for linguists. The idea that linguists might benefit from this comparison was previously mentioned by Majsak (2005, 339–45) and Plungjan (2011, 413–16), but was first worked out in detail for Russian Natural Perfectives in our book. In Dickey and Janda (2015) we have further elaborated the Verb Classifier
Hypothesis to account for the behavior of all perfectivizing prefixes in all Slavic languages, by making extensive comparisons with classifiers in a broad sample of languages. Here I will briefly paraphrase our findings and invite the reader to consult Dickey and Janda (2015) for a comprehensive analysis and plentiful illustrative examples.

The parallels between Slavic aspectual prefixes and numeral classifiers are compelling, both in terms of grammatical function and meaning. Numeral classifiers function to form and classify units for the referents of nouns to which they contribute a meaning of discreteness, and Slavic aspectual prefixes perform the function of forming and classifying the referents of verbs, to which they also contribute a meaning of discreteness. Both numeral classifiers and Slavic perfectivizing prefixes are lexico-grammatical unitizers, whose domains are the verbal and nominal lexicons, respectively. We propose a unified account whereby all types of perfectivizing prefixes in Slavic find parallels in numeral classifiers. In telic perfectives, prefixes parallel sortal classifiers, exhibiting a range of semantic overlap between the classified (verb) and the classifier (prefix). Where overlap is greatest, we find Natural Perfectives that are analogous to default numeral classifiers that are most typical for given nouns. Where there is less or no overlap, we find Specialized Perfectives that create new lexical verbs, analogous to numeral classifiers that provide alternative construals for a noun. When used in atelic perfectives, prefixes parallel mensural classifiers, and both prefixes and classifiers can create units that are not inherent to the base. Slavic atelic perfectives place temporal boundaries on a situation (Complex Act Perfectives) or pluck out a single cycle of a repeatable series (Single Act Perfectives) and these types of perfectives are most prominent in the easternmost portion of Slavic territory, primarily Russian and Bulgarian.

In addition to the arguments in Janda et al. (2013), Dickey and Janda (2015) adduce six further types of evidence that extend the Verb Classifier Hypothesis, namely that both numeral classifiers and perfectivizing prefixes: 1) exhibit polysemous radial category structure, 2) produce choices of constructions that can be selected in accordance with speaker construal, 3) can involve a general unitizer with bleached meaning, 4) can serve to mark foregrounding in discourse, 5) can express definiteness, and 6) are associated with systems that do not obligatorily mark plurality (of objects in the case of numeral classifiers, but of events
in the case of prefixes). We conclude that numeral classifiers and Slavic aspectual prefixes both belong to a category of lexico-grammatical unitizers and “[h]opefully positing such a category will contribute to a better understanding of both Slavic verbal prefixes and numeral classifiers, as both of these categories continue to generate debate, judging from the unabated appearance of analyses of both” (Dickey and Janda 2015, 82).

**Martelle (2005) Corroborates Our Results**

Swan points out that we did not cite Martelle (2005) and claims that we and Martelle “arrive at opposing conclusions” and therefore our model is “weak on predictability and replicability.” While we can hardly be chided for overlooking an unpublished MA thesis, it is perhaps unsurprising that Swan is aware of Martelle (2005), since it was written by a student at the University of Pittsburgh where Swan has been employed since 1974. More important, however, is the fact that we and Martelle actually arrive at the same conclusion, namely that there is a statistically significant relationship between the distribution of prefixes in Natural Perfectives and the semantics of verbs. The only difference is in the effect size associated with that significant relationship, where our results land in adjacent portions of the scale.

There are two relevant measures that need to be taken into account: the p-value, which tells us how likely it is that we would find a distribution as extreme as the one we observe given the overall dimensions of our data; and the Cramer’s V, which measures the effect size of a statistically significant finding in a chi-square analysis. Both we and Martelle report a p-value less than 0.0001 for a chi-square analysis of prefixes and verb semantics. Table 1 presents the scale on which Cramer’s V values are evaluated. For more about effect sizes and how they are evaluated, see: Cohen (1988, 215–71); Cohen et al. (2003, 182); King and Minium (2008, 327–30).

Cramer’s V ranges from 0 (no effect size) to 1 (complementary distribution of variables). This scale is first broken down into two parts, one of which represents values (from 0 to 0.099) that fall below the traditional threshold for a reportable effect size, and the other of which represents values that are all robust enough to be reported as important
findings. Among robust values, we can further distinguish those as “weak”, “medium”, or “strong”.

Table 1:
Cramer’s V values and their standard interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cramer’s V value</th>
<th>The values in this column fall below the threshold for a reportable effect size</th>
<th>The values in these three columns all represent robust, reportable effect sizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>from 0 to 0.099</td>
<td>from 0.1 to 0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Cramer’s V</td>
<td>not robust</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>                                                         | from 0.3 to 0.499                                                                | medium                                                                          |
                                                         | from 0.5 to 1.0                                                                  | strong                                                                          |
</code></pre>

Martelle’s (2005, 46) effect size is 0.32, which is “medium” on this scale, whereas our effect size is greater than 0.5, which is “strong” on this scale. This is actually an excellent corroboration of our findings, an independent replication that further justifies our claims. This is particularly remarkable given the many differences between our study and Martelle’s, which involved different subsets of prefixes and different semantic classes. Martelle’s semantic classes were derived from Talmy’s (1985) semantic categories, which turned out to be rather vague and not very well tailored to the task of semantically classifying Russian verbs. Martelle herself remarks that with a more detailed and appropriate set of semantic classes she might have gotten a stronger effect size (2005, 48–49). This is indeed exactly what we did get when we used the semantic tags specifically designed for Russian verbs and independently assigned in the Russian National Corpus (which became available only after Martelle’s study).

Critiques of Methods
While Swan acknowledges that we have created “important reference sources with which everyone interested in the morphology of Russian aspect will want to become familiar”, he takes issue with our methods for collecting and interpreting our data.
Swan criticizes the composition of our panel of native speakers who vetted the interpretation of dictionary entries for Natural Perfectives, stating that they “circularly, turn out to be four of Why’s own authors” and that this is “a major methodological shortcoming that permeates the entire book.” Claiming that this procedure is circular is tantamount to claiming that any study in which the same people both collect and interpret the data is also circular. Under these standards, there would be very few studies that past muster in any field.

Wherever possible, we relied on parameters assigned by external sources. For example, in our study of the semantic profiles of the prefixes по-, с-, на-, за-, and про- (Chapter 3 of Janda et al. 2013), we based our analysis on the semantic tags listed in the Russian National Corpus, which were assigned by a different group of scholars.

Our panel of native speakers that Swan is referring to did not merely follow their intuitions, but consulted with authoritative reference works, applied various criteria, and performed searches in the Russian National Corpus and by means of search engines in order to resolve difficult cases. Our criteria included the Maslov criterion, but we used it as only one in a series of criteria, not as a necessary or sufficient criterion. Kuznetsova (2015, Chapter 5) has worked this argument out in more detail, so I will merely mention some highlights here. The Maslov criterion is at once too general and too narrow. It excludes pairs almost everyone would agree on, and includes “pairs” that no one would list in a dictionary (for example, целовать ‘kiss’ / пере-целовать ‘kiss all of’ passes the Maslov criterion, cf. Percov 2001). The various diagnostics suggested by the Maslov criterion (e.g., substitution of imperfective under negation in an imperative vs. in the use of the historical present vs. conative use, etc.) yield different sets of pairs (Maslov 1948, Certkova 1996, 112). And even linguists who specialize in Russian aspectology do not agree on how to apply the Maslov criterion (Certkova et al. 1997, Gorbova 2011). Furthermore, the Maslov criterion is fairly impoverished in the way it represents the imperfective aspect (focusing on historical present, habitual, imperative and conative uses, ignoring others such as durative, on-going, processual, gnomic, general-factual, etc.). The Maslov criterion also inherits all of the problems associated with the assumption of unidirectionality in the Russian aspect system (see Section 6 below),
since it starts from a perfective verb and tests the possibility of replacing it with an imperfective verb.

Swan claims that we failed to understand that each verb “needs to be examined carefully and individually”, however, as described above, we undertook just such a laborious and comprehensive examination of each and every verb. Our combination of strategies yielded the best existing database of Russian Natural Perfectives, which we have made freely available on a public website with a user-friendly interface (the Exploring Emptiness database, which can be accessed at http://emptyprefixes.uit.no/index.php). Importantly, the database was completed before the statistical analyses were undertaken, so it is not reasonable to claim that the data was designed to support our model. Instead, it is the model that was built to account for the data.

We consider the list of 1981 pairs in our Exploring Emptiness database, each consisting of a simplex imperfective and a prefixed Natural Perfective, to be a representative sample from a dynamic population of verbs that can vary somewhat from speaker to speaker and is continuously evolving. Our sample can never be exhaustive since new pairs can enter the language, such as домажить / раз-домажить ‘destroy or damage a tank (usually in a computer game)’. However the patterns and statistical trends we have discovered are on the whole valid.

Swan claims that we have consistently manipulated the data to our own ends. In his section, The Empty Prefix Hypothesis, he states that Janda et al. (2013) “do not address evidence … when it seems to contradict their preferred interpretation of facts.” Later, in the section titled Aspectual Triplets and Secondary Imperfectives, he states: “Here as in other instances, the authors readily accept evidence from their dictionaries that supports their thesis, but no evidence that does not.” Our aim was to be as balanced and comprehensive as possible in the representation of facts, not to fudge the data, as Swan insinuates. If we were indeed guilty as charged, one would expect that we would have tried to cover our tracks in order to hide from such criticism. On the contrary, we have published all of our data on publicly-accessible websites. Perhaps our analysis is less than perfect in some ways, but at least we have made it as transparent and open as possible.

We are not in the habit of ignoring or burying findings that contradict the hypothesis that Russian aspectual prefixes bear meanings.
In a large corpus study of approximately six million verb forms in the Russian National Corpus, Janda and Lyashevskaya (2011) examined the distributional properties of inflected forms of verbs, and one of the research questions in that study was whether there is a difference between aspectual pairs formed by prefixation as opposed to suffixation. If we had found a difference between prefixation and suffixation, that difference might have provided additional evidence that the purely aspectual prefixes are not empty. However, we did not find any difference. This finding was published in a prominent journal and cited in Janda et al. (2013) as well. Note also that since Janda and Lyashevskaya (2011) addresses the role of suffixes, Swan is not justified in claiming (in his footnote 1) that “the authors [of Janda et al. (2013)] do not address the matter of purely suffixal aspect formation and what problems it might pose for their analysis and proposals.”

**The Case of Грузить ‘Load’**

Swan returns repeatedly to the verb грузить ‘load’. Following Ožegov and Švedova (2001), we recognize three Natural Perfectives for this verb: по-грузить, на-грузить, and за-грузить. We undertake a logistic regression analysis of nearly two thousand attestations of these verbs in the Russian National Corpus, investigating their distribution across the “theme-object” (as in грузить сено на телегу ‘load the hay on the cart’) and “goal-object” (as in грузить телегу сеном ‘load the cart with hay’) constructions. We find that, despite considerable overlap, the verbs do in fact behave differently and the differences that can be attributed to the meanings of the prefixes are significant even when one takes into account other factors such as the voice of the verb (active or passive) and whether both the theme and the goal are expressed or not.

Swan disagrees that the three prefixed verbs are Natural Perfectives to begin with. His solution is that по-грузить is a Complex Act Perfective (an atelic perfective that expresses temporal boundaries rather than completion), that на-грузить and за-грузить are Specialized Perfectives, and that грузить is an “aspectual orphan” of the “imperfectiva tantum” type that are incapable of forming Natural Perfectives. Since the Natural Perfectives and Specialized Perfectives form a continuum with no crisp dividing line between them, it will in some cases be possible to quibble about those designations. But the assertion
that грузить should be classed among imperfectiva tantum verbs is peculiar because грузить is an unusual candidate for this class.

There is a semantic continuum of imperfective verbs that ranges from a) those that are strongly atelic and abstain from perfectivization, b) verbs that are atelic and can form atelic perfectives, c) verbs that can refer to both atelic and telic activities and form both atelic and telic perfectives, to d) verbs that are inherently telic. Let us consider the full range of telicity expressed by imperfective verbs and then locate грузить ‘load’ along that continuum.

The imperfectiva tantum verbs express either states (like зависит ‘depend on’) or inherently undirected activities (like здравствовать ‘thrive’). Verbs like these refer to strongly non-completable states and activities that lack a telos. Without a telos, these imperfectiva tantum verbs likewise lack a Natural Perfective and resist perfectivization altogether.

Some states like сидеть ‘sit’ and undirected activities like кокетничать ‘act like a coquette’, стонать ‘moan’ and глупить ‘act stupid’ can perfectivize, but when such verbs perfectivize, they tend to form atelic perfectives, known as Complex Act and Single Act Perfectives. Examples of Complex Act Perfectives are delimitatives like по-сидеть ‘sit for a while’ and по-кокетничать ‘act like a coquette for a while’, and ingressives like за-стонать ‘begin to moan’. Semelfactives like с-глупить ‘do one stupid thing’ illustrate Single Act Perfectives.

There are many imperfective verbs in Russian that are ambiguous as to completability and can refer both to undirected (atelic) and directed (telic) activities. An example is писать ‘write’, which can refer either to an undirected activity as in Он пишет ‘He is writing’ as the answer to the question Что он делает? or to a directed activity as in Он пишет письмо ‘He is writing a letter’. These verbs typically form both telic (Natural and Specialized) perfectives and atelic (Complex Act) perfectives.

There are also directed activities that are inherently telic like блекнуть ‘fade’ and сохнуть ‘dry’. Such verbs tend to form telic perfectives, either preserving the lexical meaning of the base in Natural Perfectives as in по-блекнуть ‘fade’, or modifying it as in the Specialized Perfective у-сохнуть ‘shrink from drying up’.

If грузить ‘load’ were indeed an imperfectiva tantum verb as claimed by Swan, we would expect it to be frequently used to describe an
undirected generalized activity. For example, it should be common and natural to use this verb in response to a question as in: Что он делает? Он грузит ‘What is he doing? He’s loading.’ However, both corpus data and consultation with native speakers show that this is not the case. There is a telos available in грузить, involving the end state of either the “theme” (the hay in our example above) or the “goal” (the cart). Therefore, this verb usually refers to a directed activity, so one can say Он грузит сено ‘He is loading the hay’ or Он грузит телегу ‘He is loading the cart,’ but it is rather strange to say merely ‘Он грузит without enough context to fully support the interpretation of either a theme- or goal-directed activity.

In our study of nearly two thousand examples of грузить ‘load’ and its prefixed Natural Perfectives in the Russian National Corpus, we find fourteen examples in which neither a theme nor a goal is overtly expressed in the same clause. However, none of these examples fully support an interpretation as an imperfectiva tantum verb. The closest we come are five examples where грузить ‘load’, with sufficient supporting context, can express something like “работать грузчиком” ‘work as a loader’ as in this example:

(1) Я подумывал о мелочной работе в ближайшем гастрономе, грузить-разгрузить. [Владимир Маканин. Андеграунд, или герой нашего времени (1996–97)]
‘I considered taking a trivial job in the nearest delicatessen, loading and unloading.’

This usage is largely restricted to the infinitive (as in this example) and the imperative, and the opposition грузить : разгрузить ‘load-unload’ is important to support this interpretation, which would be harder to achieve with just грузить ‘load.’

Eight of our examples are metaphorical and assume that the theme is (excessive and boring) information while the goal is a person. See this definition for грузить ‘load’ as a slang term at http://teenslang.su: “долго рассказывать нечто неинтересное собеседнику” ‘go on with a lengthy narration of something that is not interesting for an interlocutor.’ Here is an example of this use from our data:
Examples of грузить used to mean ‘bore’ illustrate a version of the goal-object construction in which both roles are filled, but there is null instantiation of theme (the excessive information) and the goal (the person who becomes bored) has been omitted by ellipsis. These examples of a very specific metaphor do not support the suggestion that грузить ‘load’ can stand on its own as an imperfectiva tantum verb.

We find one example where neither the theme nor the goal are expressed in the same clause:

(3) — Это Гусев, — сказал он. — Клиент пытался бежать, обездвижен, сейчас грузим... — Не «грузим», а «грузят», — поправили его «медики». В данный момент двое из них, отдуваясь, проталкивали носилки с Юриным через узкую проходную, а третий, с фонендоскопом на шее, осуществлял руководство. [Олег Дивов. Выбраковка (1999)]

‘--This is Gusev, he said. -The client tried to escape, he’s immobilized, and now we will load [him]... --No, “we” won’t load him, “they” will, -- the “medics” corrected him. At that moment two of them, huffing and puffing, pushed a stretcher with Jurin through the entryway and a third one with a stethoscope around his neck, led the way.’

In this example, the theme is available from the previous context: клиент ‘client’, and the goal is specified in the following sentence: носилки ‘stretcher.’ Thus even this example does not give evidence to support Swan’s claim.

Semantically, грузить ‘load’ is similar to other verbs of placing, which are relatively more telic than the corresponding verbs of position, following the pattern in table 2.
The first column in table 2 specifies the position an object takes when placed somewhere. The second column contains verbs expressing the end state of the placed objects, which ‘stand’, ‘sit’, or ‘lie’ somewhere. While there is no correlate in this column for ‘load’, it can be expressed by using the copula быть ‘be’ with a participle по-/на-/за-гружен ‘loaded’. The third and fourth columns contain aspectual partner verbs expressing the placement of objects in the corresponding positions. The imperfective partners in the third column are relatively telic directed activities. If we were to consider грузить ‘load’ to be an imperfectiva tantum verb, we would have to revise the notion of imperfectiva tantum in order to include verbs like ставить ‘make stand’, сажать ‘seat, plant’, and кладь ‘lay’.

Table 2:
Verbs of position and placing compared with грузить ‘load’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of position</th>
<th>Verbs of position</th>
<th>Verbs of placing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAND</td>
<td>стоять ‘stand’</td>
<td>ставить 'make stand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>по-ставить ‘make stand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT</td>
<td>сидеть ‘sit’</td>
<td>сажать ‘seat, plant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>посадить ‘seat, plant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>лежать ‘lie’</td>
<td>кладь ‘lay’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>положить ‘lay’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOAD</td>
<td>грузить ‘load’</td>
<td>по-/на-/за-грузить ‘load’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Swan states that по-грузить ‘load’ is a Complex Act Perfective, putting it on a par with delimitative Complex Act Perfectives like по-сидеть ‘sit for a while’, по-кокетничать ‘act like a coquette for a while’ cited above. In that case, по-грузить would necessarily have the meaning ‘load for a while, load a little.’ However, this interpretation is clearly ruled out when the theme is a singular count noun, as in example (4).

Example (4) expresses the natural completion of грузить ящик в машину ‘load the box into the car’ with the same meaning, cf. the imperfective use in example (5). In examples like (4), it is not possible to
interpret по-грузить ‘load’ as a delimitative since it cannot co-occur with adverbs like немного or in the reduplicative V-V construction *по-грузили-по-грузили и ушли ‘they spent some time loading and then left’. We do not find any evidence in our data for delimitative use of по-грузить ‘load’.

(4) … замок сбили и ящик тоже погрузили в машину…
[Анатолий Рыбаков. Тяжелый песок (1975-1977)]
‘… they broke the lock and loaded the box as well into the car…’

(5) Нам пора грузить ящик. [Галина Щербакова. Моление о Еве (2000)]
‘It’s time for us to load the box.’

Swan’s assertion that грузить ‘load’ is an imperfectiva tantum verb does not find support in our data or among the native speakers in our research group. We stand by our argument that it is an imperfective verb that can express (and indeed most often does express) a directed activity and forms the Natural Perfectives по-грузить, на-грузить, and за-грузить.

The Case against Deprefixation and Inflectional Aspect
In his review, Swan states: “In both instances—imperfective deprefixation and imperfective suffixation—one is dealing with historically derivational processes which, in modern Russian, have become a means for producing not different verbs, but different inflectional forms of the same verb.” This sentence seems to imply that imperfective simplex verbs are historically derived by means of deprefixation, a claim that is untenable given what is known about the history of verbs in the Slavic languages. I will presume that this could not have been the intended meaning of Swan’s sentence and proceed to the other two claims in this sentence, namely that deprefixation is the means of derivation at work in relating Natural Perfectives to their partner verbs and that aspect is an inflectional category in modern Russian.

Swan is not alone in claiming that modern Russian takes the perfective as the “base” form for verbs and derives simplex imperfectives by means of deprefixation. This is also the position taken by Zaliznjak and
Mikaèljan (2012, 2014), and it is a position that I have argued against previously (Kuznetsova and Janda 2013, Janda 2015), so I will merely summarize the main points here.

The proposition that perfective aspect has a privileged status that extends to all (or nearly all) verbs amounts to a very strong and unnecessary assumption. As Swan correctly observes “the Russian system of aspect in its formal dimension was cobbled together over time.” This is precisely the reason why it is inauspicious to assume a priori that there are unidirectional universal rules as regards Russian aspect and its morphology. There is no need to suppose a single direction in the relationship between perfective and imperfective verbs, and my aspectual cluster model (Janda 2007a) specifically avoids such an assumption: aspectually related verbs are just related to each other. Russian aspectual morphology works in both directions, deriving perfectives from imperfectives and imperfectives from perfectives. Psycholinguistic evidence (Rusakova and Saj 2008) shows no support for the notion of an aspectually more “basic” form, and they show that imperfectives tend to be more salient in the minds of speakers. A model of Russian aspect in which imperfective verbs are always derived from perfective verbs relies on a more general postulation of a source-oriented model of language, which Bybee and Slobin (1982, see also Bybee 2001, 126) have shown to be unnecessary, since languages rely on both source-oriented and product-oriented schemas, obviating any need for a uniform direction of derivation.

A host of logical problems arises if one insists on a single direction for aspectual derivation in Russian. Let’s assume for the sake of argument that Swan, Zaliznjak and Mikaèljan are correct that the imperfectives of Natural Perfectives are indeed formed via deprefixation: на-писать ‘write’ drops its prefix to formписать ‘write’. For the Natural Perfectives, then, the direction of semantic derivation (perfective > imperfective) is the opposite of the direction of (historical) morphological derivation (imperfective > perfective). When Specialized Perfectives are formed we get various modifications of the meaning ofписать ‘write’, as in в-писать ‘insert’, при-писать ‘ascribe’, օ-писать ‘describe’, пере-писать ‘rewrite’, so here the prefix is adding new meaning to the verbs and these verbs are formed from the imperfective (and of course subsequently form partner verbs via suffixation, as in в-писывать, при-писать, в-писать, пере-
писывать). The Specialized Perfectives are formed by prefixation and semantic derivation follows the direction of morphological derivation. Similarly a Complex Act Perfective like по-сидеть ‘sit for a while’ is formed via prefixation. This means that some relationships between a simplex imperfective and a prefixed perfective involve deprefixation, whereas others involve prefixation.

How does a verb know which direction it should be going in? In some contexts, like (6), the meaning of за-писать ‘write (down)’ comes very close to the meaning of a Natural Perfective ofписать ‘write (down),’ as the parallel example (7) attests.

‘Write down the telephone number. I’ll call you myself.’

(7) Пишите телефон, — велела она. [Дарья Донцова. Доллары царя Гороха (2004)]
‘Write down the telephone number, she ordered.’

Does the verb за-писать ‘write (down)’ switch the direction of its semantics only in contexts where it behaves like a Natural Perfective? And how do the prefixes know when they should switch direction?

All of the prefixes that form Natural Perfectives also form other types of perfectives, and there is a zone of overlap with verbs like по-думать ‘think/think for a while’ that can perform as both Natural Perfectives and Complex Act Perfectives. In (8) по-думать ‘think’ is a Natural Perfective describing a discrete mental event, whereas in (9) по-думать ‘think for a while’ is a delimitative Complex Act Perfective describing a short duration filled with thinking. Does the direction of semantics reverse for these verbs when they are interpreted as Natural Perfectives, and what is the mechanism for this reversal?

(8) Губы моего сына дрожали. “Так больше нельзя, — подумала я. [Екатерина Орлова. Такой же хороший, как ты // «Даша», 2004]
‘My son’s lips trembled. We can’t go on this way, I thought.’
Why Neither the Prefixes Nor Our Arguments are Empty

LAURA A. JANDA

(9) Тимофея недолго подумал. Он не любил с ходу сдаваться.
[Борис Екимов. На хуторе // «Новый Мир», 2002]
‘Timofej thought for a while. He didn’t like giving up all of
a sudden.’

What happens when Natural Perfectives emerge? Colloquial
Russian has a Natural Perfective с-печь instead of ис-печь ‘bake’. How
did this Natural Perfective develop if deprefixation is the only available
relationship between a Natural Perfective and a simplex imperfective?
Recently borrowed verbs can also form Natural Perfectives by adding
prefixes, as in за-плантировать ‘plan.’ In such cases it is hard to justify
deprefixation as the only process at work. Our alternative is to make
fewer assumptions and recognize non-directional relationships among
aspectually related verbs.

For Swan, Russian aspect is an inflectional category. I tend to see it as a
derivational category, but this distinction is both hard to make and not
essential to my other arguments. As Bybee (1985, 81, 87) has observed:
“One of the most persistent undefinables in morphology is the distinction
between derivational and inflectional morphology” and “the distinction
between derivational and inflectional morphology is not discrete, but
rather a gradient phenomenon.” It may not be possible to crisply resolve
this issue with regard to Russian aspect to everyone’s satisfaction, so here
we might have to agree to disagree. However, I will offer some arguments
supporting the view that Russian aspect belongs to the derivational part
of the continuum. For a more comprehensive discussion of the difference
between inflectional and derivational morphology, I refer the reader to

Aside from formal considerations such as the boundedness of
morphemes and their status as open- or closed-class, one must also take
into account their meanings. A derivational morpheme relates more to the
identity of a word itself, whereas an inflectional morpheme relates the
word to the rest of the construction. Inflectional morphology involves
concepts that are more relevant to how the word relates to other words in
a construction than to the lexical item itself. The Russian perfectivizing

---

2 The form спечь ‘bake’ has existed dialectically for a long time (cf. Dal’ 1882, v. IV, 289),
but has recently moved into the role of a Natural Perfective in colloquial modern Russian.
prefixes arguably relate primarily to the meaning of the verbs they attach to (as detailed in Janda et al. 2013). Although perfective and imperfective verbs do differ somewhat as to the constructions they appear in, there are many contexts in which both a perfective and an imperfective verb can appear, and in such contexts the aspect depends only on the construal of the speaker. Reynolds (2016, 100–104) recently discovered that constructions that are unambiguously specific only to one aspect or the other are fairly rare for Russian verbs in corpus data (less than 5%). Further investigation of this finding is the topic of current research that we hope to publish soon.

Inflectional morphemes and the grammatical categories they express are productive: if a new lexical item enters a given syntactic class, it will inherit all the associated inflectional morphemes (Bybee 1985, 82). Inflectional morphemes are also regular: every (or nearly every) member of a paradigm is instantiated for every (or nearly every) word in a given class (Plungjan 2000, 125). This is less true for the derivation of aspectual partners for Russian verbs. Newly borrowed verbs sometimes start out as aspectually underspecified, or biaspectual verbs and then “grow” aspectual morphology by gaining association with suffixes and/or prefixes later. And there are many Complex Act and Single Act Perfectives that do not derive imperfective partner verbs with the same meaning. This is true for verbs like по-кокетничать ‘act like a coquette for a while,’ застонасть ‘begin to moan’ and the Single Act Perfective с-глупить ‘do one stupid thing’; it is difficult or impossible to form imperfectives that retain the delimitative, ingressive, and semelfactive meanings of such verbs.

An inflectional morpheme does not have the capacity to change the meaning of the words it is bound to, and will have a predictable meaning for all such words. This is definitely a problem for Russian aspectual morphology, since prefixes arguably always have some effect on the meaning, at the very least overlapping and/or narrowing the meaning in Natural Perfectives, and producing meaning adjustments in other perfectives. And a classic problem with Russian verbal prefixes is namely the fact that a given prefix does not have a single predictable meaning for all verbs. The assertion that Russian aspect is an inflectional category is therefore controversial.
Conclusion

The Russian “purely aspectual” prefixes are not semantically empty. In Janda et al. (2013) we presented abundant evidence that the behavior of prefixed Natural Perfective verbs is influenced by the meanings of their prefixes. This was the first large-scale attempt to quantify the relationship between Natural Perfectives and the prefixes that form them. Our findings matter because the patterns we adduce are robust and supported by statistical analyses, and are furthermore replicable. These patterns are valuable for descriptive and typological linguistics, and have implications for how Russian aspect may be modeled and taught.
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*Russian from Intermediate to Advanced* is a new and innovative textbook designed for students who wish to reach an advanced level of proficiency in all modalities (speaking, listening, reading and writing), according to the ACTFL scale. The book is designed to reflect the ACTFL proficiency guidelines for all four skills, as well as the skills tested in the TORFL. The authors have also produced a companion website, which features audio and video components, as well as grammar exercises. These materials can be used in a traditional one-year course, an intensive summer- or academic-year course, or over multiple years of study, with supplementary materials. This book is well suited for upper-level language courses with both heritage speakers and traditional language learners.

This book’s ten thematic chapters provide a variety of activities for reading and listening comprehension, speaking, writing, vocabulary development, word formation, and advanced grammar topics. The first five chapters cover topics familiar to students in their third year of university-level study, such as education, family, and free time. The last five chapters examine more abstract themes including health, politics, and economics. Thanks in large part to the exclusive use of authentic (albeit abridged) materials, students are also exposed to Russian cultural products and practices throughout the book, and often invited to make comparisons with their native culture.

The authors have designed the activities of each chapter in order to develop skills necessary for achieving Advanced proficiency. The authors summarize these skills:

1. “Engage in conversation in a clearly participatory manner in order to communicate information on autobiographical topics, as well as topics of community, national, or international interest.”

2. When reading, “understand the main ideas and supporting details of authentic narrative and descriptive texts.”
3. When listening, “understand the main ideas and most supporting
details in connected discourse on a variety of general interest
topics, such as news stories, explanations, instructions, anecdotes,
or travelogue descriptions.”

4. In writing, use “a variety of cohesive devices up to several
paragraphs in length” and exhibit “control of the most frequently
used syntactic structures and a range of general vocabulary”

Each chapter begins with an introduction of necessary vocabulary,
followed by short written and audio texts for comprehension and
summarizing. Some reading activities explicitly limit the time to be spent
on a text, in order to practice scanning for the main idea before finding
the supporting evidence. This is in line with the skills of Advanced
reading proficiency. These activities also develop skills for increased
literacy. For audio and video components, activities are designed to
encourage note-taking, allowing students to better identify the main idea
of a text, as well as supporting evidence. Attention is drawn to connecting
deVICES early in the textbook, allowing for students to create more
cohesive summaries in their writing. Throughout each chapter, the texts
increase in length and difficulty, ending with argumentative prose and
activities that invite students to present their own opinions, with
supporting arguments. In the early chapters, special attention is paid to
“problematic situations” such as reporting a crime or a car accident. The
ability to handle a situation with a complication is a component of
Advanced speaking proficiency, and these activities highlight the
emphasis on the proficiency guidelines that the authors have placed
throughout the book.

The grammar sections focus on many important and problematic
areas for more advanced language learners, both heritage and traditional.
These include case government (by both verbs and prepositions), verbal
aspect, verbal adverbs, verbs of motion, numerals, participles, and word
order. Additionally, the book reinforces and expands various types of
subordinating conjunctions, such concession, purpose, cause and result.
The grammar exercises provided are limited, but instructors can place
additional emphasis on these elements of grammar and syntax as students
develop writing skills.
Also worthy of mention is the treatment of vocabulary in the textbook. Each unit features a section dedicated to vocabulary, not only focusing on activation of the particular lexical items related to the theme, but also on word formation, the system of roots and affixes that is essential to increasing one’s active and passive vocabulary. Students are exposed to adjective formation and nominal suffixes, and each unit features one verbal root with various prefixes, rather than presenting the meanings of prefixes as applied to a variety of roots.

The companion website, available without a password, contains not only the audio files and links to videos for textbook activities, but also interactive exercises on vocabulary and grammar for each unit. These exercises allow the students to check their own work, and can be repeated multiple times. The website also features links to supplemental videos, such as feature films and television series, as related to a given chapter’s theme.

*Russian from Intermediate to Advanced* has many strengths as an upper level textbook, primarily its attention to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines. The book is designed to be a stand-alone textbook, with both level-appropriate content and grammar topics in one place, alongside well-structured activities to encourage Advanced proficiency tasks. The use of authentic, non-literary materials is also praiseworthy: the videos are compiled from television news reports pertaining to the themes of the chapters, and many of the written texts are compiled from Russian Internet sources, such as blogs or advice forums. The videos and texts also highlight cultural and social issues in modern Russia.

Despite the book’s many strengths, there are some shortcomings. There is no workbook with vocabulary and grammar exercises, and the online interactive exercises do not provide feedback to the instructor on a student’s progress directly from the website. Furthermore, the vocabulary exercises rely heavily on definitions, rather than using the words communicatively. The grammar exercises, however, use both multiple choice and fill-in-the-blank type activities. A printed workbook, or more online cloze exercises would be welcome. Additionally, some material in the book may be too difficult for students at this level, particularly those activities focused on opinions and supporting hypotheses, and the abstract topics of the last three chapters. However, such materials are a
useful preview for the type of work required to achieve Superior proficiency.

Notwithstanding these minor issues, I commend the authors for their work in creating a comprehensive textbook for this level of study. Given the variety of activities and texts, instructors are able to easily work with a range of student levels, a common problem in such courses.
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The late Robert L. Belknap was clearly one of the finest individuals and most creative teachers and scholars in the American profession of Slavic studies. His whole professional life encompassed both the academic and administrative sides of a long and outstanding professorial career at Columbia University. It is therefore entirely appropriate that the present volume consists of articles in the field of Russian literary criticism by some of the best and original literary critics, many of them Belknap’s former students. Not only do the articles demonstrate a high level of literary insight—they also show the example of Belknap’s remarkable creativity in methods of teaching.

The above remarks are perhaps most clearly shown in words written by the master himself in an article entitled “Text and Context.” Belknap starts by immediately diving into the red hot polemics between those who demand concentration only upon the text itself, and those who want to douse it also with relevant considerations of biography, history, politics, psychology, and so forth. With characteristic Belknapian humor, he describes his work in a core curriculum including dozens of authors from the ancient Greeks to the moderns: "For Slavists it can become a course on
the two thousand years work it took to produce Dostoevsky" (Martinsen 2014, 34).

The various chapters of the Festschrift cover a wide range of Russian authors from the nineteenth century, although there is an unsurprisingly extensive concentration on Dostoevsky, especially Crime and Punishment. Out of twenty-two separate articles, at least five of them are devoted to this murderous work. Several of their titles show a kind of humor which I think the master himself would highly appreciate: "Getting away with Murder, Teaching Crime and Punishment" (162–174); “Dostoevsky’s Notes From the Underground Revisited, Plus a Few Thoughts about Winnie the Pooh” (186–198). One might conceivably ask what connection could possibly exist between A.A. Milne’s charming children tales and a novel of murder and the highest degree of psychological dialectics.

Ellen Chances opens her arguments with a quotation from Winnie the Pooh which ends with, “which would be a Good Thing, because we might find something that we WEREN’T looking for, which might be just what we WERE looking for really” (186). Those who have pondered the depths of Fedor Mikhailovich’s paragraphs can probably appreciate Professor Chances’s jump from the A. A. Milne’s English fantasy to the Russian writer's creative imagination.

Olga Meerson handles this problem of “finding what we were looking for" in Pulkheria Raskolnikova's interpretation of Luzhin's rather nasty indication of how he sees his future happiness as a spouse to the protagonist’s sister, Dunya: "The husband should owe nothing to his wife; rather it is better when the wife regards the husband as her benefactor" (46). The Mother’s correct interpretation and Raskolnikov’s further interpretation of this sentence by the openly nasty Luzhin illustrate Winnie’s finding what we're looking for through what we're not looking for.

In considering the novelist’s privilege as a creator of his own fictional world, Gary Saul Morson gives a theoretical example of an author, Lev Tolstoy, possibly giving that privilege to Dolly Oblonskaia in Anna Karenina: “What if she could have overheard, as we the readers did, her husband’s thoughts about” — “she, the worn out woman, no longer young or good looking, in no way remarkable or interesting, merely
good mother’” (151). Professor Morson gives us an example of the kind of moral condemnation that would result in such a situation.

The festschrift is loaded with articles that look at Russian literature from a deeply felt and original point-of-view. It represents some of the best in contemporary American critical thinking.

The one weakness in the collection is an occasional over-indulgence in abstract writing which can make legitimate critical points rather hard to understand. As an example, “What is relevant for us in hermeneutics is that it focuses on the prism of perception relevant for the perceiver, a prism conditioned by the context relevant for him or her—a context that may be cultural or personal depending on the perceiver’s sore spots or points of reference, etc.” (48). But these occasional weaknesses do not lessen the overall impact of this marvelous collection.
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The Forms of Russian is a traditional approach to the fundamentals of Russian morphology based largely on the work of Jakobson, Levin, Lipson and Townsend. It is essentially the introductory course on Russian morphology that many, if not most, working North American Slavists took in graduate school. The work arises from such a course taught over many years by the author. The book is clearly intended for future teachers of Russian. The two main goals of the book are (1) to make working with and using Russian easier and (2) to explain how to establish a systematic description of Russian. As stated by the author, “the goal of the book is to improve your Russian, not to teach linguistics” (5). With these goals in mind—a basic description of the structures of Russian and an attempt to use this systematic approach to help students better understand the functioning of the language—the book is successful. The material is thoroughly covered, but the presentation does not get mired in excessive details and exceptions. The examples are largely presented with Cyrillic characters, which is important if the goals are not strictly linguistic but partially focused on learning to use Russian better. This allows future
teachers of the language a way to use the original forms of the language in explanations to students without complicating the process with transcription. The only real exception to this is that phonological transcriptions are given with Latin characters using a comma under consonants to indicate palatalization (8). It might have been more consistent to use Cyrillic characters here as well.

The pedagogical nature of the work is also clear in the style of writing and presentation. The tone of the book is that of an engaging lecture with questions for thought proposed for students to contemplate as they work through the chapter (27). Each chapter closes with practice exercises based on the material covered. Each section is thoroughly explained and well written.

Chapter 1 serves as an introduction with a brief discussion of the phonology of Russian, including transcription, allophones, complementary distribution in vowel reduction, and consonantal devoicing. The basic spelling and pronunciation rules important to morphological description are also introduced.

The subsequent chapters take on the main topics in Russian morphology following a typical order for a descriptive grammar: descriptive grammar, noun declensions, noun stress, adjective formation, pronominals, numerals, verb formations, participles, gerunds and derived imperfectives. Chapter 2, which focuses on the categories of Russian noun declension, is particularly well organized, with helpful clarifications of problematic areas like the formation of the genitive plural and rules for fill vowels (fleeting vowels). Chapter 3, noun stress, includes five concise methods for predicting stress.

Chapters 7, 8 and 10 comprise a detailed and clearly organized discussion of verbal morphology, both inflectional and derivational, serving as an excellent introduction to the topic. My one critique is, admittedly, about a personal theoretical preference for a usage-based approach to Russian morphology. I do not like the general reliance on unreal underlying forms and ordered rules to derive surface forms in verbal morphology, specifically the one-stem verb system. I admit that the system is internally consistent and that it provides an elegant description of the Russian verbal system, but it does not actually simplify the description. In order to identify the single stem, a student needs to know the infinitive, non-past and past forms as well as truncation and mutation
rules along with other rules like a disappearing u in the imperative. Why not just describe the real patterns of Russian verbs? That one critique aside, the discussion of verbal morphology is complete and clear and provides a useful introduction to the material.

*The Forms of Russian* is a well-written introductory description of Russian morphology. It is full of valuable information and is comprehensive without being bogged down with detail. Outside of my concerns with the one-stem verb system, I would use it as a supplement in my own courses on the structures of Russian.

*Grant H. Lundberg*  
*Brigham Young University*


“Еда по-русски...” это объемная, состоящая из пяти глав, коллективная монография, в написании которой участвовал представительный интернациональный коллектив исследователей из Австрии, Швейцарии и России. В книге читатель не найдет рецептов щей, борща, или кулебяки, не обнаружит рекомендаций по речевому поведению за русским столом, не отыщет экскурсов в этимологию названий русских блюд, не встретит идиоматического материала, базирующегося на пищевых и кулинарных словах и выражениях. Работа, кажется, в меньшей степени учитывает нужды и интересы филологов-русистов, студентов и аспирантов, изучающих русский язык, преподавателей русского языка как иностранного или же школьных учителей русского языка, а рассчитана больше на специалистов по деловой и межличностной коммуникации, социолингвистов, этнолингвистов, культурологов, специалистов по истории пропаганды и маркетологов.

Первая глава посвящена историческому анализу советского дискурса о пище. Здесь разбираются такие тексты на тему пищи, как
рекламные плакаты и лозунги 1920-х – 1970-х годов, а также один из ключевых советских текстов о еде – “Книга о вкусной и здоровой пище”. Анализируется пропагандистский язык в “пищевых” текстах, влияние исторических событий советской эпохи и видных советских деятелей на формирование идеологии пищевой политики в СССР. Остальные четыре главы охватывают постсоветский период в пищевой теме. Короткая вторая глава посвящает российского читателя в хорошо знакомую ему проблематику здорового питания и пищевой безопасности, отражаемую во всех СМИ. Исследователи показывают, как СМИ применяют различные коммуникативные стратегии для предостережения обывателя от приобретения вредной или якобы вредной пищи (например, генетически измененной), для формирования имиджа новых продуктов, а также для продвижения на рынке продуктов питания в рамках рекламных кампаний.

Третья глава нацелена на анализ рекламного постсоветского дискурса, в частности печатной и телевизионной рекламы последних 15 лет. Авторы находят и иллюстрируют достаточно очевидную связь между советским агитпропом и постсоветской рекламой, рассуждают о “диффузии глобальных концепций” (с. 264) и их влиянии на палитру стереотипов россиян, а также анализируют смену стереотипов культурной идентификации и социального поведения россиян, отчасти происходящую под влиянием рекламы продуктов питания.

Четвертая глава посвящена анализу текстов на упаковках российских продуктов питания и выявляет различные функции, которые выполняют подобные надписи, а именно, информирование о производителе, месте производства, ингредиентах, способе производства и способах потребления продукта, а также функцию воздействия на потенциальных покупателей с целью убедить приобрести тот или иной продукт. Особое внимание уделяно анализу вербальных средств эстетической презентации продукта, которая в частности происходит за счет использования прилагательных: вкусный, аппетитный, приятный, нежный, бархатистый, золотистый, янтарный, солнечный и др.

Последняя, пятая глава книги нацелена на обсуждение постсоветских пищевых номинаций, разбор дискурса не-
формального внутрисемейного и внесямейного общения на темы пищи, на анализ разговоров за едой дома, на работе, в кафе и ресторанах, а также на представление материалов анкетирования носителей русского языка на темы питания. В приведенных разговорах, диалогах и микродиалогах во время еды и о еде, авторами выявлены определенные пищевые российские стереотипы, например, гендерного характера, где для мужчин более характерна калорийная, сытная, жирная, острая еда с преобладанием мясных блюд, а для женщин более свойственна легкая и нежная еда, маленькими порциями, и увлечение разного рода диетами. Рассмотрены также стереотипы пищевого поведения в зависимости от доходов питающихся (еда бедных и богатых россиян), от ситуации питания (праздничное и повседневное питание), от места питания (в поезде, на пикнике, в больнице) и пр.

Коллективная монография превращается актуальной, своевременной и солидной научной работой, не приобретшей, однако, желаемой целостности, что, к сожалению, затрудняет знакомство с монографией даже заинтересованного и погруженного в тему читателя. Включение в один том статей, направленных на изучение очень разнородных текстов – поваренных книг, ресторанного меню, пищевой телевизионной рекламы, надписей на продуктных упаковках, публикаций в газетах на пищевую тему, записанных разговоров дома, в кафе и ресторанах, вероятно, может быть оправдано задачей авторов наиболее полно описать и проанализировать "русский пищевой дискурс и его культурообразующий потенциал". Однако читатель книги остается в некоторой растерянности от методологического многообразия подходов, отсутствия какой-либо связанной теоретической позиции, несмотря на уверения авторов, что все проанализированные материалы “наглядно демонстрируют знаковую, социокультурную природу пищевых представлений” (с.24). Заметим, что в монографии не приводятся мнения исследователей, ставивших бы под сомнение такие достаточно очевидные вещи, как знаковую и социокультурную природу человеческих представлений. Заявление же о том, что общей точкой отсчета является лингвистический подход, не облегчает положение читателя-филолога, ибо материал трактуется с позиций и с использованием (часто не вполне

*Late and Post-Soviet Russian Literature: A Reader* is a rich and informative classroom-oriented resource for students, scholars, and teachers alike. With the ambitious goal of capturing “the multiple voices and meanings that have emerged in the last several decades of cultural change in Russia” (Lipovetsky and Wakamiya 2014, 11), this engaging panorama of Russia’s literary milieu offers a diverse sample of literary texts, scholarly essays, and interviews published since perestroika.

The collection is organized into three thematic clusters, each prefaced with a brief introduction and supplemented with biographical sketches of each literary figure discussed. Part 1, “Rethinking Identities,” invites the reader to re-examine the potentially reductive categories of “women’s prose” and “queer literature” through the exploration of new narrative models for the expression of gender and sexual identity. This section opens with excerpts from Helena Goscilo’s canonical 1996 work *Dehexing Sex* and proceeds to include three stories by Liudmila Petrushevskaia (two of which came out in the early 1990s, while the third story, “The Fountain House,” is a product of the new millennium). This section also includes a poem by Vera Pavlova, Linor Goralik’s cycle of short stories “They Talk,” as well as several essays and stories by the gay rights activist, writer and photographer, Slava Mogutin. Bringing the discussion into the Putin era, the section concludes with excerpts from Tatiana Mikhailova’s scholarly essay dedicated to the recent phenomenon of commercial Russian “literature of glamour.” Focusing on Oksana
Robski, the pioneer writer who epitomizes this literary form, Mikhailova argues that the glamorization of the writer’s own and of her heroines’ images might be seen as a new—albeit conformist—type of female identity formation.

Part 2, “‘Little Terror’ and Traumatic Writing,” examines post-Soviet literature within the contexts of individual and collective traumas of the past and the ensuing literary and performative discourses on violence. This section begins with excerpts from two theoretical essays that have probably become staples in many courses on post-Soviet literary and cultural studies: Serguei Oushakine’s article on “post-Soviet symbolic aphasia” (2000) and Alexander Etkind’s “Stories of the Undead in the Land of the Unburied” (2009). With these two articles serving as a theoretical foundation for the discussion of violence and nostalgia, the section offers a broad array of works in various styles and genres, exploring identity formation through implied or explicit violent encounters. Included here are poems by Elena Fanailova and Andrei Rodionov, an essay by the Conceptualist poet Lev Rubinshtein (“The Smoke of the Fatherland”), excerpts from Evgeny Grishkovets’s play How I Ate a Dog, and scenes from the Presnyakov brothers’ play Terrorism. Fittingly, the section closes with excerpts from Eliot Borenstein’s 2008 volume Overkill: Sex and Violence in Russian Popular Culture, which introduces readers to the elusive Russian concept of bespredel and its representation in contemporary Russian narratives about organized crime. (Unfortunately, the editors did not offer any contextualization of Borenstein’s excellent piece within the framework of this section; students and instructors would also benefit from a list of suggested readings or viewings that are influenced by the aesthetics of bespredel).

Part 3 of the volume, “Writing Politics,” focuses on some of the most influential, popular and widely read authors in today’s Russia, whose work—according to the collection’s editors—appears “at the intersection of politics, media, and literature” (16). Some of the literary personae (for example, the postmodernist Victor Pelevin or the best-selling writers Boris Akunin and Sergei Lukianenko) are presented solely through critical responses to their works. Others, such as the political dissident Eduard Limonov and the prolific Dmitry Bykov, find their way into the collection through their own, perhaps lesser-known, prose selections. (In this vein, the anthology features Limonov’s piece “A Heroic
Attitude to Life” and Bykov’s essay “The Fall;” both of these translations appear in their English version for the first time). A segment on the prominent postmodern writer, Vladimir Sorokin, offers the latter’s 2007 interview with Spiegel as well as an original translation of his 2008 story “Petrushka.”

For those who wish to examine the original Russian texts, it would have been useful if the editors had provided each translation with the original Russian title, along with the place and date of its publication. As it currently stands, most literary pieces in the anthology are accompanied only by the publication date of the reprinted translation, which might be misleading, particularly for readers who seek to place these works in a historical context. For example, Liudmila Petrushevskaia’s story “Hygiene,” originally published in 1990, appears in the anthology under the 2011 date of its Penguin Books English translation. Another Petrushevskaia story, “The New Robinson Crusoes” (1989), does not have a publication date at all, save for a reference to the translation copyrights of 2009 in the acknowledgements section. The volume would have also benefited from a unified bibliography or at least more consistent bibliographical references: for example, this reviewer could not find in the collection any detailed bibliographical information (or the date of publication) for the aforementioned article by Oushakine.

These editorial inconsistencies aside, the present collection’s diverse choice of authors and texts will, no doubt, offer instructors abundant opportunities for the creation of a variety of courses on late and post-Soviet literature and culture. Easily supplemented by other primary and secondary texts (many of which are suggested throughout the book), this versatile anthology of some of the best writings from and about contemporary Russian literature is bound to stimulate productive classroom discussions. To further whet the appetites of students and instructors, the volume’s introductory chapter promises the release of a second reader, this time dedicated to Russian literature of the Thaw and Stagnation periods (11).

Olga Mesropova
Iowa State University

Sharon Carnicke’s *Checking out Chekhov: A Guide to the Plays for Actors, Directors, and Readers* provides a succinct foundation for understanding how to read Chekhov’s mature plays for theatre practitioners and students who so often encounter his work. As one of the most often produced and adapted playwrights in professional and academic theatres, Chekhov must be produced by theatre professionals that have a handle on how to think, talk, and, ultimately, produce Chekhov. While many books aimed at this audience offer interpretive readings, analytical strategies, and historical contexts for engaging with Chekhov’s unique dramatic worlds, none approach Chekhov using Carnicke’s astute strategy: focusing on the popular literary and dramaturgical influences on Chekhov. As she promises, Carnicke guides the novice through key background reading, emphasizing popular dramatic forms that shaped Chekhov’s dramaturgy. She manages complex dramaturgical ideas and historical information with deft, fluid, animated writing, including only what is necessary to explain how Chekhov wrote plays “that are neither fully comic nor tragic, with characters who are neither heroes nor villains and who speak nonsense and philosophy with equal fluency” (221).

As a professor of Theatre and Slavic Studies at the University of Southern California and as a professional actress, Carnicke is a leading international scholar and educator, whose work on Stanislavsky has enabled a generation of theatre scholars and practitioners to reconsider their assumptions about the actor-theorist’s vital experiments. In *Checking out Chekhov*, she demonstrates her multi-faceted facility with the performance, literary, historical and personal contexts in which Chekhov wrote his plays, understanding what theatre practitioners need in order to engage deeply with Chekhov. Her focus on key aspects of the literary context is significant because theatre scholars and professionals, dismissive of nineteenth century popular forms, rarely engage with the genres that enable a rich understanding of Chekhov. In addition to reintroducing a discussion of French vaudeville and melodrama in relation to Chekhov’s work, Carnicke points to Maeterlinck, Gogol, and less familiar influences on Chekhov’s distinctive playwriting style. In
doing so, Carnicke wrestles him from the pervasive clutches of a categorical ‘realism’ which has often limited the possibility of his plays in performance. As she did with Stanislavsky, Carnicke hopes to release Chekhov from persistent myths and misunderstandings that can limit his impact.

Carnicke divides the book into six chapters, with an introduction and a conclusion. She builds toward the most innovative sections of the book. In the first chapter, she reviews key elements of Chekhov’s background and family life that influenced his thinking and stage representations. Growing up in Taganrog, the impact of his father and the church, early romantic and sexual pursuits, his relationship with his sister Masha, his trip to Sakhalin Island, and his background in medicine form the core elements of the biography addressed by Carnicke. This quick introduction suffices for the novice to move into more critical elements of Carnicke’s analysis which focus on the literary and theatrical “soil” of his experiments. For students and theatre artists unfamiliar with Chekhov, Chapter Three, “The Devil in the Details of Chekhov’s Plays” is an essential reading. Carnicke divides Chekhovian details into twelve categories that serve as an important guide for understanding the writer’s mature plays. The twelve items include (1) apparent non-sequiturs in conversations and behavior, (2) apparent irrelevancies, (3) puns and word play, (4) verbal tics, meaningless phrases, and eccentric grammar, (5) fractured foreign languages, (6) grandiloquent speech and philosophizing, (7) clothing as commentary, (8) stage settings and the emotional progression of a play, (9) furniture and inanimate objects, (10) food and drink as commentary on the symptoms of heartache, (11) the pause, and (12) soundscapes and the music of the everyday. Educators will find this chapter particularly useful in the classroom.

The final chapters provide a unique comparative approach to analyzing Chekhov’s work that highlight its intertextual relations to vaudeville and melodrama. In Chapter Four, Carnicke compares Chekhov’s work with A Peculiar Position by Eugene Scribe. She expertly guides the reader through the analysis simplifying, contextualizing, and explaining broad concepts. While pointing out Chekhov’s departures from Scribe, she notes that Chekhov “finds value in the shorthand techniques that Scribe used for quick characterizations” (146). In Chapter Five, Carnicke explains how Chekhov used typical melodramatic
techniques (disasters, duels, the loss of virtue, suicide) to introduce moral ambiguity, to strip away sentimentality, and to present characters who both discard their illusions and learn to face themselves without pretense (158–9). The following chapter guides readers through Stanislavsky’s production of *The Seagull*, using the director’s production plan and letters to the author. Of note to Chekhov scholars, in her conclusion, Carnicke introduces the full text of a little-known short play Chekhov wrote in 1883 entitled, *Na Lune (On the Moon)* to demonstrate that “Chekhov’s characters are always good and bad, heroic and villainous, silly and serious and always seeking a better life. But only those who come to see life clearly as it is, who face and discard their illusions and lies, can find what they seek” (223).

Theatre educators and practitioners will find Carnicke’s *Checking out Chekhov* to be useful for deepening their ability to work productively and richly on one of the most complex writers for the theatre. It has great potential to revitalize discussions of Chekhov in the classroom and the rehearsal room.

*Valleri J. Robinson*
*University of Illinois*


This is the second, revised and expanded edition of the *Russian-English Dictionary of Idioms* by Sophia Lubensky. The first was published by Random House in 1995.

While the underlying lexicographic principles employed in the original edition have been preserved and the structure of the dictionary entries has remained unchanged, the second edition is different from the original edition in two important respects. First, about 550 new entries containing over 900 idioms along with their synonyms and variants have been added. This brings the total number of entries to approximately 7,500 and the total number of idioms close to 14,000. The new entries reflect the ongoing changes in the Russian language as well as the author’s continuous work to remedy significant omissions. Second, a great number
of entries have been revised in light of the author’s continued use of language corpora and informants. As with the first edition, the dictionary incorporates a number of unique features. Unlike traditional bilingual dictionaries, it provides definitions of the basic meanings of idioms in English, including usage notes and temporal, stylistic and sociocultural details; it gives grammatical descriptions of the collocations using a few clearly delineated patterns; and it offers, in most cases, more than one translation variant of each idiom. Most of the idioms have been taken from published translations of Russian prose fiction. It can be said that it is a five-in-one lexicographical resource, combining the features of a regular bilingual (Russian-English) dictionary, a monolingual dictionary (explicating the essential meanings of idioms), a translator’s dictionary (supplying multiple, real-life solutions to translation problems), a Russian/English language learner’s dictionary and a cultural resource providing access to a wide array of Russian literary works and illustrating the variability of cross-cultural representation of prose fiction. The dictionary is descriptive, i.e. it reflects the actual functioning of the Russian language as well as the actual translations of the idioms. Each entry represents a fascinating world of its own. As Lubensky puts it, “By creating a semantic habitat for each idiom, the dictionary [offers] assistance without curtailing the translator’s ingenuity and creativity” (vii). Based on solid lexicographic principles, the dictionary differs markedly from the much larger online bilingual dictionaries, which tend to be unsystematic compilations of lexical items formed through accretion. In his article “O ‘Longmane’ bednom zamolvite slovo” (2009),1 the leading Russian lexicographer Dmitry Yermolovich refers to such dictionaries as “verbal dumps” [bol’shaya svalka slovesnogo materiala].2

The sources for the Russian idioms include 285 works of Russian literature, the National Russian Corpus, all available Russian monolingual general dictionaries, monolingual phraseological dictionaries, surveys of countless Russian speakers, and major linguistic

2 See also Yermolovich’s response to a reader’s question “Doveriat’ li ‘Mul’titravu’ i sokhraniat’ li obshchiye slovari?” (September 17, 2011, 23:44) here: http://yermolovich.ru/board/1-1-0-103.
works on Russian phraseology. The bibliography section at the back of the dictionary is a useful lexicographic and literary reference source in its own right.

I have been using the dictionary on a regular basis since it first came out in 1995. Unlike traditional dictionaries, this particular dictionary can be more conveniently and efficiently used from back to front. The Index section at the back of the dictionary contains a list of all the key words used in the idioms that appear in the main body of the dictionary. They are presented in the forms used in the actual idioms. The Index indicates the quickest routes to the idioms in question. I start my searches from there.

Although the dictionary is generally oriented toward the American variety of English, speakers of other varieties of English will find it equally useful since most of the equivalents presented in the dictionary are common to all varieties of English. Speakers of Russian, especially translators, will find the dictionary especially useful as it provides explanations and variants of translation that cannot be found in other smaller Russian-English dictionaries of idioms currently available. In my view, Sophia Lubensky’s dictionary is an unsurpassed achievement, representing the result of a prodigious amount of work spanning many years. Apart from everything else, it is the largest dictionary of its kind existing today. Having it is a must for any language and translation specialist.

Alexander Burak
University of Florida
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