

The Verbal Prefix *do-* in Russian and Ukrainian

David Schledewitz

1. Introduction

There is a copious literature on Slavic prefixes, but even the studies analyzing many different prefixes usually focus on those that form natural perfectives, i.e. perfectives “which describe the logical completion of the corresponding Imperfective Activity (and are thus denotationally equivalent to the Activity, differing from it only in terms of aspect)” (Janda 2007, 609). According to Krongauz, the reason lies in the aspectological roots of prefix research. Aspectology, as he continues, is mainly interested in three topics:

во-первых, связь префиксации и перфективизации, во-вторых, семантика способов действия и, в-третьих, видовые пары глаголов, образуемые приставкой, и, соответственно, так называемое чистовидовое значение приставки. (Krongauz 1998, 79)

This focus on aspect results in fewer studies on prefixes which lead to a new meaning of the resulting verb. One of these prefixes is *do-*. Since it does not form natural perfectives, it is not relevant in the study of aspect (e.g., it is not covered in Janda et al. 2013). But even in literature dedicated to other topics, *do-* seems to be underrepresented. For instance, Krongauz (1998) names it in several places, often in a list together with other locational prefixes, but does not provide a detailed analysis. An exception is Janda (1986) which analyzes *do-* as one of several prefixes expressing EXCESS.

In the present paper, the prefix *do-* will be analyzed in Russian and Ukrainian. It is generally considered that the prefix has identical functions in these languages, as, for instance, in the comparative grammar by Basova et al. (2003, 144). However, when comparing semantic equivalents in both languages, a verb prefixed with *do-* does not always correspond to a verb with the same prefix in the other language, e.g., ukr. *doslidžuvaty* – rus. *issledovat'* ‘investigate’. In the absence of detailed studies on this topic, a small corpus study is conducted to provide a first impression on whether *do-* actually has identical applications in both languages.

The following section provides an overview of *do-* based on previous literature. Section 3 describes the research question, data, and methodology to be applied in the present article. Afterwards, the data is analyzed in section 4. The last section will conclude the study. The meanings for the Russian words were retrieved from Ožegov & Švedova (1999),

those of the Ukrainian words from Rusaniv's'kyj (2011-). For both dictionaries, the online version has been used.

2. Literature overview

Both Russian and Ukrainian are East Slavic languages and thus closely related (Comrie & Corbett 1993). One of the similarities they share is the verbal prefix *do-* which has the same etymological origin in both languages and is derived from the preposition *do* (Kopečný 1973). Therefore, I will give an overview of the preposition before describing the verbal prefix *do-* in both languages.

2.1 The preposition *do* in Russian and Ukrainian

According to Kopečný (1973), the etymological meaning of the preposition *do* is to specify the goal of a motion event in the same way as the English preposition *to* in *I went to my parents*. This meaning is still used in Ukrainian (*Ja pišov do svojix bat'kiv*), whereas Russian uses the preposition *k* in these cases (*Ja pošel k svojim roditeljam*).

Today, *do* can be used to describe motion up to a boundary, e.g. rus. *On doexal do granicy*, ukr. *Vin dojixav do kordonu* 'He drove to/until the border', or when an action is performed until a temporal boundary is reached, e.g. rus. *Ja ostanus' do pjatnicy*, ukr. *Ja zalyšajus' do p'jatnyci* 'I will stay until Friday'. Furthermore, in both languages the temporal *do* can mean 'before' as in rus. *do obeda*, ukr. *do obida* 'before noon'.

Summarizing, the Ukrainian preposition *do* can still be used in its etymological meaning, whereas in Russian this function is now fulfilled by the preposition *k*.¹ Apart from that, *do* has the same main meanings in both languages. For a more detailed overview of all meanings, see Kopečný (1973, 60–65).

2.2 Russian

As for the verbal prefix *do-* in Russian, Janda (1986) lists three meanings. The meaning REACH, i.e., movement up to a specified goal, is expressed in combination with verbs of motion like *dojti* 'reach (by foot)'. Furthermore, it can express the intentional addition of something to something else (ADD) as in *dobavit'* 'add'. When used together with the postfix *-sja*, the resulting circumfix adds the meaning EXCESS, i.e., the agent exceeds a limit and thus causes an unintended, usually negative, consequence. As an example, Janda (1986) names *doigrat'sja* 'play for a while with negative consequences'. This verb demonstrates that the limit is not contained in the base verb itself (here: *igrat'* 'to play'), but rather overdoing the action or becoming careless in the process leads to those consequences.

According to Petrušina (2000), when *do-* is combined with a perfective base verb, it can express that a normative amount is reached, for instance in *dopolučit'* 'receive the rest of a normative or expected amount'. Since this normative amount can be regarded as goal and the accumulation as abstract movement towards the goal, it will be called REACH (ABSTRACT). Petrušina furthermore states that the circumfix *do...sja* not necessarily

¹ In Ukrainian, this preposition appears only in fixed expressions like *k čortu* 'to the devil' (von Waldenfels 2017, 101).

implies negative consequences as in *dozvonit'sja* ‘reach someone by telephone after significant effort’, which constitutes a further example for REACH (ABSTRACT).

A meaning that has not been described in previous grammars and studies is CONVEY in the sense of ‘causing sb./sth. to reach a specified goal’ as in *doložit* ‘inform; report’ or in the expression *dovesti do svedenija* ‘inform’, which are both used in official contexts. Here, the agent causes an information to reach the recipient, i.e., the goal. The absence in previous literature and the limited usage could indicate that this meaning is not used productively in Russian and only conserved in official usage.

2.3 Ukrainian

Ivčenko (1960, 403) lists two meanings for *do-* in Ukrainian. When used with verbs of motion, it expresses the approach to something, e.g., *dojixaty* ‘reach (driving)’. It can furthermore express the termination of an action as in *dočytaty* ‘read to the end’. Apart from that, he lists verbs in which the prefix expresses “other meanings”: *domohtysja* ‘enforce’, *dopovnyty* ‘complete’, *dodaty* ‘add’, *dopovidaty* ‘inform’.

Applying the terminology from the previous subsection, the act of approaching something can be categorized as REACH and the termination of an action as REACH (ABSTRACT). The latter meaning is also contained in the verbs *dočytaty*, *domohtysja*, and *dopovnyty*. The verb *dodaty* can be categorized as ADD and *dopovidaty* as CONVEY.

In dictionaries, *do-* can be found together with the postfix *-sja*, which expresses reaching a goal after significant effort. This can involve negative consequences like in *dotancjuvatysja* ‘dance for a while with negative consequences’, i.e., EXCESS, or not, as in *dodrukuvatysja* ‘finish printing’, i.e., REACH (ABSTRACT).

2.4 Comparison

As the descriptions of *do-* in Russian and Ukrainian show, the prefix seems to have the same functions in both languages. It can express REACH, REACH (ABSTRACT), ADD, CONVEY, and, when used together with the postfix *-sja*, EXCESS.

If we assume that the semantics of the prefix *do-* is grounded in the semantics of the preposition *do*, the meaning REACH clearly has been inherited from the preposition. By extending the REACH meaning to contexts unrelated to movement, the meaning REACH (ABSTRACT) can be derived. The meaning ADD, by contrast, is not recorded for the preposition and specific to the prefix. It might be an extension of the REACH (ABSTRACT) meaning as adding something often has the goal of reaching a certain amount.² Finally, CONVEY can also be derived from REACH (ABSTRACT) by shifting the focus from the actual movement to its cause.

3. Hypothesis, Data, and Methodology

The research question to be investigated is how similar or different the verbal prefix *do-* is in Russian and Ukrainian. Based on the reviewed literature and the assumption that the meaning CONVEY is not used productively in modern Russian, I expect Ukrainian *do-*

² In this paper, I assume that the ADD meaning only refers to intentional addition, both in Russian and Ukrainian.

to have a wider application than its Russian equivalent. This hypothesis will be tested through a corpus linguistic analysis.

The data was gathered from the Ukrainian parallel corpus of the Russian National Corpus (RNC) which contains literary texts (9.4 million tokens) with Ukrainian or Russian as the source language as well as their respective translations into the other language. As this study focuses on the contemporary languages, data from before 1900 was excluded by creating a subcorpus.

For the analysis, two datasets were created. The first one was compiled using a subcorpus that contained only texts with Russian as the source language. In this Russian subcorpus, a search was conducted for verbs beginning with *do*, using the option “Search only in Russian texts”. The RNC provides the functionality to create a table which is supposed to contain all the results, but it turned out not to work properly. Therefore, the results were extracted by means of several scripts.³ The results were stored in a table, and from the 796 translation pairs a sample of 100 random pairs was picked to investigate how Russian verbs beginning with *do-* are translated into Ukrainian.

For the second dataset, a subcorpus was created that contained only texts with Ukrainian as the source language. The search was conducted using the option “Search only in Ukrainian texts”, again searching for verbs that begin with *do*. Here, too, the information was extracted with scripts. From the ca. 3200 translation pairs, a sample of 100 random pairs was picked to investigate how Ukrainian verbs with *do-* are translated into Russian.

There were entries for which no translation was present. Several of them were removed by hand before drawing the sample to increase the number of valid translation pairs. Both samples were organized in a table with the following columns: *left context*, *center* (i.e., the relevant verb), *right context*, *cognate*, *base verb*, and *prefix*. The *cognate* column was annotated with *yes* whenever the relevant base verbs in source and translation had the same etymological origin, e.g., rus. *ezdit'* and ukr. *jizdyty* ‘drive’, otherwise with *no*, e.g., rus. *dobavit'* and ukr. *dodaty* ‘add’. When the translation of the match contained a prefix different from *do-*, the corresponding prefix was captured in the *prefix* column, e.g., *po* in the case of *pozvolit'* ‘permit’. This provided an overview of how verbs with *do-* in one language are translated into the other, the most interesting cases being cognates with differing prefixes. A possible disadvantage of using a parallel corpus could be priming, i.e., translators might tend to translate *do-* verbs in the source language with *do-* verbs in the target language. Thus the translated texts might contain *do-* verbs in contexts that otherwise would contain verbs with different prefixes. However, the present approach enables us to focus on the cases with different prefixes.

The methodology used here is similar to the *radial category profiling* applied in Nessel et al. (2011), a radial category profile being defined as “the relative frequency distribution of the subcategories of a radial category.” First, it is established which meanings the items cover, as was done in section 2 of the present paper. Then the collected data is analyzed to

³ The scripts for both parts of the analysis as well as the data are available here: <https://doi.org/10.18710/1U2AQJ>.

determine which meanings can be attested. The major difference between the study conducted by Nessel et al. (2011) and the present one is that the former compared two similar prefixes in one language, namely *vy-* and *iz-* in Russian, whereas here the etymologically same prefix is compared cross-linguistically. A disadvantage of this methodology is that only the number of verbs with certain meanings is investigated, but not their frequency. For instance, the ADD meaning of Russian *do-* could occur only with infrequent verbs, whereas the same meaning in Ukrainian could have a much higher token frequency. Radial category profiling could not detect such a discrepancy. Nevertheless, the number of attested verbs is still an indicator for usage and productivity, especially in a small-scale study like the present one.

4. Analysis

In this section, the collected data are analyzed. First, I investigate how Russian verbs with *do-* are translated into Ukrainian, and afterwards I assess the translation of Ukrainian *do-* verbs into Russian. Finally, the results are compared and discussed.

4.1 Translations of Russian verbs with *do-* into Ukrainian

The sample of 100 translation pairs contains 24 invalid pairs, i.e., cases where the words in question are either not verbs like rus. *domoj* ‘home (direction)’ or *do-* cannot be regarded as a prefix, like in rus. *doit* ‘milk (verb)’. Another 25 translations (33% of the valid pairs) were realized by using non-cognates, e.g., rus. *doprosit*’, ukr. *dopytaty* ‘interrogate’. The remaining 51 pairs (67%) are translations with cognates, eight of them with a different prefix. Table 1 lists examples of cognate translations with identical prefix in this sample. The number of occurrences has not been determined for each verb since these are not the items of investigation here. Each verb in this and the following tables is listed in its infinitive form.

Russian	Ukrainian	Meaning	Number of occurrences
<i>dojest</i> ’	<i>dojisty</i>	‘eat until the end’	
<i>dostat</i> ’	<i>distaty</i>	‘fetch’	
			Σ: 43

Table 1: Cognate translations from Russian into Ukrainian with identical prefix (examples)

Table 2 provides an overview of cognate translations with different prefixes in this sample.

Russian	Ukrainian	Prefix	Meaning	Number of occurrences
<i>dopustit</i> ’	<i>prypustyty</i>	<i>pry-</i>	‘imagine’	2
<i>dovestis</i> ’	<i>pryvestysja</i>	<i>pry-</i>	‘get to do’	1
<i>dogadyvat</i> ’sja	<i>zdohaduvatysja</i>	<i>zdo-</i>	‘guess’	2
<i>dognat</i> ’	<i>nazdohnaty</i>	<i>nazdo-</i>	‘catch up with’	2
<i>dopytyvat</i> ’sja	<i>pytaty</i>	∅	‘find out’	1
				Σ: 8

Table 2: Cognate translations from Russian into Ukrainian with different prefix

In the following, I cover all the contexts with different prefixes and check whether the prefix choice in Ukrainian is due to a meaning of *do-* in Russian that does not exist in Ukrainian.

The last alternation was used in the context rus. *dopytyvat'sja u sebja*, ukr. *pytaty u sebe samoho* ‘ask oneself’. In the Russian example, the prefix *do-* expresses REACH in the sense of reaching the truth. As described in the literature review, this meaning can be expressed in Ukrainian, too. Furthermore, the verb *dopytuvatysja* exists in Ukrainian as well with the same meaning as the Russian *dopytyvat'sja* ‘find out’. Hence, the missing prefix in the Ukrainian translation can be explained by *pytaty u sebe* being a fixed expression which requires the verb *pytaty* ‘ask’.

The alternation between *do-* and *pry-* is not surprising as their respective meanings REACH and APPROACH are fairly similar but involve different perspectives. *pry-* (or *pri-* in Russian) in its prototypical meaning expresses ARRIVE (Janda et al. 2013), i.e., approaching the speaker, as in rus. *kto-to priexal*, ukr. *xtos' pryjixav* ‘someone arrived (here)’, whereas *do-* expresses reaching a location that is not identical with the speaker’s location, e.g. rus. *on doexal do granicy*, ukr. *vin dojixav do kordonu* ‘he arrived at the border’.⁴ The subtle difference between approaching and reaching something is less relevant in the case of abstract entities which do not have clear boundaries. This is illustrated by the following example from this sample:

- (1) rus. *Arxeologi i **dopustit'** ètogo ne mogli: doistoričeskij čelovek zanimalsja živopis'ju — nado že pridumat' takoe!*
 ukr. *Arxeolohi ne mohly **prypustyty**, ščob doistoryčna ljudyna zajmalasja živopysom, — treba ž otake vyhadaty!*
 ‘The archaeologists could not image that prehistoric man could paint.
 That’s unbelievable!’

Here, the archaeologists could not let the idea of prehistoric paintings reach the state of a realistic idea, because their knowledge about prehistoric man did not allow such a conclusion.⁵ The state of being realistic is not binary (*yes* or *no*), but rather a continuum, as claims can be more or less realistic. On such a continuum, both REACH and APPROACH are adequate to express the intended idea of regarding something as realistic or not.

The alternation between Russian *do-* and Ukrainian *zdo-* and *nazdo-* is interesting because Ukrainian has the respective verbs with just *do-* as well. According to Rusaniv's'kyj (2011-), *dohnaty*, *zdohnaty*, and *nazdohnaty* have the same meaning ‘catch up with’. The same is true for *dohaduvatysja* and *zdohatuvatysja* ‘guess’. Still the Ukrainian translators did not choose to simply translate *dognat'* with *dohnaty* or *dogadyvat'sja* with *dohaduvatysja*. This phenomenon will be further analyzed in section 4.3 below.

4.2 Translations of Ukrainian verbs with *do-* into Russian

This sample contains 32 invalid examples like ukr. *dodomu* ‘home (direction)’ and 32 translations with non-cognates like ukr. *dovidatysja*, rus. *uznat'* ‘find out’. Among the 36

⁴ There are cases where the prefix *pry-/pri-* does not express movement to the speaker, e.g., in biographies: rus. *On priexal v Moskvu, gde postupil v universitet*. For a more general discussion of this topic see Nesset (2020).

⁵ In this context, it is more appropriate to call this a state, since ‘being realistic’ depends on the available knowledge of the topic and is thus not an inherent property of prehistoric paintings.

cognate translations (53% of the valid pairs), 11 are not prefixed with *do-*. Table 3 lists examples of cognate translations with identical prefix in this sample. The number of occurrences has not been determined for each verb since these are not the items of investigation here. As in the previous subsection, each verb is listed in its infinitive form.

Ukrainian	Russian	Meaning	Number of occurrences
<i>dokazuvaty</i>	<i>dokazyvat'</i>	'prove'	Σ: 26
<i>dostavyty</i>	<i>dostavit'</i>	'deliver'	

Table 3: Cognate translations from Ukrainian into Russian with identical prefix (examples)

Table 4 provides an overview of cognate translations with different prefixes in this sample.

Ukrainian	Russian	Prefix	Meaning	Number of occurrences
<i>dopuskaty</i>	<i>podpuskat'</i>	<i>pod-</i>	'let sb./sth. come closer'	1
<i>dopomahaty</i>	<i>pomogat'</i>	∅-	'help'	3
<i>dožydaty</i>	<i>oždat'</i>	<i>o-</i>	'wait for; expect'	1
<i>dohodžaty</i>	<i>ugoždat'</i>	<i>u-</i>	'accommodate'	1
<i>dokorjaty</i>	<i>ukrojat'</i>	<i>u-</i>	'reproach; accuse'	1
<i>dozvoljaty</i>	<i>pozvolit'</i>	<i>po-</i>	'permit'	4
				Σ: 11

Table 4: Cognate translations from Ukrainian into Russian with different prefix

In the following, I cover all the contexts with different prefixes and check whether the prefix choice in Russian is due to a meaning of *do-* in Ukrainian that does not exist in Russian.

The alternation between *do-* and *pod-* is not surprising, since the prefix *pod-* can express APPROACH (Janda et al. 2013), which is similar to the REACH meaning of *do-*. The difference between these prefixes is that *pod-* is restricted to horizontal approach, e.g., rus. *podojti* 'come closer'. Their similarity can be seen in the fact that Ukrainian has the verb *pidpuskaty* with the same meaning as *dopuskaty* 'let sb./sth. come closer'. The following example shows the context in which this translation pair occurred:

- (2) ukr. *Vin sam vyxovuvav svoju Annu, ne **dopuskajučy** do neji nijakyx žinok.*
 rus. *Sebast'an v odinočku vospityval svoju Annu, ne **podpuskaja** k nej ženščin.*
 'He/Sebastian raised his Anna himself, not letting any women come close to her.'

In the context of not letting somebody come close to someone else, both APPROACH and REACH are adequate to express the intended meaning. Nevertheless, the meaning REACH can be expressed by Russian *do-*, too.

The use of *do-* in the Ukrainian verb *dopomahaty* ‘help’ is plausible if helping someone else is seen as performing actions that allow that person to reach their goal like in the following example from the present sample:

- (3) ukr. [...] *duže korysno prokazuvaty taku niby molytvu, ščo za syvoji davnyny **dopomahala** na oxoti našym predkam-myslyvcjam*
 rus. [...] *očen' polezno proiznosit' takuju kak-by molitvu, ispokon vekov ves'ma **pomogavšuju** vo vremja oxoty našim predkam oxotnikam*
 ‘it is very useful to say this, sort of, prayer that in ancient times helped our hunting ancestors on the hunt’

Here, the prayer is supposed to help the hunters reach their goal of killing a prey. Once again, the Ukrainian prefix *do-* expresses a meaning that could be expressed by its Russian counterpart as well, namely REACH (ABSTRACT).

Similarly, when waiting for something to happen, this “something” can be seen as a goal that will be reached by waiting for it. Thus the use of *do-* in Ukrainian is understandable and Russian, too, has the verb *doždat'sja* with the additional postfix *-sja*. Here, the circumfix *do...sja* expresses that the waiting takes a lot of time (Petrušina 2000, 214), but this verb is commonly used with animate agents, whereas the Ukrainian *dožydaty* can be combined with inanimate ones like in the following example from the present sample:

- (4) ukr. *pekel'ni muky, jaki **dožydajut'** na tim sviti hrišneho Semena*
 rus. [*adskie mučenijsa*], *kotorye **ožidajut** na tom svete grešneho Semena*
 ‘infernal anguish that is waiting for Semen after death’

Again, this alternation is not due to a meaning of *do-* that is specific to Ukrainian, namely REACH (ABSTRACT). Instead, it is due to the unavailability of a Russian equivalent with *do-* that can take animate subjects.

The alternation between *do-* and *u-* can be described by different perspectives in the case of ukr. *dokorjaty* and rus. *ukorjat'* ‘reproach; accuse’. The prefix *u-* can express REDUCTION (Janda et al. 2013). When person A reproaches person B, the latter is reduced in their honor or integrity. *do-* in this case expresses that the reduction lets their honor or integrity reach a certain point. In *ugoždat'* ‘accommodate’, the prefix expresses a reduction in personal freedom of behavior in order to reach a certain goal. Another interpretation could be that *u-* in the latter example expresses PLACE/FIT, i.e., the own behavior is adapted to reach a goal. In the Ukrainian equivalent *dohodžaty*, the prefix can be interpreted as either reducing one’s own freedom of behavior until a certain point, i.e., the point that is necessary in order to achieve a goal, or as adapting one’s own behavior up to a point that allows a goal to be reached. Hence, these alternations are not grounded in meanings of Ukrainian *do-* that are not described for its Russian counterpart.

In ukr. *dozvoljaty* ‘permit’, the prefix expresses the meaning CONVEY, i.e., the permission is conveyed from one person to another. The prefix *po-* in the Russian equivalent *pozvolit'* expresses RESULT, and in this case focuses on the result of giving the permission, i.e. the permission allows the recipient to perform an action. Once more, Ukrainian *do-* expresses a meaning that could also be expressed by Russian *do-*, and the

relevant meaning is actually present in the participle *dozvoleno* ‘permitted’ although the corresponding verb *dozvolit’* is marked as archaic in Ožegov & Švedova (1999).

4.3 Discussion

A quantitative comparison of the number of cognate translations that can have a prefix different from *do-* leads to the following result: The 51 valid translation pairs of Russian *do-* into Ukrainian gave five unique pairs with prefix alternation (cf. Table 2), that is ca. one out of ten. As for the opposite direction of translation, 36 valid translation pairs gave six unique pairs (cf. Table 4), that is one out of six. There is, of course, not enough data to make strong claims, but among cognate translations, Russian *do-* verbs more often correspond to Ukrainian verbs with the same prefix than the other way round. This at least does not contradict this study’s hypothesis that Ukrainian *do-* has a wider application, assuming that all different meanings which this prefix can have in Russian are present in Ukrainian, too.

The analysis of the first sample revealed that Russian *do-* sometimes corresponds to *zdo-* or *nazdo-* in Ukrainian. At first glance, this looks like a case of prefix stacking which has been described for Russian (Biskup preprint; Tatevosov 2009). In prefix stacking, however, each prefix adds a meaning, either a lexical one or one related to aktionsart, whereas *z-* and *naz-* do not seem to alter the verb’s semantics. Nevertheless, since the Ukrainian translators specifically chose the verbs with *zdo-* and *nazdo-* instead of the semantically identical *do-* verbs, we can assume that at least some difference exists, maybe on the stylistic level. A possible explanation could be that the verbs with *nazdo-* and *zdo-* are perceived as “more Ukrainian” or as belonging to a higher style. There are examples for such competitions in Ukrainian, e.g., the question ‘What is your name?’ can be formulated in two ways: *Jak tebe zvaty?* or *Jak tebe zvut?* The latter is considered “less Ukrainian” as the verb form originates from Russian *zovut*. However, a dedicated corpus study is necessary to answer this question.

None of the samples contained meanings of *do-* in one language that are not attested for the other. Nevertheless, the present study indicates that the use of *do-* in Russian seems to decline with respect to the meaning CONVEY. As described in the section 2.1, the available literature does not list this meaning, which might be a result of rare and non-productive usage. However, the small scale of this study does not enable us to test this hypothesis.

5. Conclusion

The present study has confirmed that the verbal prefix *do-* has very similar applications in Russian and Ukrainian. In both languages it can express REACH, REACH (ABSTRACT), ADD, CONVEY, and, when used together with the postfix *-sja*, EXCESS. The assumption that Russian *do-*, in contrast to its Ukrainian counterpart, has a restricted and non-productive usage with regard to the meaning CONVEY led to the hypothesis that Ukrainian *do-* has a wider application.

Although the limited amount of data and the restriction to literary sources does not enable me to draw conclusions with certainty, there are tendencies that support my hypothesis. The first sample with translations of Russian *do-* into Ukrainian gave one verb with a different prefix for ten cognate translations. In the second sample, which contained

translations of Ukrainian *do-* verbs into Russian, the relation was one to six. In other words, translations of Ukrainian *do-* verbs were more often realized with another prefix than translations of Russian *do-* verbs.

A further discovery was that Russian *do-* in some cases was translated with *zdo-* or *nazdo-* although the base verbs are also attested with just *do-* and have the same lexical meaning as the verbs with the “stacked” prefixes. This phenomenon deserves further investigation since it cannot be explained by prefix stacking as it is attested for Russian.

As stated in this paper’s introduction, the verbal prefix *do-* did not receive much attention in the past as it does not form natural perfectives in Russian. The same seems to be true for Ukrainian. Future studies might use larger samples and more authentic material to look for further possible meanings of this prefix in both languages and specifically for Russian verbs in which the prefix *do-* expresses CONVEY. This could lead to a better understanding of *do-* in both languages individually and would allow us to write more accurate contrastive grammars. The claim that the prefix *do-* has the same application in Russian and Ukrainian is only partially true.

6. References

- Basova, G. D., Kačura, A. V., Kixno, A. V., Musienko, V. P., Ozerova, N. G., Olejnik, G. P., Romanova, N. P., Snitko, E. S. & Tvoronovič, O. E. (2003). *Sopostavitel'naja grammatika ruskogo i ukrajinskogo jazykov*. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.
- Biskup, P. (preprint). “Deriving Morphological Aspect in Russian: A Matryoshka Way.” In Ch. Clasmeier and J. Golbek (Eds.), *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik. XXIX. JungslavistInnen-Treffen vom 09. bis 10. September 2021 an der Ruhr-Universität Bochum*. Berlin/Bern/Bruxelles/New York/Oxford/Warszawa/Wien: Peter Lang. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364997755_Deriving_Morphological_Aspect_in_Russian_A_Matryoshka_Way
- Comrie, B. & Corbett, G. G. (1993). *The Slavonic Languages*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Ivčenko, M. P. (1960). *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*. Kyjiv: Kyjivs'kyj Universytet.
- Janda, L. A. (1986). A semantic analysis of the Russian verbal prefixes: *Za-*, *pere-*, *do-*, and *ot-*. München: O. Sagner.
- Janda, L. A. (2007). Aspectual clusters of Russian verbs. *Studies in Language*, 31(3), 607-648. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.31.3.04jan>
- Janda, L. A., Endresen, A., Kuznetsova, J., Lyashevskaya, O., Makarova, A., Nessel, T. & Sokolova, S. (2013). *Why Russian aspectual prefixes aren't empty: Prefixes as verb classifiers*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Kopečný, F. (1973). *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků: Slova gramatická a zájmena. Svazek 1: Předložky, koncové partikule*. Praha: Československá akademie věd.
- Krongauz, M. A. (1998). *Pristavki i glagoly v ruskom jazyke: Semantičeskaja grammatika*. Moskva: Škola “Jazyki ruskoj kultury.”
- Nessel, T. (2020). What's in a Russian Aspectual Prefix? A Cognitive Linguistics Approach to Prefix Meanings. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 28(2), 141-162.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/jsl.2020.0008>

- Neset, T., Endresen, A., Janda, L. A. (2011). Two ways to get out: Radial Category Profiling and the Russian prefixes vy- and iz-. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 56(4), 377-402. <https://doi.org/10.1524/slwa.2011.0039>
- Ožegov, S. I. & Švedova, N. Ju. (1999). *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Azbukovnik. <https://lexicography.online/explanatory/ozhegov>
- Petruxina, E. V. (2000). *Aspektual'nye kategorii glagola v russkom jazyke v sopostavlenii s češkim, slovackim, pol'skim i bolgarskim jazykami*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- Rusanivs'kyj, V. M. (ed.) (2011-). *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy u 20 tomach*. Kyjiv: Naukova Dumka. <https://sum20ua.com>
- Tatevosov, S. G. (2009). "Množestvennaja prefiksacija i anatomija russkogo glagola." In K. L. Kiseleva et al. (Eds.), *Korpusnye issledovanija po russkoj grammatike* (pp. 92-156). Moskva: Probel.
- von Waldenfels, R. (2017). The expansion of the preposition do+genitive in North Slavic. *Russian Linguistics*, 41(1), 79-108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-016-9172-y>

*author: David Schledewitz
affiliation: Universität Greifswald
email: s-daschl@uni-greifswald.de*