In contemporary aspectology the distinction between “phase” and “quantitive” aspect is generally accepted (cf., for example, Plungian 1997). As regards quantitive aspectual meanings, the distinction between “iterative” (in the broad sense, i.e. including “multiplicative” type) and “distributive” types of predicate (or “verbal”) plurality (cf. Dressler 1968: 62-74; Khrakovskij 1989: 22-50; Dolinina 1996: 232-245) is also generally accepted. In the first case a situation with the same set of participants is repeated several times (as in Russian: *U etoj ženś’iny izbivali syna* ‘This woman’s son was beaten’). In the second case a different participant (or participants) takes part in the situation each time (as in Russian: *U mnogix ženś’in po-izbivali synovej ‘Many women’s sons were beaten’, where the prefix po- is the marker of distributivity). In other words, “iterative” meanings in the domain of predicate plurality do not presuppose any change in the predicate-argument structure of the sentence (the predicate maintains the initial set of arguments and their marking in the syntactic structure), whereas “distributive” meanings do entail changes in the predicate-argument structure (the predicate changes its set of arguments, and this change is often attended with changes in the syntactic structure, cf. Russian: *Mal’čik dal d’evočke jabloko* ‘The boy gave the girl an apple’, and *Mal’čik dal d’evočam po jabloku* ‘The boy gave each girl an apple’, where the preposition phrase *po jabloku* ‘(lit.) at an apple’ is used instead of the direct object noun phrase *jabloko* ‘apple’).

The opposition between “iterative” and “distributive” types might be expected to mean that, if a language has a special marker for predicate plurality, then this can be either a special marker of “iterative” plurality, or a special marker of “distributive” plurality, or there are two different special markers for the two types.

However, in Tundra Nenets (Malozelemlsky dialect) both types of predicate plurality are combined in the same marker, the so-called Frequentative -or- (in the terms of [Salminen 1997]).

When the Frequentative marker is added to an intransitive verbal stem, the “iterative” type of predicate plurality is always the result:

(1) a. wan’a xarda-xonanda xaji.
    Van’a house-1SG.LOC.SG stay.3SGs
    ‘Van’a stayed home.’

b. wan’a xusuwej jal’a xarda-xonanda xaj-ur-ŋ.
    Van’a every day house-1SG.LOC.SG stay-FREQ-3SGs
    ‘Van’a stays home every day.’

When the Frequentative marker is added to transitive verbal stems the result can be either “iterative” (as in (2)) or “distributive” (as in (3)):

(2)a. wan’a p’et’am? p’is’ila-pta.
    Van’a P’et’a-ACC.SG laugh-TRANS.3SGs
    ‘Van’a made P’et’a laugh.’

1 The Tundra Nenets material was collected during field research with the Nenets Linguistic Research of the Philological faculty, MSU, 2003, with support of RFH, grant №03-04-18005e.

b. wan’a p’et’am? xusuwej jal’a p’is’ila-pt-or-ŋa.
Van’a P’et’a-ACC.SG every day laugh-TRANS-FREQ-3SGs
‘Van’a makes P’et’a laugh every day.’

(3)a. wan’a tinz’a-m paŋgal-ŋa.
Van’a fishing.net-ACC.SG net-3SGs
‘Van’a netted a fishing net.’

b. wan’a xusuwej jal’a tinz’a-ʔmna paŋgal-or-ŋa.
Van’a every day fishing.net-PROS.PL net-FREQ-3SGs
‘Van’a nets a fishing net every day.’

c. wan’a tinz’a-m paŋgal-ŋa.
Van’a fishing.net-ACC.SG net-3SGs

In (2b) the second argument of the predicate is the same when the situation repeats; there are no semantic or syntactic changes in forming the Frequentative. In (3b) the second argument of the predicate is a different object when the situation repeats; this argument syntactically is not an Accusative (as in (3a)), but Prosecutive ([Tereschenko 1956] provides some information on this frame). Particularly crucial is the fact that the Frequentative of this group can never take an Accusative argument (3c).

The paper will examine some constraints on forming Frequentatives having properties like those of (2b) and of (3b).
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