

Aspect and temporal definiteness

Berit Gehrke

EGG summer school (week 1)
July 22–26, 2024

Russian aspect (towards the end: some Czech)

Roadmap

- Aspect morphology: Verbal prefixes and suffixes
- (Im)perfectivity diagnostics
- IPFV and PFV readings/uses (“particular meanings”)
- (A)telicity diagnostics → (Im)perfectivity ≠ (A)telicity
- Internal vs. external vs. intermediate prefixes
- Tatevosov’s (2011, 2015) arguments against prefixes and suffixes as (I)PFV markers
- Klein’s (1995) proposal for the semantics of Russian (I)PF
- After this: General issues with finding a semantics for Russian IPFVs (different slides)

Recall: Form and meaning

- Typical imperfective meanings:
 - In-process (e.g. English PROG, Russian IPFV)
 - Habituality (e.g. Russian IPFV, but not English PROG)
- Issues of “markedness” and competition:
 - English only has forms for IPFV meaning (PROG) → Should we treat non-PROG forms as PFV? (My take: No)
 - Russian IPFV can often appear in contexts where also the PFV can appear, but not vice versa → Is the (Russ.) IPFV “unmarked”, or is it sometimes even “fake”? (My take: No)
 - Russian “marks” PFV on atelic/variable VPs, IPFV on telic ones

In the following, we will first look only at the forms that are descriptively labelled (im)perfective. We will address the meaning side (and related syntactic issues) later.

Russian aspect morphology

(see Gehrke 2008b, and ref.s therein)

- **Simple verbs:** Most are IPFV, a few are PFV (1)

- (1)
- ipfv. *spat'* 'to sleep'
ipfv. *pisat'* 'to write'
 - pfv. *dat'* 'to give'

- **Prefixed verbs** are PFV, if there is no further suffix (2)

- (2)
- pfv. *po-spat'* 'to sleep'
 - pfv. *po-pisat'* 'to write (for a while)'
 - pfv. *na-pisat'* 'to write (up)' (lit. on-write)
 - pfv. *pod-pisat'* 'to sign' (lit. under-write)
 - pfv. *iz-dat'* 'to edit' (lit. out-give)

Russian aspect morphology

- A subset of the prefixed verbs and the few simple PFV verbs can undergo “secondary imperfectivisation” (descriptive label):
 - (3) a. pfv. *pod-pisat'* > ipfv. *pod-pis-yva-t'* ‘to sign’ (lit. under-write)
 - b. pfv. *iz-dat'* > ipfv. *iz-da-va-t'* ‘to edit’ (lit. out-give)
 - c. pfv. *dat'* > ipfv. *da-va-t'* ‘to give’
- Limited **stacking of prefixes** (more common in **South Slavic**):
 - (4) e.g. Russian:
ipfv. *vy-da-va-t'* > pfv. *po-vy-da-va-t'* ‘to hand out, distribute’
 - (5) e.g. **Czech**:
pfv. *od-stoupit* > pfv. *po-od-stoupit* ‘to step aside (a bit)’

Aspectual pairs

- Every Russian (Slavic) verb form is either IPFV or PFV
 - Identical lexical meaning can be expressed by IPFV and PFV verb forms
 - Common assumption: Many verb(form)s come in **aspectual pairs**
- Aspectual pairs **derived by prefixes from simple IPFVs**:

(6)

a.	ipfv. <i>pit'</i> > pfv. <i>vy-pit'</i>	'to drink'
b.	ipfv. <i>risovat'</i> > pfv. <i>na-risovat'</i>	'to draw'
c.	ipfv. <i>videt'</i> > pfv. <i>u-videt'</i>	'to see'
- Aspectual pairs **derived by suffixes from (mostly prefixed) PFVs**
 - **S(econdary) I(mperfective)s** [descriptive term]

(7)

a.	pfv. <i>pro-dat'</i> > ipfv. <i>pro-da-va-t'</i>	'to sell' (lit. through-give)
b.	pfv. <i>ot-kryt'</i> > ipfv. <i>ot-kry-va-t'</i>	'to discover, open' (lit. from-cover)
c.	pfv. <i>dat'</i> > ipfv. <i>da-va-t'</i>	'to give'
- (**Suppletive pairs** that – at least from a synchronic point of view – are not morphologically transparent; e.g. ipfv. *klast'* – pfv. *položit'* 'to put' ...)

Aspectual pairs

- **Tendency:** Correlation Vendler classes – markedness
 - **Accomplishment/achievement:**
prefixed PFV > prefixed-suffixed IPFV
 - **Variable telicity** (incremental verbs, degree achievements etc.):
simple IPFV > prefixed PFV (“empty” prefix)
 - **States, e.g. perception verbs:**
simple IPFV (“pure state”) > prefixed PFV (“inchoative state”)
 - ...
- Not all verbs form aspectual pairs:
 - Many states and activities are “**imperfectiva tantum**”
 - There are certain prefixes that derive “**perfectiva tantum**”

(see below)

Some diagnostics for (im)perfectivity

- PFV is incompatible with phase verbs (e.g. Filip 1999; Borik 2002, 2006)

- (8)
- a. Ona načala pisat' pis'mo.
 she began.PFV write.IPFV letter.ACC
 'She began writing a / the letter.'
- b. *Ona načala na-pisat' pis'mo.
 she began.PFV ON-write.PFV letter.ACC
- c. *Ona načala po-pisat' (pis'mo).
 she began.PFV PO-write.PFV letter.ACC
- d. *Ona načala dat' ženščine knigu.
 she began.PFV give.PFV woman.DAT book.ACC

Some diagnostics for (im)perfectivity

- Only IPFVs derive periphrastic future forms (e.g. Schoorlemmer 1995; Filip 1999)

- (9)
- Ona budet pisat' pis'mo.
she will write.IPFV letter.ACC
'She will write a / the letter.'
 - *Ona budet na-pisat' pis'mo.
she will ON-write.PFV letter.ACC
 - *Ona budet po-pisat' pis'mo.
she will PO-write.PFV letter.ACC
 - *Ona budet dat' ženščine knigu.
she will give.PFV woman.DAT book.ACC

- Further diagnostics:
 - Only IPFVs can form present participles (active and passive) (e.g. Schoorlemmer 1995; Borik 2002) (but there are exceptions; this is specific for Russian)
 - PFV present tense forms never refer to the ongoing present but get a future reference. (again: there are exceptions; in South Slavic: modal)

A side note on Tense in Russian

- Synthetic forms for **present** and **past** for IPFV and PFV
 - Past: (former) “perfect” *I*-participle, which agrees with the subject in gender and number; no auxiliary (unlike, e.g., *Czech*)
 - PFV present tense forms never refer to the ongoing present but usually get a future reference (e.g. *South Slavic*: also modal)
(additional aspectual past tenses in *Old Church Slavonic*, *Bulgarian*, *Macedonian*, some *Serbian* (in remnants): Aorist, Imperfect)
- Analytical forms for **future**: *budu* etc. + infinitive; only for IPFV (can be different in *other Slavic* languages)

e.g. **I.FEM READ books.ACC**:

- (10) a. IPFV/SI PRS: Ja {čitaju / pro-čit-yv-aju} knigi.
 b. PFV PRS: Ja {pro-/po-}čitaju knigi.
- (11) a. IPFV/SI PST: Ja {čitala / pro-čit-yv-ala} knigi.
 b. PFV PST: Ja {pro-/po-}čitala knigi.
- (12) a. IPFV/SI FUT: Ja budu {čitat' / pro-čit-yv-at'} knigi.
 b. *PFV FUT: *Ja budu {pro-/po-}čitat' knigi.

Particular meanings [readings] of the Russian IPFV

(after Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000, 21-26)

- “Actual process”: process or state that holds at the point of reference

(13) Kogda ja vo-šla, moj brat **na-kry-va-l** na
 when I IN-walked.PFV, my brother ON-cover-SI-PST.M.SG on
 stol.
 table.ACC
 ‘When I entered, my brother was setting the table.’

- “Habitual, repetitive”: any kind of repetition of an event(uality)

(14) Každyj den', pri-xodja s raboty, ja **ot-kry-va-ju**
 every day, TO-walking.SI off work.GEN, I FROM-cover-SI-PRS.1SG
 okno.
 window
 ‘Every day when I return from work, I open the window.’

→ “Canonical IPFV meanings”

Particular meanings [readings] of the Russian IPFV

(from Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000, 21–26)

- “General-factual” [term: Maslov (1959)]: focus is on the fact that some event took place (but not whether it is in its process, completed or the like) (“non-canonical meaning”)

(15) Zimnij Dvorec **stroil** Rastrelli.
 winter-.ACC palace.ACC built.IPFV Rastrelli
 ‘The Winter Palace was built by Rastrelli.’

Two subtypes (terms of Grønn 2004) (cp. Padučeva 1996):

- **Presuppositional**: The event is already given in the context; e.g. (15)
- **Existential**: There was at least one such event; e.g. (16)

(16) Ne bylo somnenij, čto ja prežde **vstrečal** ee.
 not was.NEU doubts.GEN that I before met.SI her
 ‘There was no doubt that I had met her before.’

Particular meanings [readings] of the Russian PFV

(after Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000, 19ff.)

- “Concrete fact”: single event that took place in the past or is expected to take place in the future

(17) Daria **u-exala** za granicu i **po-stupila** v
 Daria AWAY-drove.PFV behind border.ACC and ON-stepped.PFV in
 universitet.
 university.ACC
 ‘Daria went abroad and entered university.’

→ “Canonical PFV meaning”

Particular meanings [readings] of the Russian PFV

(after Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000, 19ff.)

- “Vivid-exemplifying”: habitual event presented as single exemplifying event (habituality has to be marked contextually)

(18) U nee takaja privyčka – kak **vernetsja** s raboty,
 at her such.NOM habit.NOM how returns.PFV off work.GEN
 srazu **ot-kroet** okno.
 immediately FROM-covers.PFV window.ACC
 ‘She has this habit – as soon as she returns from work, she immediately opens the window.’

- “Potential”: specifying intellectual or physical ability

(19) Ona **rešit** ljubuju zadaču.
 she solves.PFV random.ACC task.ACC
 ‘She can solve any task.’

→ More marked uses of PFV (“non-canonical meanings”)

(note also: PFV PRS forms without “future” meaning)

Telicity tests: PFV ≠ telic

- PFVs that behave like telics:

- (20)
- Ona ot-kryla okno *(za) dve minuty.
she FROM-covered.PFV window.ACC in two minutes
'She opened a/the window in / *for two minutes.'
 - On u-bil svoju ženu *(za) dve minuty.
he AWAY-hit.PFV his.ACC wife.ACC in two minutes
'He killed his wife in / *for two minutes.'
 - Ona dala ženšćine knigu *(za) dve minuty.
she gave.PFV woman.DAT book.ACC in two minutes
'She gave a/the woman a/the book in / *for two minutes.'

- PFVs that behave like atelics:

- (21)
- Ona pro-spala (*za) dva dnja.
she PRO-slept.PFV in two days
 - Ona po-pisala knigu (*za) dva dnja.
she PO-wrote.PFV book/ACC in two days

The in/for-adverbial test in Russian (Slavic)

- Recall the **potential problem** we face with this telicity test: The adverbials are (additionally) sensitive to (I)PFV.
 - Filip (2000, 2003): In “Slavic”, this is a test for (I)PFV.
 - Łazorczyk (2010); Milosavljević (2023) (syntactic approaches): (I)PFV in “Slavic” is an inner-aspectual distinction.
- Given (21) (repeated in (22)), however, neither can be true, at least not for Russian. (note, though, that Czech, Polish, BCMS behave the same in this respect)

- (22)
- a. On pro-spal (*za) dva dnja.
 he PRO-slept.PFV in two days
- b. On po-pisal knigu (*za) dva dnja.
 he PO-wrote.PFV book/ACC in two days

(These verb forms pass the tests for PFV outlined before.)

Another telicity test for Russian

- **Progressive test** in Borik (2002, 2006)
(adaptation of the imperfective paradox test)

(23) Kogda po-zvonila mama, Petja **iskal** knigu.
when called.PFV mom, Peter looked-for.IPFV book.ACC

→ Petja uže **iskal** (ètu) knigu.
Peter already looked-for.IPFV this.ACC book.ACC

(24) Kogda po-zvonila mama, Petja **čital** knigu.
when called.PFV mom, Peter read.IPFV book.ACC

⇒ Petja uže **pro-čital** (ètu) knigu.
Peter already THROUGH-read.PFV this.ACC book.ACC

(A)telicity ≠ (im)perfectivity

(see Borik 2002, 2006; Gehrke 2008b)

- There are PFVs that behave like atelic predicates:

(25) Ona po-pisala (stat'ju) {dva časa / *za dva časa}.
 she PO-wrote.PFV article.ACC two hours / in two hours
 (Intended:) 'She wrote (was writing) (an/the article) {for
 two hours / in two hours}.'

- There are IPFVs that (can) behave like telic predicates:

(26) Ona pere-pis-yva-la celuju stat'ju za dva časa.
 she re-wrote.SI whole.ACC article.ACC in two hours
 'She re-wrote a/the whole article (i.e. by changing it) in two
 hours.' (e.g. habitually)

Prefixes

(see Gehrke 2008b, for further discussion and references)

- Do not “mark” PFV:

- Not all PFVs have prefixes (e.g. *dat* ‘give’).
- SlIs are IPFV and (usually) contain a prefix.
- Stacking prefixes (see also Filip 2000)
- Some IPFVs also seem to have prefixes, e.g. (27).

- (27)
- nad-zirat* ‘to super-vice’ (lit. ‘above-watch’; cp. German *über-wachen*)
 - protivo-stojat* ‘to re-sist’ (lit. ‘against-stand’; cp. German *wider-stehen*)
 - vy-gljadet* ‘to look like’ (lit. ‘out-see’; cp. German *aus-sehen*)
 - so-čuvstvovat* ‘to sym-pathise’ (lit. ‘with-feel’; cp. German *mit-fühlen*)

- Do not “mark” telicity: There are VPs with prefixed (and even PFV) verbs that behave like atelic predicates (see previous slides).

Internal and external prefixes

- Di Sciullo and Slabakova (2005) on Bulgarian:
 - External prefixes must precede internal ones, the reverse order is ungrammatical.
 - Internal prefixes can affect the argument structure, external prefixes never do.
 - External prefixes do not alter the aspectual class of the verb they attach to; internal prefixes do, since they signal telicity.
 - Only internal prefixes impose a specific reading on internal argument DPs.
 - Only external prefixes can be iterated and co-occur.
- Aka *lexical vs. superlexical prefixes* (Babko-Malaya 1999, on Russian) (see also Romanova 2004, 2007; Ramchand 2004; Svenonius 2004)
- Application to various Slavic languages, e.g. papers in *Nordlyd* 32.2 (2004); Arsenijević (2006); Jabłńska (2007); Žaucer (2009); Biskup (2017) ...

Internal and external prefixes in Russian

(Gehrke 2003, 2005, 2008a, b)

	internal prefixes	external prefixes
Argument structure effects	✓	*
SIs	✓	(*)
Event nominals and participles	✓	*
Infinitival subjects	✓	*
Stacking	*	✓

Internal prefixes

- Bring in their own semantics, often idiosyncratic → derive new lexical items which can derive further SIs (with the same lexical meaning)
- Form a constituting part of the event structure
→ **telicity/result state markers?**

- (28)
- u-bit'* 'kill' (lit.: away-hit) > SI *u-bi-va-t'*
 - u-mere-t'* 'die' > SI *u-mira-t'*
 - pri-exat'* 'arrive (driving)' (lit.: to-drive) > SI *pri-ezžat'*
 - na-jti* 'find' (lit.: on-go) > SI *na-xodit'*

Internal prefixes

- More debatable: “empty prefixes” (29)
 - Traditional view: Derive PFV aspectual partner, just double some meaning that is already part of the IPFV verb meaning [mostly with incremental theme verbs]

- (29)
- s'est* ‘OFF-eat’
 - na-pisat*, *na-risovat* etc. ‘ON-write’, ‘ON-paint’
 - vy-pit* ‘OUT-drink’
 - pro-čitat* ‘THROUGH-read’

- Less clear that they bring in their own semantics or affect the argument structure
- Still: Such VPs are telic, optional internal arguments become obligatory

External prefixes in Russian

(Literature on Russian: **Aktionsart prefixes**)

- Are outside the VP, not part of the event structure
- No nominalisations, past participles, infinitival subjects with externally prefixed verbs
- One group: **Temporal delimiters**

mark temporal bounds on otherwise unbounded events (either on atelic events, (30), or on pluralities of telic events) → **PFV markers?**

- (30)
- INGRESSIVE *za-*: *Ona vstala i zapela pesnju*. 'She got up and sang (started singing) a song.'
 - DELIMITATIVE *po-*: *Ona poela tort*. 'She ate cake (for a while).'
 - PERDURATIVE *pro-*: *Oni prosideli tam celyj den*'. 'They sat there all day.'
- (31) (SEMELFACTIVE perfectivising suffix *-nu-*: *prygat'-prygnut'* 'jump' etc.)

External prefixes in Russian

- Another group: “**quantificational prefixes**”; or (at least for Russian): mark bounded event pluralities (with plural internal arguments)

(32) a. CUMULATIVE *na-* (see later slides)

b. DISTRIBUTIVE *po-*, e.g. (33) (from Mehlig 1996)

(33) Igor' nemnogo **po-vy-da-va-l** knigi i
 Igor' a bit PO-OUT-give-SI-PST.PFV books.ACC and
 zakryl biblioteku.
 closed.PFV library.ACC

'Igor' handed out books for a while and (then) closed the library.'

(on Russian prefixes more generally see Isačenko 1962)

External prefixes in Czech: No temporal delimiters?

(Gehrke 2003, 2005, 2008a, b)

- Unlike Russian *po-*, Czech *po-* ~ ‘a bit’ is not restricted to temporal interpretations, e.g. (34) (from Kundera, *Žert*; discussed in Gehrke 2002)

(34) Pak holička **po-od-stoupila** [...]
 then hairdresser.FEM.NOM PO-AWAY-stepped.PFV
 ‘Then the hairdresser stepped (a bit) away ...’

- No ingressive *za-* in Czech (35) (from Ivančev 1961, my glosses & translations)

(35) a. ... zvolna si **sedl** vedle mne a Josefa, **položil**
 slowly REFL down.sat.PFV next.to me and Josef put.PFV
 hlavu do dlaně a **díval** na mne.
 head.ACC to palm and looked.IPFV on me
 ‘He slowly sat down next to me and Josef, put his head in his palm and
 looked at me.’ CZ

b. ... on тихо **sel** vozle menja i lozefa, **sklonil** golovu
 he quietly down.sat.PFV near me and losef tilted.PFV head.ACC
 na ruki i **stal smotret’** na menja.
 on hands and began.PFV watch.IPFV.INF on me
 ‘He quietly sat down near me and losef, put his head on his hands and
 started watching me.’

RU

External prefixes in Czech: Součková (2004)

- [Second group:] truly **quantificational** (possibly unlike Russian) (36)

- (36) a. Petr na-pekl koláče.
Petr NA-baked cakes
'Petr baked a lot of cakes.'
- b. Ester svou výpověď po-z-měnila.
Ester her testimony PO-changed
'Ester changed her testimony a little.'

Součková (2004):

- These prefixes are internal, because they denote extensive measure functions on events (cp. Filip 2003) → telic events (cp. Žaucer 2009, for internal analysis of the Slovenian counterparts)
- po-* in (36-b) is distinct from the (external) delimitative *po-* 'for a while', e.g. (37), which merely provides a temporal bound.

- (37) Jakub o tom po-přemýšlel.
Jakub about it PO-thought
'Jakub thought about it for a little while.'

Proposal in Gehrke (2008b)

- **Internal prefixes** (Russian and Czech):
 - Are of category P, head a PredP in complement to the VP, form a complex predicate with the verb they attach to
 - Mark the upper bounds of incremental chains of BECOME events (in the sense of Rothstein 2004)
 - Are necessarily part of telic VPs (ACCs and ACHs)
- **External prefixes:**
 - Czech: ~ adverbial VP modifiers (VP adjuncts)
 - Russian (at least some external prefixes): base-generated in Spec, AspP; signal PFV? (cp. Ramchand 2004)

Intermediate prefixes (Tatevosov 2008)

- (38) a. COMPLETIVE *do-*, e.g. pfv. *do-pisat'* 'complete writing'
 b. REPETITIVE *pere-*, e.g. pfv. *pere-pisat'* 'rewrite'

- Unlike internal/lexical prefixes:

- fully compositional
- never affect the argument structure
- have to appear outside internal/lexical prefixes (39)

- (39) to pfv. *za-pisat'* 'record'
- a. *pere-za-pisat'*, **za-pere-pisat'*
 b. *do-za-pisat'*, **za-do-pisat'*

Intermediate prefixes (Tatevosov 2008)

- Unlike external/superlexical prefixes:

- can attach to PFVs (39) (as well as IPFVs)
- have to appear closer to the stem (40)

- (40) a. pfv. *na-pere-pis-yva-t'* 'accumulate the quantity of sth. as an outcome of rewriting' (**pere-na-pis-yv-at'*)
- b. pfv. *po-do-pis-yva-t'* 'spend some time completing writing something' (**do-po-pis-yv-at'*)

- can be part of nominalisations (41-a) (vs. external (41-ba))

- (41) a. *do-za-biva-ni-e gvozdej* 'completing hammering nails'
- b. **na-za-biva-ni-e gvozdej* (intended: 'hammering a lot of nails')

- can undergo secondary imperfectivisation, e.g. ipfv. *do/pere-pis-yva-t'*

Tatevosov (2015): Main claims

- Russian aspect is not lexical.
As in English and lots of other languages, semantic aspects appear in the functional domain of a clause.
- Russian “aspectual morphology” is never interpreted as rendering semantic aspects in the position where it is merged.
(This does not mean that it is not interpreted at all; all it means that its semantic contribution, if any, is to be found elsewhere.)
- Aspectual operators are phonologically silent.

Tatevosov (2011)

Testing different possible theories for PFV and [internal] prefixes:

(42) Aspect-low theory

- a. $[CP \dots [Fi+1P \dots [FiP \dots [Fi-1P \dots [VP \dots [V \text{PFV} \text{pro} \check{c}i\text{-}]]]]]]]$
 b. $[CP \dots [Fi+1P \dots [FiP \dots [Fi-1P \dots [XP \dots \text{PFV} \text{pro-} \dots [V \check{c}i\text{-}]]]]]]]$

(according to Tatevosov: Filip 2000; Ramchand 2004; Svenonius 2004)

(43) Aspect-high theory

- a. $[CP \dots [Fi+1P \dots [FiP \dots \text{PFV} [Fi-1P \dots [VP \dots [V \text{pro} \check{c}i\text{-}]]]]]]]$
 b. $[CP \dots [Fi+1P \dots [FiP \dots \text{PFV} [Fi-1P \dots [XP \dots \text{pro-} \dots [V \check{c}i\text{-}]]]]]]]$

(according to Tatevosov: Verkuyl 1999; Paslawska and von Stechow 2003; Grønn and von Stechow 2010) [analysed as a concord phenomenon in, e.g., Arsenijević (2010)]

- **a.-options:** internal prefixation in the lexicon
- **b.-options:** internal prefixation in the syntax

Tatevosov (2011)

Arguments for an Aspect-high theory:

- Argument supporting deverbal nominals:
 - Do not contain AspP (project up to vP) but contain [internal] prefixes, e.g. *pro-čtenie* from *pročítat'* 'read.PFV'
 - Do not show perfectivity effects
- **Schoorlemmer (1995, 1998)**: retain “aspectuality” & eventivity of the underlying verb, but do not have Aspect
 - e.g. those derived from PFVs do not behave like PFV verbs (44)
 - No aspectual pairs in nominals (see also Dickey 2000; Pazelskaya 2012)

(44) Nominalisation of pfv. *is-polnit'* 'to perform':

Načalos' ispolnenie arii Šaljapiny
 began.PFV performance aria.GEN Šaljapin.INSTR

'The performance of the aria by Šaljapin began.'

(from Schoorlemmer 1998, 209)

Deverbal nominals (Dickey 2000)

- **Russian** (also: Bulgarian)
 - Nominalisation from one or the other aspectual partner
 - No predictable aspectual meaning (also: Ukrainian)
- **Czech** (also: Polish, Slovak)
 - True aspectual pairs
 - Aspects contribute essentially the same meanings as with finite verb forms (e.g. IPFV ongoing vs. PFV completed event)

(45) e.g. 'realise, execute' > 'realisation, execution'

a. pfv. osuščestvit' / ipfv. osuščestvljat'
 > osuščestvlenie/*osuščestvljanie (Russian)

b. pfv. provést / ipfv. provádět
 > pfv. provedení / ipfv. provádění (Czech)

(examples after Dickey 2000, ch. 9)

Extension to external prefixes

(handout Tatevosov 2013, cited in Tatevosov 2015)

(46) [... [... **PFV** ... [... external prefix ... [... internal prefix ...]]]]

allegedly also based on nominalisations

BUT examples from Pazelskaya (2012):

- (47)
- a. DELIMITATIVE *po-sidet'* 'to sit for a while' > **posidenie*
 - b. CUMULATIVE pfv. [na-[[otkry]-va]]-t' banok ('to open plenty of cans') > **naotkryvanie banok*
 - c. CUMULATIVE ipfv. [[na-[dar]]-iva]-t' podarkov ('to regularly give plenty of gifts') > *nadarivanie podarkov*

→ maybe at most intermediate prefixes inside nominals?

Tatevosov (2015)

If prefixes are low, what about the **SI-suffix**? Again, two options:

(48) **-yva-** as an **IPFV** operator:

[*FP* ... **IPFV** *yva* ... [*VP* ... [... *pro-čita* ... [...]]]]

(49) **-yva-** is lower, not an **IPFV** operator:

[*FP* ... **IPFV** ... [... *yva* ... [... *pro-čita* ... [...]]]]

- Under (49) and the previous assumptions, both prefixes and suffixes would be merged low, which does not mean that they are interpreted there; it only means that they are NOT interpreted as (I)PFV.

e.g. **Tatevosov (to appear)**: Event structure role (“Neo-Kleinian”; see below)

Tatevosov (2015)

- Arguments for *-yva-* not being an IPFV operator:
 - Some [external] prefixes can apply to SIs, e.g. (50).
 - Such verb forms are PFV.
- There has to be a PFV above this.

(50) “Selectionally restricted” external prefixes on *otkryvat*^{ipfv} ‘open’:

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------|
| a. | pere- [[ot-kry] ^{pfv} -va] ^{ipfv} -t' | DISTRIBUTIVE |
| b. | za- [[ot-kry] ^{pfv} -va] ^{ipfv} -t' | INGRESSIVE |
| c. | na- [[ot-kry] ^{pfv} -va] ^{ipfv} -t' | CUMULATIVE |
| d. | po- [[ot-kry] ^{pfv} -va] ^{ipfv} -t' | DISTRIBUTIVE |
| e. | po- [[ot-kry] ^{pfv} -va] ^{ipfv} -t' | DELIMITATIVE |

- Arguments for *-yva-* being inside vP
 - e.g. subject-object asymmetries with *pere_{dist}* → *v* is above *-yva-*
- Arguments for IPFV outside vP

Tatevosov (2015)

- Semantic assumptions:
 - IPFV ~ Landman's theory of PROG
 - PFV: not really addressed in this paper
- If suffixes/prefixes are not (I)PFV exponents, why:
 - PFV prefixed stem: OK
IPFV prefixed stem: *
 - PFV *yva*-stem: *
IPFV *yva*-stem: OK

Proposal (inspired by Klein):

- PFV: relation between events and states (of type $\langle v, \langle v, t \rangle \rangle$)
- IPFV: property of events (of type $\langle v, t \rangle$)

- (51)
- yva* combines with a relation between events and states (of type $\langle v, \langle v, t \rangle \rangle$), existentially binds the state variable and yields a property of events.
 - $[[yva]] = \lambda R. \lambda e. \exists s [R(e)(s)]$

Klein (1995) about Russian Aspect

- (Tense relates utterance time TU and assertion time T-AST)
- Distinction between **1-state verbs** (\sim STA, ACT) and **2-state verbs** (\sim ACC, ACH) [though not quite, because he also includes externally-prefixed verbs]
- 2-state verbs are associated with two time intervals, that of the **source state (T-SS)** and that of the **target state (T-TS)**
- **Distinguished state (DS)** for Russian:
 - The state of 1-state verbs
 - With 2-state verbs: the T-SS of SIs or else can be any

- (52)
- a. PFV: T-AST OVL T-SS & T-AST OVL T-TS
 - b. IPFV: T-AST OVL T-DS & T-AST NOT OVL T-TS

cp. Klein (1995) about English

DS for English: T-SS

- Perfect: T-AST AFTER T-DS
- Progressive: T-AST IN T-DS
- Simple: T-AST OVL T-DS AND T-AST OVL POSTTIME OF T-DS

References I

- Arsenijević, B.: 2006, *Inner Aspect and Telicity: The Decompositional Nature of Eventualities at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, LOT Dissertation Series 142, LOT, Utrecht.
- Arsenijević, B.: 2010, Verb prefixation of the slavic type in terms of concord and relativization. Ms. Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Babko-Malaya, O.: 1999, *Zero Morphology: A Study of Aspect, Argument Structure and Case*, PhD thesis, Rutgers University.
- Biskup, P.: 2017, Prepositions and Verbal Prefixes: The Case of Slavic. Habilitationsschrift, Leipzig University.
- Borik, O.: 2002, *Aspect and Reference Time*, LOT Dissertation Series 64, LOT, Utrecht.
- Borik, O.: 2006, *Aspect and Reference Time*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Di Sciullo, A.-M. and Slabakova, R.: 2005, Quantification and aspect, in A. van Hout, H. de Swart and H. Verkuyl (eds), *Perspectives on Aspect*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 61–80.
- Dickey, S. M.: 2000, *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach*, CSLI Press, Stanford.
- Filip, H.: 1999, *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Nominal Reference*, Garland Publishing, New York.
- Filip, H.: 2000, The quantization puzzle, in C. Tenny and J. Pustejovsky (eds), *Events as Grammatical Objects: The Converging Perspectives of Lexical Semantics and Syntax*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA, pp. 39–95.
- Filip, H.: 2003, Prefixes and the delimitation of events, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* **11.1**, 55–101.

References II

- Gehrke, B.: 2002, Systemhafte Unterschiede im Aspektgebrauch zwischen dem Russischen und dem Tschechischen. MA thesis, Humboldt University Berlin.
- Gehrke, B.: 2003, Aspectual affixes in Russian and Czech. Ms. Utrecht University.
- Gehrke, B.: 2005, The prepositional aspect of Slavic prefixes and the goal-source asymmetry, *Proceedings of the ESSLLI Workshop on Formal Semantics and Cross-Linguistic Data*, pp. 47–56.
- Gehrke, B.: 2008a, Goals and sources are aspectually equal: Evidence from Czech and Russian prefixes, *Lingua* **118**(11), 1664–1689.
- Gehrke, B.: 2008b, *Ps in Motion: On the Semantics and Syntax of P Elements and Motion Events*, LOT Dissertation Series 184, LOT, Utrecht.
- Grøn, A.: 2004, *The Semantics and Pragmatics of the Russian Factual Imperfective*, PhD thesis, Oslo.
- Grøn, A. and von Stechow, A.: 2010, Complement tense in contrast: The SOT parameter in Russian and English, in A. Grøn and I. Marijanovic (eds), *Russian Contrast*, Oslo Studies in Language 2-1, pp. 1–45.
- Isačenko, A.: 1962, *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart: Formenlehre*, Niemeyer, Halle (Saale).
- Ivančev, S.: 1961, *Kontekstovo obuslovena ingresivna upotreba na glagolite ot nesvāršen vid v češkija ezik*, Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet: Filologičeski fakultet, Nauka i izkustvo.
- Jablónska, P.: 2007, *Radical Decomposition and Argument Structure*, PhD thesis, Tromsø University.

References III

- Klein, W.: 1995, A time-relational analysis of Russian aspect, *Language* **71**, 669–695.
- Maslov, J.: 1959, Glagol'nyj vid v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke, in S. Bernštejn (ed.), *Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Nauka, Moscow, pp. 157–312.
- Mehlig, H.: 1996, Some analogies between the morphology of nouns and the morphology of aspect in Russian, *Folia Linguistica* **30.1-2**, 87–109.
- Milosavljević, S.: 2023, *Specification of event duration and aspectual composition in Slavic*, PhD thesis, University of Graz, Graz.
- Padučeva, E.: 1996, *Semantičeskie Issledovanija*, Škola 'Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury', Moscow.
- Paslawska, A. and von Stechow, A.: 2003, Perfect readings in Russian, in A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert and A. von Stechow (eds), *Perfect Explorations*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 307–362.
- Pazelskaya, A.: 2012, Verbal prefixes and suffixes in nominalizations: Grammatical restrictions and corpus data, *Oslo Studies in Language* **4(1)**, 245–261.
- Ramchand, G.: 2004, Time and the event: The semantics of Russian prefixes, *Nordlyd* **32.2**, 323–361.
- Romanova, E.: 2004, Lexical vs. superlexical prefixes, *Nordlyd* **32.2**, 255–278.
- Romanova, E.: 2007, *Constructing Perfectivity in Russian*, PhD thesis, University of Tromsø.
- Rothstein, S.: 2004, *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

References IV

- Schoorlemmer, M.: 1995, *Participial passive and Aspect in Russian*, OTS, Utrecht.
- Schoorlemmer, M.: 1998, Complex event nominals in Russian: Properties and readings, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* **6.2**, 202–254.
- Součková, K.: 2004, Measure Prefixes in Czech: Cumulative *na-* and Delimitative *po-*. Master's thesis, University of Tromsø.
- Svenonius, P.: 2004, Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP, *Nordlyd* **32.2**, 205–253.
- Tatevosov, S.: 2008, Nominalizacija i problema neprjamoĝo dostupa, *Dinamičeskie modeli. Slovo. Predloženie. Tekst. Sbornik statej v čest' E.V. Padučevoj*, pp. 750–773.
- Tatevosov, S.: 2011, Severing perfectivity from the verb, *Scando-Slavica* **57(2)**, 216–244.
- Tatevosov, S.: 2015, Severing imperfectivity from the verb, in G. Zybatow, P. Biskup, M. Guhl, C. Hurtig, O. Mueller-Reichau and M. Yastrebova (eds), *Slavic grammar from a formal perspective: The 10th anniversary FDSL conference, Leipzig 2013*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M., pp. 465–494.
- Tatevosov, S.: to appear, Event structure and derivational morphology, in B. Gehrke and R. Šímič (eds), *Topics in the semantics of Slavic languages*, Open Slavic Linguistics, Language Science Press, Berlin.
- Verkuyl, H.: 1999, *Aspectual Issues: Structuring Time and Quantity*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Zaliznjak, A. and Šmelev, A.: 2000, *Vvedenie v Russkujū Aspektologijū*, Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, Moscow.

References V

- Žaucer, R.: 2009, *A VP-internal/resultative analysis of 4 'VP-external' uses of Slavic verbal prefixes*, PhD thesis, University of Ottawa.
- Łazorczyk, A.: 2010, *Decomposing Slavic aspect: The role of aspectual morphology in Polish and other Slavic languages*, PhD thesis, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.