

Two types of secondary imperfectives: Evidence from Polish and Bulgarian

Dorota Klimek-Jankowska (University of Wrocław)

Vesela Simeanova (University of Graz)

Motivation and goal: Secondary imperfective (SI) morphology differs in its productivity in Polish (PL) and Bulgarian (BG): in PL, the SI morphology combines with some **but not all** prefixes. By contrast, almost every BG perfective verb has a SI variant (see Nicolova 2017, Rivero and Slavkov 2014). To our knowledge, there is no research which has attempted to get a closer understanding of the source of this discrepancy. To fill in this niche, we conducted a comparative study testing the interaction of SI morphology with different classes of aspectual prefixes in PL and BG and the meaning effects these different combinations of aspectual prefixes with SI morphemes give rise to. We present novel observations on SI in BG and PL supported with corpus and judgment data, showing a finer-grained grammaticalized expression of SI than previously noticed. We explain the differences in the meaning and distribution of SI in PL and BG by proposing that there are two distinct layers at which SI morphemes are generated in BG and only one such layer in PL.

Background on PL and BG: In both PL and BG, aspectual distinctions are encoded on almost all verbs, and perfective is often expressed with prefixes, e.g. *писа́* – *написа́*^P [PL] / *писа́* – *написа́*^P [BG] ‘to write’. Imperfective verbs can be bare e.g., *писа́* [PL] / *писа́* [BG] or derived [most often] by means of an *-yw-* suffix on the perfective base, e.g. *подписа́*^P – *подписыва́*^I [PL] / *подписа́*^P – *подписва́*^I [BG] ‘to sign’. These derived imperfectives are called secondary imperfective (cf. Willim 2006, Nicolova 2017 a.o.). Note that the final result is imperfective, undoing the perfectivizing contribution of the prefix. SI morphology differs in its productivity in PL and Bulgarian. As stated earlier, BG SI morphology is considerably more productive as compared to Polish (see Nicolova 2017, Rivero and Slavkov 2014). In order to understand the difference in the productivity of SI morphology in BG and PL, we tested its interaction with different classes of aspectual prefixes in these languages. Slavic prefixes are generally divided into lexical and super-lexical (Svenonius 2004a,b, Babko-Malaya 1999, Romanova 2004, Ramchand 2008a, b). The former are highly idiosyncratic (change the lexical semantics of the verb) and the latter have predictable meanings. Some linguists distinguish a separate class of purely perfectivizing prefixes which play a purely aspectual role (impose a final temporal boundary on the event) (Svenonius 2004a, 2004b; Willim 2006 a.o. (but see also Isačenko 1960; Filip 1999; Janda & Nessel 2010; Janda & Lyashevskaya 2012 for the opposite view). Additionally, in her study of the hierarchy of the Bulgarian verbal prefixes Markova (2011) makes a distinction between outer, inner and lexical prefixes. According to Markova (2011), BG SI morphology is projected above the outer prefixes: [SI [outer prefixes [inner prefixes [lexical prefixes]]]], which predicts SI verbs with all these different classes of prefixes should uniformly generate episodic ongoing and habitual readings. This is also explicitly stated in Rivero and Slavkov (2014) who suggest that *all* constructions with SI morphology in Bulgarian should display both habitual and ongoing readings. We decided to put this claim under closer scrutiny and test whether Bulgarian SI morphology gives rise to the same range of readings when combined with lexical prefixes, outer and inner superlexical and purely perfectivizing prefixes. Our crucial observation is that BG lexical and inner prefixes are ambiguous between an episodic ongoing and habitual reading (see (1) and (2) vs. (3)) and outer prefixes and empty prefixes allow for a habitual reading only (see (4) and (5) vs. (6)), contrary to what was claimed in earlier literature. Curiously, these BG SI verbs which can be used in habitual contexts only are the ones which do not have SI equivalents in Polish. Based on this

observation, we propose that SI morphology in BG is represented at two different syntactic layers SI2 >> OUTER >> SI1 >> INNER >> LEXICAL.

- (1) {Kogato vlyazoh/ vinagi kogato vlizah} v ofisa na Ivan, toy
when entered.AOR /always when entered.IMP in office of Ivan he
POD-pisvashe dokumenti.
he signed.SI.3sg documents **LEXICAL PREFIXES**
'When/whenever I entered John's office, he was signing/signed documents.'
- (2) (Kogato vljazoh v stajata) toj si **do-livashe** rakija.
when entered.AOR.1sg in room.def he refl.dat **DO-pour.SI.3sg** rakija
'When I entered the room, he was topping up his glass with rakija.' **INNER**
- (3) Toj vse mi **do-livashe** rakija.
he always me.dat **DO-pour.SI** rakija
~'He always topped up my glass with more rakija.' **INNER**
- (4) (Vinagi/*vchera) sled obyad tja si **PO-drem-va-she**.
always/yesterday after lunch she refl.gen a.little-take.a.nap-**SI-IMP**
'After lunch she (always) used to take a nap.' (habitual ONLY: *yesterday) **OUTER**
- (5) Tova vreme lisus **izyade/*izyazdashe** edno magare [...] a David
this time Jesus ate.AOR/***SI** one donkey and David
yadeshe/*izyazdashe kantarida
ate.IPF/***SI** Spanish.fly **PURELY**
- PERFECTIVIZING**
'At that time Jesus was eating a donkey [...] and David was eating a Spanish fly ...
- (6) Vseki den **izyazdashe** po petima indusi i po dve dechitsa za desert...
every day ate.**SI** distr five hindus and distr two kids for dessert
'He used to eat five Hindus and two kids for dessert daily...' **PURELY PERFECTIVIZING**

Additionally, we observe that unlike SI verbs with lexical and inner prefixes, SI verbs with purely perfectivizing and outer prefixes have a restricted distribution. The latter can never be used in simple sentences without any licensing dyadic QAs cf. **Postrojavah kushti* 'I built.SI houses.' (I was building/used to build houses.) in contrast to *Ana podpisvashe.SI dokumentite*. 'Ana signed.SI documents.' (Anna was signing/used to sign documents). Cinque's (1999) gives typological evidence for the relative order of suffixes in which the habitual ones scope the highest of all the aspectual suffixes repetitive, frequentative, terminative, continuative, retrospective, durative, progressive, completive. Based on that we would like to argue that in BG there are two syntactic layers in which SI morphemes may be generated and it is only the higher layer which takes outer and purely perfectivizing prefixes as its input giving rise to their obligatory habitual readings.

References:

- Cinque, G. 1999. "Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective." Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press. xii, 275 pages. • Isačenko, A. V. 1960. *Grammatičeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s slovackim*. Morfologija (Čast' vtoraja). Bratislava: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk. • Janda, L. and T. Nessel. 2010. *Taking Apart Russian RAZ-*. Slavic and East European Journal 54:3: 476–501. • Janda, L. and O. Lyashevskaya. 2012. Semantic Profiles of Five Russian Prefixes: po-,s-, za-, na-, pro-. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 21: 211–258. • Karagjosova, E. 2014. Telicity, boundedness and secondary imperfective verbs in Bulgarian. Paper presented at the FDSL conference, University of Leipzig. June 2-5th, 2021. • Markova, A. 2011. On the nature of Bulgarian prefixes: Ordering and modification in multiple prefixation. *Word Structure* 4: 244–271. Nicolova, R. 2017. Bulgarian Grammar. Berlin: Frank & Timme. • Ramchand, G. 2008a. Perfectivity as aspectual definiteness: Time and the event in Russian. *Lingua* 118(11), 1690–1715. • Ramchand, G. C. 2008b. *Verb meaning and the lexicon. A first phase syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Rivero M.L. and N. Slavkov. 2014. Imperfect(ive) variation: The case of Bulgarian. *Lingua* 150. 232–277. • Romanova, E. 2004. Superlexical vs. lexical prefixes. *Nordlyd* 32(2) (Special Issue on Slavic Prefixes): 255–278. • Svenonius, P. 2004a. Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP. *Nordlyd* 32(2) (Special Issue on Slavic Prefixes): 205–253. • Svenonius, P. 2004b. Slavic prefixes: Introduction. In: Svenonius, P. (ed.), *Nordlyd* 32.2: Special issue on Slavic prefixes. Tromsø: University of Tromsø. 177–204. • Willim, E. 2006. *Event, individuation and countability. A study with special reference to English and Polish*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.