The Representation of Aspect 4: Radical variability in feature content

Bronwyn M. Bjorkman

EGG 2014 @ Debrecen

1 Aspect in Slavic

Basic description of aspectual morphology in Russian:

- Underived roots are generally **imperfective** (small set of exceptions).
- Prefixes create perfective stems, often with additional changes in meaning.
- The imperfective suffix (-yva) attaches to perfective stems and derives an imperfective stem. It cannot appear on simple imperfective roots.
- (1)Russian (Tatevosov, 2011)

'record, write down' pisat' 'write' \rightarrow za-pisat' ryt' za-ryt' 'dig in' 'dig 'fall in love' ljubit 'love' \rightarrow po-ljubit' bit' 'beat' \rightarrow po-bit' 'beat up"

- Prefixes are generally divided into lexical prefixes (LP) and superlexical prefixes (SLP).
- LPs can affect the lexical meaning and/or argument structure of the verb.
- SLPs do not affect argument structure, and have more transparently compositional meanings.
- (2)Russian (Tatevosov, 2011)
 - a. rubit' derevja / drova / ??plennogo chop.INF trees.ACC firewood.ACC captive.ACC "chop trees/firewood/??a captive."
 - derevja / *drova / *plennogo LP b. s-rubit' S-chop.INF trees.ACC firewood.ACC captive.ACC "chop down the trees/*the firewood/*the captive."
 - \mathbf{LP} с za-rubit' *derevja / *drova / plennogo ZA-chop.inf trees.acc firewood.acc captive.acc "slash *the trees/*the firewood/the captive."
 - d. na-rubit' derevjev / drov / ??plennyx SLP NA-chop.inf trees.gen firewood.gen ??captives.gen "chop (down) a quantity of trees/*the firewood/*the captive."

- (3)Russian "Secondary Imperfective" -yva (Svenonius, 2005)
 - a. v-sta-t'
 - IN-stand-INF
 - v-sta-va-t' b. IN-stand-IMPF-INF
 - "stand up."
 - It is possible for prefixes to co-occur. Usually fairly limited, but consider the following example (Imperfective -*yva* claimed to attach outside prefix *do*- "completive"):
- (4)Vasja po-na-do-pere-za-pis-yva-l diskov Vasja DISTR-CUM-COMPL-REP-ZA-write-YVA-PAST.3SG DVD-GEN.PL "Vasja accumulated a quantity of DVDs, which he finished recording again, this having happened at distinct times or locations."



The feature can result from one of several things:

- Default is [-def]
- LP results in [+def]

Two puzzles

1. How do lexical prefixes control the value of Asp⁰?

(DP)

 \mathbf{R}^{0} ŝc

 \mathbf{LP}

2. Why does -yva only occur in derived imperfectives?

- ŘΡ
 - - Can be specified [-def](=-yva=)
 - Higher SLP can re-assert [+def]

Emphasis mine:

"I will assume that the existence of this lexically specified transition [from the lexical prefixes], introduces **presuppositional structure to the aspectual head**, to the effect that it creates a **definite** rather than an indefinite time moment in Asp." (Ramchand, 2005, p. 349)

"the difference between Germanic and Slavic here can be stated in terms of the perfectivizing function of the Slavic prefix, which is not a **grammaticized function** of the Germanic particle." (Svenonius, 2005, p. 229)

2 Radical variability in feature content

Ritter and Wiltschko (2009, 2010): The function of a category like $Infl^0$ is universal/invariant across languages. Plays the role of *anchoring* a clause to the context ([\pm coincidence]).

Variation in the interpretive **content** of the category.

- English = time
- Halkomelem = **place**
- Blackfoot = participant

Wiltschko and Ritter (2014) on other inflectional features:

English: tense, viewpoint aspect, and situation aspect are all about *time* in the clausal domain. Situation aspect is about **boundedness** (=telicity) and dimensionality (=process).

situation aspect	\rightarrow	[+bounded]	[-bounded]
nominal domain		count	mass
verbal domain		telic	atelic

Blackfoot: tense, viewpoint aspect, and situation aspect are all about *person* in the clausal domain. Situation aspect is about **animacy** and **transivitity** (instead of telicity and duration).

Louie (2008):

	[+animate]	[-animate]
[+transitive]	Transitive Animate (TA)	Transitive Inanimate (TI)
[-transitive]	Intransitive Animate (AI)	Intransitive Inanimate (II)

What does it mean to have participant-based viewpoint aspect? In English we can ask "does this event take place over a period of time?"

In Blackfoot: "Does the event have more than one participant/argument?"

- (5) Blackfoot (Wiltschko and Ritter, 2014)
 - a. na-oo-**wat**-yii-wa amo mamii PAST-eat-**TA**-DIR-3SG DEM fish.AN "S/he ate this fish."
 - b. na-oo-yi-wa PAST-eat-AI-3SG

Ritter and Rosen. (2010): Blackfoot lacks detectable effects of telicity.

References

Louie, Meagan. 2008. Atemporal anchoring of individuals, events and sub-events in Blackfoot: Consequences for the syntax-semantics interface. Master's thesis, University of Toronto.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2005. Time and the event: The semantics of Russian prefixes. Nordlyd 32.

- Ritter, Elizabeth, and Sara Thomas Rosen. 2010. Animacy in Blackfoot: Implications for event structure and clause structure. In *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure*, ed. Malka Rappaport-Hovav, Edit Doron, and Ivy Sichel, 124–152. Oxford/New York: OUP.
- Ritter, Elizabeth, and Martina Wiltschko. 2009. Varieties of INFL: Tense, location, and person. In Alternatives to Cartography, ed. Hans Broekhuis, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, and Henk van Riemsdijk. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ritter, Elizabeth, and Martina Wiltschko. 2010. The composition of INFL: An exploration of tense, tenseless languages and tenseless constructions. LingBuzz/001078, July 2010.

Svenonius, Peter. 2005. Slavic prefixes inside and outside vp. Nordlyd 32.

Tatevosov, Sergei. 2011. Aspect in slavic. Class handout. Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Slavic. MIT.

Wiltschko, Martina, and Elizabeth Ritter. 2014. Animating the narrow syntax. Talk given at GLOW 37, April 2014.