

FDSL Workshop
Secondary Imperfectives

Conclusion (June 5, 2021)

Berit Gehrke, Olav Mueller-Reichau, Jurica Polančec,
Sergei Tatevosov

Slavic secondary imperfectives (SIs)

Q Is there, beyond mere description, a theoretical need to distinguish between two operations of primary and secondary imperfectivization?

Descriptive addition by Breu (this workshop):

- Indirect secondary imperfectivization
- Pseudo-secondary imperfectivization
- De-prefixation

Do SIs fulfill the same functions across Slavic languages?

Q Which factors govern the different degrees in productivity of SIs in Slavic languages (today and earlier)?

Completion implicature in Bulgarian (Karagjosova)?

Why are SIs more productive in Bulgarian than in other Slavic languages (e.g. Petrušina 2000; Rivero & Slavkov 2014)?

Do the other Slavic languages also show a difference in productivity (some higher, some - e.g. the Western ones - lower)?

And if so, can this be related to different functions of SIs in these languages?
What else could play a role?

Q How do imperfectivization and iterization relate to each other in different Slavic languages?

Possible Functions

- Viewpoint imperfectivity (“processual meaning”)
- Pluractionality (“iterative meaning”)
- Genericity (“habitual meaning”)
- General-factual

Resian *napisūwat* only in iterative function (Pila)

How can we account for the observed differences between generic *-va* and imperfective *-va* (Filip & Carlson 1997) in Czech? Do we find such a distinction in other Slavic languages?

How do secondary imperfectives relate to “iteratives”, like Russian *pisyvāt* ‘to write from time to time’, or *byvat* ‘used to be’?

Toops (1998) reports on a division of labor between SIs *-owa-* and *-a-* in Upper Sorbian, with *-owa-* denoting only iterative and/or distributive events.

Do SIs belong to inflection or to derivation?

Does SI morphology never derive a new lexeme, as suggested by analyses that consider forms such as (Russian) *podpisat'* and *podpisyvat'* as genuine aspectual pairs (Isačenko 1960)?

Is the SI suffix an inflectional marker?

Is the SI suffix a word-formation device?

Do we find cross-Slavic differences?

How can we make sense of so-called orphan SIs, i.e. SIs for which there is no perfective base. Cf. Russian *nabljudáju* (1sg.IPFV), but **nabljudú* (1sg.PFV) (Polančec 2018; [Breu, this workshop](#))?

SIs vs. simple IPFs

Can they be used in the same contexts, or is there only a partial functional overlap?

If the functional overlap is only partial: Is this a semantic difference due to the difference in morphosyntax, or is this merely a pragmatic difference? (e.g. Boban during the discussion: pragmatic narrowing down in competition with other forms)

Q How do simple IPFs and SIs relate to each other in so-called aspectual triplets?

- Pila (this workshop): Resian *pīsat* - *napīsat* - *napišūwat* 'to write', where the SI is restricted to habitual readings (but such triplets are rare/obsolete for some speakers)
- Breu (this workshop): Many triplets in Molise Slavic - simple and secondary IPFs differ in frequency and sometimes also in function (stative vs. dynamic; less often: underspecified vs. habitual)
- Karagjosova (this workshop): Bulgarian simple IPFs are states/activities, SIs are accomplishments

Object omission is possible with (some? many? most?) simple IPFs, but (maybe? probably?) not with SIs.

Q To what extent do SIs block object demotion (resp. omission from the proposition), from a cross-linguistic perspective?

What is the morphonology of SIs?

Can the heterogeneity of forms be traced back to one underlying morpheme (Matushansky 2007, [this workshop](#)), or is it a manifestation of a function that transposes verb stems to a specific conjugation class (Isačenko 1960; Gladney 2013)?

QUESTION SOLVED => [Ora Matushansky: Secondary imperfectives and w-epenthesis in Russian](#)

- No underlying glides in Russian SIs, but underlying back yer
- SI suffix allomorphy due to w-epenthesis with stems ending in a vowel
- W-insertion + secondary imperfective tensing (Matushansky 2009)
- The same epenthesis is found in other verb forms, noun forms, and elsewhere in the system
- Extension to -ova in Russian and other Slavic languages

Q What is the relation between SI suffixes and theme vowels?

- Are SI suffixes theme vowels?
- Are SI suffixes morphologically complex and include theme vowels?
- Are SI suffixes and theme vowels two completely disjoint types of items?

Kwapiszewski favors the final option

(see also yesterday's talk by Arsenijević for further discussion of this question)

What is the diachrony of SIs, in relation to its synchrony?

Is there just one instance of SI, or do we need to distinguish (at least) between early *-a* and late *-yva*, as suggested by Tatevosov (2013) for Russian?

Q How real is the shift from the "old" SIs (in *-a*) to the "new" SIs (in *-ova/-iva/-ava*) suggested in the literature (e.g., Schuyt 1990)?

- What is the best way to identify and measure this shift in individual Slavic languages?
- How different are Slavic languages with respect to this phenomenon?

J. Polančec & Zrinka Kolaković: Competing secondary imperfectives in Croatian: A corpus study

- Good predictor: register/subcorpus, root, homonymy, prefix
- No good predictor (at least not quantitatively): frequency, diachrony
- Difficult to trace the alleged diachronic change quantitatively

What is the morphosyntax and semantics of SIs?

Is it an aspectual head (e.g. Ramchand 2008; (probably) Matushansky, this workshop; ~~Karagjoseva, this workshop~~), or does it apply below aspect (e.g. Tatevosov 2015; Ramchand & Minor 2019; Kwapiszewski, this workshop; Arsenijević yesterday)? Or is it even an exponent of inner aspect, e.g. an ‘atelicizer’ (cf. Łazorczyk 2008, 2010; Kwapiszewski Wednesday)?

Intuitively, the attachment of SIs can be described as the undoing of perfectivization induced by prefixation. How can we model this interpretative effect in a compositional semantic framework?

Q Is there such a thing as a secondary imperfective operator in the semantics? Or is secondary imperfectivization a purely morphological phenomenon?

Arsenijević (2018, yesterday): SI as a (re-)verbaliser

Kwapiszewski: SI contributes to inner aspect as a purely morphological indicator (indicating that the prefix does not move up)

Relationship between (I)PF and Vendler classes

Q Can we map perfective, imperfective and secondary imperfective verbs in Slavic onto the aspectual class distinction between states, activities, accomplishments, achievements?

Elena Karagjosova: Telicity, boundedness and secondary imperfectives in Bulgarian

- Interplay of inner and outer aspect, plus imperfect and aorist
- ~~Analysis of secondary imperfectivization along the lines of Dowty's Imperfective Paradox~~
- (In aspectual triplets) simple IPFs correspond to states/activities, prefixed PFs to achievements, SIs to accomplishments

Past passive participles (PPPs) of SIs?

Why does Russian exclude PPPs of SIs, while allowing for PPPs based on simple IPF stems (Knjazev 2007; Borik & Gehrke 2018)? What is the picture in other Slavic languages?

- (Apparently there are SI PPPs in Czech; Radek Šimík/Denisa Lenertová, p.c.)
- [There are SI PPPs in Polish \(Wiemer et al., ~~this workshop~~\)](#)
- Croatian: IPF PPPs of both types are perfectly acceptable and widely used (Polančec 2015)
- Molise Slavic: No SI PPPs in *-iva* (Breu & Makarova 2019; [Breu, this workshop](#))
... but there are PPPs derived from SIs in *-ova*
- [Resian also excludes SI PPPs \(Pila, this workshop\)](#)
... but there are also no PPPs derived from simple IPFs

Possible follow-up question: Which IPF readings can IPF PPPs express (whether simple or SI)?

- Molise Slavic: process and others
- (vs. Russian: no process reading ...)

What is the role of SI morphology in deverbal derivations?

E.g. Tatevosov (2011, 2015): How much verbal morphology is inside Russian deverbal adjectives and nouns? If we find SI morphology, does it even make sense to view it as an aspectual head?

An argument in favor of the SI suffix being derivational rather than inflectional?

Arkadiusz Kwapiszewski: Secondary imperfectives in participial adverbs and agentive nominalisations

- Polish SI morphology in non-eventive participial adverbs and *er*-nominals, which do not support argument structure
- SI morphology is below Voice => cannot be an exponent of outer aspect
- Precise analysis of its function is left open (but ...)
- (proposal on Wednesday) SI suffixes are inner-aspectual operators, merged below the projection that introduces external arguments

SIs under contact conditions

When do loan verbs enter the Slavic recipient language as basic perfectives, and when as basic imperfectives? Is this related to telicity? How to test that? (problem of indirect access; Zucchi 1999)

Walter Breu: Primary and secondary imperfectivization under contact conditions: The case of Molise Slavic in Italy

- Integration of Italian “telic” loan verbs as PFs => *-iva* in primary imperfectivization
- Orphan derivations, to avoid homophony with Slavic stems

Malinka Pila: Secondary imperfectives under contact conditions: The case of Resian in Italy

- Integration of Germanic loan verbs mostly as simple IPFs, deriving an aspectual correlate by means of prefixes
- Integration of Romance loan verbs mostly as PFs, deriving an aspectual correlate by means of suffixes
- This is related to a systemic difference: German has a productive system of prefixes (non-prefixed loan verbs get integrated on a par with simple imperfectives) whereas Romance does not.

Could this be related to Talmy’s (1985 et seq.) typology between verb-framing and satellite-framing, and/or to Levin & Rappaport Hovav’s (1991 et seq.) manner-result-dichotomy?

And finally ...

Q How does the system with aspectual affixes found in all Slavic languages interact with the additional aspectual past tenses in, e.g., Bulgarian (see also Karagjosova, this workshop), Macedonian?

Breu (this workshop) on Molise Slavic:

- Also inherited a perfect-imperfect distinction (aorist got lost)
- Many aspectual triples

Bulgarian (Petruşina 2000, Rivero & Slakov 2014): SI is more productive than in other Slavic languages

Q Is there a correlation?

Karagjosova (this workshop)

- Bulgarian SIs derive telic, non-homogeneous events
- Aspectual triples: simple IPF (states/activities) vs. prefixed PFs (achievements) vs. SIs (accomplishments)

Follow-up question: Could this be the same in (some of) the other Slavic languages, or is Bulgarian fundamentally different?