FDSL Workshop
Secondary Imperfectives

Introduction (June 5, 2021)

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

Slavic secondary imperfectives (SIs)

Secondary imperfectivization, some paradigmatic examples:

(1) a. *pisat'* 'to write.IPF' > *pod-pisat'* 'to sign.PF' > *podpisyvat'* 'to sign.IPF' Russian

b. *pisati* 'to write.IPF' > *pre-pisati* 'to copy.PF' > *prepisivati* 'to copy.IPF' Croatian

c. *pisać* 'to write.IPF' > *za-pisać* 'to record.PF' > *zapisywać* 'to record.IPF' Polish

d. *piša* 'I write.IPF' > *na-piša* 'I write up.PF' > *napisvam* 'I write up.IPF' Bulgarian

Primary imperfectivization:

(2)   *dat'* 'to give.PF'   > *davat'* 'to give.IPF' Russian

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

Do SIs fulfill the same functions across Slavic languages?

Why is secondary imperfectivization more productive in Bulgarian than in other Slavic languages (e.g. Petruxina 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 Which factors govern the different degrees in productivity of SIs in Slavic languages (today and earlier)?

Possible Functions

- Viewpoint imperfectivity ("processual meaning")
- Pluractionality ("iterative meaning")
- Genericity ("habitual meaning")

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 *pisyvat'* '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.

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

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?

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

- Pila (this workshop): Resian *pïsat - napïsat - napišüwat* 'to write', where the SI is restricted to habitual readings (but such triples are rare/obsolete for some speakers)
- Breu (this workshop): Many triples in Molise Slavic - simple and secondary IPFs differ in frequency and sometimes also in function (stative vs. dynamic; less often: underspecified vs. habitual)

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)?

Ora Matushansky: Secondary imperfectives and *w*-epenthesis in Russian

- SI suffix allomorphy due to *w*-epenthesis with stems ending in a vowel
- 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?

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

- Can the trend of replacement of (early) *a*-SIs with (late) *ova/iva*-SIs be observed in synchronic corpora?
- What is the best predictor for the choice between competing SIs: the verb, the root, the register, the (sub)corpus, or maybe something else?

What is the morphosyntax and semantics of SIs?

Is it an aspectual head (e.g. Ramchand 2008; Karagjosova, this workshop), or does it apply below aspect (e.g. Tatevosov 2015; Ramchand & Minor 2019; Kwapiszewski, this workshop)? Or is it even an exponent of inner aspect, e.g. an 'atelicizer' (cf. Łazorczyk 2008, 2010)?

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?

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

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

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.)
- 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)
- Resian also excludes SI PPPs (Pila, this workshop)

Björn Wiemer, Joanna Wrzesień-Kwiatkowska & Alexander Rostovtsev-Popiel: Grammatical integration of *n-*/*t*-participles of secondary imperfectives in Polish and Russian

- PPPs derived from secondary imperfectives exist in Polish.
- Aspectual behavior of simple vs. secondary IPF PPPs in Russian, Polish (1750-2018)
- Corpus study: Russian, Polish PPPs with SI suffixes; 1750-2018
  Diachronic change in type/token frequency, aspectual functions, syntactic functions?

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
- Proposal: 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

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

Q Is there a correlation?