

Resulting States and (Im)Perfectivity

Tatjana Zybatow & Luka Szucsich (University of Leipzig)

In this paper we will give a unified account for the aspectual dichotomy perfective vs. imperfective assuming that the imperfective also has an interpretive value linking (potential) resulting states to time intervals. In our cross-linguistic analysis we proceed from the assumption that the meaning of complex linguistic expressions is derived compositionally involving cases of feature transmission (where possible). Aspectual interpretations may be specified by verbal morphology or by grammatical information "borrowed" from nominal expressions (cf. Krifka 1989, 1998, Filip 1995 among others). Crucially, both specifications depend on verbal lexical information concerning argument structure (and its mapping to syntax). Certain verb class specific information on relations among participants of an event restricts aspectual interpretation.

We assume a syntactic category *Asp* (also responsible for case checking of objective case [Accusative]) where feature transmission ("agreement") takes place. Aspectual features have access to some generalized properties of verbal lexical entries: (i) T_E (establishing time), the time interval which contains all subevents relevant for an event, (ii) the predicate Q expressing the property of the resulting state (linked to a time interval T_i strictly following T_E). Q may be specified for a verbal entry. If not (cf. last paragraph), only $\neg Q$ is available for *Asp* triggering the imperfective (cf. (1)).

Furthermore, feature transmission is only possible for verb classes where Q is specified as a property of the internal argument only. Feature transmission is impossible in cases where the property Q expresses a relation between two arguments (e.g. with subject experiencer verbs like *slyšat'* 'hear'). We assume the following aspectual specifications.

(1) imperfective: $\lambda Q \exists T_E \forall t' (\neg Q(t') \leftrightarrow t' \subseteq T_E)$

(2) perfective: $\lambda Q \exists T_E \forall t' (Q(t') \leftrightarrow t' \subseteq T_i)$

If the predicate Q does not (totally) hold at an arbitrary point in time t' , t' has to be part of T_E , yielding an imperfective interpretation (i.e. an "event-internal perspective"), cf. (1). ('Totally hold' means that concerning so-called incremental themes Q must hold for the whole object or for all individuals of a set.). If the predicate Q holds at an arbitrary point in time t' , t' has to be part of T_i yielding a perfective, "event-external" interpretation (2).

In the second part of the paper we will examine the different readings of the imperfective aspect in Russian (the different contexts of its usage). We want to show that the generalized notion of the imperfective aspect in (1) allows for the derivation of episodic, iterative, habitual, generic, and general factual readings, including the reading traditionally called 'the meaning of the nullified result' (*značenie annullirovannogo rezul'tata*) where the temporal marking *past tense* comes into play producing a temporal gap between the speech time and the time interval for which the truth of an event (specified by (1) or (2)) is asserted. This gap may be optionally "pragmatically filled" (enforced by appropriate situative or linguistic contexts) with events (including the arising of Q and its subsequent cancelling). Crucially, the latter reading is restricted to (subsequently imperfectively marked) verbs which specify such a Q in their lexical entry. These are verbs which typically form aspectual pairs, i.e. which are potentially processes [imperfective] (e.g. *otkryvat'* 'open') and accomplishments [perfective] (e.g. *otkryt'* 'open') – the perfective marking is licensed only if the condition on totality for Q is obeyed).

Bare unergative process verbs (*rabotat'* 'to work', *igrat'* 'to play', *smejat'sja* 'to laugh', etc.) do not contain a specified Q . Consequently, a reading with a nullified result is unavailable. These verbs are imperfectiva tantum and allow only for Aktionsart-derivations (e.g. ingressive, egressive). Thus, information on argument structure restricts potential readings of imperfective verbs.

Filip, H. (1995) Integrating Telicity, Aspect and NP Semantics: The Role of Thematic Structure. In: J. Toman (ed.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 3*. Ann Arbor, 61-96.

Krifka, M. (1989) *Nominalreferenz und Zeitkonstitution. Zur Semantik von Massentermen, Individualtermen, Aspektklassen*. München.

Krifka, M. (1998) The Origins of Telicity. In: S. Rothstein (ed.) *Events and Grammar*. London, 197-235.