Microvariation in the Slavic secondary imperfective: The East-West parametric division

Goal: While the secondary imperfective (SI) is a prominent phenomenon in Slavic languages, there is variation in its realization across languages and debates about its meaning, see **[1]-[13]** a.o. We explore the nature of the cross-Slavic variation in the distribution and range of meanings of SI verbs with different prefix classes. We provide novel data from MK, BG, SR, CZ, PL, RU, UA informing the nature of the cross-Slavic variation in the distribution and range of meanings of SI verbs with different prefix classes.

New data and proposal: This project builds on preliminary evidence from our previous work on Polish and Bulgarian where we propose that in languages that allow triplets (imperfective – perfectivized – SI), there are two classes of SI with different merge sites in morphosyntax and separate semantic profiles – and the same language can realize both depending on the prefix class. We now extend our analysis to CZ, MK, RU, SR, UA and we show that our new data related to secondary imperfectivization form a pattern and are compatible with **[14]** and **[15]**'s Eastern and Western typology of Slavic aspectual verbal systems. More specifically, we provide evidence that BG, MK, RU, UA are triplet languages and CZ, PL, SR are aspectual pair languages. Both Eastern and Western Slavic aspectual lg types allow for secondary imperfectivization of lexically prefixed verbs but only the former allow (either fully productively or to a considerable extent) for secondary imperfectivization of verbs with purely perfectivizing prefixes, as shown below in **Table 1**. Moreover, we will show that SI forms of lexically prefixed verbs are ambiguous between the single ongoing and habitual meaning while the superlexical prefixes which do not form SI in the Western type but form SI equivalents in the Eastern type are interpreted habitually (see example (1) below). SI counterparts of empty prefixed verbs are unacceptable in scenarios eliciting single ongoing readings of the type illustrated in (2).

Formal syntax-semantics analysis: We propose that in BG, MK, RU, UA, there are two syntactic layers where SI morphemes may be merged, whereas in CZ, PL, SR there is only one layer SI_{low}.

Eastern group: $SI_{high} \gg SI_{low}$
Western group: SI_{low}

SI_{low} forms (lexically prefixed verbs) are ambiguous between a single ongoing and habitual meaning, while SI_{high} (superlexically prefixed verbs) is interpreted only habitually and does not allow ongoing readings. SI_{low} has the same semantics in all the discussed lgs: it is input to the null IPFV operator acting at the level of AspP (along the lines of **[16]**). According to **[16]**, IPFV selects for VPs referring to singular or plural events giving rise to single ongoing and habitual interpretations, respectively IPFV [VPsg / VPpl]. A plural event is defined as a mereological sum ($e1 \oplus e2 \oplus e3$) having singular events as its proper parts. We supplement Ferreira's theory with semantics for SI_{high} as a habitualizer. We propose that SI_{high} acts only on perfective input and it gives a sum of bounded non-overlapping events as an output. We propose the following semantics of SI_{high}:

$$\llbracket \text{High SI} \rrbracket = \lambda P. \lambda t. \exists e_1 \ldots e_n: \textbf{sum(e, P)} \text{ \& } \tau(e) \sqsupseteq t \text{ \& } P(e) = 1$$
$$\text{where } sum(e,P) \leftrightarrow P(e) \text{ \& } \exists e_1 \ldots e_n < e: P(e_1) \text{ \& } P(e_2) \text{ \& } \ldots \text{ \& } P(e_n) \text{ \& } e = e_1 \oplus e_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus e_n$$

Defined only if P is a predicate of bounded events.
Defined only if there is a precedence relation between $e_1 \ldots e_n$ such that the left boundary of e_{j+1} follows the right boundary of e_j

Our findings provide novel cross-linguistic evidence for **[17]**'s claim that habitual projection in languages which morphologically encode habituality is realized above other aspectual morphemes: it's the highest in the aspectual field. SI_{high} is merged in a functional head corresponding to **[17]**'s Asp_{hab}. This analysis allows us to capture cross-linguistic variation and make typological and theoretical generalizations.

ENG	read (PRIM. IPFV)	read (PFV)	read (SI)
PL	czytać	przeczytać	*przeczytywać
CZ	číst	přečíst	*přečítávat
SR	čitati	pročitati	*pročitavati
BG	četa	pročeta	pročitam
MK	čita	pročita	pročituva
UA	čytaty	pročytaty	pročytuvaty
RU	čitať	pročitať	pročityvať

Table 1: SI in PL, CZ, SR, BG, MK, UA and RU

(1) **a.** *Taňa pročitala 240 stranic knigi. Obyčno ona **pročityvajet** 40 stranic v čas. Skoľko vrjemeni nužno ej, čtoby dočitat' knigu, jesli poka ona pročitala trjet'?* (**RU**)

'Tanya read 240 pages of the book. She usually **reads-SI** 40 pages an hour. How long does it take her to finish a book, if so far she has read a third? source

 b. *Ta Lisovyk Džan tak zaXopyvsja čytanňam, ščo kovtav odyn roman za druhym i za deň, provedenyj u sXovku, **pročytuvav** cili tomy* (**UA**), **source:** InterCorp.

'But Forester Dzhan was so fond of reading that he devoured one novel after another, and during the day he spent in hiding, he **read.SI** whole volumes.'   Кальвіно, І., Наші предки

 c. *Čitanjeto na knigi ì e edna pasija, vo ovoj period najmnogu čita romani i sekogaš vo tek na mesecot najmalku **pročituva** eden roman.* (**MK**)

'Reading books is one of her passions, during this period she mostly reads novels and always **reads.SI** at least one novel during the month.' source

 d. *Ot mnogo godini nasam **pročitam** po tri knigi na sedmitsa.* (**BG**)

'Since many years till.now **read.SI** distr 3 books per week.'

(2)   A (on the phone): What is our child doing right now?

B: She is reading #(pročityvajet (RU)/pročytuje (UA)/pročituva (MK)/pročita (BG)) her book.

Abbreviations: MK = Macedonian, BG = Bulgarian, SR = Serbian, CZ = Czech, PL = Polish, RU = Russian, UA = Ukrainian, prim = primary, ipfv = imperfective, pfv = perfective, SI = secondary imperfective.

References: [1] Antonyuk-Yudina, S., B, Arsenijević, S, Quaglia, and M, Simonović. 2020. Allomorphy, morphological operations and the order of Slavic verb-prefixes. Talk presented at FASL 29. May 8–1, 2020, U. of Washington-Seattle. ● **[2]** Biskup, P. 2021. Aspect Separated from Aspectual Markers in Czech. Paper presented at the FDSL conference, U, of Leipzig. June 2-5th. ● **[3]** Biskup, P. Slavicus Expert Meeting Wrocław October 31, 2022 ● **[4]** Karagjosova, E. to appear. Telicity, boundedness and secondary imperfective verbs in Bulgarian. Paper presented at the FDSL conference, U. of Leipzig. June 2-5th, 2021. ● **[5]** Klimek-Jankowska, D. & J. Błaszczak. 2022, The status of secondary imperfectivization in Polish: Evidence from VP idioms. JSK, vol. 30, no. FASL 29 extra issue, 1-19. ● **[6]** Kwapiszewski, A. 2021. The morphosyntax of secondary imperfectives: A fusion-based account. Paper presented at the Slavic Linguistics Colloquium, Humboldt U. of Berlin, March 26, 2021. ● **[7]** Kwapiszewski, A., submitted, The morphosyntax of aspect and event structure: Slavic prefixes and secondary imperfectives. ● **[8]** Markova, A. 2011. On the nature of Bulgarian prefixes: Ordering and modification in multiple prefixation. *Word Structure* 4: 244–271. ● **[9]** Matushansky, O. Secondary Imperfectives and W-Epenthesis in Russian, FDSL 14, Leipzig, June 2-4, 2021. ● **[10]** Romanova, E. 2004. Superlexical vs. lexical prefixes. *Nordlyd* 32(2) *(Special Issue on Slavic Prefixes)*: 255–278. ● **[11]** Nicolova, R. 2017. Bulgarian Grammar. Berlin. ● **[12]** Rivero M.L. and N. Slavkov. 2014. Imperfect(ive) variation: The case of Bulgarian. *Lingua* 150. 232-277. ● **[13]** Szymanek, B. 2010. Secondary imperfectives in Polish: Morphology and semantics. In Verb structures. Between phonology and morphosyntax, ed. Eugeniusz Cyran, and Bogdan Szymanek, Studies in Linguistics and Methodology, vol.2, 193-217. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL. **[14]** Dickey, S. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach*. Stanford: Center for Language and Information. ● **[15]** Dickey, S. 2015. Parameters of Slavic aspect reconsidered: The East–West aspect division from a diachronic perspective. In *Studies in Accentology and Slavic Linguistics in Honor of Ronald F. Feldstein 29–45*. Edited by M. Schrager, G. Fowler, S. Franks and E. Andrews. Bloomington: Slavica. ● **[16]** Ferreira, M. 2016. The semantic ingredients of imperfectivity in progressives, habituals, and counterfactuals. *NLS* 24:353–397. ● **[17]** Cinque, G. 1999. Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press. xii, 275.