Appliquée au verbe polonais, la notion de fait a été utilisée pour rendre compte d’un emploi apparentment paradoxal des verbes imperfectifs. Ainsi, Koschmieder (1934) recourt à cette notion pour expliquer la question, adressée dans un restaurant par un garçon à un client : Czy panowie już zamawiali ? (Est-ce que vous avez déjà commandé ?). Le verbe utilisé (zamawiać, ‘commander’) est imperfectif, et pourtant il n’est question ici ni de procès en cours, ni de procès répété, ni de procès incomplet. L’explication que propose Koschmieder est que le verbe exprime ici une action qui « a eu lieu (ou non) une fois quelconque indépendamment de son résultat et d’autres circonstances qui l’accompagnent » (1934 : 77). Selon cet auteur, l’imperfectif polonais se rapproche alors de l’emploi de l’aoriste grec appelé Konstatierender Gebrauch (emploi constatif).


Il semble que la principale raison de l’intérêt, en slavistique, pour ces formes imperfectives est qu’elles paraissent transgresser l’incomplétude traditionnellement associée à cette valeur aspectuelle. Cependant, cette anomalie disparaît si l’on conçoit, avec Jakobson, le couple perfectif VS imperfectif comme une opposition non pas équipollente mais privative – l’imperfectivité étant alors le terme non-marqué de l’opposition. En ce cas, en effet, « the perfective aspect presents the narrated event with reference to its absolute completion, whereas the imperfective aspect is non-committal in regard to completion or noncompletion » (Jakobson 1984 : 27).

Il est remarquable que les énoncés habituellement reconnus comme imperfectifs factuels en polonais sont systématiquement traduits, en français, par des passés composés. La question de la factualité offre ainsi une excellente opportunité de confrontation linguistique, aussi bien du point de vue des données que de celui des concepts descriptifs utilisés. Cette confrontation, et son exploitation dans la description des temps composés du français, sont les principaux objectifs de cette communication. Concernant la notion de fait, nous aurons notamment recours aux apports de Van de Velde (2006).

En français, on sait que certains emplois des temps composés, et en particulier du passé composé, résistent à la distinction habituelle entre interprétation résultative et interprétation processive (« accomplie » et « inaccomplie », dans la terminologie grammaticale traditionnelle). Il en va ainsi de ceux qui, sans être résultatifs, du moins au sens habituel de ce terme, n’en sont pas pour autant narratifs. Cette situation a conduit certains auteurs à repenser la typologie des emplois du passé composé (par ex. Vet 1992). Par ailleurs, il existe également en français, comme cela a été mentionné pour l’imperfectif factuel des langues slaves, une certaine proximité entre ces passés composés et ce même temps verbal quand il est employé comme parfait d’expérience. En nous fondant sur ce type de constats, nous montrerons l’intérêt...
que peuvent présenter les imperfectifs factuels du polonais pour la description des temps composés du français.

**Références**


In decompositional approaches to verb meaning (Dowty 1979, Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998, Harley 2012, Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2020) stative and change-of-state words are built from a state-denoting root plus some event template comprised of basic elements (e.g. functional heads) indicating the event or state's temporal and causal flow. The templatic operator responsible for introducing the semantic notion of change in change-of-state verbs is usually some sort of BECOME-type operator that says that at the end of the event the state denoted by the root holds, and it did not hold before. However, more recent approaches to change (Tenny 1994, Krifka 1998, Hay et al. 1999, Kennedy and Levin 2008, Rappaport Hovav 2008, Beavers 2011, 2012) have instead assumed that change is scalar in nature, where the final state of the patient is that it holds a higher degree of some property than it did before along some ordered ranking of possible degrees. Decompositionally, the usual assumption is that the root denotes a measure function that returns the degree to which an entity holds the relevant value --- the same measure function that underlies corresponding scalar adjective meanings --- while templatic structure introduces degree comparison that ensures the patient's final degree is higher than its initial degree. This approach provides a more unified way of subsuming a range of different types of changes of state under a single umbrella (creation/consumption, property change, motion; Beavers 2011, 2012) while also capturing the fact that different sorts of scales give rise to verbs with different aspectual properties (Kennedy and Levin 2008).

In this talk I present a novel argument (expanding on a suggestion by Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2020) that English verbal roots denote states and not measure functions (see also Wellwood 2015). I furthermore argue that the relevant state is one that has comparison built into it already. The primary role of templatic operators on this approach is instead to fill in the details of the root-supplied comparison and/or to derive new types of comparison that build off of the root-supplied scale, while also providing access to different degree arguments for overt expression. This argument is based on evidence from sublexical modification (e.g. by "again" and other such modifiers) as well as evidence from comparative morphology, degree modifiers, and the relationship of verbs to their corresponding adjectival forms. In addition to capturing more facts about change-of-state verbs, I also suggest that this approach better aligns scalar analyses with traditional decompositional work in verb meaning, while providing another argument that change-of-state verbs are not built on simple or comparative adjectives, but instead verbs and their corresponding adjectives are derived equipollently from the same roots.
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Much recent work has concerned non-culminating accomplishments in various languages, their subtypes, and the sources of non-culmination (ex. Martin 2019). Attenuative morphemes and their relation to scalarity has been described in languages such as Russian (Kagan 2019) and Chuvash (Tatevosov 2006). Such works draws upon Kennedy and McNally (2005), who have shown that scale structure is determinative of the semantics of gradable adjectives; relative standards (i.e., context dependent) are used with totally open scales, while absolute standards (i.e., context independent) occur with a scale closed on either end. This has been applied to explain the behavior of incremental theme verbs and scalar verbs (i.e., verbs derived from gradable adjectives).

1. moroženoje podtajalo, no ne ractajalo sovsem [Russian]
   ‘The ice cream melted slightly, but did not melt entirely.’

2. vašja stakan siv čiš-kele-r-ē [Chuvash] [Tatevosov 2006: 365]
   V. cup water drink-KALA-PFV-3.SG
   ‘Vasja drank a part of the cup of water.’

The Georgian attenuative preverb c’a- however does not necessarily have such a reading of partial accomplishment as the prefix pod- in Russian and the morpheme -kala- in Chuvash, where there is an absolute standard due to a closed scale being lexicalized by the verb, as in (1), or by the nominal predicate being quantized, as in (2). In both cases there is a restriction on the maximal degree reached. The goal of my talk is to present an analysis of the Georgian attenuative preverb c’a-, which attaches to a non-negligible class of medial verbs that can optionally take direct objects (Holisky 1981: 174-179). Aronson’s claim that the preverb c’a- “denotes […] an action performed for a short time” (1990: 441) and the suggestion made by others that this preverb has a delimitative function (Bondarenko 2017: 93) does not hold, as the preverb can occur in telic predicates, and eventualities of a (relatively) long time can be denoted. I will argue that the preverb carries an evaluative meaning of a lack of effort that, according to context, allows for non-culminative readings but does not necessitate them.

Medial verbs that can take an incremental theme argument form accomplishment predicates of variable telicity (i.e., combination with the equivalent in- and for-adverbials is possible) and as such can be considered flexible accomplishments (Martin 2019: 2). This is in contrast to Class I and II verbs, where preverbation forms telic predicates (Bondarenko 2017). When such incremental medial verbs undergo preverbation with c’a-, non-culmination is contextual and need not rely on the presence of a for-adverbial, which is required for the preverbless verb form.

3. vano-m č’adrak’-is p’art’ia *(c’a)-i-tamaš-a, magram
   Vano-ERG chess-GEN game (c’a)-i-play-AOR.3SG but
   da-a-srul-a
   could_not PVB-PV-finish-AOR.3SG
   ‘Vano played a game of chess, but could not finish it.’

However, if an appropriate context is supplied, the event can be read as culminating, and additionally the predicate can occur with an in-adverbial. Here, the context is that Vano is a visiting chess master giving a series of lectures at a school, during which he plays a match with a student unseriously:

4. vano-m sauk’eteso-s st’udent’-s č’adrak-is p’art’ia (daaxloebit naxevar saatši) c’a-e-tamaš-a
   Vano-ERG best-DAT student-DAT chess-GEN game
   approximately half hour-in PVB-PV-play-AOR.3SG
   ‘Vano played a game of chess against the best student (in approximately half an hour).’
Abbreviations used:
NOM = nominative, GEN = genitive, DAT = dative, ERG = ergative, INST = instrumental, PVB = preverb, PV = preradical vowel, AOR = aorist, PRS = present, PFV = perfective
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Se situant à l’interface entre la sémantique et la syntaxe, l’aspect en russe s’inscrit dans un modèle bien plus vaste dans lequel se manifestent les catégories temporelles et modales et dont l’appréhension requiert la prise en compte des paramètres énonciatifs. C’est particulièrement vrai lorsque deux verbes d’aspect différent forment un couple aspectuel et ont la propriété d’exprimer la réalisation d’un événement révolu. Les configurations contextuelles et énonciatives observées indiquent que le choix de la forme aspectuelle correspond à deux perspectives différentes dans la présentation de la situation par l’instance énonciative.

La problématique aspectuelle en russe est abordée à travers l’expression de l’itération. Traditionnellement associée à l’aspect imperfectif, l’itération rendue par les verbes perfectifs est tenue pour un fait marginal illustré avec les combinaisons du perfectif avec des quantificateurs « X raz » (X fois). Par opposition aux emplois itératifs de l’imperfectif, le perfectif serait doté de la valeur dite « sommaire » caractérisée par l’effacement de la distance temporelle entre les occurrences réitérées, alors que son étendue serait mise en valeur par un verbe imperfectif qui soulignerait l’étendue de la rupture spatio-temporelle :

1. On neskol’ko raz, pjat’ raz, neodnokratno, dvaždy proiznes ètu frazu.
   il plusieurs fois, cinq fois, à-plusieurs-reprises, deux-fois, prononcerpf.passe cette phrase

2. On neskol’ko raz, pjat’ raz, neodnokratno, dvaždy proiznosil ètu frazu.
   il plusieurs fois, cinq fois, à-plusieurs-reprises, deux-fois, prononcerimpf.passe cette phrase

Tous les contextes cependant ne s’inscrivent pas dans ce schéma itératif. L’emploi de l’imperfectif dans sa valeur factuelle non déterminée dénote l’existence multiple de l’événement, alors que le perfectif dans sa valeur factuelle déterminée présume l’indexation d’un procès réitéré sur un (des) repères précis. En fonction du mode de repérage adopté, la présentation de l’itération par les verbes d’aspect différent n’adopte pas la même perspective énonciative.

L’analyse de l’itérativité exprimée avec les verbes perfectifs se fait dans le cadre de la sémantique d’intervalles intrinsèquement et extrinsèquement bornés. Sont pris en compte, entre autres, le principe du bornage et de la discontinuité des intervalles, leur étendue et leur repérage, la perspective énonciative adoptée par l’instance énonciative. La concurrence des aspects dans leurs emplois itératifs se révèle comme un phénomène de surface et est résolue avec la prise en compte des paramètres contextuels et discursifs.
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Traditionally, nominals have been semantically associated with notions of ‘time stability’, considered to typically denote objects which do not belong to the temporal domain, e.g. *table* (Langacker 1991:298; Givon 2001:51). Nevertheless, nominals have proven the capability to express temporal meaning (Vendler 1967). For example, the nominal *fire* construes a dynamic event, as a *fire* can ‘take place’, and ‘be observed over time’ (Vendler 1967:141). Recent research into the temporal semantics of nominals has identified that particular deverbal nominalizations (Balvet et al 2011), deadjectival nominalizations (Arche and Marín 2014) and underived nominals (Huyghe et al 2017) can express temporal meaning. However, while studies have largely focused on the identification of temporal meaning in different nominal forms, significantly less work has been devoted to the examination of the specific character of these temporal meanings in relation to nominal form. Thus, the aims of this research are twofold: (1) to evaluate the extent to which different nominal forms vary in relation to temporal semantic behaviour, and (2) to determine how object, state, and event meaning come to be expressed in nominal form.

Using part-of-speech tagging, a random sample of 2702 nominal instances was extracted from the British National Corpus (BNC). The nominals were analysed for ‘Lexical Aspect’ (i.e. Aktionsart, Ontological/Situation Aspect) (summarised in Smith 1991; Declerck 2006), count/mass status and abstract/concrete status. This process involved applying diagnostic syntactic tests to the nominals (Vendler 1967; Dowty 1979; Smith 1991; Declerck 2006), e.g. did NOUN take place?. Six types of lexical aspect are associated with this research: ‘State’, ‘Activity’, ‘Accomplishment’, ‘Achievement’, ‘Semelfactive’ and ‘Object’. Through consulting the Oxford English Dictionary (2020), the nominals were then further classified into 8 categories based on their etymology: ‘Borrowing’; ‘Compound’; ‘Morphologically derived from adjective’ (MDA); ‘Morphologically derived from noun’ (MDN); ‘Morphologically derived from verb’ (MDV); ‘Other’; ‘Transcategorization’ (TC), and ‘Underived’. The results from this research indicate an overall significant difference between the distribution of temporal semantics expressed by the different word formation types. Most notably, MDAs, MDVs and TCs were shown to display a stronger association with temporal semantics than each of the other word formation types. Despite this significant relationship between word formation type and temporal semantics however, the results from this research also suggest that abstract/concrete status is the most influential variable overall in predicting the distribution of temporal semantics expressed by the nominal instances.
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The concept of ‘non-culminating’ or ‘partitive’ accomplishments (PA) (1)/(3) has attracted considerable attention (Martin & Demirdache 2020) since (Bar-El, Davis & Matthewson 2006)’s seminal paper, and I intend to further its study here, claiming that it should be broadened up so to incorporate non-culminating achievements/iterated achievements (2)/(4), as they form distinct subclasses of what I will call partitive culminations (PCs). Furthermore, elaborating on (Copley & Harley 2014), and pace (Kroeger 2017), I will argue that PCs pertain to the wider class of failed culminations (FCs) along with avertives (Kuteva et al. 2019): all require that expected results of a culmination do not hold (which may or may not follow from an event’s endpoint not being reached cf. (1) vs (2)), i.e., have related modal-inferential contents. This stems from telicity being a sub-lexical teleological modality (Koenig & Davis 2001), and for inflectional avertive FCs, also from said inflection having a proximative meaning (‘be about to’), as in e.g. many Papuan/Indo-European/Australian (4)-(5) languages. It should be noted that while inflectional avertives semantically encode FCs, some types of PC utterances appear to (at least diachronically) involve cancelled implicatures, i.e., a pragmatic strategy.

This talk will first focus on Australian languages, where PC-type FCs can be fully pragmatic (1), or conventionally expressed via past indicative utterances followed by negation or a special ‘in vain’ word (1)-(3). Irrealis ‘proximative’ FCs are common in these languages (4)-(5), and can be optionally followed by a negative, ‘in vain’ word. While the interpretative overlap between these two types of FCs is particularly strong with reduplicated achievement verbs as in (2), it remains substantial with other aspectual types. This arguably follows from the fact that as all FCs express a failure to actualize a modal (proximative/teleological) meaning, they must involve similar sets of ‘target’ (result state) event properties inferentially derived from lexical and contextual information – cf. (Piñón 2014)’s notion of consequent states.

(1) n-alyubaru-nu=ma y-akina yinumaninga akena nara  kin-alyubari-na
   REAL.3M-eat-PST=MUT MASC-that MASC.food but NEG
   IRR.3M>MASC-eat-PST
   ‘He tried to eat the wild apple, but he didn’t eat it’ (Bednall 2019: 121). (Anindilyakwa) (PC)

(2) R-urlukba-n::       wardajb-ung   (Iwaidja)
   3sgMA>3sgO.ANT-step.on-ANT   3sg.ANT-couldn’t.break it-ANT
   ‘He (repeatedly) tried to break it with his foot but he failed.’ (Iwaidja) (PC)

(3) Ri-ldalku-ny    wunman    karlu.
   3sgMA>3sgO.ANT-cut-ANT 3sg.ANT-try-ANT NEG  (Iwaidj a)
   ‘He tried to cut it [a tree], but in vain’. (lit. ‘he cut it, he tried, but no’). (Iwaidja) (PC)

(4) Ana-ra-Ø      (and karlu)   (Iwaidja) (inflectional FC)
   3sg.TWD.PastIRR-go-PastIRR   (and neg)
   ‘He tried to come (in vain)/he nearly came/he was going to come (but he didn’t come).’

(5) Ana-jurrkba-ndi    (Iwaidja) (inflectional FC)
   1sg>3sgO.PastIRR-bury-PastIRR   (but NEG)
   ‘I tried to bury it (in vain)/I nearly buried it/I was going to bury it (but I didn’t bury it).’

Finally, I will try and shed some light on the crosslinguistically convergent development paths of PC constructions and proximate avertives (Kuteva et al. 2019). This is notably reflected in
the adverbal domain, where proximative adverbs (e.g. ‘nearly, almost’) have come to be used to form PCs (Ziegeler 2006; Ziegeler 2015) across a number of languages. I will at once stress (i) their similar teleological modal and postmodal content (van der Auwera & Plungian 1998) (i.e. their shared ‘failed culmination’ meaning), and (ii) their aspectuo-temporal differences, as grammatical avertive FCs involve inflections with proximative imperfective meanings (as is the case with Australian avertive/irrealis inflections), whereas PCs involve either ‘partitive’ perfective tenses à la (Altshuler 2014), or bona fide perfective tenses combined with partitive/proximative modifiers – thereby making them both related and distinct categories.
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The expression of habituality by habitual markers across three different languages – three different types of habituality?

Habituals are considered as a subtype of genericity, and are variable cross-linguistically (Bertinetto & Lenci 2010, Carlson 2012). Some forms, essentially imperfectives, are more likely to express habituality alongside other meanings, while other languages have dedicated markers (Bybee et al 1994). For Comrie (1976), Boneh & Doron (2008), habitual sentences are intrinsically characterizing: they attribute a defining property to the intended referent(s) and/or to a whole period of time. Equally remarkable is the relation noted between modality and habituality. For Givón (1994), Cristofaro (2004) and others, habitual markers are a hybrid category, between realis and irrealis.

We believe that there is no language-independent encoding of habituality, but to use (Slobin 1996)’s characterization, « verbalized events » of habituality: the manner in which each language expresses it ultimately depends on the specific semantics of the given construction within the language system. This talk focuses on three languages that have such dedicated markers and/or constructions. Russian (ex1) and Breton (ex2) have a habitual form of be, which can take on a quasi-polyphonous semantic function: the situation is often presented as a time-honored one, emanating from an interpersonal habitual experience. Hungarian (ex3) has a verb meaning be used to, a common lexical source for habituals (Heine & Kuteva 2002), that took on a quasi anaphoric use as an auxiliary of habit:

1. Pogoda u nas často takaja, depressivnaja. No byvaet i xuže, kogda doždi idut nedelju podrjad. ‘The weather is often like this, pretty depressing. But it can get much worse, when it rains a whole week.’

2. “Ma’z aer goustad e vez riskl e krogfe an heol ennomp. If you-go slowly PART be-HAB risk PART would-be-caught the sun in-us ‘If you walk too slowly, you risk getting sunstroke.’

3. Nem fáj annyira, amennyire ordítok. A növérem is így szokta. ‘I’m yelling more than it actually hurts. My sister too same-way aux-HAB. My older sister does this, too.’

Apparent similarities end here: in all three languages, habituality can be expressed by other means (present and imperfect tense in Breton, imperfective and perfective aspect in Russian, present and past in Hungarian): Russian can conjoin the byvaet/byvalo form and a present perfective verb; Breton has many periphrastic constructions (progressive, perfect, passive) which exploit the distinction between non-habitual and habitual be; Hungarian szokott interacts strongly with the focus-topic structure of the Hungarian sentence. This talk is an empirical investigation into habitual markers.
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Intermediate PERFECTS

The typological and theoretical literature on the (PRESENT) PERFECT reveals extensive cross-linguistic variation in the distribution and meaning of the configuration HAVE+past participle (Schaden 2009, Dahl & Velupillai 2013, Bertinetto & Squartini 2016 and others). Besides languages with a classical PERFECT (English and Spanish), we find languages with a widespread, liberal PERFECT (French and Italian), and languages with a very restricted PERFECT (Modern Greek, Portuguese). Van der Klis et al. (2021) carry out parallel corpus research to map out the cross-linguistic variation in L’Étranger (by Albert Camus) and its translations. The subset relation that emerges from the data shows that the competition between PERFECT and PAST is shaped like a scale, rather than a categorical classification:

French Italian >> German >> Dutch >> Spanish >> English >> Modern Greek Portuguese
liberal PERFECT intermediate PERFECT classical PERFECT strict PERFECT

In the literature, English and Spanish serve as the starting point for the semantics of the PERFECT as a grammatical category. For strict PERFECT languages like Modern Greek and Portuguese, specialized meanings are postulated. For French and Italian, one view holds that these languages have abandoned the PERFECT as a grammatical category, and simply use the configuration HAVE+past participle as the expression of the perfective past (Lindstedt 2000). Others disagree, and maintain a perfect interpretation for liberal PERFECTs (de Swart 2007, Apothéloz 2016, Bres 2010, 2020, and others).

Intermediate PERFECT languages like German and Dutch have not played much of a role in the typological and theoretical debate. Yet such intermediate PERFECT languages raise important questions for a cross-linguistically robust semantics of the PERFECT. What meaning do we assign to HAVE+past participle in languages where the PERFECT has extended its meaning beyond the classical use in English and Spanish, but has not completely replaced the SIMPLE or PERFECTIVE PAST? In this paper, we argue that this cannot be dismissed as a language-specific problem for German and Dutch, because Catalan and Breton have intermediate (PRESENT) PERFECTs as well (for Catalan, see Curell & Coll 2007, Xiques 2015 among others). Accordingly, a more in depth analysis of intermediate PERFECTs is called for.

We extend the dataset used by Van der Klis et al. (2020, 2021) with the Catalan and Breton translations of L’Étranger. We observe that the frequency of PERFECT use in Catalan and Breton is higher than in Spanish, but lower than in French and Italian, confirming their status of intermediate PERFECT languages, with Catalan a more liberal PERFECT language than Breton. Besides a quantitative analysis, we use Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) to compare tense use in context. The distributional analysis shows that in all contexts in which Spanish uses a PERFECT, Breton and all the other languages use a PERFECT. Similarly, in all contexts in which Breton uses a PERFECT, Catalan, French and Italian also use a PERFECT. So the data reveal a second subset relation besides the one reported in Van der Klis et al. (2020, 2021):

French Italian >> Catalan >> Breton >> Spanish
liberal PERFECT intermediate PERFECT classical PERFECT

We now have two subset relations, and we may wonder whether we can collapse them into one. The dataset shows similar numbers of PERFECTs for German and Catalan, but the application of
MDS reveals differences in distribution. Breton and Dutch are also fairly close in the number of perfect in the dataset, but their distribution is not the same. We conclude that we cannot reduce the two subset relations to a single competition between perfect and (perfective) past.

A qualitative analysis of the datapoints that lead to differences in tense use across languages enables us to connect distribution to grammar. We find that the meaning ingredients brought out by van der Klis et al (2020, 2021) also play a role in Catalan and Breton, but they are organized in different ways across the two subset relations. Catalan and German share the possibility to use a perfect to describe sequences of events in narrative discourse. They differ in that German avoids perfect use with stative verbs, while Catalan is not sensitive to Aktionsart. In contrast, German can use the perfect to locate an event in the pre-hodiernal past, whereas Catalan maintains a hodiernal perfect. Dutch and Breton share the ban on perfect use in narrative contexts, but just like German, Dutch can use the perfect to locate an event in the (pre-hodiernal) past, while Breton generally maintains the restriction on hodiernality, just like Catalan.

We conclude that the existence of two subset relations and four intermediate perfects strengthens the need for a cross-linguistically robust semantics of the perfect that goes beyond the dichotomy between perfect and past. The analysis of the contexts in which languages behave similarly as well as where they differ helps brings out the core meaning ingredients that we need to build this semantics.
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This talk starts from the observation that, in many genetically and geographically unrelated languages, there is a remarkable restriction on the use of the present tense to refer to dynamic or perfective situations that are happening at the time of speaking – a phenomenon called the ‘present perfective paradox’ (Malchukov 2009; De Wit 2017). With stative and imperfective situations, on the other hand, there are no such alignment problems. In English, for instance, it is ungrammatical to employ the simple present to refer to present-time events (e.g., *Be quiet, I write), whereas present-time states do allow the use of the simple present (e.g., I feel sick). Similar interactions between the present tense and aspect have been attested in language-specific studies of, among others, various Slavic languages, creole languages, Bantu languages, Niger-Congo languages and Japanese. In these languages, the so-called present tense (when combined with perfective/dynamic verbs) is primarily used to report future, past or habitual rather than present-time events.

In this presentation, I will analyze the manifestation of this present perfective paradox in English, French, the English-based Surinamese creole language Sranan, and a variety of Slavic languages (Russian, Polish, Czech, and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian), thereby adopting an epistemic approach to temporal and aspectual categories (e.g. Langacker 1991). The analysis starts from the assumption that there is a cognitive constraint on the alignment of bounded situations in their entirety with the time of speaking, and that this constraint is linguistically reflected in the fact that it is difficult to use present perfective constructions with dynamic verbs to report present-time events. On the basis of a detailed study of corpus data and native-speaker elicitations, I argue that languages have developed a variety of strategies to tackle this alignment problem. One solution is to insert a construction that, like the progressive, has the capacity to imperfectivize originally perfective situations. Another solution is to assign a non-present interpretation to present perfective constructions: a past interpretation (‘retrospective strategy’), a future interpretation (‘prospective strategy’), or a habitual/generic interpretation (‘structural strategy’). I will propose a variety of diachronic, contact-related, and cognitive explanations to account for which specific strategy is chosen and for the cross-linguistic variation in this respect.
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New perspective on aspect: the role of the aspectual cognate object in Hungarian

Preliminaries: In our presentation, we discuss the role the aspectual cognate object (ACO) plays in the aspectuality of the Hungarian VP. Hungarian lacks ACOs that are literally cognate with the unergative verb they accompany. Instead, it has accusative pseudo-objects (POs) (Piñón 2001; É. Kiss 2004; Kiefer 2006; Csirmaz 2008; Halm 2012; Farkas & Kardos 2018) that fulfill the function of the ACO in the language (Farkas 2019, 2020, 2021). Hence, the Hungarian counterpart of the English ACO construction in (1) is not the sentence in (2a) but the construction in (2b):

(1) John slept a sound sleep.
   ‘John slept a sound sleep.’   ‘John slept a sound sleep.’

Data: Similarly to English ACOs (Tenny 1994; Macfarland 1994, 1995; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995; de Swart 2007; Puigdollers Real 2008; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010), such Hungarian POs have been shown to effect a shift of aspectual character with respect to the corresponding unergative verb used on its own but without being completely acceptable with the alatt ‘in’ time adverbial (3); cf. Piñón (2001); É. Kiss (2004); Kiefer (2006); Csirmaz (2008) or Farkas (2017). In other words, the telic nature of the construction does not follow unequivocally from this canonical aspectual test:

(3) ??/*János fél óra alatt aludt egy mélyet.
   ‘John half hour under slept a sound.’

Although such constructions may be grammatical with the alatt ‘in’ adverbial (Csirmaz 2008) and they are also compatible with the belül ‘within’ adverbial (É. Kiss 2004; Csirmaz 2008), the question arises as to why the presence of the alatt ‘in’ adverbial gives rise to a (slightly) ungrammatical or neutral sentence.

Findings: In sharp contrast to verbal particles, result predicates and goal PPs, POs (and ACOs more generally) have a non-maximalizing function by virtue of encoding an aspectual operator that picks out a contextually-defined non-maximal subpart of the event in the denotation of the verbal predicate (Farkas & Kardos 2019a, 2019b). They give rise to a telic VP but telicity in this case does not go together with maximality. With the alatt ‘in’ adverbial, the emphasis is on the endpoint of the event; hence, only VPs denoting a telic and maximal event (with a prominent endpoint) are compatible with this adverbial. But these constructions – in the absence of a (prominent) endpoint, which would be encoded in the PO/ACO – do not denote an endpoint-oriented event; hence, as VPs denoting a telic but non-maximal event, they are not (completely) acceptable with the same adverbial.
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In his monograph on aspect, Comrie (1976: 64) briefly mentions an aspectual form he calls 'prospective aspect'. Prospective aspect relates a state to a subsequent situation and 'defines a temporal phase located close before the initial boundary of the situation' (Kuteva 2001: 92). Although German does not have grammaticalized prospective aspect, it expresses prospective aspect by means of light verb constructions (LVCs). An LVC is a complex predicate consisting of a semantically light verb (compared to its heavy verb use) and a non-verbal element which provides the main predicational content. The combination of the light verb *stehen* ‘stand’ with a PP headed by the preposition *vor* ‘in front of’ results in a prospective interpretation (1). The interpretation of the LVC in (1) is that the subject referent is close to the event denoted by the PP-internal NP.

(1)  *Der Kessel steht kurz vor der Explosion.*

'The boiler is close to explosion.'

The prospective interpretation is not possible with any noun but shows specific restrictions. An essential question is which nouns are licensed within this construction? At first glance, it looks as if only eventive nouns denoting a change of state are licensed. However, actual language data show that other types of nouns are possible as well. The noun *Wettkampf* ‘competition’ is eventive but does not express a change of state.

(2)  *[…] das geht jedem so, der vor seinem ersten Wettkampf steht.*\(^1\)

‘[…] everyone is like that facing his first competition.’

So far, the expression of prospective aspect in German has not been the subject of any empirical study. In the talk, I present the results of a first corpus study (based on the German reference corpus DeReKo\(^2\)) on the types of NPs admissible within the German prospective-LVCs. The talk presents a first corpus study on the expression of prospective aspect in German supplementing the compositional analysis presented in previous work (e.g. Fleischhauer & Gamerschlag 2019, Fleischhauer et al. 2019). The specific question answered in the study is: what are the specific semantic restrictions on the type of events licensed within this particular aspectual construction. This study might serve as a first step towards a better understanding of the development and grammaticalization of prospective aspects.
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\(^1\) https://www.ausdauerblog.de/erster-wettkampf-das-sollten-anfaenger-beachten/

\(^2\) https://www1.ids-mannheim.de/kl/projekte/korpora.html

In cross-linguistic research literature, Russian is often used as an example of a non-SOT language (e.g., Khomitsevich, 2007; Kubota et al., 2009; Minor, 2012; Altshuler, 2008). In past-under-past constructions, the authors do not mention the difference between IPF and PF past-under-past. They use examples with subordinated stative verbs or perception verbs in the main clause. Other verbs types, such as activities, accomplishments or achievements, for which verb aspect is relevant for their interpretation as backward-shifted or overlapping, are hardly or never discussed. The aim of this paper is to answer the question of how sentences like (1) and (2) are interpreted according to time reference, which I perceive to be a gap in the literature.

(1) Anna skazala, čto v ofise rabotnica ubrala.\textit{PV.PST bol'soj zal.}

(2) Anna skazala, čto v ofise rabotnica ubirala.\textit{IPV.PST bol'soj zal.}

Both indirect speeches in (1) and (2) represent the past-under-past condition. Nevertheless, the utterance $S$ in (1) is different from $S$ in (2). According to A. Barentsen (1996), the IPF past tense form in the dependent clause in (2) is an absolute tense\(^3\), because it refers «directly to the utterance time» and introduces «in the semantic representation a temporal relation with the utterance time as one of its arguments» (Costa & Branco, 2012: 4). The initial and final boundaries of the event denoted by the imperfective verb are not included in the reference time. The perspective rules out the endpoints of the narrated event. The PF past-under-past in (1) requires a viewpoint that establishes the perspective of an event within the time of the original utterance (see Comrie, 1976; Klein, 1994; Borik, 2006; Kazanina & Phillips, 2003). The following figures illustrate this distinction. Figure 1 illustrates the time reference such as in (1), and Figure 2 such as in (2):\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) B. Comrie (1985) distinguishes between absolute and relative tense. An ‘absolute tense’ is interpreted at the speech time whereas a ‘relative tense’ is interpreted at a time supplied by the linguistic context and may differ from the speech time.

\(^4\) \(t\)=time, \(R\)=point in time \(t\) of the indirect speech, \(E\)=point in \(t\) at which the narrated event took place relating to \(R\); \(t_0\) is the time when direct speech is uttered; \(t_1\) lies right from \(t_0\) on the time axis, which means \(t_1\) is posterior according to \(t_0\). \(t_{0-x}\) is anterior in relation to \(t_0\).

---

verb solely elicits the recognition of the PF event picture (result, here: backward shifted reading). For IPF subordinated verb in past-under-past condition, I suppose recognition for the IPF event picture (process, here: simultaneous or overlapping reading) by the majority of answers. Reaction time (RT) measuring for picture choice is supposed to give insight into the processing costs for the interpretation of the reference time.

![Figure 3: Process picture](image1)

![Figure 4: Result picture](image2)

The majority of the participants (88%) interpreted IPVpast similar as PVpast as backward shifted (see Figure 4) but the processing costs are significantly higher in IPVpast condition. IPF past-under-past strengthens an overlapping interpretation (see Figure 3). In my view, higher RTs for present-under-past can be explained by the temporal localization of $S$, $R$ and $E$ on the time axis. Main clause and subordinate clause refer to different points on the time axis. The time reference in such an indirect speech is more complex, slowing down processing and leading to higher RTs.
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Laurent Gosselin – Université de Rouen

L’expression de l’aspect au moyen de périphrases complexes en français

Les périphrases verbales constituent un moyen d’exprimer l’aspect en français. Certaines d’entre elles (aller, venir de, se mettre à…) ont fait l’objet d’analyses approfondies, mais il existe peu d’études qui les traitent dans leur ensemble. La conférence abordera trois questions qui concernent l’ensemble de la classe des périphrases aspectuelles :
- le statut des périphrases aspectuelles au sein de l’ensemble des périphrases verbales ;
- les distinctions de sous-classes de périphrases aspectuelles ;
- les combinaisons d’auxiliaires et de semi-auxiliaires servant à former des « périphrases complexes » (en particulier la question de l’ordre de ces semi-auxiliaires).

The expression of aspect using complex periphrases in French

Verbal periphrases are one way of expressing aspect in French. Some of them (aller, venir de, se mettre à...) have been the subject of in-depth analysis, but there are few studies that address them as a whole. The conference will address three questions that concern the whole class of aspectual periphrases:
- the status of aspectual periphrases within the set of verbal periphrases;
- the distinctions of subclasses of aspectual periphrases;
- the combinations of auxiliaries and semi-auxiliaries used to form "complex periphrases" (in particular the question of the order of these semi-auxiliaries).
1. The biologist François Jacob (1977) described evolution of the species as “tinkering”. Unlike an engineer who tries to realize a pre-established plan using appropriate tools, evolution is like a tinkerer (bricoleur) who combines whatever objects happen to be lying around to create new physical organs.

More recently, the neurobiologist Stanislas Dehaene (2004) demonstrated that evolution in the human brain can take place without a change in the genome. He and his colleagues provided evidence showing that the human faculties of reading and arithmetic were formed by the recycling of existing brain circuits to establish new neural patterns.

Evolution in the grammar of a natural language also takes place without any change in the genome. Under grammaticalization, a lexical item which is part of the description of a state or event at one synchronic stage of a grammar takes on a new, functional role at a later stage.

I suggest that the grammaticalization process also applies in synchronic grammar. The sentence that we pronounce and perceive in linear time is not composed in linear fashion. The Minimalist Program of Chomsky (1995) assigns it a history. A sentence is derived bottom up via reiteration of Merge, a process which combines two lexical items or phrases to form a single more complex lexical item or phrase. Early merges derive a v/VP phase which describes a state or event. Subsequent merges derive a larger TP/CP phase which places that eventuality description in time and motivates its subsequent construal as an assertion or other speech act. This derivational history includes the recycling and merge/tinkering by which a lexical item which contributes to a three-dimensional event description in vP is construed as a one-dimensional temporal functional element in TP.

However, tinkering in both diachronic and synchronic grammar is, I claim, a kind of engineering. The success of the process is determined, not, as for evolution, by natural selection over thousands of years, but rather by the necessity for every derivational output to realize one or more of a limited set of conceptual configurations which exist in the human mind both within and outside of language.

Building on work such as Chomsky (1995) and Borer (1984), I suggest that important differences between languages reduce to differences in the syntactic recycling of and and tinkering with members of the same set of universal formal features in order to satisfy members of the same set of universal mental configurations. To illustrate, I will attribute similarities and differences in the syntactic distribution of English HAVE and French AVOIR to variation in the way their grammars manipulate formal features in order to satisfy the basic mental configurations of Figure-Ground and Predication. I will propose that French verbs have a feature for aspect that English verbs lack while the English verb HAVE has a locative F which functions as aktionsart in vP and is recycled as aspect in TP.
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As pointed out by Pottier (2012:141), it should be distinguished between the category of aspect, which is grammaticalized in some languages and expressed as a correlation of perfective and imperfective verbs (like in Russian), the onomasiologically defined category of aspectuality and the individual linguistic means which contribute to the expression of the latter (cf. Haßler 2016:181).

The notion of viewpoint aspect – as explained by Bertinetto (1986:76), according to whom the description of a certain process or situation depends on the speaker’s perspective – is especially interesting for the study of languages in which the opposition of perfectivity and imperfectivity is not obligatorily marked like in Spanish and Portuguese on the one hand and English and German on the other hand. While Spanish and Portuguese can make use of the perfective and imperfective tenses (e.g. sp. cantar ‘to sing’: cantó.PERF/cantaba.IMPF), especially German rather relies on the use of lexical means in order to express a certain viewpoint regarding a described process (e.g. ger. singen ‘to sing’: sang.PERF/war (gerade) am Singen.IMPF).

In the languages which are the object of study, the imperfective aspect or aspectuality opens a path to the semantic-functional categories of epistemic modality and evidentiality because the factuality of the state of affairs is left open or marked as an information obtained from external sources, as the following example from Spanish indicates:

El referéndum presidencial […] sigue siendo obstaculizado por el Gobierno y ayer decía el ministro que esperaba aún un pronunciamiento del Tribunal Constitucional […] (ABC 22/05/1997)

‘The presidential referendum […] is still being obstructed by the government and yesterday the minister said [IMPF] he was still waiting for a pronouncement from the Constitutional Court […]’

The adverb ayer (‘yesterday’), indicating a fixed moment in the past, appears next to the verb decía.IMPF (‘say’) used in the imperfective tense (not indicating any fixed point in the beginning or end of saying). From the pragmatic-functional perspective, this use of the imperfect expresses epistemic modality and evidentiality: the journalist does not completely assume responsibility for the statement, indicating that the information comes from a third-hand source. This path or “metonymic bridge” (Dessì 2010) from one category to the others is demonstrated in a contrastive study via a qualitative analysis of authentic examples from Spanish, Portuguese, English and German, which are retrieved from different corpora1,2,3,4.
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Christophe Lenoble – Université Sorbonne Nouvelle

*Imperfectivity in Singapore English*

In Inner Circle varieties, the Present-day English aspectual system is said to lack the feature of general imperfectivity, which was characteristic of Old English, according to, among others, Kranich (2013: 23), Ziegeler (2017), Núñez-Pertejo (2004) and Traugott (1992) – the latter two authors being cited in Ziegeler & Lenoble 2020: 242). In Outer Circle varieties such as Singapore English (SgE), and in particular Colloquial Singapore English (CSE), however, there are signs that a move towards a general imperfective aspectual system seems to be under way. Indeed, not only has the extension of the progressive to statives been shown to be a common property of the varieties spoken in former British colonies (Van Rooy (2006, 2014), Van Rooy & Piotrowska (2015), Ziegeler & Lenoble 2020: 240)), but the overgeneralisation of habitual *will* in Singapore English (Ziegeler 2017) appears to be yet another grammaticalizing tool for expressing imperfectivity in the latter variety - that is, if one refers to Comrie's (1976) hierarchy of the English aspectual system, in which imperfectivity branches out into either habituality or continuative. Furthermore, Ziegeler (2012) has shown that the use of past tense in CSE is also a variable marker of habituality. The combination of the three grammemes - stative progressives, habitual *will*, and past-for-present (PFP) uses (Ziegeler 2012: 230) - may therefore indicate a nascent general imperfective system both in CSE and Standard Singapore English (SSE). Although stative progressivity is only a diagnostic to discriminate between general imperfectivity and progressivity, according to De Wit (2017: 24), and is not a means "to identify imperfective markers *an sich*" (ibid.), the present paper hypothesizes that its presence in Singapore English, along with the relatively more frequent use of overt marking for habitual aspect, suggests that Singapore English may be considered to be an example of an imperfective variety of English today which replicates in some ways the Old English imperfective category. Quantitative data is taken from the ICE corpora and GloWbE so as to support such a view and fieldwork data concerning *I will / I won't*-habitual contexts in SgE will also be considered.

**Key Words:** Imperfectivity - Singapore English - Stative progressives - Habitual *will* - Past for Present uses.

**References:**


German is commonly not viewed as a typical aspect language, for in German the perfective and imperfective aspectual distinctions are not marked morphologically on the verb, as it is common in the Slavic languages, particularly in Russian (Comrie, 1976; Forsyth, 1970; Leiss, 1992). However, aspect is a grammatical category that is currently being discussed as grammaticalizing in German (Gárgyán, 2014; Krause, 2002). The present work endeavours to define the similarities between the two languages German and English in the way they grammaticalize the category of aspect by acquiring progressive aspect forms. While the English progressive is fully grammaticalized, German progressive constructions are lagging behind, but – as stated by Reimann (1997) (and many others) - German is on its way towards developing obligatory, i.e. fully grammaticalized progressive aspect marking. The study strives to uncover the similarities and differences between the progressives in the two languages in the way they emerged. It will be investigated whether the grammaticalization process in the English language resembles the supposedly presently emerging, presumably similar process in Modern Standard German. For instance, a striking parallel exists between the German am- and beim-progressives and the Early Modern English locative constructions of the type ‘be in hunting’, built also with the prepositions ‘on’, ‘at’, or ‘upon’ (Núñez-Pertejo, 2004), showing a close formal parallel to the Modern German prepositional progressive forms.

To this end, a comparative corpus study of the progressive in Late Modern English as well as of the progressive forms in Present-Day German is conducted that draws on grammaticalization theory (Lehmann, 2015; Diewald & Smirnova, 2012) as well as on aspectual and aktionsart theory (Comrie, 1976; Leiss, 1992; Bache, 1985). For the English part, the current version of the ARCHER corpus is used, and for the investigation of Present-Day German, DWDS corpus data are analyzed, with a focus on conceptually near-spoken registers.

It is expected that the German am-Progressive approaches obligatorification and grammaticalization. Furthermore, the am-Progressive is expected to behave syntactically as well as semantically similar to the English Progressive before its complete grammaticalization in the Late Modern English period, such that it may be concluded that both Germanic languages within their relevant stages of diachronic development undergo or underwent a very similar process of grammaticalization of progressive markers, yet at different times in their individual histories.
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Aspect in Chinese: toward a unidimensional model

The systematic study of aspect in Chinese started in the late 20th century, and due to typological considerations and to the influence of Vendler’s (1957) seminal work, aspect in Chinese was compared to its counterpart in English, rather than Russian. Smith’s model of aspect has also been widely used in Chinese linguistics, not the least because she herself published about aspect in Chinese (Smith 1990; 1994; 1997; Smith and Erbaugh 2005). But some linguists have argued for the specificity of Chinese regarding the expression of aspectual meaning.

Thus, in this talk, we start by reviewing works that adopt the bi-dimensional approach to aspect – distinguishing “situation aspect” from “viewpoint aspect” (Smith 1997), while discussing the relevance of certain situation types for Chinese.

We then discuss propositions of three-dimensional models for Chinese, like Xiao and McEnery's (2004), where the analysis of situation aspect is split in two levels, to explain how aspect operates both at the lexical and the phrasal levels. Similarly, Jin (金立鑫 2008) advocates a distinction between Aktionsart (applying to lexical verbs) and situation types (encompassing verb phrases). Such a distinction aims to disentangle what in aspectual meanings pertains to the lexicon proper, as opposed to morphosyntax.

However, we aim to show that it is not a straightforward task, given the imbrication of the lexical and the morpho-syntactic levels as regards aspectual meaning. As exemplified in (1-3) below (examples from Lin 2004), alongside verb meaning, perfective grammatical aspect marker -le crucially contributes to the definition of situation types.

(1) State
zhe shuang xie hen po
this CL shoe very broken
This pair of shoes is lousy.

(2) State + -le → Achievement
zhe shuang xie po-le
this CL shoe broken-PRF
This pair of shoes is worn out.

(3) Activity + [Achievement State+ -le] → Accomplishment
zhe shuang xie chuan-po-le
this CL shoe wear-broken-PRF
This pair of shoes has been worn to rags.

Building on the difficulty to ascertain the aspectual specifications of verbs abstracted from their morphosyntactic contexts in Chinese, we argue for a unidimensional model, ranging from the lexicon to aspectual syntax. We adopt Michaelis’ (2004) claims that the lexicon (verb types) and the morphosyntax (aspectual operators) basically use the same aspectual classes, the same basic distinction obtaining at both levels. Focusing on three different aspect markers – perfective -le, durative -zhe and progressive zai, we describe coercion as a central operation accounting for the versatility of aspectual types in Chinese.
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Revisiting the manner/path complementarity in light of French data

Talmy’s typology of motion events description (Talmy 1985, 2000) contrasts Verb-framed languages with Satellite-framed languages. Verb-framed languages (including Romance languages) express the Path component in the verb (1), while Satellite-framed languages (including Germanic languages) express the Path component outside the verb, by an adposition or a particle designated as a Satellite (2).

(1) Il entre dans la maison en courant
PATH SITE MANNER
(2) He runs into the house
MANNER PATH SITE

This typological division has been supported by the definition of two classes of verbs: directed motion verbs (or path verbs) and manner of motion verbs (cf. Levin 1993). These two classes have been defined by spatial properties (boundary crossing) and aspectual properties (telicity). At the risk of circularity, researchers have often used telicity to avoid ambiguities due to a referential conception of boundary crossing: Atelicity has been associated with manner of motion verbs (marcher ‘to walk’ in (3)) and telicity with directed motion verbs (SORTIR ‘to come out’ in (4)):

(3) Il a marché sur la plage pendant une heure / ?à 5 heures
‘He walked on the beach for an hour / ? at 5 o’clock’
(4) Il est sorti de la boutique ?pendant une heure / à 5 heures
‘He came out of the store ?for one hour / at 5 o’clock’

A refinement of verb classification has been introduced based on the notions of scalar/ non-scalar change (McClure 1994, Rappaport Hovav 2008). These notions have allowed to better specify the above correlations between verb classes and aspectual properties.

Rappaport, Hovav and Levin (2010) put forward a general hypothesis according to which a verb lexicalizes either the manner or the path, but not both simultaneously in the same root. Their principle was generalized beyond the domain of motion and further stipulates a complementarity between the expression of manner and result. While this principle adequately accounts for a large part of the verbal lexicon, there are also counterexamples, i.e. verbs which seem to express both manner and path (Beavers & Koontz-Garboden 2012, 2017, 2020, Sarda 2019).

Focusing on French data, this study highlights a range of motion verbs which combine both manner and path: débouler, ‘tumble’, s’infiltrer ‘infiltrate’, s’insérer ‘insert’, se glisser ‘slip’, se faufiler ‘sneak’, filer, s’échapper, s’évader, ‘escape’, s’extraire ‘extract’, se dégager ‘get away’, se barrer ‘leave’, s’ ejécter ‘eject’, se retirer ‘withdraw’, s’esquiver ‘dodge’ etc. Based on a corpus study (extracted from the Frantext database), I will identify the lexical and constructional factors which, together, contribute to the specification of the aspectual behavior of these verbs (Gosselin 2020). I will rely on the classification of motion verbs from Aurnague 2011, and argue for a view of manner in terms of semantic features (Stosic 2009), associated with a verbal lexeme independent of its aspectual properties. The results support a perspective
wherein the manner and the path conceived of as to be semantic features that can coexist in a verbal root. In analogy with gene expression, where genes can be silent or active depending on internal or external stimuli, meaning may be seen as a potential that can be revealed depending on lexical or contextual conditions.
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The aspectual system of (mostly Modern) Greek is often discussed in relation to what may be described as the Slavic model – already in Comrie 1976 but also works like Joseph 1983, which note the presence of an obligatory (and apparently symmetrical) opposition throughout the verbal system. Although most researchers recognise a [+/-perfective] opposition, the exact relation of the Greek facts to the categorization of the oppositions observed in Slavic and other languages is not always clear. The interaction of categories discussed under Aspect and Aktionsart across languages will also be relevant (as in Smith 1991/1997; also Moser 2013, 2014). The analysis reviews some of the diachronic facts that have led to the establishment of a clear-cut morphological distinction in practically all Greek verbs, across tense and mood distinctions, and then concentrates on the nature of this distinction, in the light of cross-linguistic expectations (as in Bybee et al. 1994 and Dahl 1985).

An important question to be addressed involves the details of the present perfective paradox (as in De Wit 2017), contrasting the Greek case both to earlier accounts (that seem to ignore aspectual oppositions) and to the data found in the literature on Slavic languages. At the same time, the data reviewed will shed some light on the nature of the paradox and the cross-linguistic prototypes of the categories involved, in terms of both Tense and Aspect. The evidence will then be related to theoretical questions regarding the content of the oppositions across languages and their interactions in terms of (in)compatible or (in)felicitous combinations (in the sense of Malchukov 2009, 2011). A further interesting complication involves the comparability of the restrictions attested in Modern Greek with those found especially in South Slavic, raising questions of areal influence (and a possible Balkanism).

Overall, the evidence from a host of independent phenomena will be argued to support the validity of a generalization that relates the Greek facts to the cross-linguistic prototypes of the perfective / imperfective distinction.


Corpus studies have identified various factors influencing aspect choice in French, i.e. the distinction between *passé composé/passé simple* and *imparfait*. The reported predictors and their influences are summarized in the table below (Reid 1979, Labelle 1987, Engel 1990, Di Vito 1997, De Jonge 2000 for Spanish, among others).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aktionsart</td>
<td>Dynamic-telic predicates</td>
<td>Stative-atelic predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Preference for 1SG</td>
<td>Preference for 3SG/PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Active, preferred in passive</td>
<td>Active, dispreferred in passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarity</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentivity</td>
<td>Agentive predicates</td>
<td>Non-agentive predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Structure</td>
<td>Independent / matrix clauses</td>
<td>Subordinate / relative clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Spec.</td>
<td>Positional and iterative adverbials</td>
<td>Durative and frequential adverbials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, no study has taken into account possible interaction effects between two or more predictors. Second, empirical data are mostly restricted to written data (literature/newspapers). Third, statistical analyses are limited to the description of frequencies or varbrul analyses without comparing the relative importance of predictors, although newer regression methods are available by now. Therefore, I aim to expand on these studies by modeling aspect choice in French multifactorially.

The study is couched in a bidimensional selection theory (Sasse 1991, Bickel 1997, Michaelis 2011). Aspectual constructions are operators that select elements in the aktionsart representation of a predicate. Aktionsart represents the lexical-aspectual semantics of the verbal predicate including its argument structure (Verkuyl 1993). Flexible predicates such as degree achievements can have multiple construals (Croft 2012) with varying telicity.

Data were retrieved from FRCOW16, a high-quality mega web corpus of French (Schäfer 2015, Schäfer/Bildhauer 2012). I generated a stratified random sample based on Biber & Egbert’s web registers (2016 and subsequent), collapsed into five balanced registers: narrative, informational, argumentative, spoken(-like) and hybrid. 2 x 1200 instances of PC and IMP were annotated for the predictors listed above. Given the Zipfian distribution of verb types, mixed-level logistic regression was carried out with VERB TYPE as a random factor. The model also accounted for two-way interactions among the predictors. Stepwise backward selection of variables identified those (in)significant for aspect choice.

The final model performed significantly better than a base line model without any predictors ($\chi^2$(22): 720.36, $p < .0001$) and has an excellent fit ($C$: .890, Somers’ $D_{xy}$: .780). POLARITY and AGENTIVITY are, contrary to expectations, no relevant predictors for aspect choice in French. Instead, the final model reported a significant interaction between AKTIONSART and AGENTIVITY ($\chi^2$(5): 16.14, $p = .006$). AKTIONSART turns out to be the most relevant predictor for aspect choice in French, although PERSON, VOICE and CLAUSE STRUCTURE have an influence, but much more limited, as well. An exception is the behaviour of inceptive states (*voir*, *savoir*), which strongly favor perfective aspect. The findings will be discussed with respect to the notion of gradience in the aspectual system (Ayoun et al. 2018), with a special focus on marked aktionsart-aspect combinations.
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Revisiting the Singapore English habitual aspect

The absence of tense marking in past stative or imperfective contexts has frequently been noted in Singapore English (e.g., Ho & Platt 1993), though Maurer (2013) has noted that Singapore English is both an aspect and tense-based variety. In Colloquial Singapore English, the present tense often marks past habituals and progressives, and this is attributed most often to influence from substrate or adstrate languages such as Chinese, which do not have tense marking. However, a less frequently-occurring feature is present habitual aspect marked by past tense which in standard usage would require the simple present tense; this asymmetric situation has been observed earlier in Singapore English internet forums (Ziegeler 2012) (though not in the ICE-Singapore corpus). In that study, the marking of present habitual aspect with past tense was said to resemble the tendency in some Slavic languages for perfective aspect to be marked in present habituals (e.g. Mønnesland 1984), as Ho & Platt (1993) claimed that past tense marks perfective aspect rather than past time reference in Singapore English. However, on closer examination, not all of the examples in the (2012) study could be said to express prototypical habitual aspect situations. Furthermore, the methodology of the investigation was based mainly on predictions regarding the lexical aspect of the relevant verb types found. A further study using a larger corpus and a different search method reveals that many of the earlier examples could be explained as functions of iamitive aspect (i.e. perfects or perfective aspects grammaticalized from lexical sources meaning ‘already’ or ‘finish’ – Dahl (2006, Olsson 2013). It is also observed that not only present habitual aspect, but also conditionals and contexts which could be described as expressing ‘present perfectivity’ (see, e.g., De Wit 2017), are similarly marked with the past tense. The marking of present habitual aspect and other present perfective contexts in Singapore English using past tense may be explained by considering not only shared characteristics with substrate and other languages, but also the progressive grammaticalization of past tense in a dialect in which the question of the division of labour between aspect and tense is not yet completely resolved.
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