

## **Aspectual properties of a habitual: evidence from Karachay-Balkar.**

A semantic distinction between perfective vs. imperfective is widely recognized and claimed universal. “Outer aspect” distinguishes bounded (perfective) vs. unbounded (imperfective) point of view on the situation, cp. [Comrie 1976] or, more formally, [Smith 1991]. Aspectual values make restrictions on the actional (concerned as “inner aspect”) meanings of a predicate that are accessible for perfective or imperfective point of view. Predicates belonging to most of actional classes of a language have different sets of actional meanings in perfective and imperfective (those meanings correspond to different phases of the event as a whole). In particular, telic actional meanings, such as Entry into a state or Entry into a process<sup>1</sup>, are not possible in imperfective.

Habituals are event-external pluractional (cp. [Lasersohn 1995]) markers which pluralize an event. A habitual situation is repeated more or less regularly. But a puzzle should be noticed: which precisely phases of the situation should be considered as repeated? Which actional values for predicates of a given actional class are accessible for a habitual, or, in other words, which are aspectual properties of a habitual?

I have investigated a particular case of a habitual marker, *-ucu*-marked verbal forms in Karachay-balkar. In general, all the actional values contained in the actional semantics of a predicate are possible for Karachay-Balkar habituals. Strong-telic predicates (i.e. having Entry into a state as the only actional value in perfective (1a) and Process as the only value in imperfectives (1b)) combined with the habitual marker can have both telic (1c.1) and atelic (1c.2) interpretation. The other remarkable case in the case of “posture” predicates; those have Entry into a state (2a.1) and State (2a.2) actional values in perfective and Process (2b.1) and State (2b.2) actional values in imperfective; habituals of this actional class have all the three possible values, Entry into a state (2c.1), Process (2c.2) and State (2c.3).

So, the set of actional values accessible to Karachay-Balkar habitual is the largest possible. This form should be claimed as aspectually neutral, i.e. admitting both perfective and imperfective points of view. The further problem to investigate is that of universal character of such aspectual properties of a habitual category. A number of languages (e.g., Czech, Nenets, Eve) distinguish perfective vs. imperfective habituals, but in the other cases a tendency for aspectual neutralization in habitual context indeed exists.

---

<sup>1</sup> Here I use a set of universal actional meanings proposed in [Tatevosov 2002] for a universal method to classify actional classes of predicates in an arbitrary language. Using the notation of actional classes I also follow that paper.

## Examples

(1) a. kerim ket-ti.

Kerim leave-PST

*Kerim left.*

b. kerim ket-e-di.

Kerim leave-PRES-3SG

*Kerim is leaving.*

c. kerim ket-iücü-dü.

Kerim leave-HAB-3SG

*1. Kerim ususally leaves.*

*1. Kerim ususally tends to leave.*

(2) a. kerim oltur-du.

Kerim sit-PST

*1. Kerim sat down.*

*2. Kerim sat (for some time).*

b. kerim oltur-a-dy.

Kerim sit-PRES-3SG

*1. Kerim is sitting down.*

*2. Kerim is sitting.*

c. kerim oltur-uucu-du.

Kerim sit-HAB-3SG

*1. Kerim usually sits down.*

*2. Kerim usually tends to sit down.*

*3. Kerim usually sits (for some time).*

## References

Comrie, Bernard. Aspect: an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Lasersohn, Peter. Plurality, Conjunction and Events. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995.

Smith, Carlota. The Parameter of Aspect. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991.

Tatevosov, Sergei. The Parameter of Actionality. // Linguistic Typology, vol. 6, 3. 2002.