

Aspectual derivation in a complex situation: case for Balkar *tur-* with causatives

Problem. One can take for granted the existence of a special parameter of situations and, as a consequence, of situation-denoting verbal stems, than can be called inner aspectuality, or actionality, Aktionsart, etc, describable as a characteristic of the temporal development of a situation, that is, its telicity, stativity, punctuality etc (Dowty 1979, Smith 1991, Tatevosov 2002). This characteristic of a predicate can be changed by using certain derivational or inflexional means: English verbal particles (Ramchand, Svenonius 2002) or Slavic Aktionsart suffixes (Filip 2003, Ramchand 2004) can be a good example, though their exact meaning and grammatical status remains an open issue. In this paper, however, I am going to discuss an aspectual modifier with a much more precise meaning, but addressing an intriguing question of how its semantics interacts with verbs that denote complex causative situations, consisting of at least two subevents: the one of causation and the caused one.

Background. Balkar provides a good possibility for such a study, as it possesses a highly productive imperfectivizer, superficially realized by a construction “converb + light verb *tur-* ‘stand’” (1), as well as a causative expressed by a morpheme on the verbal stem and forming verbal stems with complex meaning, with clearly identifiable causing and caused subevents (2). The subevents are rather independent from one another: they can, for example, have their proper adverbs and be negated separately.

Data. The exact meaning of construction “causative verb+*tur-*” depends on four factors: lexical semantics of the initial verbal stem, type of converb, used with *tur-* (perfective *-ip*-converb vs. imperfective *-a/e*-converb), position of the causative marker (on the verb or on *tur-*), and morphological tense of the resulting predicate (Present, marked with *-a/e-* + *-di/di* in 3d person singular (cf. (1b)) vs. Preterit, designated by *-di/di/du/dü* (cf. 1a)). Verbs with *tur-* without causative morpheme (column IV in the table) can denote a resultant state, as in (1ab), a process (3a), or a habitual situation (3b). When dealing with a complex causative situation, new modified interpretation for its two subevents is calculated independently, that is, we can have a meaning, in which the causing subevent is represented by its resultant state (‘causation occurred successfully, and the causee has an intension to perform the caused action or already performs it’), and the caused subevent is viewed as a running process (causee is performing the caused action). This possibility is exemplified in (4.1).

As can be seen from Table 1, almost all pragmatically possible combinations of interpretations of the causing and caused situations are expressible within *tur*-constructions. For example, when the causing situation is understood as a resultant state (column I in Table 1), the caused situation can be interpreted as a resultant state, too (‘Fatima’s mother caused her to knit a jacket, and she already has it knitted’), or as a process (see (4.1)), or as a habitual situation (‘Fatima’s mother caused her to knit jackets, and now she does it every day’, (4.2)). If the causing situation itself is represented as a process (column II in Table 1), then the caused situation can be a parallel process (‘Marat is causing Alim to read a book, and Alim is reading it now’), or it can have non-factive meaning, that is, the sentence says nothing about realization of the caused situation (‘Marat is causing Alim to read a book, but we don’t know if Alim reads it’). And, finally, if the causing situation is habitual, the caused situation is habitual, too (‘Every day Fatima’s mother causes her to knit jackets, and she does it’). We will need a calculation of the meaning of the complex causative situation with *tur-* that would be able to construct all these possibilities, given interpretations for each component of the construction.

Analysis. Let us define meanings of the components. Meanings for converbs correspond to their meanings as heads of dependent clauses: *-ip* converb has two meanings, depending on the characteristics of the basic stems: with telic predicates it returns the resultant state of the situation (assume it bears a Stativizer in the spirit of Kratzer 2000), and with atelic stems it can have the same meaning or work as just imperfectivizer (cf. Filip 1999), whereas *-a/e-* converb bears an imperfectivizer, that picks out imperfective stage of the situation. Causative morpheme contributes to the meaning of the stem a new causing subevent, that can be parallel to the caused situation, and thus understood imperfectively, or, otherwise, finish before its beginning, being understood perfectly. Light verb *tur-* serves as an imperfectivizer for the situation it attaches to. Tense form of the whole predicate sets the general viewpoint, associated with a certain aspectual perspective: perfective for Preterit, imperfective for Present (cf. Klein 1994). Habitual interpretation is always available and can be the ‘last resort’ when no other interpretation can be derived. Interpretation of the whole predicate is calculated through successive application of the meanings of its parts.

The simplest case is the derivation of the construction with causative marker on the main verb, *-a/e-* converb, and the light verb in present tense (5): superposition of imperfectivizers imposed by the converb, *tur-* and Present tense gives processual interpretation (5.1), and the interpretation with occurring causing process and non-factive caused subevent (5.2) is available if the caused subevent doesn’t fall within the scope of imperfectivizer.

More interesting is the interpretation of a construction involving different operators, as in (4). First of all, causative imposes a new subevent, that can be parallel to the caused subevent or precede it. If it is parallel, that is, causation and knitting occur simultaneously and can be viewed as a single process, *-ip* converb can derive from it the resultant state or process meaning. With the imperfectivization imposed by *tur-* in Present, it gives ‘process-process’ (4.4) or ‘state-state’ (4.3) meaning. If the causing finishes before starting of caused situation, two possibilities are present: first, the causing subevent can be represented by its resultant state, and the caused subevent is either an ongoing process (4.1), or a habitual situation (4.2). Otherwise, if the causing is an ongoing process itself, the caused situation can be non-factive (4.5). And the very last possibility is the habitual interpretation of the whole situation (4.6).

- (1a) alim ešik-ni ac-ti. (b) alim ešik-ni ac-ip tur-a-di.
 Alim door open-PRT Alim door open-CONV stand-IPFV-3SG
Alim opened the door. Alim has the door opened.
- (2) kerim alim-ge ešik-ni ac-tir-di.
 Kerim Alim-DAT door open-CAUS-PRT
Kerim caused Alim to open the door.
- (3a) fatima kofta eš-e tur-a-di. (b) fatima kofta eš-e tur-du.
 Fatima jacket knit-IPFV stand-IPFV-3SG Fatima jacket knit-IPFV stand-PRT
Fatima is knitting a jacket. Fatima used to knit jackets.
- (4) ana fatima-ga kofta-ni eš-tir-ip tur-a-di.
 mother Fatima-DAT jacket-ACC knit-CAUS-CONV stand-IPFV-3SG
 1. *Fatima's mother caused her to knit a jacket, and she is doing it now.*
 2. *Fatima's mother (once) caused her to knit jackets, and she does it every day.*
 3. *Fatima's mother caused her to knit a jacket, and she has already done it.*
 4. *Fatima's mother is causing her to knit a jacket, and she is doing it now.*
 5. *Fatima's mother is causing her to knit a jacket, but we don't know if she does it.*
 6. *Fatima's mother always causes her to knit jackets, and she does it.*
- (5) marat žaščik-xa top-nu at-tir-a tur-a-di.
 Marat boy-DAT ball-ACC throw-CAUS-IPFV stand-IPFV-3SG
 1. *Marat is causing the boy to throw a ball, and the boy is throwing it.*
 2. *Marat is causing the boy to throw a ball, but we don't know if the boy does it.*

| | | CAUSATIVE | | | WITHOUT DERIVATIONS IV |
|-----------------|---------------|--|---|---|--|
| causing subev. | caused subev. | resultant state I | process II | habitual III | |
| resultant state | | -CAUS-ip tur-a-di (4.3) | | | -ip tur-a-di (1b) -ip tur-du |
| process | | -CAUS-ip tur-a-di (4.1) -CAUS-a tur-a-di | -CAUS-ip tur-a-di (4.4) -CAUS-a tur-a-di (5.1) | | -ip tur-a-di -a tur-a-di -ip tur-du -a tur-du |
| habitual | | -CAUS-ip tur-a-di (4.2) -CAUS-ip tur-du | | -CAUS-ip tur-a-di (4.6) -CAUS-ip tur-du -ip tur-CAUS-du -CAUS-a tur-du | -ip tur-a-di -a tur-a-di (3a) -ip tur-du -a tur-du (3b) |
| non-factive | | | -CAUS-ip tur-a-di (4.5) -ip tur-CAUS-a-di -CAUS-a tur-a-di (5.2) -ip tur-CAUS-du | | |

Table 1. Interpretations of *tur*-constructions with and without causative.

References

- Butt, Miriam. The Light Verb Jungle. // Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics, Volume 9, 2003. Pp. 1-49.
- Comrie, B. Aspect: an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge, 1976.
- Dowty, David R. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht, 1979.
- Durie, M. Grammatical structures in verb serialization. // Alsina, A., Bresnan, J., Sells, P. (eds.). *Complex predicates*. Stanford, 1997.
- Filip, Hana. 1999. *Aspect, eventuality types and noun phrase semantics*. New York, London: Garland Publishing.
- Filip, Hana. 2003. Prefixes and the Delimitation of Events. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12, 55-101.
- Klein, W. 1994. *Time in Language*. London: Routledge.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. Building Statives. In *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 26.
- Ramchand, Gillian. 2004. Time and the Event: the Semantics of Russian Prefixes. Ms., University of Tromsø/CASTL.
- Ramchand, Gillian and Peter Svenonius. 2002. The lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verb-particle construction. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 21*, eds. Line Mikkelsen and Christopher Potts, pp. 387-400. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, Ma.
- Smith, Carlota S. *The parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht, 1991.
- Tatevosov, Sergei. The Parameter of Actionality. // *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 6, #3. 2002. Pp. 317-401.