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Aspect – viewpoint aspect

• Gives us information about the development of the eventuality.

• Whether an event is about to happen, is happening or has happened
(1) Bill is going to color the castle.
(2) Bill is coloring the castle.
(3) Bill colored/has colored the castle.

- Metaphorical descriptions
- Interval ordering descriptions
  - Reichenbach 1947
Viewpoints as predicates of interval ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoints</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>AT (WITH)IN EvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>AT (Total) OVERLAP EvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>AT AFTER EvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>AT BEFORE EvT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntax of Aspect

- Structure of the meaning; the layering of the meaning
- Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 2000 and ss work
- Stowell 1993
Syntax of Tense and Aspect

Is this enough?

- Correspondence between the syntax and the morphology?
- What do we want to show in our syntax?
- What are the cues to discern what we want to distinguish?
- Are the intervals & predicates above all we need to account for Aspect?
- Is this way the only/best way of representing Aspect syntactically?
Inflected Spanish imperfective –aba/-ía

Meanings:

• Progressive: Marta cantaba cuando entré en el cuarto.
  Marta sing.past.imp.3ps when entered-l in the room
  ‘Marta was singing when I entered the room’

• Habitual: Marta nadaba cuando era pequeña.
  Marta swim.past.imp.3ps when she was little
  ‘Marta used to swim when she was little’

• Continuous: Marta tenía los ojos claros.
  Marta have.past.impf.3ps the eyes light
  ‘Marta had blue eyes’

• Attitudinal –ability: Marta comía carne
  Marta eat.past.impf.3ps meat
are accounted for by alluding to pragmatic factors.

The subsequent issue that needs attention is the morphological account of the structure involving two aspect heads is the same. It is the auxiliary verb that carries the bundle of tense (synthetic) imperfect inflected form with a progressive reading. I argue that in this case interval that is contained within the structure in

A - A

T T

Asp Merge (within)

That machine crushes grapes

That is, we can consider that

Una idea circuló por su cabeza

Cien uvas caen por el pino

That is, we can consider that there is

As is known

While in perfective progressives the Aspect heads contain different semantic content each, in

When I visited her
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With all this in mind, a structure for habituality is attempted below, containing two aspect heads with two different orderings predicates. The structure of (77) reads: the AT is within an interval that contains a plural number of intervals that overlap with event times of swimming. The duration of such overlap relation is five hours. What clusters the habitual together with the other readings of the imperfect is the predicate within that appears in the upper Aspect head and has a reflex on inflection. The aspect head capturing the perfectivity of each instance does not receive any morphological form in Spanish, but it is visible for the semantics component, as it can be modified—recall that only when the perfective is present is a for-time adverbial viable. The adverbial cuando era pequeña 'when I was young' acts as a restrictor of the AT of the clause; the AT is within an interval containing a plurality of occasions which are interpreted as perfective each, hence the need of another aspect head. Each instantiation of the eventuality is modified by durante cinco horas 'for five hours'.

Syntax of the Spanish perfective

(16) Pfect Progressive (analytical & synthetic)

Estuvo coloreando / coloreó
was pfve coloring/coloured

TP
T aux [past]
AstT AspP1
Asp P1

(To/ver/la) Interval

Asp [within] (seg.)
EvT
EvTP
[cobra a castle]

(17) Non-progressive

TP
T aux [past]
AstT AspP
Asp P

(overlap)
EvT
EvT VP

Questions

• What about the lower interval in the tree?
• If we can have a perfective progressive, what is at the heart of the difference between imperfective and perfective?
• How many perfectives can we say we have in Spanish?

Testing ground to probe for answers

• Non-culminating accomplishments in the perfective
Non culminating accomplishments

- Heterogeneous events
- Do not entail the culmination of the situation
- Tackle the heart of the relation between:
  - Telicity
    - Heterogenous events
    - not event terminus/completion/telos
  - Perfective viewpoint aspect
    - Perfective: supposed to bring completion; interval bounded

Leading cases and points of investigation

- For the sake of the discussion, focus on cases such as (1):

  (1) Pedro coloreó el castillo durante tres horas, pero no terminó.
  Pedro colour-pfve.3ps the castle for three hours, but not finished
  ‘Pedro coloured the castle for three hours but he did not finish to’
Points for exploration

1. Quality of the eventuality: true accomplishments?
2. Semantics of the perfective
   paraphrases as perfective progressive
3. Syntax-semantics of the temporal modifiers that seem to foster nonculmination in these cases
   “For x time”; “from x to y”
4. The compatibility of the overt clause declaring the lack of culmination explicitly “not finish to” (vs. not completely).

I will explore

• A sort of correlation among these elements
• Which may point to the availability of PARTITIVE semantics in the perfective in Spanish.
• Which takes us to the issue of what the key difference with the imperfect is.
1. Quality of the eventuality

True accomplishment? yes

Culmination is possible

(2) Pedro coloreó el castillo durante tres horas y lo terminó.
Pedro coloured the castle for three hours and it finished
‘Pedro coloured the castle for three hours and he finished it’

• The event is susceptible of culminating, *ergo*, it is not an activity.

2. The meaning of the perfective

• In all these cases, the perfective can be paraphrased with a perfective progressive:

(5) Pedro *estuvo coloreando* el castillo durante tres horas, pero no/y terminó.
Pedro was coloring the castle for three hours, but not/and finished.
3. The semantics of the temporal modifier

(6) Pedro coloreó el castillo, pero no terminó.
    Pedro coloured the castle, but not finished (to)
• OK for some speakers, but many react by adding a “for-time” modifier.

(7) Pedro coloreó el castillo durante tres horas, pero no terminó.
    Pedro coloured the castle for three hours, but not finished

The meaning of the temporal modifier

• Why does this adverbial make the sentence better?
• What does it mean?
• For three hours gives us the size of an interval
• Which interval?

(8) Pedro coloreó el castillo durante tres horas...
    Pedro coloured the castle for three hours ...

(8) is true even if Pedro coloured the castle for five hours.
    (Arche 2014)
The meaning of the temporal modifier

- So, which interval?

- The Topic Time/Assertion Time? Klein 1994
- The Event Time?

- The interval we want to assert (the TT, AstT), rather than the interval of the whole event per se.
- *For three hours* can give us only part of the interval the event may extend over.

The meaning of the temporal modifier

- *For*-time adverbials sharply contrast with *in*-time adverbials:

(9) Pedro coloreó el castillo en tres horas.

Pedro coloured the castle in three hours

- cannot be true if it took Pedro five hours to colour the castle.
- cannot be continued by “not finish to”

(10) *Pedro coloreó el castillo en tres horas, pero no terminó.*

Pedro coloured the castle in three hours, but not finished
The meaning of the temporal modifier

*En tres horas*

*in three hours* → interval of the whole actual event

*Durante tres horas*

*for three hours* → interval of the assertion

- Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 2004: temporal adverbials are modifiers of the Assertion Time or the Event Time.

The syntax of *interval size* modifiers

- *durante-time*
  - *for-time*
    - Asp\(^P\)
      - Ast\(T\)
        - Ast\(T\) *for-PP* Asp\(^o\) Evt\(T\)
      - Asp\(^’\)
    - Ast\(T\)
      - Asp\(^o\)
      - Evt\(T\)

- *en-time*
  - *in-time*
    - Asp\(^P\)
      - Ast\(T\)
        - Ast\(T\)
          - Ast\(T\) *for-PP* Asp\(^o\) Evt\(T\)
        - Asp\(^’\)
      - Asp\(^o\)
      - Evt\(T\)
        - Evt\(T\) *in-PP*
Cont. Semantics of interval size modifiers

• Both *for-time & in-time* give the size of an interval
  • Hence both compatible only with *perfective*

• *For-time*: measures the Assertion Time, then the interval can give us only PART of the Event Time.

• *In-time*: measures the Event Time (→ bounds the whole event—and that is why it is not okay with activities or states.)

Some correlations

► *Pfve progressive*
► *For-time*
► *Not completely*  
► VPfve progressive
► V For-time
► V not finished to
Correlations

1. *For*-time: partitive

2. Perfective is progressive: partitive

3. “Not finished to”: compatible with those cases that allow for perfective progressive and *for*-time adverbials

Partitive perfective

- Only a part of the event time is asserted.
- The asserted part can be said to be contained *within* the whole event time.
- What is the difference with the imperfective, then?
• Only intuitive answer:
  • With the imperfective: the interval of the event may continue
  • With the perfective: seems finished.

• But then, why do we still say that the event that matters is the topic time/assertion time?

• How critical is the role of the predicates to distinguish across viewpoints?

That’s it for the moment
Some References


• Subinterval property: does not hold of accomplishments
• Cortó el césped del jardín de 10 a 2/en un momento.
• Estuvo cortando el cesped del jardín de 10 a 2/*en un momento.
• Coloreó el castillo de 10 a 11:30am/durante una hora y media.

Qs

• What do we have with an “incomplete accomplishment”?
• Maybe “incomplete accomplishment” is a bad label. We have an accomplishment insofar as it has been substantiated up to a point.??

• Coloreó el castillo durante tres minutos pero no terminó/y terminó:
• The for-interval modifier is vague wrt culmination.
• The in-interval modifier is NOT vague. It is only compatible with culmination. The event does finish in a more obvious way.