

Perfective *dozapisyvat'* - real or fake?

Olav Mueller-Reichau (Leipzig University)

It has been argued that Russian verb forms such as *dozapisyvat'* are biaspectual, as the result of two different derivational histories (1a) vs. (1b) (Zinova & Filip 2015; Zinova 2016). The main argument for (1b) is the felicitous use in chain-of-event contexts (2a), which are known to call for perfectives. If true, the proposal falsifies the most elaborate theory of Russian complex verb formation "on the market", i.e. Tatevosov (2009, 2013), which predicts that the prefix *do-* may never appear above the suffix *-yva-*. In (1b), however, it does. The present paper inquires about the existence of perfective *dozapisyvat'*, and about the consequences that would follow from its existence. Specifically, it pursues the hypothesis that the verbs in (2) are indeed perfective, but they do not result from the derivational history (1b), and that their existence does therefore not falsify Tatevosov's theory.

Observation 1: If we change the order of events, we observe that, while (3b) is easily accepted out of the blue, (3a) calls for contextual support. For (3a) to be sound, we have to think of the recording of the song as being realized in distinct stages, with the non-final stages having been realized before going home (think of a recording studio context). (3b), on the other hand, is fine because embroidering a picture is an action that normally involves taking breaks. (4a) is felicitous because we know that installing a computer program proceeds in distinct from each other stages. (4b) is acceptable only if we take the denoted event to be the final stage of a lengthy endeavor to persuade the husband, as in (5). Note that substituting *dougavarivaju* by *ugovorju*^{PFV} will abandon the information that the speaker was constantly on her husband's back about a second child (the form *dougovorju* does not exist in Russian).

Observation 2: It has been observed (Zinova 2016) that the problematic verbs are acceptable with *za-X-time* adverbials, a standard diagnostics for perfectivity. Indeed, if combined with *za 10 minut* ('within 10 minutes'), all of the verbs in (6) lend themselves for a habitual reading, explicated by *obyčno* ('usually'), which expresses that the speaker used to finish recording a song (installing Windows etc.) within 10 minutes. This can be explained by that the verbs are imperfective (1a) and that the adverbial is VP-internal. To ban the habitual reading, we use a short-term framesetter like *segodnja utrom* ('today in the morning'). Still the verbs are fine with *za 10 minut*, albeit (6a) and (6d) need contextual support. We again observe that for the verbs to be usable as perfectives, they must form VPs that characterize events made up of distinct subevents. For *doustanavlivat' Windows* and *dovyšivat' kartinu* this condition is met without further ado, the other two require appropriate contextualizations.

Analysis: Assume that the biaspectuality hypothesis according to which there is *dozapisyvat'*^{PFV} besides *dozapisyvat'*^{IPFV} is real. I have observed that the former denotes recording events that are made up of the sum of subevents, possibly dislocated from each other in space and time. This property of *dozapisyvat'*^{PFV} falls out if we assign to the suffix *-yva-* a different place in the derivational history than in (1b). One might propose that *-yva-* attaches prior to any prefixation. At that early stage of derivation, iterative stems are formed from simplex imperfective bases. Next, an internal prefix attaches. To handle the consequence that the output is imperfective (8), one would have to assume that the meaning of internal prefixes always modifies (i.e. assigns a culmination condition to) atomic events, also if the prefix attaches to an iterative base. Whether speakers accept *dovyšivat'*, *dozapisyvat'* and *dougovarivat'* as perfectives then depends on whether they accept the structures in (8). The most problematic derivational history is (8b), because it is difficult to think of a recording as the sum of distinct writing events. This may explain why speakers differ as to whether they accept *dozapisyvat'* as a perfective (Zinova 2016:16). Finally, external *do-* attaches on top to create a perfective, scoping over the sum of events, cf. (10). Comparing (2a) and (11), we note an intuitive difference: (2a) invites the inference that it took quite a while for the recording to come to an end. (11) merely says that

the recording will be finished. The hypothesis offers an explanation for this intuition. A problem for it is *doustanavlivat*^{IPFV}, as there is no verb *stanovit'*. Given strict construction rules for derivational histories (Zinova & Filip 2015), this rules out (12a). Note, however, that an analysis along the lines of (12b) would face the same problem. If *-yva-* in perfective verbs like *dovyšivat'* combines locally to the base morpheme, this yields an explanation for why *do-* in this special case may attach above of it: *-yva-* is no true imperfectivizing suffix. It has a more narrow semantics forming sums of events denoted by its derivational base. As such, *-yva-* is predicted to behave like another pre-prefixal suffix, *-a-*. This marker is shown to not fall under the constraint that completive *do-* had to apply below of it (13) (cf. Tatevosov 2013:66).

(1a) [[do-[za-[pis-]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}]-yva]^{IPFV}(-t') (1b) [do-[[za-[pis-]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}-yva-]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}(-t')

(2a) *Ja dozapisyvaju pesnju i pojdu domoj.* (2b) *Ja dovyšivaju kartinu i pojdu domoj.*

(3a) [?]*Ja pojdu domoj i dozapisyvaju pesnju.* (3b) *Ja pojdu domoj i dovyšivaju kartinu.*

(4a) *Ja pojdu domoj i doustanavlivaju Windows.* (4b) *Ja pojdu domoj i dougovarivaju muža.*

(5) *Moldcy na vtorogo rešilis', i ja skoro muža dougavarivaju na vtorogo sovsem nemnožečko...* [<https://m.babyblog.ru>]

(6a) {^{OK}Obyčno / ^{??}Segodnja utrom} *ja dozapisyval pesnju za 10 minut.*

(6b) {^{OK}Obyčno / ^{OK}Segodnja utrom} *ja doustanavlivala Windows za 10 minut.*

(6c) {^{OK}Obyčno / ^{OK}Segodnja utrom} *ja dovyšivala kartinu za 10 minut.*

(6d) {^{OK}Obyčno / ^{??}Segodnja utrom} *ja dougovarivala muža za 10 minut.*

(7a) [[ši-]^{IPFV} -va]^{IPFV}(-t') (8a) [vy- [[ši-]^{IPFV} -va]^{IPFV}]^{IPFV}(-t')

(7b) [[pis-]^{IPFV} -yva]^{IPFV}(-t') (8b) [za- [[pis-]^{IPFV} -yva]^{IPFV}]^{IPFV}(-t')

(7c) [[govar-]^{IPFV} -iva]^{IPFV}(-t') (8c) [u- [[govar-]^{IPFV} -iva]^{IPFV}]^{IPFV}(-t')

(9a) [do- [vy- [[ši-]^{IPFV} -va]^{IPFV}]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}(-t') (9b) [do- [za- [[pis-]^{IPFV} -yva]^{IPFV}]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}(-t')

(9c) [do- [u- [[govar-]^{IPFV} -iva]^{IPFV}]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}(-t')

(10) *V poslednie gody muž ugovarival menja rodit' vtorogo rebenka. Dougovarival do togo, što ja popala k psihoterapevtu.* [<https://ru-perinatal.livejournal.com>]

(11) *Ja dozapišu pesnju i pojdu domoj.*

(12a) [do-[u-[[stnav(1)-]^{IPFV}-iva]^{IPFV}]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}(-t') (12b) [do-[[u-[[stnav(1)-]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}-iva]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}(-t')

(13) [do- [[reš-]^{PFV} -a]^{IPFV}]^{PFV}(-t')

Selected references: Filip, H. (2008). Events and Maximalization. In Rothstein, Susan (ed.), *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*. Amsterdam. ♦ Filip, H. (2017). The Semantics of Perfectivity. *Italian journal of linguistics* 29. ♦ Kagan, O. (2016). Scalarity in the verbal domain. Cambridge. ♦ Tatevosov, S. (2009). Množestvennaja prefiksacija i anatomija ruskogo glagola. In K. Kiseleva et al. (eds.), *Korpusnye issledovanija po russkoj grammatike*. Moskva. ♦ Tatevosov, S. (2013). Množestvennaja prefiksacija i ee sledstvija. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 3. ♦ Zinova, Y. & H. Filip (2015). The role of derivation history in aspect determination. In G. Zybatow et al. (eds.), *Slavic grammar from a formal perspective*. Frankfurt a.M. ♦ Zinova, Y. (2016). *Russian Verbal Prefixation: A Frame Semantic Analysis*. PhD-Dissertation. Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf.