

Appendices

The Saisiyat Language:

- Saisiyat is a heavily endangered Austronesian language spoken in two mountainous villages in northwestern Taiwan (Hsinchu and Miaoli counties)
 - o There are only a few hundred (at most) elderly native speakers of Saisiyat remaining, none of whom are monolingual
 - o Saisiyat is argued to have been influenced considerably by the Chinese languages of Taiwan (Mandarin, Minnan/Taiwanese, and Hakka)
- All the examples in this presentation were elicited by the presenter in fieldwork sessions with a native Saisiyat speaker, 'Oemaw a 'Oebay Tawtawazay (Chao Shan-He)
- Saisiyat expresses aspectual categories mostly through verbal prefixes and proclitics
 - o One of the two markers I focus on, [ila], is an enclitic, appearing after verbs, adverbs, objects, or (rarely) subjects
 - [ila] attaches to the first independent phonological word under its scope
 - o The other marker I focus on, [ina], is a proclitic, appearing only before the main verb (or predicate)
- [ila] combines freely with other aspectual markers besides [ina], including the future imperfective/progressive [am] and the past imperfective [ima]
- o [ina] cannot occur with these markers, which are also verbal proclitics
- o The fact that [ila] can appear with these markers suggests that it appears in a different functional head than them
- [ina] necessarily occurs with the Agent Focus infix <AF>, which indicates that the agent is the subject
- The nominal marker [ka] (which I gloss as 'KA') needs much more investigation
 - o Descriptions of Saisiyat usually call it a Nominative/Accusative case marker, but there may be more going on (e.g., specificity, information focus)

Other Footnotable Facts:

- While I have claimed that most predicates in Saisiyat are atelic [+co] by default, some predicates, specifically object-creation predicates do seem to be telic [-co] by default
 - o Creation predicates have been argued to be necessarily telic in Mandarin (Soh and Kuo 2005) and Hindi (Singh 1998), languages in which other predicates get terminative readings in the perfective (similar to Saisiyat)
 - o Combining perfective [ina] with a creation predicate like [tomaew'aen ka imaSaso' taew'aen] 'build a new house' yields a necessary culminative reading
 - Ataw ina t<om>aew'aen ka imaSaso' taew'aen
Ataw Pftv <AF>build.house KA new house
'Ataw built a new house (and the house is built)'
 - o Interestingly enough, with [ila] the U-perfect reading is still available with this creation predicate: 'has been building a new house'
- [ila] gives a mirativity reading (i.e., surprise or counter-expectation) with some predicates, especially individual-level states
 - o Individual-level states cannot get a typical U-perfect reading; mirativity may be the semantic reflex of the U-perfect structure ([+co] agreement) with these predicates

- U-perfect readings are also hard to get with individual-level states in other languages, e.g., English ??'John has been tall', ??'Mary has been a woman'
- Perfect morphology can express mirativity in other languages, e.g., Bulgarian and Turkish (DeLancey 1997, Aikhenvald 2004)
- DPs in Saisiyat lack number or classifier morphology, which may be the reason that telicity must usually be encoded by the covert [-co] Aktionsart head
 - The composition of a telic VP by a verb and its object in other languages crucially relies on the quantization of the object DP (Krifka 1989, 1992)
 - If Saisiyat DPs are impoverished in overt specification of quantization properties, then likely they would not be able to compose a telic VP with a verb

Remaining Questions (and a Possible Solution):

- The [+co] feature agreement/licensing account predicts that [ina] should also be able to license the covert [-co] telic Aktionsart head
 - However, in actual Saisiyat, [ina] usually does not imply culmination, and does not seem to be used to derive inchoatives
 - [ila] is the usual means to derive inchoatives and imply culmination
- This account also predicts that both the [+co] and [-co] readings with [ila] should always in principle be available
 - The inchoative and culminative [-co] readings are usually easier to pick up on than the U-perfect [+co] reading
- More elicitation is needed to check these predictions, i.e., whether both [+co] and [-co] readings are always available with both [ila] and [ina]
 - Construction of the right examples may bring out this ambiguity
- The fact that U-Perfect [+co] readings in other languages, such as English, are often hard to pick up on without context or overt [+co] adverbials or aspect, may point to a bias toward E-Perfect [-co] readings with the perfect
 - The lack of a U-Perfect in many languages with an E-Perfect may provide further evidence for this bias toward the [-co] reading with the perfect
- If the U-Perfect reading is indeed hard to pick up on out of the blue in Saisiyat, then the E-perfect Resultative reading (with [-co] Viewpoint and Aktionsart values) may be taken as a default reading of [ila]
 - If [ila] is typically interpreted with a [-co] reading, then [-co] Aktionsart (inchoatives and culminatives) may be preferred to be expressed with [ila]
 - As a consequence, [ina] may be typically interpreted with [+co] Aktionsart (without context or overt markers to suggest a [-co] reading)

Broader Implications:

- [co] agreement in the temporal aspectual domain may account for several tendencies across languages, such as:
 - Why can certain Tenses, Viewpoints, and Aktionsarten not occur with each other?
 - Why must certain Tenses or Viewpoints occur as defaults with specific other Viewpoints or Aktionsarten?
- The tendency for languages not to allow perfective [-co] Viewpoint with stative [+co] Aktionsart or present [+co] Tense might be a case of obligatory [+/-co] feature agreement (i.e., no matter the overtness of the element with the [co] feature)

- The use of perfective [-co] Viewpoint morphology to derive Inchoative [-co] Aktionsart from [+co] statives may be a way to satisfy [+/-co] agreement (Smith 1991, Filip 1997)
- The tendency for telic [-co] Aktionsart to occur with default past [-co] Tense or perfective [-co] Viewpoint in the absence of overt marking might be a case of licensing of covert [co] features
 - In Mandarin, atelic predicates get a default imperfective Viewpoint and present Tense reading ([+co] agreement), while telic predicates get a default perfective and past reading ([-co] agreement) (Lin 2003, 2005)

Crosslinguistic Comparisons

- The Saisiyat perfect [ila] is similar to aspectual markers in the unrelated (or distantly related) languages Niuean and St'át'imcets.
 - The Niuean perfect [kua ... tei] gives inchoative readings with individual-level states, in-progress readings with activities, and completive readings with accomplishments (Matthewson et al 2012).
 - The aspectual marker [plan] in St'át'imcets also shows similar behavior, giving inchoative readings with individual-level states, in-progress readings with activities, and completive readings with accomplishments and achievements (Davis 2006)
 - These two markers may both be perfects like [ila], with the availability of the Universal or Resultative Perfect reading depending on Aktionsart in Niuean and St'át'imcets (as opposed to being ambiguous in Saisiyat)
- The Saisiyat perfect [ila] also shows similarities to the Mandarin aspectual marker [-le]
 - Accounting for the difference between verbal [-le] (which is immediately post-verbal) and sentential [-le] (which is sentence-final) has been a source of controversy for decades
 - Verbal [-le] gives a terminative or completive reading to events, while sentential [-le] may provide an inchoative reading, a “contrary to expectation” reading, or a present relevance reading (Soh 2008, 2009)
 - A couple of approaches inspired by my account of Saisiyat may be fruitful here:
 - Sentential [-le] may be a perfect that enforces [-co] agreement in Viewpoint and Aktionsart, while verbal [-le] may be a [-co] Viewpoint marker that may license [-co] Aktionsart
 - Sentential and verbal [-le] may be the same [-co] marker, but with the sentential marker having raised to a higher Perfect head, enforcing [-co] agreement in Viewpoint and Aktionsart, while verbal [-le] stays in the Viewpoint head, so the Perfect head is left empty (and thus not [-co])

Crucial Thanks:

- My Saisiyat informant and “uncle” (Mama’) ‘Oemaw a ‘Oebay Tawtawazay (Chao Shan-He), for his tireless work in both defending the Saisiyat language and culture and putting up with my tiresome linguistic questions
- My fieldwork partners, most importantly Huilin Fang, who collaborated with me on the Saisiyat aspect project
- My adviser for this project, Roumyana Pancheva, for her invaluable input and probing questions, as well as the rest of my screening committee (Khalil Iskarous, Karen Jesney, and Andrew Simpson) for their support

- My fellow linguists in LING 610, Syntax 635, and Syntax+ at USC
- A generous grant from the Tsai Fund, granted by the USC East Asian Studies Center
- All errors, oversights, and other egregious defects in the above are solely my own

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, Henry. 2006. A Teacher's Grammar of Upper St'at'imcets.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: the Grammatical Marking of Unexpected Information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33-52
- Demirdache, H., Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 2000. The primitives of temporal relations. *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, eds. R. Martin, D. Michaels, J. Uriagereka: 157-186. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Demirdache, H., Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 2003. The syntax of time adverbs. *The Syntax of Time*, eds. J. Gueron and J. Lecarme: 143-179. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Demirdache, H., Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 2007. The syntax of time arguments. *Lingua* 117: 330-366
- Filip, Hana. 1997. Integrating Telicity, Aspect and NP Semantics: The Role of Thematic Structure. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics* 3: 61-96.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1984. Notes on world view and semantic categories: some Warlpiri examples. *Features and Projections*, eds. P. Muysken and H. van Riemsdijk: 233-254. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1990. *As Time Goes By: Tense and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- Iatridou, S., E. Anagnostopoulou and R. Izvorski. 2001. Observations about the Form and Meaning of the Perfect. *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz: 189-238. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. Reprinted in *Perfect Explorations*, eds. A. Alexiadou, M Rathert, and A. von Stechow. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2003. Telicity and the Meaning of Objective Case. *The Syntax of Time*, eds. J. Gueron and J. Lecarme. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1989. Nominal Reference, Temporal Constitution and Quantification in Event Semantics. *Semantics and Contextual Expression*, eds. R. Bartsch, J. von Benthem, and P. van Emde Boas: 75-115. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1992. Thematic Relations as Links between Nominal Reference and Temporal Constitution. *Lexical Matters*, eds. Ivan Sag and Anna Szabolcsi: 29-53. CSLI Publications: Stanford University Press.
- Lin, J.-W. 2003. Temporal reference in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 12: 259-311.
- Lin, J.-W. 2005. Time in a language without tense: The case of Chinese. *Journal of Semantics* 23: 1-53.
- Matthewson, Lisa, Heidi Quinn, and Lynsey Talagi. 2012. Notes on the Niuean Perfect. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics, Theories of Everything* Volume 17, Article 27: 222-233
- McCoard, Robert W. 1978. *The English Perfect: Tense Choice and Pragmatic Inferences*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Press.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. 2003. The Aspectual Makeup of Perfect Participles and the Interpretations of the Perfect. *Perfect Explorations*, eds. A. Alexiadou, M Rathert, and A. von Stechow: 277-306. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study of Subatomic Semantics*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Singh, Mona. 1998. On the Semantic of the Perfective Aspect. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 171-199.
- Smith, Carlota. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 2008. The syntax and semantics of change/transition: Evidence from Mandarin Chinese. *Theoretical and cross-linguistic approaches to the semantics of aspect*, ed. Susan Rothstein, 387-419. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 2009. Speaker presupposition and Mandarin Chinese sentence final -le: A unified analysis of the "change of state" and the "contrary to expectation" reading. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27. 623-657.
- Soh, Hooi Ling and Jenny Yi-Chun Kuo. 2005. Perfective Aspect and Accomplishment Situations in Mandarin Chinese. *Perspectives on Aspect*, eds. Angeliek van Hout, Henriette de Swart and Henk Verkuyl: 199-216. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Tai, James H.Y. 1984. Verbs and Times in Chinese: Vendler's Four Categories. *Papers from the Parasession on Lexical Semantics, Chicago Linguistics Society* 20, eds. D. Testen, V. Mishra, and J. Drogo: 289-296.
- Travis, Lisa. 2000. Event Structure and Syntax. *Events as Grammatical Objects*, ed. J. Pustejovsky and C. Tenny, 145-185. CSLI: Stanford University Press.