

FACTORS FOR ASPECT CHOICE IN CONTEXTS OF OPEN ITERATION IN CZECH

1. Introduction

As is well known, there is a typological cross-Slavic variation of verbal aspect with a western and an eastern type and transitional zones, as described in Dickey (2000). The paramount example for the eastern type is Russian which also often serves as *the* example for Slavic aspect in general; a good representative of the western type is Czech. An important domain of this variation is open iterativity, for which Russian grammar largely prescribes the use of the imperfective aspect (IA) – except for the stylistically marked ‘vivid-exemplary’ function (наглядно-примерная функция) of the perfective aspect (PA) –, while Czech allows for the PA to a much larger extent if the individual repeated situation is presented as a closed event. So in Russian iterative contexts the IA can be seen as being motivated by the global level of open iteration (the ‘macro’ situation), neutralizing the aspectual shape of the individual or ‘micro’ situation, whereas in Czech the latter may be preserved and encoded by grammatical aspect irrespectively of iterativity, which is then expressed by lexical or contextual means only.

The aim of this article is to give an overview over the different factors influencing aspect choice in Czech open iterative contexts, i.e. the factors influencing the shift between the dominance of the macro situation and the focusing of the micro situation. For Czech there has been emphasized the importance of the micro situation as being dominant in the sense that, in contrast to Russian, aspect choice depends on the aspectual properties of the verb and the aspectual presentation of the micro situation (Stunova 1993, Breu 2000). Less attention has been paid to the more global factors such as the combination with adverbial quantifiers, scope of negation, and sentence structure. The focus of this article will be on these global factors, showing results of corpus investigation and a small fill-in-the-blank test with native speakers.

2. Iterated micro and iterative macro situations: two levels of perspective with possible relevance for grammatical aspect

In any case of open iteration there are two levels of perspective, either of which may be encoded by grammatical aspect in some language: 1. the individual or micro situation which we may refer to as being iterated (repeated), and 2. the global or macro situation which we may refer to as being iterative, i.e. consisting of iterated individual situations. This different marking does not only exist in Slavic languages, but also e.g. in English or French. Consider the following examples, in which grammatical aspect is motivated by the presentation of the individual micro situation: the English progressive form by the respective process, the French *Passé composé* (colloquial perfective past) and the Czech PA by the respective event – i.e. the progressive form in English, the *passé composé* (perfective past) in French and the PA in Czech – is motivated by the respective micro situation:

- (1) Every morning she *was running* in the park. (respective process)

- (2) Chaque matin, *je me suis levée* de bonne heure pour avaler des litres d'eau salée. (respective event) (Internet)
- (3) Každé ráno *jsem koupil^P* noviny. (respective event)
(‘Every morning I *bought^P* a newspaper’).

In (4-7), by contrast, aspect is motivated by the open iterative macro situation:

- (4) While Cavern was in hospital, I *was getting up* at 6 a.m ... (macro process)
(Internet)
- (5) John *swam* regularly. (macro state [habitual])
- (6) Quand j’étais en vacances, je me *levais* plus tard. (macro state/process)
- (7) O prázdninách *jsem vstával^I* později. (macro state/process)
(‘On vacation I *got up^I* [or *used to get up^I*] later.’)

Note that in English, unlike in French and the Slavic languages, there is a grammatical difference between the conceptualization as a process and a state: So in (4) the macro situation is presented as an iterative macro *process* consisting of the chain of iterated events, or at least as an *episodic*¹ macro situation, whence the progressive form, whereas in (5) the simple form stands for the conceptualization as an abstracted nonepisodic habitual *state*. In French both states and processes are rendered by the *Imparfait* (imperfective past), in the Slavic languages by the IA.

As for Czech, we see that the PA with open iteration is always motivated by the micro situation presented as an event, while the IA may be motivated either by the open macro situation or again by the micro situation which is then presented as an open process or state. So when the IA occurs, we have to consider by which level it is motivated. For example, in the context of an internal structure of several micro subsituations being iterated as a whole, the IA may occur to contrast a simultaneous process with a foregrounded event.

From a morpho-syntactic view the different motivation of grammatical aspect in iterative contexts results in two different principles of marking iterativity: If the morphological IA is motivated by the open macro situation, it serves as an iterativity marker directly connected to the verb, whereas if aspect is determined by the micro situation, the iteration can be encoded only by other means such as iterative adverbial quantifiers. This suggests a difference in informational or semantic structure: in the former case the verb is qualified as “plural” itself, and an adverbial quantifier such as ‘often’ specifies this plurality and is also more directly connected to the verb (‘x *verbs-often*’), whereas in the latter case the adverbial quantifier has a wider scope over more constituents and typically stands in an initial position, introducing and “multiplying” a

¹ In my terms, an episodic temporal situation is a situation which is conceptualized as an episode, i.e. a temporal entity or *Gestalt*, be it an original concept of event/process implying change or an abstract episode consisting of a state predicate being true for that episode. A nonepisodic temporal situation is just a state predicate about a certain time without the conceptualization of an episode. So I make a difference between episodic and nonepisodic states, which is represented in English by the difference between the sentences *The book was lying on the table* and *The book lay/was on the table*, but which is not represented in the in the Slavic or Romance imperfective aspect. What is traditionally referred to as an ‘actual/nonactual’ and by Lehmann as an ‘episodic/nonepisodic’ situation is in my terms ‘episodic/ nonepisodic reference’ to a temporal situation which means that the situation is or is not visualized in the Psychic Now (cf. Lehmann 1994).

case of a micro situation ('Often it is the case, that x verbs'). We will see that this roughly sketched difference between the "plurality" and the "multiplicational" principle is crucial for the factors of aspect choice described below.

3. Open vs. closed iteration

At this juncture I should briefly explain the difference between open and closed iteration. The iteration is closed in the case of adverbial quantification with absolute "count quantifiers", be they definite such as *five times*, or indefinite such as *several times* or *many times*. Closed iteration can be asserted only as a whole in the past or the future, but not in the present, cf. *She got up at 5 a.m. several times* vs. **She gets up (or is getting up) at 5 a.m. several times* (in a true present, i.e. not historical present function). The present tense is only possible if the absolute count quantifier is relativized by a relational time span such as *several times a month* which results in open iteration again. Some quantifiers can refer either to open or closed iteration such as *often* which in the latter case can be paraphrased as 'many times', others can only refer to open iteration such as *regularly*. As for grammatical aspect, with closed iteration the IA cannot be motivated by an open macro situation. It is rather the PA which may be motivated by the closed macro situation and which for Russian is ascribed a 'summative' function, since it seems to be more marked than the IA in such contexts. Here the latter still occurs more often even if the micro situation is an event. For Czech, by contrast, where the micro situation may be generally focussed by aspect, closed iteration with count quantifiers seems to be a case of the 'multiplication' principle par excellence, i.e. if the micro situation is an event, the PA is the default and the IA can be used only if the verb may generally have a progressive reading. There are good reasons to treat the cases of the IA with closed iteration, where it is not directly motivated by a progressive reading of the micro situation, as a special kind of the general-factual function of the IA in both languages (cf. Dickey 2000: 50). In Czech the general-factual function is also restricted to verbs with a possible progressive reading but in Russian it is possible with any verb and has a wider functional scope. However, although with closed iteration the IA cannot be explained by the macro situation, in Russian it still seems to function as an iteration marker due to its widespread use which might exceed the scope of the ordinary general-factual function. But this issue will not be discussed in this article.

4. Factors for focusing the micro or macro situation with open iteration in Czech

4.1. Factors of the micro structure

A rather trivial factor is the above-mentioned existence of an internal set of subsituations on the micro level which is iterated as a whole. Aspect then is very likely to profile the internal relationships between the subsituations, e.g. the PA is used in an internal sequence of events as in the following example:

- (8) V Žižkově ulici měl tehdy lahůdkářský obchod pan Brůžek. Tam velmi často muž *zašel^P* a *koupil^P* buď dva pomeranče, nebo banány a mě a hoča *podělil^P*.
'In the Žižkov street Mr. Brůžek had a delicatessen shop in those days. The

man very often *went^P* there and *bought^P* either two oranges or bananas and *shared^P* them with me and the boy.’ (CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

It is evident that the adverbial quantifier in such a case has wide scope over the whole set of subsituations and typically has an initial position as in the above example in order to introduce the microsituation which is asserted to have occurred repeatedly. Such a set of subsituations is also characteristic for the Russian ‘vivid-exemplary function’ of the PA in colloquial language, which is virtually the only case in which the PA – but only in morphological present tense even for past contexts – is allowed in open iterative contexts, and which is typically introduced by the particle *бывает / бывало* ‘it happens / used to happen’. There is just one instance where the PA in the past tense may not refer to a single or summative event in Russian, namely if it has a perfect (anteriority) function in a subordinate clause as in the sentence *Он всегда приходил, когда все уже ушли* ‘He always used to arrive when everybody had gone’. Here again, we have an internal relation of subsituations, though here the PA does not have just a sequentiality but an anteriority function.

Another possible factor for the aspectual relevance of the micro situation in Czech is the possible progressive reading of the verb itself. So Petrušina (1978) suggests on the basis of surveys with native speakers that as soon as the IA *may* be interpreted as a process on the micro level, there is a tendency to get this reading, so that the PA is used to avoid such a progressive or possibly conative reading and to guarantee the assertion of the respective completion of the event. She contrasts the following examples (Petrušina 1978: 58):

- (9) a. Z tohoto pole *sklizejí^I* brambory každý rok až naposled.
b. Z tohoto pole *sklidí^P* brambory každý rok až naposled.
‘They *pick^{I/P}* the potatoes from this field last every year.’

Both sentences allow for a complete event reading, but (9a) may have a conative reading and be supplemented by the clause *a často nestačí sklidit^P včas* ‘and often they do not manage to pick^P them in time.’ So if such a reading shall be precluded, the PA has to be used and thus according to Petrušina *will* be used more often than the IA. If, on the other hand, there is no possibility of a progressive reading of the verb as in the sentence *Denně dostávám^I několik dopisů* ‘Every day I get^I several letters’, there is no need to avoid a progressive reading and thus the IA is more commonly used, as Petrušina suggests. My own corpus investigation has shown that there is a group of achievement verbs which cannot have a progressive reading, but which nevertheless in open iterative contexts more often occur in the PA. These are verbs such as *dorazit / dorážet* ‘arrive, reach s.th., come in’, *poznat / poznávat* ‘recognize’, *překvapit / překvapovat* ‘surprise’, *odhalit / odhalovat* ‘reveal’, *všimnout si / všimat si* ‘notice’, *do(z)vědět se / do(z)vídat se* ‘hear, learn’ and *zjistit / zjišťovat*. They all share a certain connotation of a sudden change of state and have some stress on the result state which may not that easily be reversed or iterated, in contrast to the verb *dostat / dostávat* ‘to get, receive’ in the above example. So by contrasting the state before with the state after the change, they also establish a micro structure of sequential subsituations.

Summing up, we can say that whenever there is some salient internal structuring of the micro situation, be it explicit by several verbs, by the possibility of a progressive reading, or by the contrast of the state before with the state after a punctual change, this

is a factor for attracting grammatical aspect to the micro situation rather than encoding the open iterativity of the macro situation.

4.2. Factors of the macro structure, information structure, and scope

4.2.1. Type and position of adverbial quantifier

Petruxina (1983: 105-107) states that the quantifiers *stále* or *pořád* with the meaning ‘permanently, all the time’ (further synonyms are *neustále*, *ustavičně* ‘unceasingly, steadily’ and *furt* as a colloquial equivalent of *pořád*) can only be combined with verbs in the IA. *Pravidelně* ‘regularly’ has a strong tendency towards the IA, but also occurs with the PA. She also mentions that the preference of the IA increases if *pravidelně* occurs after the verb, i.e. in a rhematic position. At the other end of the scale she locates quantifiers such as Russian *иногда, иной раз* ‘sometimes, time and again’, which even in Russian sometimes occur with the ‘vivid-exemplary’ PA. Most quantifiers such as *často* ‘often’, *zřídka* ‘seldom’, *každý den* ‘every day’ according to Petruxina behave neutrally with respect to aspect choice.

Our corpus research could affirm these tendencies and reveal further insights. In the investigation with the Czech National Corpus (subcorpora SYN2000, SYN2005 and SYN2006PUB with 500 million word forms altogether) we searched for collocations of a certain iterative quantifier and a finite verb form in the PA or IA, respectively, with an interval of 0-7 words in between. We searched for random verbs as well as for concrete verb lexemes, especially such event lexemes which do not allow for a progressive reading or with which such a reading is rather peripheral and especially in iterative contexts very unlikely. While with random verbs the ratio of the IA is higher due to the activity and state verbs, the search for the concrete lexemes without a progressive reading ensured that the ratio of IA and PA really maps the ratio of the motivation of aspect by the macro or the micro situation. But also with the random verbs, in accordance with concrete verbs, there can be seen a tendency for a relative hierarchy of the quantifiers. Though the order of quantifiers may slightly vary, with a statistically sufficient number of relevant hits there can be seen certain universal regularities. So we could ascertain that the above-mentioned quantifiers with the meaning ‘permanently’ indeed do not combine with the PA at all. Among the other quantifiers, *pravidelně* ‘regularly’ has always the first place with respect to the preference of the IA (187:11 with the verb ‘come’), and *často* ‘often’ has always a higher ratio of the IA (515:271) than *občas* ‘sometimes’ (106:400) or *čas od času* ‘time and again’ (29:57).

At first glance the hierarchy seems to have to do with the frequency of the iterated event as expressed by the quantifier: the more frequently the event is iterated, the higher is the likelihood for the macro level to trigger the IA. So, there is no doubt that ‘permanently’ denotes the highest frequency, while ‘sometimes’ denotes a rather low frequency. However, ‘regularly’ which has the highest ratio of the IA after ‘permanently’, does not necessarily mean a higher frequency than ‘often’ (cf. example 14 below!), but rather denotes a steadiness of the iteration interval which highlights the continuity of the macro situation. The utmost continuity is expressed by ‘permanently’, which literally means that there are no gaps in the chain of iterations. Thus it is not frequency by itself, but rather the focus on frequency which is the decisive criterion. The corpus study also confirmed that if the quantifier comes after the verb and is thus

likely to be stressed, the ratio of the IA is always higher than if the quantifier is in a preverbal position. Very notably, with the quantifier *zřídka* ‘seldom’ and the verb ‘come’ the ratio of the IA turned out to be even slightly higher (38 out of 53 hits, i.e. 72%) than with *často* ‘often’ (515 out of 786 hits, i.e. 66%)! The reason is that *zřídka* in most cases is postverbal and stressed, while *často* is more often preverbal than *zřídka*:

	<i>často</i> preverbal	<i>často</i> postverbal	<i>zřídka</i> preverbal	<i>zřídka</i> postverbal
<i>IA</i>	324	191	1	37
<i>PA</i>	209	62	2	13

There is one feature by which we can generally distinguish two types of iterative adverbial quantifiers also in English and which also has to do with the different aspectual behaviour: Quantifiers of the first type have comparison forms and can be modified by relative degree adverbs such as ‘very’, ‘quite’, ‘rather’, ‘relatively’ or be negated; quantifiers of the second type have no comparison forms and cannot be modified or negated – cf. *very often*, *quite seldom*, *not regularly*, but **very sometimes*, **quite now and then*, **not time and again*. Quantifiers of the first type denote a gradable kind of frequency and thus may easily function as specifiers of plurality and highlight the macro situation, whereas quantifiers of the second type just indirectly imply a degree of frequency (*now and then* implies ‘not very often’ or at least ‘not regularly’), but this frequency is not directly denoted and cannot be modified, so they tend to function as multiplicative quantifiers and focus on the micro situation. We may call the first type “strong” quantifiers since they denote a modifiable kind of frequency and tend to put emphasis on the macro situation, and the second type “weak” quantifiers since they do not denote a modifiable kind of frequency and tend to leave the motivation of aspect on the exemplary micro situation. So “strong” quantifiers have a tendency to function according to the “plurality” principle, but do allow for the “multiplicative” principle as well. “Weak” quantifiers tend to function according to the “multiplicative” principle, but also allow for the “plurality” principle of aspectual marking motivated by the open macro situation. Especially in one case they may even be classified as “strong” quantifiers, directly denoting a frequency rate. Though quantifiers such as ‘sometimes’ cannot be modified by degree adverbs such as ‘very’ or ‘rather’, they can be stressed as denoting a rather low frequency by the restricting adverb *jen(om)* ‘only’, and then they are very likely to trigger the aspectual dominance of the macro situation and typically occur in a postverbal position, cf. the following sentence, for which in English the present perfect progressive is the most adequate translation, since the iterative macro situation lasts until the time of utterance (signalled by *zatím* ‘so far’) and can be seen as a macro process:

- (10) *Zatím jsme se setkávali¹ jen občas.*
 ‘So far we *have been meeting*¹ only sometimes.’

Most interestingly, in Czech there are synonyms for *často* and *zřídka*, *mnohdy* and *málokdy*, which seem to behave like weak quantifiers, i.e. they cannot be easily combined with degree modifiers (see the table at the end of this section), they occur predominantly in a preverbal position and tend to trigger the aspectual focussing of the micro situation. Especially *zřídka* and *málokdy* seem to have complementary functions

as a strong and a weak quantifier, by which we can explain the predominant postverbal use of *zřídka*. Compare the numbers of *málokdy* with those of *zřídka* above:

	<i>málokdy</i> preverbal	<i>málokdy</i> postverbal
<i>IA</i>	3	3
<i>PA</i>	29	7

Mnohdy, however, is rather literary in style in relation to *často* much less used than *málokdy* in relation to *zřídka*. So, *často* also quite often occurs in the multiplicative function. Of course, ‘often’ may be used more easily than ‘seldom’ to introduce an exemplary micro situation, because ‘often’ has a positive or neutral meaning, whereas ‘seldom’ we use in order to especially emphasize a low frequency. So if something happens not often, but yet repeatedly, we rather take a quantifier like ‘sometimes’. This may explain why *často* also often occurs in the multiplicative function focussing the micro situation and has just a marginal partner *mnohdy* for the multiplicative function, while *zřídka* has the special partner *málokdy* which on the one hand expresses low frequency and on the other has the multiplicative function which focusses the exemplary micro situation. *Zřídka* even has another multiplicative partner *zřídka(k)dy* or *zřídka kdy*. The morphological structure of all these weak partners *mnohdy*, *málokdy* and *zřídka(k)dy* makes it obvious why they are used as multiplicative quantifiers leading the aspectual focus on the exemplary micro situation: They are composed of the quantificational element *mnoh(o)* ‘much, many’ or *málo* ‘little, few’ and the temporal particle *(k)dy* ‘when’. So they literally say something like ‘there are many/few occasions, when ...’, after which follows the micro situation.

The following table shows the token frequencies of the above-mentioned pairs and triples of synonymous quantifiers and the frequencies of their collocations with the modifiers *velmi*, *velice*, *moc* ‘very’, *docela*, *dost(i)* ‘quite, rather’, and *poměrně*, *relativně* ‘relatively’ in the subcorpus SYN of the Czech National Corpus (1.3 billion words). We see that the weak partners *mnohdy*, *zřídka(k)dy* and *málokdy* are very rarely or never combined with modifiers, and that the best example of a pair with nearly complementary functions is *zřídka* and *málokdy* which also have a very similar overall token frequency.

	overall tokens	modified quantifier	% of overall tokens
<i>často</i>	400 955	23 611	5.9
<i>mnohdy</i>	61 208	0	–
<i>zřídka</i>	12 154	2 289	18.8
<i>zřídka(k)dy</i>	2 890	21	0.73
<i>málokdy</i>	14 574	32	0.22

4.2.2. Scope of negation and quantifier

A quite clear criterion for the aspectual relevance of the macro or the micro situation is the scope of negation in combination with iterative adverbial quantifiers.

If the quantifier has wide scope over the negation, i.e. the schema is ‘It is *often* the case that *not p*’, I claim that grammatical aspect is *always* motivated by the micro

situation, since it is only the verb or the entailed proposition and not the quantifier which is negated, so the quantifier must have a wider scope and thus function as a multiplicative quantifier and not a specifier of a plurality of the verb. Cf. (11):

- (11) Domů nikdy nechodil^l před setměním a často nepřišel^p vůbec.
'He never came home before dawn, and often he didn't (wouldn't) come^p at all.'
(CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

The syntactic surface structure in this case corresponds with the scopal relations: the quantifier is in an phrase-initial position and thus corresponds with its wide scope, and the negation particle *ne-* is directly connected to the verb (which is a general regularity for Czech) and thus corresponds with its narrow scope. Of course, the quantifier can also be postverbal with the same scopal relation, as in (12):

- (12) Nevyberete^p si často vůbec nic.
'You often don't (won't) choose^p anything.'
(CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

If in such cases of wide scope of the quantifier over the negation the IA is used, we can be sure that it is also motivated by the micro situation, compare the state reading in (13):

- (13) Už jsem sice nevypadal na sedmnáct, ale ani v mých dvaadvaceti letech mne často lidé nebrali^l vážně.
'I didn't look like seventeen any more, but even with my 22 years of age people often didn't (wouldn't) take^l me seriously.'
(CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

If, on the other hand, the negation has wide scope over the quantifier, i.e. the schema is "It is *not* the case that *often* p", this normally presupposes that the situation p does occur, and only the frequency denoted by the quantifier is negated ("not often", "not seldom" etc.). As we said above only strong quantifiers can be modified by degree adverbs or be negated. The negation of the quantifier can be seen as a special kind of modification, turning its denotation into the direction of its (gradual) antonym: "not often" means "rather seldom", "not seldom" means "rather often". So typically we have a dominance of the macro situation which triggers the IA irrespectively of the micro situation. A typical example is (14), where we even have a contrasting of two quantifiers and the affirmative presupposition made explicit by the second part (note that the negation particle has scope over the first quantifier only):

- (14) Ne setkáváme^l se často, ale pravidelně.
'We don't meet^l often, but regularly.'

The fixed position of the Czech negation particle on the verb in this case does not correspond with the scopal relations: logically it negates the whole proposition with the focus on the quantifier. Again, the word order can also be inverse for reasons of topicalization of the quantifier which is then negated by the negation particle, cf.:

- (15) Moc často mi nevolá^l, ale když se ozve^p, pokaždé je někde jinde než posledně ...,
'He doesn't phone^l me very often, but when he gives^p me a ring, he is every time at a different place than the time before ...'
(CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

However, wide scope of the negation over the quantifier does not necessarily imply that aspectual choice is determined by the macro situation. The dominance of the macro

situation is just the typical case and occurs more often than the focussing of the micro situation, because if the negation has wide scope, the quantifier which is negated tends to function as a specifier of the plurality of the verb, so the structure can be represented as “NOT (x verbs-often)”. But there is no logical contradiction for the quantifier to function according to the multiplicative principle even under the scope of negation, so that we may assume a double bracketing in the structure: “NOT (OFTEN (x verbs))” or “It is not the case that it is often the case that x verbs”, which leads to the aspectual focussing of the micro situation in the same way as without the negation. Examples for this case are the following ones in either word order:

- (16) ... jsem chtěl využít vzácného setkání s kultivovaným člověkem, jaký se v tomto zapadlém kraji *neobjeví^P často*.
 ‘... I wanted to make use of a precious meeting with a cultured man, whom you *don’t (won’t) meet^P often* in this shabby region.’ (CNC, Subcorpus SYN)
- (17) Mám dojem, že *moc často* z tý svý maringotky *nevylezou^P*.
 ‘I’ve got the impression that they *don’t (won’t) get out^P* of their caravan *very often*.’ (CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

Since the focussing of the micro situation is not so typical for the wide scope of the negation, in the morphological present tense of the PA there might be some nuance of a potentiality reading, which is generally often associated with these forms and also has an affinity to the usual future meaning of the PA in the present tense, cf. sentences such as *On to unese^P* ‘He will carry this’, i.e. ‘He is able to carry this’. If the PA is used in the past tense, it may also be motivated by a “summative” view as in the following example:

- (18) Zatím jsem se s ní *nesetkal^P právě často*.
 ‘So far, I *have not met^P* her really *often* yet.’ (CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

As mentioned above, the quantifier *často* ‘often’ allows for such a summative view and then functions as a count quantifier, i.e. as a synonym of *mnohokrát* ‘many times’. It is significant that the quantifier *pravidelně* ‘regularly’, which generally has the lowest ratio of the PA, hardly ever occurs in the PA with wide scope negation: In the subcorpus SYN with 1.3 billion words there are just 10 (!) relevant hits for the collocation ‘negated verb in PA + *pravidelně*’ (in either word order, with an interval of 0-7 words in between) with wide scope of the negation (out of 139 overall hits most of which are irrelevant). 28 of the overall hits have narrow scope of the negation, i.e. wide scope of the quantifier, which then often can also be translated as ‘as a rule’ or ‘mostly’ rather than ‘regularly’, i.e. they select the majority of a given set of cases. In comparison, the overall number of hits for the collocation ‘negated verb in IA + *pravidelně*’ is 2058 (including irrelevant hits).

4.2.3. Distributive arguments

In contexts of iterativity we can distinguish between two sorts of arguments in singular number: a) an argument which has an identical referent for all iterated situations, and b) an argument which just denotes a type of referent but refers to a different individual for each of the iterated situations, so that the argument has a distributive reading and each referent takes part in just one of the repeated situations. The latter case suggests –

especially if it is a distributive subject – a semantic structure in which the argument is introduced by the existential quantifier (“there exists an x”) under the scope of the iterative quantifier: “OFTEN [x: P(x)]” (“Often it is the case that there exists an x which verbs”). So the quantifier has a wide scope over the argument and thus functions as a multiplier of the whole proposition rather than as a specifier of a plurality of the verb. So the micro situation has a strong tendency to be aspectually focussed, as in (19):

- (19) Často se jako na zavolanou *zjevil^P* nějaký kamarád anebo mě přítel *pozval^P* na večeři.
 ‘Often just at the right moment there *showed up^P* some fellow or a friend *invited^P* me for dinner.’
 (CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

The same effect can also be induced by a distributive object as in (20):

- (20) Dělal nám průvodce a každý den jsme *navštívili^P* nějakou pamětihodnost.
 ‘He played the guide for us, and every day we *visited^P* some sight.’
 (CNC, Subcorpus SYN)

If on the other hand an argument – let us say the subject – refers to an identical individual for all iterated situations, it is natural that the quantifier functions as a specifier of the plurality of the verb, so we have a predication about an individual x that has the property (habit) to *verb* often/seldom or however the frequency is specified. Then the macro situation is aspectually dominant. But this is, of course, not necessary, since the quantifier may have wide scope and “multiply” a micro situation with an identical subject as well as a micro situation with a distributive subject.

The aspectual focussing of the micro situation with a distributive argument seems to be bound to its singular number which by itself focusses the respective micro situation which is repeated, because from a global view there is a plurality of referents and the singular number refers to the respective micro situation only. If a plural argument has a distributive reading, the same effect cannot be observed, maybe because such a plural argument is conceptualized as a collective entity although their single referents take part in only one situation each.

4.3. Competing factors: some results from a fill-in-the-blank test

After showing the different possible factors for aspect choice with open iteration I would like to address the question what happens if there are different factors in one sentence competing with each other. This shall be illustrated by some results from a fill-in-the-blank test with native speakers. As mentioned above the quantifier *pravidelně* ‘regularly’ has a strong tendency towards the IA motivated by the macro situation. Correspondingly, in the following sentence all of 14 study participants inserted a form of the IA (*přicházel* or *přijížděl* ‘came [on foot or by vehicle]’):

- (21) Honza bydlel sám ve starém domě na venkově, ale *pravidelně* k němu *při*..... jeho nejlepší přítel Saša.
 ‘Honza lived alone in an old house in the countryside, but often his best friend Saša *came* to him.’

When *pravidelně* was replaced by *často* ‘often’, still 10 participants chose the IA, while 4 inserted forms of the PA. With *občas* ‘sometimes’ 9 participants preferred the PA and only 5 the IA. – In a different sentence which was constructed analogously, instead of

the identical subject ‘his best friend Saša’ there was the subject *nějaký starý přítel* ‘some old friend’ which allows for a distributive reading. Here, with *pravidelně* it was still 14 out of 15 participants who chose the IA while just one participant inserted the PA. With *často* the ratio of IA:PA was 9:5, with *občas* 2:12. The changed subject thus effected a slight shift towards the PA, but the factor of the quantifier still dominated. Possibly the quantifier also influenced the reading of the subject, so that with *pravidelně* most participants understood the subject as having an identical referent (*nějaký přítel* in the sense of ‘a certain friend’).

Completely different results were obtained with a modification of the sentence (19) above which not only has two distributively interpretable subjects, but by the adverb *jako na zavolanou* ‘just at the right moment, right on cue’ also a kind of internal situation structure. Instead of the quantifier *často* ‘often’ we used *pravidelně* ‘regularly’ and *neustále* ‘permanently’. The results were significant: The ratio of the aspects with *pravidelně* was actually reversed, so that the PA was chosen by 12 out of 14 participants with the first and by 11 out of 14 with the second verb. Somewhat puzzling were the results for *neustále*: Although this quantifier is practically incompatible with the PA and always highlights the macro situation, with the first verb 3 out of 14 participants chose the PA, with the second even 5. This seems striking since in these cases the factor of the micro structure apparently overrides the obligatoriness of the IA with ‘permanently’. But on the other hand we have to admit that the combination of *neustále* and *jako na zavolanou* is by itself on the borderline to oddness, so that maybe the test persons who chose the pv aspect just forgot about the quantifier, especially with the second verb.

5. Conclusion

The aspectual relevance of the micro and the macro situation with open iterativity in Czech depends on various factors which themselves can be ascribed to the micro or the macro structure, if we subsume under the latter also information structure and scopal relations. The factors of the micro structure are factors which attract the focus to the micro situation and can be summarized as the presence of an internal structuring which makes it reasonable to be aspectually profiled. Among the factors of the macro structure an important role play iterative adverbial quantifiers, the scope of negation and quantifiers, and the distributivity or identity of arguments. The question which level is decisive for aspect choice directly corresponds with two principles of expressing open iterativity: the “plurality” principle in which the iterativity is already encoded by the IA on the verb (dominance of the macro situation) and a quantifier specifies this iterativity by denoting a certain kind of frequency, and the “multiplication” principle in which the quantifier, though it may also imply a degree of frequency, has a wider scope and introduces an exemplary micro situation which determines aspect choice and is thus aspectually focused. “Exemplary” in this context does not mean, however, that the construction is stylistically marked as in the Russian “vivid-exemplary” function of the PA. This Russian construction is just a rather marginal case in which the focus on the micro situation is also reflected by grammatical aspect (but always in the morphological present tense), but generally the difference between the two principles of expressing iteration and the scopal relations is not aspectually reflected. Concerning this difference between Czech and Russian it is also worth mentioning that the diversity of synonymous quantifiers with the meaning ‘often’ and ‘seldom’ in Czech, which share

functions as strong and weak quantifiers and underline the difference between the two principles of expressing iteration, does not exist in Russian.

References

- Breu, W. 2000. Zur Position des Slavischen in einer Typologie des Verbalaspekts (Form, Funktion, Ebenenhierarchie und lexikalische Interaktion). In: Breu, W. (Hrsg.): *Probleme der Interaktion von Lexik und Aspekt (ILA)*. Tübingen, 21-54.
- Dickey, S.M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect. (A Cognitive Approach)*. Stanford (California).
- Fortuin, E. 2008. Frequency, iteration and quantity: the semantics of expressions of frequent repetition in Russian and their relationship to aspect. *Russian Linguistics* 32, 203-243.
- Lehmann, V. 1994. Episodizität. In: Mehlig, H.R. (ed.): *Slavistische Linguistik 1993*. München.
- Petruchina, E.V. 1978. O funkcionirovanii vidovogo protivopostavlenija v rusckom jazyke v sopostavlenii s češckim (pri oboznačenii povtorjajuščichsja dejstvij). *Russkij jazyk za rubežom* 1978.1, 57-60.
- Petruchina, E.V. 1983. Funkcionirovanie prezentnych form glagolov soveršennogo i nesoveršennogo vida (s točki zrenija vzaimodejstvija grammatičeskich kategorij vida i vremeni) v češckom jazyke v sopostavlenii s russkim. In: Konstantinova, T.I. et al. (red.): *Konfrontační studium ruské a české gramatiky a slovní zásoby*, Bd. 2. Praha, 95-116.
- Petruchina, E.V. 2000. *Aspektual'nye kategorii glagola v rusckom jazyke: v sopostavlenii s češckim, slovackim, pol'skim i bolgarskim jazykami*. Moskva.
- Stunova, A. 1993. *A Contrastive Study of Russian and Czech Aspect. (Invariance vs. Discourse)*. Amsterdam.

CNC = Czech National Corpus, Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha.
URL: <<http://www.korpus.cz>>.

Резюме

Статья занимается вопросом факторов для выбора глагольного вида у неограниченной итерации в чешском языке. Предполагаются два разных принципа выражения итерации и тем самым разное мотивирование вида: (а) принцип множественности, у которого итеративность как в русском языке у всех типов повторяющихся ситуаций маркирована несовершенным видом, который мотивирован неограниченной макроситуацией, и (б) принцип мультипликации, у которого повторяемость обозначается только другими средствами как итеративными наречными квантификаторами, а вид мотивирован соответственной микроситуацией (событием или протеканием/ состоянием) и тем самым фокусируется повторяемая микроситуация. Различаются факторы микроструктуры, у которых членение микроситуации в разные подситуации приводит к применению принципа мультипликации, и глобальные факторы как

тип квантификатора, информационная структура, скопус отрицания и дистрибутивность актантов. Особенное внимание посвящается роли квантификаторов, у которых можно различать «сильные» как *pravidelně* «регулярно» или *zřídka* «редко», способные модифицироваться наречиями выражающими степень как «очень» и которые склонны функционировать по принципу (а), т.е. специфицировать множественность выраженную прямо у глагола, и «слабые» как *občas* «иногда», не способные модифицироваться и склонные функционировать по принципу (б), т.е. иметь более широкий скопус и вводить в микроситуацию. Интересно, что в этом отношении в чешском языке есть синонимные квантификаторы как *zřídka* и *málokdy* с противоположными ролями, которые в русском языке не существуют.

Valentin Dübbers, Tübingen
(valentin.duebbers@gmail.com)