**Introduction:** A current debate within studies on language variation involves whether macroparameters exist (see Baker 2008, Kayne 2005). Baker (2008) suggests three ways to approach the question, one of which is related to the “impact” that a parameter has on the language generated; macroparameters will have a large impact. As noted, at least since Kayne (2005), the “size” of the impact can very easily depend on arbitrary expectations, and consequently may not be very informative. In this paper, I address the notion of impact be examining variation in inner aspect between English and Bulgarian; I suggest that the notion impact can be understood in terms of the scope of a parameter; this leads to a relativized notion of the micro-/macro-parameter distinction.

**Background:** MacDonald (2006, 2008), argues that English eventives have an aspectual projection, AspP, between vP and VP, which is the source of three properties: 1. The object-to-event (OTE) mapping, shown in (1); 2. A sequence of similar events (SSE) interpretation of bare plurals (BPs), shown in (2); and 3. The ability of a goal P to turn an atelic predicate into a telic predicate, shown in (3). MacDonald (2006) observes that English statives systematically differ from English eventives in lacking all three properties: Statives lack the OTE mapping, shown in (4); BPs do not elicit an SSE interpretation, as in (5); and goal Ps do not make statives telic, as in (6). English statives lack AspP.

**Bulgarian:** Evidence suggests that Bulgarian biaspectral verbs (roughly, verbs whose aspect is not dependent on prefixes) project AspP. Slabakova (1997) notes that they share properties with English eventives. They show the OTE mapping, shown in (7). While both the time span and for-adverbial are compatible with a count noun internal argument, as in (7a), when the internal argument is a mass noun, only the for-adverbial is compatible, as in (7b). Moreover, BPs elicit an SSE interpretation, indicated by the compatibility of both the time span and for-adverbial, as in (8), cf. English example (2). We also expect that goal Ps can make a predicate telic, as in English in (3); however, there is a complicating factor involved; biaspectral verbs of motion seem to be manner of motion verbs (see 9), and not allow a direct motion reading for independent reasons (see Snyder 1995). Thus, the goal P in (10) does not make the predicate telic, but arguably due to independent properties of the verb.

Standard (non-biaspectral) verbs in Bulgarian pattern with Slavic verbs quite generally (see, for example, Svenonius 2004). They have simplex imperfective forms, which (ignoring habitual interpretations) are atelic, behaving like activities, as in (11a). With the addition of a lexical prefix, the predicate becomes telic, as in (11b). Furthermore, they differ from biaspectral verbs in that they do not show the OTE mapping property, shown in (12). Note that bare nouns are incompatible with prefixed verbs in Bulgarian, shown in (12a); yet, it is not clear that the definite article here determines the aspect of the predicate (see Jackendoff 1996 for English, Nishihda 1994 for Spanish); minimally a count noun does not affect the atelicity of a simplex imperfective verb, shown in (12b). Standard verbs do not allow an SSE interpretation of BPs, illustrated in (13). Like English eventives, Bulgarian biaspectuals project AspP, and like English statives, Bulgarian standard verbs do not project AspP.

**Scope of a parameter:** Both English and Bulgarian have AspP in their inventory of functional projections. When AspP projects in either language the same properties are found. When AspP does not project, in contrast, we find different properties. In English, when AspP does not project, the resulting predicates show properties of statives; they lack (sub)event structure. In contrast, when AspP does not project in Bulgarian, the resulting predicates do not pattern with statives; minimally, as much as imperfectives pattern with activities (see 11a) and perfectives with telic predicates (11b), they possess (sub)event structure. This difference can be conceived of in terms of the scope of AspP. AspP in English scopes over all verbs, thus, the impact of AspP is reflected in all verbs; they are either stative or eventive. In contrast, in Bulgarian, the scope of AspP is restricted to a well-defined subclass of verbs: biaspectuals, which are borrowings (Slabakova 1997, Stambolieva 2008).

**Implications:** Based on the “size” of impact, then, AspP is more macro-like in English and more micro-like in Bulgarian. In a sense, it is both a macro- and a microparameter. This conclusion only makes sense if the macro/micro distinction is not absolute, but relative (perhaps to the degree of (historical) relatedness between languages, in the sense of Kayne 2005). Moreover, in order for the scope of AspP to be distinct, it must be activated differently in English and Bulgarian. One possibility falls under the idea that one facet of language acquisition is parameter setting; we might assume that the earlier a parameter is activated, the wider scope it may have over a language, since it may have an effect on items that enter later in the acquisition process. This is not wholly unexpected if parameters are universal, and differences among languages result from differences in the activation of these parameters (see, for example, Roberts & Roussou 2003).
Inner aspect and the micro/macro parameter distinction

(1) a. John drank beer # in ten minutes/for ten minutes.
   b. John drank a beer in ten minutes/#for ten minutes.
(2) John drank beers in ten minutes for an hour straight.
(3) a. John carried a bag # in ten minutes/for ten minutes.
   b. John carried a bag into the room in ten minutes/#for ten minutes.
(4) John owned a stereo/equipment # in a week/for a month.
(5) John owned books # in a week for a month straight.
(6) John owed a large sum of money to the bank # in a week/for a week.
(7) a. John carried a bag # in ten minutes/for ten minutes.
   b. John carried a bag into the room in ten minutes/#for ten minutes.
(8)  John drank beers in ten minutes for an hour straight.
(9) a. Chetoh uroka #edin chas/za edin chas. [Slabakova 1997:693]
   b. Deteto jade (edna) riba 1 čas/#za 1 čas.
   “He drank up (all) the coffee.”
(10) transportiram, shofiram, maneuviram, parkiram, putuvam, kurmuvam
     “transport” “drive” “manoeuvre” “park” “travel” “drive”
     “I read the lesson #for an hour/in an hour.”
   b. Porchetoh uroka #edin chas/za edin chas.
     Read.PERF lesson-the #an hour/in an hour
   “I read the lesson #for an hour/in an hour.”
     he iz-drink.PERF *coffee/ coffee-DET
     “He drank up (all) the coffee.”
   b. Deteto jade (edna) riba 1 čas/#za 1 čas.
     Child-the eat.IMP.AOR (one) fish 1 hour/#in 1 hour.
(13) #Napravih chasovnici 10 minuti v produljenie na 1 čas
     made-I watches in 10 minutes in continuation of 1 hour
     “I made watches in ten minutes for an hour.”