

**Perfective readings in Saanich: the  $ET \subseteq RT$  account**  
**Claire Turner, University of British Columbia**

Much work on aspect assumes that the perfective involves temporal inclusion, placing the entire run time of an event (ET) within a contextually given reference time (RT) (Kratzer 1998).

$$(1) \lambda P_{\langle 1, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle} . \lambda t_i . \lambda w_s . \exists e_1 (\text{time}(e) \subseteq t \ \& \ P(e)(w) = 1) \quad (\text{Kratzer 1998})$$

In work on Salish languages, however, Bar-el (2005) and Kiyota (2008) have argued that clauses in the perfective don't always get a reading where the event time is included entirely within the given reference time. Kiyota, looking at SENĆOŦEN (Saanich, Northern Straits), focuses on activities and certain state-like predicates, which get inceptive readings in certain contexts:

(2)  $\text{ʔiləm=sən}$                        $k^w=s$                        $k^w\text{ʔ}$                        $téčəl-s$                        $tə$                       Jack  
**sing[PFV]=1SG.SBJ**                      **COMP=NMLZ**                      **PERF**                      **arrive-3POSS**                      **DET**                      **Jack**  
 'I sang when Jack arrived.' / \*'I was singing when Jack arrived.' (Kiyota 2008: 48)

(3)  $\text{čey=sən}$                        $\text{ʔə=k}^w=s$                        $\text{čələq}^w\text{ʔ}$   
**work[PFV]=1SG.SBJ**                      **OBL=COMP=NMLZ**                      **yesterday**  
 'I started working yesterday / \* I worked yesterday.' (Kiyota 2008: 95)

In order to account for this data, Kiyota (2008) proposes that i) activities and states have an extra BECOME subevent in their denotation (which is based on Rothstein 2004), ii) perfective aspect in SENĆOŦEN requires only one subevent of a complex event to be included in the reference time:

$$(4) \llbracket \text{PFV} \rrbracket = \lambda P . \lambda i . \exists e . \exists e' [e' \sqsubseteq e \ \& \ \tau(e') \subset i \ \& \ P(e)] \quad (\text{Kiyota 2008: 15})$$

Further, Bar-el and Kiyota propose that English activities also contain a BECOME subevent, since they also can get an inceptive reading in contexts like (2).

However, there are some problems with the definition of perfective in (4). First, it wrongly predicts that accomplishments will not also get inceptive readings when modified by punctual clauses (similarly to (2)), since Bar-el and Kiyota propose for independent reasons that they include only one subevent (DO). Second, including BECOME in the representation of an activity is conceptually problematic as it suggests that activities involve change and that the initial subevent is different from other subevents. Lastly, (4) predicts that inceptive readings will be found across tenses; yet they are not found with overt past tense:

(5)  $\text{čey=1əʔ=sən}$                        $\text{ʔə}$                        $k^w=s$                        $\text{čələq}^w\text{ʔ}$   
**work=PST=1SG.SBJ**                      **OBL**                      **COMP=NMLZ**                      **yesterday**  
 'I worked yesterday.' (Kiyota 2008: 95)

I argue in this paper that a standard definition of perfective, as in (1), is more desirable than the proposed modification in (4). Kamp & Rohrer (1983) argue that the sequential (or "inceptive") readings of French examples like (2) occur because clauses in the perfective aspect can introduce a new reference time. If we adopt Kamp & Rohrer's claims to SENĆOŦEN, then the modifications in (4) are not necessary to account for (2). It is better to adopt the standard definition of perfective (1) since it does not require the unusual claim that activities contain a BECOME subevent. In (3),

‘yesterday’ appears to set the RT. However, as shown in (5), the clause with the overt past tense is interpreted differently from the clause with no overt past tense. (5) shows that when the RT is explicitly specified as prior to the utterance time, the entire event is also prior to the utterance time ( $ET \subseteq RT$ ). I suggest that in (1) the RT includes the utterance time.

One difficulty that arises is the presence of ‘medial’ readings. The definition in (1) predicts that these are not possible with perfective aspect, since the entire run time of an event should be included in the reference time. Actually this is what we find in SENĆOŦEN when a specific reference time is given. Kiyota showed that perfective aspect is not appropriate for a situation when the run time of an event explicitly exceeds the reference time on both ends:

Context: You had to fix something on your house and it took three days, Tuesday-Thursday.

(5) #č́éy=ləʔ=sən                      ʔə      kʷsə      nə                      ʔéʔləŋ      ʔə      tsə      sɬixʷs  
 work[PFV]=PST=1SG.SBJ                      OBL      DET      1SG.POSS      house      OBL      DET      Wed  
 ‘I was working on my house Wednesday.’ [must use imperfective of ‘work’] (Kiyota 2008: 93)

Translations suggesting medial readings arise only in ‘out of the blue’ contexts, when there is no overtly specified or contextually salient reference time.

(6) qékʷəŋ                      tə                      Jack  
 rest[PFV]                      DET                      Jack  
 ‘Jack is resting.’ (Kiyota 2008: 31)

Such sentences contain no overt tense. I suggest that in these situations, speakers assume a reference time which is larger than an instant and includes now. I have found in my own fieldwork that tenseless sentences can also be read with the event in the past or immediate future. Speakers must differ with respect to the interval they interpret as the RT when faced with an out of context tenseless sentence.

(7) a. qékʷəŋ                      b. qékʷəŋ=sən  
 rest[PFV]                      rest[PFV]=1SB.SBJ  
 ‘He took a rest.’                      ‘I’m going to rest.’ (FW 2009)

In conclusion, using examples from published sources and from my own fieldwork, I argue that the formula presented in (1) can account for the readings of different predicate types with perfective aspect in SENĆOŦEN. Given that (1) is often assumed for work on perfective across languages, this work provides contributing evidence for the universal nature of the basic aspectual categories.

BAR-EL, Leora A. 2005. Aspectual distinctions in Skwxwú7mesh. Vancouver: UBC. PhD Thesis.  
 KAMP, Hans & Christian Rohrer. 1983. Tense in texts. In Rainer Bäuerle, Christoph Schwarze & Arnim von Stechow (eds), *Meaning, Use, and Interpretation of Language*, 250-269. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.  
 KIYOTA, Masaru. 2008. Situation aspect and viewpoint aspect: From Salish to Japanese. UBC. PhD Thesis.  
 KRATZER, Angelika. 1998. More structural analogies between pronouns and tenses. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory VII*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.  
 ROTHSTEIN, Susan. 2004. *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*. Oxford: Blackwell.  
 TURNER, Claire K. 2011. *Representing events in Saanich (Northern Straits Salish): the interaction of aspect and valence*. University of Surrey. PhD Thesis.