



Utrecht University

The *feel-like* periphrasis in Eastern Abruzzese

Roberta D'Alessandro & Luana Sorgini

UiL-OTS, Utrecht University

CIDSM 13

Messina, 1-3 July 2018



Feel-like

- Interesting mismatch between telicity and perfectivity
- Pragmatic use of the imperfective

- This construction is productive, but restricted to some verb classes

Verb classes

(3)

Verb classes	Dynamicity	Duration	Telicity	Examples
States	-	+	-	love, know
Activities	+	+	-	Run
Accomplishments	+	+	+	run a mile
Achievements	+	-	+	reach the top

Vendler (1967)

Feel-like with different verb classes

Sorgini (2017): compatibility of this construction with different verb classes.

Stative predicates: not compatible

(4) *mə te saputə
 to.me-CL.DAT hold-PRES.3SG known-PTCP.SG
 'I need to know/feel like knowing' (Sorgini 2017:39)

Achievements

Achievement predicates: not compatible

- (5) *mə te rəvatə
 to.me-CL.DAT hold-PRES.3SG arrive-PTCP.SG
 'I need to arrive/feel like arriving' (Sorgini 2017:32)

Accomplishment

Accomplishment predicates: not compatible

- (6) *Mə te crisciutə
to.me-CL.DAT hold-PRES.3SG grow up-PTCP
'I need to grow up/feel like growing up' (Sorgini 2017:41)

Accomplishments > Activities

Accomplishments: compatible, but with object drop! (Activities?)

(7)a. mə te cucinatə
 to.me-CL.DAT hold-PRES.3SG cooked-PTCP.SG
 ‘I need to cook/feel like cooking’

b.*mə te cucinatə na tortə
to.me-CL.DAT hold-PRES.3SG cooked-PTCP a cake
‘I need to bake/feel like baking a cake” (Sorgini 2017:41)

(we will come back on the role of the object!)

Activities

Hypothesis:

Feel like constructions are restricted to ACTIVITIES

[+ Dynamicity; + Duration; -Telicity]

Why do we use a perfective participle?

Tenere+pp in Italo-Romance

Periphrases built on tenere+pp are spread also in other Italo-Romance varieties.

-In Northern Italian varieties: **continuative/ iterative meaning (similar to English 'keep on' (Vincent, CIDSM 2012)).**

-In Neapolitan: **resultative meaning (Ledgeway, 2009)**

→ Different from the Abruzzese periphrasis

Telicity vs perfectivity

Two main issues:

- Necessity reading
- Mismatch between non-telic event and perfectivity

Terminological disclaimers

- Telicity usually refers to the **VP** (event); perfectivity refers to the **TP**
- Inner vs outer aspect
- Potential endpoint vs actual endpoint (viewpoint aspect) (Comrie 1976, Dahl 1981, Binnick 1991, Depraetere 1995, Laleko 2010) or situation aspect vs viewpoint aspect/boundedness (Smith, 1991)

Perfectivity and the past participle

The past participle is perfective. Is that possible?

Perfectivity is introduced at TP level: does the pp have perfectivity? It does, **lexically** (but is it outer aspect? Maybe)

(see Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski 2001)

In Italian: *mangiato* vs *mangiante*; *esistito* vs *esistente*

Telicity vs perfectivity

If telicity and perfectivity are different things then what's the problem?

- **Mapping:** can we map a perfective on an a-telic predicate?
- Ladman (1992): NO. Perfective aspect has in its denotation complete events. It is the identity function.
- Parsons (1980 ff): YES: both complete and incomplete events can be in the denotation of the base VP; **perfective aspect restricts its denotation to only culminating events**
(Zucchi 1999:184)

The participle

Our construction:

Imperfective present + perf (atelic)

Events in the denotation of perfective must be atelic (Sorgini 2017)

- Further evidence for –telicity
- Where is the perfective?
- Why the imperfective in the root clause?

Atelic predicates – the internal argument

Unaccusatives are not allowed, as they usually lexicalize telic predicates (8)

(8)	*Me	te	cræsciutə.
	to=me.DAT	holds.3SG.PRES	grown.PP.SG
	'I feel like growing'		Sorgini (2017:41)

Unergatives are allowed. They are [+ dynamic], [+durative], [-telic]

Transitives

Transitive verbs are allowed, under one condition: **the object must be dropped**

(8)*Mə	te	magnatə	na/la	tortə
to=me.DAT	holds.3SG.PRES	eaten.PP.SG	a/the	cake
'I feel like eating a cake'				

Predicate mapping

Mapping to objects (Krifka 1998)

A telic interpretation of the predicate arises whenever the incremental theme argument is quantized.

Quantized vs cumulative

Cumulative predicates: water or apples.

If x and y fall under apples, then the sum of x and y falls under apples as well.

Quantized predicates: *3 liters of water* or *three apples*

If x falls under three apples, then it cannot have a proper part y that also falls under three apples.

Quantized predicates

(9) a. A predicate P is **quantized** if and only if no entity that is P can be a subpart of another entity that is P (see Krifka 1998, p. 200).

b. An event description R is telic if and only if it applies to events e such that all parts of e that fall under R are initial and final parts of e (see Krifka 1998, p. 207).

- The moment you eliminate a quantized object, you eliminate telicity
- You are transforming an accomplishment into an activity

Creating and eliminating endpoints and boundaries

The *feel-like* construction step by step:

A telic event (accomplishment) [virtual endpoint]

Becomes atelic (object drop) [no endpoint]

Becomes perfective [real endpoint/boundedness]

➤ the event denoted by the VP is telic

➤ **An atelic bounded event (telic?) is in the scope of IMPERFECTIVE!**

The *feel-like* meaning

How does the *feel-like* meaning arises?

Borik (2013), following Laleko (2010):

VP imperfectivity reflects telicity markers

TP: imperfectivity operators changing the aspectual value of the the V
(although the aspectual value of the predicate remains intact)

CP – **imperfectivity** triggers pragmatic effects

CP imperfectivity

The only possibility (to have the *feel-like* reading is to have imperfective):

(10) *M' a tenure magnate
To-me has held-PRF eaten
'I felt like eating'

It is very well possible to set a feel like periphrasis in the past, but only the imperfective can be used:

(11) Me tenè magnate
To-me held-IMPF eaten
'I felt like eating'

Telicity and for/in adverbials

Dowty (1991), Krifka (1998)

a. Jè n'ore chi me te magnate

is one-hour that me holds eaten

'I have been feeling like eating for an hour/it's been an hour that I've felt like eating'

b. *Me te magnate gnè n'ore

me holds eaten with one hour

'I have needed to eat in an hour/within an hour'

The aspectual system of EA

The pp is atelic

It is in the scope of perfective

Imperfective is in the C field

Are we getting this right?

Perhaps the vP in Abruzzese is larger than in other Romance?

The vP in Abruzzese

D'Alessandro & Roberts (2010): the pp in EA is lower than in Italian
(Adverbs, *li so bbone magnate*, etc)

BUT

The vP contains the auxiliary

It is richer

It contains a phi-head

D'Alessandro (2017)

> Perfectivity is probably expressed within the vP

Conclusions

- **Telicity and lexical aspectuality on the pp can mismatch**
- **Parsons vs Landman (incomplete events approach / events in the denotation of predicates that are inputs to perfective can be both culminated and non culminated) vs (identity function of the perfective: only completed events)**
- If we consider this at vP level: Parsons is right. We have an atelic event in the denotation of a perfective (issues: is the pp really perfective? In isolation, yes – see absolute predicate constructions like *fatto questo*)

Grazie!

References and comments:

r.dalessandro@uu.nl

l.sorgini@uu.nl