PROBING FOR ASPECTUAL CHANGE: AN ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL ASPECT ACROSS THREE GENERATIONS OF RUSSIAN SPEAKERS IN THE GREATER TORONTO AREA

Amer Ahmed, Iryna Lenchuk
York, Canada

Summary: The present study tests Pereltsvaig's Lexical Hypothesis [2005, 2008] by investigating the interaction between the features of grammatical aspect (±perf(ectivity)) and those of lexical aspect (±telic(ity)) in the varieties of Russian spoken among three generations of heritage speakers of Russian (HSR) in the Greater Toronto Area. Two hypotheses are tested: (a) the variety of Russian as spoken by the first generation of HSR is not different from that of Contemporary Standard Russian (CSR); particularly, the constellations [+perf, +telic] and [-perf, -telic] are a tendency rather than a rule, (b) the Russian spoken by the second and third generations of HSR is distinct from CSR in that the constellations [+perf, +telic] and [-perf, -telic] are a rule rather than a tendency. The results of the study generally though not categorically lend support to the Lexical Hypothesis.

1. Introduction

This paper explores the relationship between two kinds of aspect: lexical aspect (inner aspect [Smith 1991], situation aspect [Travis 2010]) and grammatical aspect (outer aspect [Smith 1991], viewpoint aspect [Travis 2010]). Lexical aspect encodes the inherent endpoint of an event (i.e. whether or not the event has an inherent endpoint). The values [±telic] are used to encode lexical aspect. Telicity is compositional in nature. In other words, the verb together with its complements contributes to the telicity of the event or lack thereof. On the other hand, the grammatical aspect expresses the temporal constituency of the event, i.e. whether the event can be divided into several subevents and hence looked at from an insider's perspective, or whether the event is otherwise considered as a whole, hence can only be looked at from an outsider's perspective. The values [±perf] are used to encode grammatical aspect. To illustrate the distinction between the two kinds of aspect, consider the following examples:

(1) John built a house.

(2) John built houses.

In (1), the event is telic. The lexical verb *build* is [-telic] on its own, since there is no inherent endpoint to the event of building. However, the determiner phrase (DP) *a house* is [+quantized], where quantization means that the object referred to by the DP has a definite size and shape. Together, the verb and its complement DP make the whole event expressed by the sentence in (1) telic. In (2), on the other hand, the event is [-telic]. Here again, *build* is [-telic]. The DP *houses* is [-quantized], since the denotation of the DP is not an object with a definite size and shape. Thus, the verb phrase (VP) makes the whole event [-telic]. Con-

sider now the following two examples to illustrate the second type of aspect, namely grammatical aspect:

(3) John has built a house.

(4) John was building a house.

The example in (3) shows that the event can be looked at from the outside. Here, the event is construed of as an inseparable whole, and therefore, the event has the so-called perfective grammatical aspect. In contrast, the example in (4) expresses an insider's viewpoint. In other words, the event is divided into several intervals, and only one such interval is focused. For this reason, the event in (4) has the so-called progressive grammatical aspect. Note that lexical and grammatical aspects may, but need not match. Thus, in (3), lexical aspect and grammatical aspect match in that the event is [+telic, +perf]. This is not the same as (4), where the event is [+telic, -perf].

2. Background

Canadian Russian is the variety of Russian spoken by the heritage speakers of Russian (HSR) in Canada. Hence, in the context of the present study, the dominant language is Canadian English.

The present study investigates the relationship between lexical and grammatical aspect in the variety of Russian spoken by three generations of HSR who live in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). The study takes as its point of departure a series of studies done on heritage speakers of American Russian by Pereltsvaig [2005, 2008]. In her first study, Pereltsvaig [2005] shows that heritage speakers of American Russian, particularly those whose dominant language is English, experience a loss of grammatical aspect. Faced with the fact that grammatical aspect morphology is obligatory on every verb in Russian, these speakers have to mark the verbs in their Russian for grammatical aspect. Given that Contemporary Standard Russian (CSR) marks verbs for the perfective aspect (e.g., *pročitat'* 'to read') or the imperfective aspect (e.g., *čitat'* 'to read'), heritage speakers of American Russian have to choose one or the other. To compensate for their loss of grammatical aspect, these speakers internalize an alternative rule, whereby grammatical aspect is determined by lexical aspect [Pereltsvaig 2008]. In other words, these speakers copy the values of lexical aspect and use them to assign values to grammatical aspect in the form of a rule. Thus, events are either [+telic, +perf] or [-telic, -perf]. Pereltsvaig notes that while the above constellations are very common in CSR, this is not a rule but rather a tendency, as events with [+telic, -perf] or [-telic, +perf] are also possible in CSR even though much less common than the previous constellations.

Inspired by Pereltsvaig's work on lexical and grammatical aspect of the Russian variety of heritage speakers, the present study investigates how lexical and grammatical aspects are used in the variety of Russian spoken by three generations of HSR in the GTA.

3. Research questions

The present study explores the following research questions:

(a) Is the use of lexical and grammatical aspect amongst three generations of HSR in the GTA similar or different? In particular, is there any perceivable change in the aspectual systems of the three generations?

(b) How different, if any, is the variety of Russian spoken by HSR from that of CSR?

4. The study

4.1. Method

To answer the above questions, the following procedures are followed:

(a) The Russian variety of three generations of HSR in the GTA is analyzed. The data consist of natural conversations and picture description tasks recorded during interviews conducted by a research team working for Naomi Nagy of the University of Toronto. For the purpose of this study, an hour of recorded speech of each participant is analyzed. The aspectual system of each participant is focused. Of particular interest are cases where there is a mismatch in the values of lexical aspect and those of grammatical aspect. In other words, the focus is on cases, where the event is either [+telic, -perf] or [-telic, +perf].

(b) The grammatical aspect (perfectivity) of a given verb is determined based on the intuitions of a native speaker of Russian. In addition, questions of the form *čto delaet* 'what does X do' for [-perf] and *čto sdelal(a)'* 'what did/ has X done' for [+perf] are also used.[1] This is the standard procedure when deciding whether a given verb in Russian is [+perf] or [-perf].

(c) To decide whether an eventuality is [+telic] or [-telic], the following tests are used: (1) a telic situation is one, which is acceptable with the frame 'in X time' but unacceptable with the frame 'for X time'. In contrast, an atelic situation is one, which is acceptable with the frame 'for X time', but unacceptable with the frame 'in X time', (2) a given situation is not a state if it can be used in the imperative mood; if it can be used as the complement of verbs, such as *to persuade* or *to force* in the frame 'X *forced/ persuaded* W to do Z', and if it can be pseudo-cleft in the frame 'what X did was Y' (for a full account of these tests, see [Smith 1991]).

4.2. Hypotheses

Bearing in mind Pereltsvaig's work, the following hypotheses are posited:

(I) The variety of Russian spoken by the first generation of HSR in the GTA will not be different from CSR. Particularly, the match between the values of telicity and perfectivity is a tendency rather than a rule. Thus, it is often the case that an event is [+telic, +perf] or [-telic, -perf]; yet, this need not be the case, as events with the mismatching values [+telic, -perf] or [-telic, +perf] are also available.

(II) The variety of Russian spoken by the second and third generations of HSR in the GTA will be different from that of the first generation of HSR and CSR. Thus, while in the former case, the constellations [+telic, +perf] or

---

[1] These tests are used in traditional grammar to differentiate between [+perf] and [-perf] verbs in Russian.

[-telic, -perf] are a rule, the same constellations are a tendency in the latter cases.

4.3. Participants

A total of 11 participants took part in the study:
(a) 3 x 1st generation
(b) 3 x 2nd generation
(c) 3 x 3rd generation
(d) 2 x control[2]

The criteria used for classifying the first, second, and third generations of HSR in the GTA are the following (taken from [Nagy 2010]):

1st generation:
  ▪ Born in the homeland AND
  ▪ Moved to the GTA after age 18 AND
  ▪ In Canada for at least 20 years

2nd generation:
  ▪ Born in the GTA (OR came from homeland before age 6) AND
  ▪ Parents qualify as the 1st generation

3rd generation:
  ▪ Born in the GTA AND
  ▪ Parents qualify as the 2nd generation

In addition to the above, all the participants must be fluent enough for a one-hour conversation in the heritage language.

5. Data analysis

5.1. First generation

Three participants are randomly selected for analysis. Based on the analysis conducted, this group's variety of Russian is not different from CSR. Thus, in those cases, where there is a mismatch between the values of lexical and grammatical aspect, this group performed in a way similar to CSR. Consider some illustrative examples from the first participant in this group:

(5) Menja   vsegda **budili**   potomu čto ja **ljubila**   lepeški
    I-DAT always woke-up.PASS.IMPF because   I liked.IMPF <u>flat cakes</u>
                                                              (R1F81A_IV)

    'I was always woken up because I liked <u>flat cakes</u>.'

In (5), there is a mismatch between the values of telicity and perfectivity, since the verb *budili* '[they] woke up' is [+telic, -perf], and this constellation of features is the same as that found in CSR. There is also another event in (5),

---

[2]In the data analysis, the control group is referred to as CSR. Our control group are two native speakers of Russian who live in St. Petersburg and Kiev. One of these participants is a monolingual speaker of Russian. The other participant is predominantly Russian although he spoke Ukrainian in his childhood. It is worth noting here that the marking of telicity and perfectivity in Russian and Ukrainian is almost identical (see for example [Richardson 2007]).

namely that of liking, and the verb *ljubila* is [-telic, -perf]. This feature constellation is also the same used in CSR.

Thus, the aspectual system of the first participant in this group is similar to that of CSR. Consider now some illustrative examples from the second participant in this group:

(6) **Privozjat** noč'ju gruzoviki produkty ne **splju** **smotrju**
Bring.IMPF at night trucks food not sleep.IMPF watch.IMPF
(R1M808_IV)

'Trucks bring food at night; [I] do not sleep; [I] watch.'

In (6), there is a mismatch between the values of telicity and perfectivity, since the verb p*rivozjat* '[they] bring' is [+telic, -perf], and here also, the constellation of features is the same as that used in CSR. In addition, the example in (6) has two other events, that of sleeping and another of watching. The feature assembly of these events is [-telic, -perf], and both are expressed in the same way in CSR.

(7) Deti kotorye ne **byli** pri tserkvi oni uže **poterjali**
Children who not be.PAST.IMPF at church they already lost.PF
jazyk svoikh roditelej
language their parents (R1M808_IV)
'Children who did not belong to the church; they already lost the language of heir parents.'

In (7) there are two events, one of being and another of losing. The verb *byli* '[they] were' is [-telic, -perf], and the verb *poterjali* '[they] lost' is [+telic, +perf]. Both constellations of features are the ones used in CSR.

(8) Eti ljudi nikuda by nikogda živymi ne **ostalis'**
These people nowhere PRT never alive not stay.PF (R1M808_IV)
'These people would never stay alive anywhere.'

In (8), there is a mismatch between the values of telicity and perfectivity, since the verb *ostalis'* '[they] stayed' is [-telic, +perf]. This assembly of features is the same as that used in CSR. Thus, the second participant's aspectual system is not different from that used in CSR.

Based on the data above, we conclude that the aspectual system of the first generation of HSR in the GTA is not different from CSR. The examples above clearly show that the match between telicity and perfectivity is a tendency rather than a rule.

5.2. Second generation
Three participants are randomly selected for analysis. Below are some illustrative examples provided by the first participant in this group:

(9) Ja khoču kogda-to **počitat'** no ja eščjo ne **čital**
I want sometime read.IMPF but I yet not read.IMPF (R2M12A_IV)

(10) Ja khoču kogda-to **pročitat'** no ja eščjo ne **čital**

    I want   sometime read. PF but I yet   not read.IMPF   (CSR)

    'I want to read [it] sometime but I haven't read it yet.'

In (9), the participant uses the verb *počitat'* 'to read', which is [-telic, -perf]. This deviates from (10) in CSR, where the verb *pročitat'* 'to read' is used instead. This verb is [-telic, +perf]. Based on these examples, the second hypothesis is borne out, since the second generation speaker of Russian is matching the value of perfectivity based on that of telicity. In other words, both lexical aspect and grammatical aspect match in terms of grammatical aspect (perfectivity) as well as lexical aspect (telicity) here.

(11) I   moj učitel' jego   **nazyvajut**   V.Sokolovski

    And my   teacher he.ACC call.PASS.IMPF V.Sokolovski   (R2M12A_IV)

(12) I   moj učitel' jego   **zovut**   V.Sokolovski

    And my   teacher he.ACC call.PASS.IMPF V.Sokolovski   (CSR)

    'And my teacher, he is called V.Sokolovsky.'

In (11), the participant uses the verb *nazyvajut* '[they] call', where the verb *zovut* is used in the example from CSR. However, both varieties of Russian are alike in that the event of calling in both has the feature constellation [-telic, -perf]. Therefore, the difference between (11) and (12) is simply a matter of difference in lexical choice. Based on example (11), the second hypothesis is still borne out, since there is a match between the values of perfectivity and telicity in the variety of Russian spoken by the second generation speaker.

(13) On [papa] govorit "**stan'**   kto   ty khočeš"

    He [father] says   become.PF who.NOM you want   (R2M12A_IV)

(14) On [papa] govorit "**stan'/ bud'**   kem   ty khočeš"

    He [father] says   become.PF/ be.IMPF who.INSTR you want   (CSR)

    'He says, «be whoever you want to be».'

In (13), the second generation speaker of Russian uses the verb *stan'* '[you] become', which is [+telic, +perf], where either the verb *stan'* '[you] become' or *bud'* '[you] be', which is [-telic, -perf], is used in (14) from CSR[3]. Based on example (13), the second hypothesis, namely the rule-based hypothesis, is still borne out. This is because the values of perfectivity are set based on those of telicity. The only difference between the second generation speaker of Russian and CSR is in lexical choice.

---

[3]That the verb *stan'* '[you] become' is not a state is decided based on the following syntactic tests: (1) It can be used in the imperative mood, for example, *Stan' vračom* 'Be a doctor'; (2) It can be a complement to verbs like *to persuade*, as in *On ubedil menja stat' vračom* 'He persuaded me to become a doctor'; (3) It can be pseudo-cleft, as in *čto X sdelal, on stal vračom* 'what X did was become a doctor'. For more details on the above syntactic tests, see [Smith 1991: 83-84].

(15) No mne   by **nravilos'** jesli by   ty byl doktorom
     But I.DAT PRT like.IMPF if   PRT you be   doctor   (R2M12A_IV)
(16) No mne   by **ponravilos'** jesli by   ty byl doktorom
     But I.DAT PRT like.PF   if   PRT you be   doctor   (CSR)
     'But I would be pleased if you were a doctor.'

In (15) above, the second generation speaker of Russian uses the verb *nravilos'* 'liked/ was pleased', which is [-telic, -perf], where the verb *ponravilos'* 'liked', which is [-telic, +perf], is used instead in (16) from CSR. Example (15) is again in line with the second hypothesis, since the values of perfectivity and telicity match, as per the rule-based account of the second hypothesis. The examples in (9) through (15) show that the Russian variety of the first participant of the second generation deviates from CSR, as predicted by the second hypothesis. Consider now some illustrative examples from the second participant in this group:

(17) Khorošo čto ja **idu**   [v russkuju školy] a   to   by ja ne znala
     good   that I   go.IMPF [to Russian school] but PRT PRT I not know
     russkij jazyk
     Russian language   (R2F12A_IV)
(18) Khorošo čto ja **khožu**   [v russkuju školy] a   to   by ja ne znala
     good   that I   go.IMPF [to Russian school] but PRT PRT I not know
     russkij jazyk
     Russian language   (CSR)
     'It is good that I go to a Russian school; otherwise I would not know Russian.'

In (17), the second generation speaker of Russian uses the motion verb *idu* '[I] go', which is [-telic, -perf], where the verb *khožu* '[I] go', which is also [-telic, -perf], is used instead in (18) from CSR. Based on these examples, the variety of Russian spoken by this participant does not seem to deviate from CSR. The difference between the two varieties is simply a matter of lexical choice.

   That there is no difference between the variety of Russian spoken by this participant and CSR is also evident from the following examples:

(19) Devočka ona kartinku khočet **vzvesit'**
     girl   she picture want   weigh.up.PF   (R2F12A_FW)
(20) Devočka ona kartinku khočet **povesit'**
     girl   she picture want   hang.up.PF   (CSR)
     'A girl wants to hang a picture.'

In the above two examples, the events of weighing something up and hanging something up are both [+telic, +perf]. The only difference is that the participant in (20) seems not to know that the prefix *po-* is the one used in CSR instead of the lexical prefix *vz-* which changes the meaning of the root *vesit'* from the one of hanging to the one of weighing. Based on the examples in (16) through (19), the variety of Russian spoken by this participant does not seem to deviate from

CSR. Consider now some illustrative examples provided by the third participant in this group:

(21) Ja khotel **brat'**   kompjuter [kurs po kompjuteru]
     I   wanted take.IMPF computer   [course in computers]   (R2M22)[4]

(22) Ja khotel **vzjat'**   kompjuter [kurs po kompjuteru]
     I   wanted take.PF computer   [course in computer]   (CSR)
     'I wanted to take a course in computers.'

(23) Budut **privyknut'**   k etomu budut smotret' vsegda sledit' za etim delom
        will   get used to.PF to this   will   see   always pay   to this thing
                                                                         (R2M22)
     '[They] will get used to this, and [they'll] always pay attention to it.'

(24) Budut **privykat'**   k etomu
     will   get used.IMPF to this   (CSR)
     '[They] will get used to this.'

In (23), the second generation speaker of Russian uses the verb *privyknut'* 'to get used to', which is [+telic, +perf], where the verb *privykat'* 'to get used to', which is [-telic, -perf], is used instead in (24) from CSR.

(25) Tol'ko čto   iz   art-školy dolžen **uznat'**
     only   what from art school should learn.PF   (R2M22)

(26) Tol'ko čto   iz   art-školy dolžen **znat'**
     only   what from art school should know.IMPF   (CSR)
     '[I know] only what I was supposed to learn from the art school.'

In (25), the participant uses the verb *uznat'* 'to learn', which is [+telic, +perf], where the verb *znat'* 'to know', which is [-telic, -perf], is used instead in (26) from CSR.

   The examples in (22)-(26) show that even though the participant deviates from CSR, these examples do not threaten the validity of the second hypothesis, that is, the second generation speaker of Russian is still matching the values of perfectivity to those of telicity.

   Based on the data above, we conclude that the aspectual system of the second generation of HSR in the GTA is different from CSR. However, these differences do not invalidate the second hypothesis. Thus, while this group may use values of perfectivity and telicity that are distinct from those used in CSR, they still match the values of perfectivity based on those of telicity.

---

[4]This participant is not part of the project conducted by Naomi Nagyi's team at the University of Toronto. The interview with this participant was conducted as part of the requirements for LING6420, York University. The participant is included since he falls under the category of the second generation speakers of Russian.

5.3. Third generation
Three participants are randomly selected from this group. Below are some illustrative examples to show their linguistic behavior with regard to lexical and grammatical aspect.

(27) Khorošo jesli my **sokhranim** russkij jazyk
    good   if   we preserve.PF Russian language   (R3M56A_eoq)
    'It is good if we preserve Russian language.'

(28) Ja **vižu**   takoj balagan kotoryj u   nas   teper' **tvoritsja**
    I   see.IMPF such circus   that   PREP we.GEN now   happen.IMPF
                                                                (R3M56A_eoq)
    'I see [describing a picture] a mess very much like ours [at our home] now.'

The above two sentences are in line with CSR. In (27), the speaker uses the verb *sokhranim* '[we'll] preserve', which is [-telic, +perf]. In (28), the speaker uses the verbs *vižu* '[I] see' and *tvoritsja* '[it] happen[s]' both of which are [-telic, -perf].

(29) Oni **p'jut**   **vypivajut** u   nas
    They drink.IMPF drink.IMPF PREP us.GEN   (R3M56A_eoq)
    'They are drinking at our place.'

The example in (29) is also in line with CSR. The speaker uses the verbs *p'jut* '[they] drink' and *vypivajut* '[they] drink', both of which are [-telic, -perf].

(30) Inogda   idjom   **sdelat'** raznyje vešči, vot sejčas   osen'ju my
    Sometime go.IMPF do.PF different things PRT nowadays autumn we
    idjom   jabloki sobirat'
    go.IMPF apples pick   (R3F25A_eoq)

(31) Inogda   **delaem** raznyje vešči, vot   sejčas   osen'ju my idjom
    Sometimes do.IMPF different things PRT nowadays autumn we go.IMPF
    jabloki sobirat'
    apples   pick   (CSR)
    'We do different things [with my friends] sometimes; nowadays we go and
    pick apples.'

In (30), the participant uses the verb *sdelat'* 'to do', which is [+telic, +perf]. In (31) from CSR, the verb used is *delaem* '[we] do', which is [-telic, -perf]. Thus, while the speaker deviates from CSR, the values assigned to the event are still in accord with the second hypothesis. This is because the speaker is matching the values of perfectivity to those of telicity.

(32) Teper' ja by   khotela čtoby ja nemnožko lučše **pogovorila** po-russki
      now   I PRT want   that I little   better speak.PF   Russian
                                                                (R3F25A_eoq)

(33) Teper' ja by   khotela čtoby ja nemnožko lučše **govorila**   po-russki
       now I PRT want   that I little   better speak.IMPF Russian (CSR)
     'Now I would like to speak Russian a little better.'

In (32), the participant uses the verb *pogovorila* '[she] spoke', which is [-telic, +perf]. The example in (33) from CSR shows that the verb *govorila* '[she] spoke' is used instead, which is [-telic, -perf]. The examples show that the participant deviates from CSR. More importantly, the second hypothesis is not borne out by the example in (32). This is because the participant is not matching the values of perfectivity to those of telicity, contra the predictions of the second hypothesis. That this is the case can also be shown using the following examples:

(34) No mne   trudno **pogovorit'** po-russki
     But I.DAT difficult speak.PF   Russian   (R3F25A_eoq)
(35) No mne   trudno   **govorit'**   po-russki
     But I.DAT difficult speak.IMPF Russian   (CSR)
     'But it is difficult for me to speak in Russian.'

In (34), the participant uses the verb *pogovorit'* 'to speak', which is [-telic, +perf]. In (35) from CSR, the verb *govorit'* 'to speak' is used instead, which is [-telic, -perf]. Here again, the second hypothesis is not borne out by the data in (34). This is because the participant is not matching the values of perfectivity to those of telicity, contra the predictions of the second hypothesis. At this point, one might argue that this participant is using the form of the verb for 'speak' as a memorized chunk rather than compositionally. Yet this argument is not supported by the data, as there are other cases, where the participant is using the form *govorit'* in a way similar to the use of the form in CSR. The following is one such example:

(36) Mnongije russkije **pridut**   takže my vse po-russki **govorim**   togda
     Many   Russians come.PF also we all Russian   speak.IMPF then
                                                                (R3F25A_eoq)
(37) Mnongije russkije **prikhodjat** takže my vse po-russki **govorim**   togda
     Many   Russians come.IMPF also we all   Russian   speak.IMPF then
                                                                     (CSR)
     'Also when there are many Russians around, we all speak Russian.'

Note, however, that the participant uses the verb *pridut* '[they'll] come', which is [+telic, +perf], when the verb in (37) from CSR is *prikhodjat*, which is [-telic, -perf]. Here, the participant deviates from CSR. In this example, the deviation from CSR does not provide evidence against the second hypothesis, simply because the participant seems to be matching the values of perfectivity to those of telicity, as predicted by the second hypothesis.

Based on the data provided in (32)-(37), this participant seems to be fluctuating between matching and mismatching the features of perfectivity and telicity.

(38) Nel'zja **skazat'** materit' nužno skazat' rugatel'noje slovo

    Never say.PF swear   should say   bad   word   (R3F37A_FW)

(39) Nel'zja **govorit'**   maternoje slovo nužno skazat' rugatel'noje slovo

    Never   talk.IMPF vulgar   word should say   bad   word (CSR)

    'Don't say «speak vulgar»; instead one should say «bad word».'

In (38), the participant uses the verb *skazat'* 'to say', which is [+telic, +perf]. In (39) from CSR, the verb *govorit'* 'to talk' is used instead, which is [-telic, -perf]. Based on these examples, the rule-based hypothesis is still maintained here, since the participant is matching the values of perfectivity to those of telicity. Thus, while the participant deviates from CSR, the second hypothesis is still maintained.

(40) Moja podruga khorošaja kotoraja so   mnoj **pošla** v russkoj   škole

    My   girlfriend good   that   with me   go.PF to Russian school

                                                  (R3F37A_FW)

(41) Moja podruga khorošaja kotoraja so   mnoj **khodila** v russkuju školu

    My   girlfriend good   that   with me   go.IMPF to Russian school

                                                  (CSR)

    'My girlfriend that went to a Russian school with me was a good one.'

In (40), the participant uses the verb *pošla* '[she] went', which is [+telic, +perf]. In example (41) from CSR, the verb *khodila* '[she] went' is used instead, which is [-telic, -perf]. Here also, the rule-based account is maintained, since the participant is matching the values of perfectivity to those of telicity. In other words, while the participant deviates from CSR, the second hypothesis can still be maintained.

    Based on the data (26)-(39), we conclude that the second hypothesis, namely that the variety spoken by the third generation speakers of Russian in the GTA deviates from that of the first generation and from CSR, can still be maintained even though the performance of one participant seems to suggest otherwise.

6. Conclusions and discussion

Based on the analysis conducted in this study, the following results are obtained:

(a) The variety of Russian spoken by the first generation of HSR in the GTA is not different from CSR.

(b) The variety of Russian spoken by the second generation of HSR in the GTA deviates from CSR.

(c) The variety of Russian spoken by the third generation of HSR in the GTA deviates from CSR.

The present study tests the following two hypotheses repeated here for convenience:

(I) The variety of Russian spoken by the first generation of HSR in the GTA will not be different from CSR. Particularly, the match between the values of telicity and perfectivity is a tendency rather than a rule. Thus, it is often

the case that an event is [+telic, +perf] or [-telic, -perf]; yet, this need not be the case, as events with the mismatching values [+telic, -perf] or [-telic, +perf] are also available.

(II) The variety of Russian spoken by the second and third generations of HSR in the GTA will be different from that of the first generation of HSR and CSR. Thus, while in the former case, the constellations [+telic, +perf] or [-telic, -perf] are a rule, the same constellations are a tendency in the latter cases.

Looking at the results obtained in (a)-(c) above, and given the hypotheses posited in (I)-(II), the following conclusions can be drawn:

(a') According to the data obtained from the first generation of HSR in the GTA, their language variety is not different from CSR as far as lexical and grammatical aspects are concerned. Particularly, the data provide evidence for the hypothesis in (I) above. Thus, just like in CSR, the matching between the values of grammatical aspect (perfectivity) and lexical aspect (telicity) is a tendency rather than a rule.

(b') The language in the data obtained from the second generation of HSR deviates from CSR. However, this deviation aside, the data supports the hypothesis posited in (II) above. Specifically, for this group of participants, the constellations [+telic, +perf] and [-telic, -perf] are a rule rather than a tendency. The deviations from CSR, which this group of participants exhibits come in two different flavors. One type of deviations occurs when the participants choose a [+telic, +perf] event for a [+telic, -perf] event in CSR, or a [-telic, -perf] event for a [+telic, -perf] event in CSR. The second and more interesting deviation is when the participants choose a [+telic, +perf] event for a [-telic, -perf] event in CSR, or a [-telic, -perf] event for a [+telic, +perf] event in CSR. Crucially, the participants of this group always match the values of perfectivity to those of telicity, exactly as predicted by the second hypothesis.

(c') The data obtained from the third generation of HSR also show deviations from CSR as far as lexical and grammatical aspects are concerned. These deviations aside, the data (with the exception of the linguistic behavior of one participant in this group) can be taken to provide support to the hypothesis in (II) above. Here also, the deviations from CSR come in the same two flavors observed with the data obtained from the second generation of HSR. At this point, one might want to explain the exceptional behavior of one participant in this group. Here a number of scenarios might be entertained. The first scenario might be one, where hypothesis (II) is better stated in relative rather than in absolute terms. In other words, the second hypothesis may be true for some but not all representatives of the second and third generations of HSR. To be sure, this hypothesis is suggested by Pereltsvaig [2008]. In a response to a recent study by Bar-Shalom and Zaretsky [2006, as cited in Pereltsvaig 2008: 28], where no departures from CSR are reported among the pool of speakers studied, Pereltsvaig [2008: 28] writes that «this [result] is, however, unsurprising, as it is not the case that all Diaspora Russian speakers undergo the same changes in their lin-

guistic system». The second scenario that can be considered to explain the exceptional behavior of one participant in the third generation of HSR might be that this participant is unaware of the difference between two forms of certain lexical items, hence uses them interchangeably. It is worth noting here that all the data obtained from this participant, which run against the second hypothesis, have to do with the use of the forms *govorit* and *pogovorit* 'to speak'. Thus, it could be the case that this participant is unaware of any differences in meaning between the two forms of the verb for 'to speak', hence uses them interchangeably. The third scenario that might explain the exceptional behavior of this participant might be that the participant uses the form *govorit* with certain complements and *pogovorit* with others. In other words, it could be the case that for this participant, there are collocational restrictions on the use of these two forms of the verb for 'to speak'.

Notwithstanding the exceptional behavior of one participant in the group of the third generation of HSR, we conclude that all in all the data provide strong evidence for both the first and the second hypotheses. In other words, at least some speakers of the second and third generations of HSR in the GTA have undergone a change in their linguistic system as far as aspect is concerned.

One final point about the degree to which a heritage language is maintained is worth mentioning. The conversations obtained from the participants seem to strongly suggest that maintenance of a heritage language is a function of a number of factors. First, being part of a speech community is an important factor that seems to help heritage speakers to maintain their heritage language. In other words, engaging in a number of activities with members of the heritage language, such as for example going to church seems to be a factor in maintaining a heritage language. Second, instructed learning also seems to be playing a role in maintaining a heritage language. Thus, participants who go to Russian schools seem to be doing better in keeping their heritage language than those who do not. The third factor in maintaining a heritage language is the amount of exposure to the heritage language. Thus, participants who use Russian at home or while communicating with friends seem to be doing better than those who do not.

This study should serve as a starting point towards quantitative-oriented studies before any firm conclusions about the aspectual system of HSR can be drawn.

REFERENCES

Nagy 2010 – *Nagy N.* Heritage language variation and change in Toronto. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010.
Pereltsvaig 2005 – *Pereltsvaig A.* Aspect lost, aspect regained: Restructuring of aspectual marking in American Russian // P.Kempchensky, R.Slabakova (eds.). Aspectual Inquiries. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.

Pereltsvaig 2008 – *Pereltsvaig A.* Aspect in Russian as grammatical rather than lexical notion: Evidence from Heritage Russian // Russian Linguistics, 32 (2008), 27-42.

Richardson 2007 – *Richardson K.* Case and aspect in Slavic. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Smith 1991 – *Smith C.* The parameter of aspect. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.

Travis 2010 – *Travis L.* Inner aspect: The articulation of VP. Dordrecht: Springer, 2010.