A Doctoral Dissertation Summary

Title	On the problem of a "correlation" between modal meaning and verbal aspects in modern Russian — the analysis from examples of modal predicates of "possibility" with infinitive —
Author	Nobuyoshi ADEGAWA

In modern Russian, aspect is developed morphologically and functions as a grammatical category of verbs. Most Russian verbs have two aspectual forms: Perfective and Imperfective. In addition, one of the most noticeable linguistic characteristics of Russian in comparison with other European languages is that grammatical forms of aspect still continue to function even if a verb is used in the infinitive. So speakers of Russian are forced to select one of the two aspectual forms when they make an utterance using an infinitive.

With such linguistic features, various kinds of grammatical correlations between aspect and other grammatical categories are more explicitly exhibited than in other languages that have a "poor" grammatical system of aspect. One such case is the correlation between modal and aspectual meaning. Earlier works have pointed out that a certain kind of "correlation" exists between modal meaning and the usage of verbal aspectual forms. For example, when a sentence contains a modal predicate (or, in a broader sense, the modal meaning of "impossibility") then an infinitive collocated with a modal predicate will be used chiefly in a Perfective form.

The main purpose of this study is to reexamine descriptions of this phenomenon in previous studies and to clarify and describe a "correlation" between modal meaning and the usage of verbal aspectual forms in Russian. The specific topic of investigation is collocations of modal predicates having a modal meaning of "possibility" with the infinitive.

In chapter I, we introduce the range of problems related to a "correlation" between modal meaning and aspectual forms. Previous studies have pointed out that when a sentence contains the modal meaning of "possibility", then the infinitive will be used chiefly in a Perfective form. However, at the same time, we can readily find examples that contradict these "rules". Accordingly, there seems to be room for correcting or improving the description of this phenomenon.

The following points are the main aims of this paper:

a. to show how the previous studies properly described the usage of infinitives, making use of data from linguistic corpora;

b. to reconsider the correlation between modal and aspectual meanings with a proper

sub-classification for the modal meaning of "possibility";
   c.   to take into consideration the lexical meaning of infinitives and review the grammatical behavior of aspectual forms of the infinitive.

In chapter II, as a preliminary to further investigations, we discuss such grammatical categories as aspect and modality in order to share our theoretical background. Plungjan (2011) divides aspectual meanings (functions) into two types: primary aspect and secondary aspect. The primary aspectual function, which is also called a "linear" aspect, shows in what way a situation is making progress in a speaker's internal temporal perception. The secondary one, which is also called a "quantitative" aspect, is related to the "quantity" of events and differentiates between a speaker's perception of an event as a single instance or one of a series of instances.

In Plungjan (2011) the category of modality is divided into two types: modality for "evaluation" and modality for "unreality". The modality of "evaluation" is related to the attitude of a speaker toward the propositional part of a sentence. The modality of "unreality" is related to a differentiation in the speaker's mind between hypothetical and factual.

At the end of this chapter, we classify sentences with modal predicates expressing the meaning of "possibility" into four types according to their semantic-syntactic structure. Type I is for expressing the "possibility" of a situation. Type II is a variant of type I. Type III is for expressing "impossibility", and type IV, a variant of type III, expresses "inevitability".

In chapter III, we collect samples from linguistic corpora. We adopt as a main corpus the "Uppsala Russian Corpus", which is well known and highly esteemed in Russian linguistics. We collect sentences which include character strings identical to the forms for predicates of "possibility". These include *moch', umet', sposoben, v sostojanii, v silakh, mozhno, nel'zja, vozmozhno* and *nevozmozhno*. Then we filter out the linguistic samples to be used as data for our investigation and organize them according to the types of semantic-syntactic structure given in the previous chapter.

In chapter IV, the author makes an analysis of the grammatical behavior of aspectual forms of infinitives on the basis of the data laid out in the previous chapter.
As far as the predicate *moch'* is concerned, only this predicate can express both modality for "evaluation" and for "unreality" in each sentence. So in this chapter we describe the relations of semantic realization of these two modal meanings in an utterance and its semantic-syntactic structures. This description also serves as a detailed clarification of the usage of this predicate.
The data also show that certain kinds of tendencies in the selection of aspectual forms exist when the infinitive is used. These apply not only to the meaning of "impossibility", but also to the other meanings which are related to "possibility" (i.e. possibility and inevitability of the situation). Interestingly, the data also reveal the tendency for some lexical items to be used in a

certain aspectual form irrespective of the semantic-syntactic types of the sentences where the lexical item is used.

In order to show these tendencies in the selection of aspectual forms statistically, we introduce "the scale of aspectual opposition". This scale indicates which aspectual forms of a lexical item appear in the data and to what extent. The value "10" means that a given lexical item is used only in the Perfective form. The value "-10" means that a given lexical item is used only in the Imperfective form. According to the numbers shown on the scale, we can classify the lexical items that make aspectual pairs into two types: Verbal Group I and Verbal Group II.

Verbal Group II consists of those lexical items that are used chiefly in the Perfective form. The function of aspectual forms of this group is secondary, i.e. to show the opposition "event (shown by perfective)-iterative event (by imperfective)". Verbal Group I consists of those lexical items that are used chiefly in the Imperfective form. The function of aspectual forms of these items is primary, i.e. to show the opposition "completed situation (shown by perfective)-durative situation (by imperfective)". However, at the same time, we can find many cases where the formal opposition of aspect is neutralized (i.e. both forms are used synonymously).