Inclusion of English Phasal Aspect into Zeisler's Onomasiological Framework for Aspectual Systems in Language

In this paper, I present a discussion on English Phasal Aspect, PHASE (a number of different subintervals in the development of the event) based on Dik's "phasal aspect" (Dik, 1989, pp. 190-192) and how it can be incorporated into Zeisler's (2004) framework which is one of the first onomasiological approaches for the categorisation of tense and aspect.

The highest level of Zeisler's framework subdivides languages into two conceptual categories; TOTALITY (an opposition of perfective/imperfective) which has a +totality perspective focusing on the event in its entirety without regard to its internal or external states, and FRAMING (an opposition of internal/holistic) which has a +internal perspective. This perspective shifts the attention to the internal structure of an event and presents limited information in respect to the boundaries. Events are typically represented as a simple open event or a complex open event comprising of an indefinite number of open or closed sub-intervals. English is a FRAMING language.

Phasal expressions for English, *he started walking*, are sub-intervals of a complex developing event. They focus on the temporal structure of the event and have a +internal perspective (Zeisler, 2004, pp 176, 177). In regard to Zeisler's discussion of "phasal aspect" for TOTALITY languages, she classifies them as being compatible with the +totality perspective, focusing on the initial or final boundary when modifying prefixes are utilised e.g. Russian *zapet* 'start to laugh' (Zeisler, 2004, p 108).

However, Zeisler (2004) does not adequately describe or show how the complex phasal system for FRAMING languages would fit into her framework. My focus is on the INGRESSIVE, CONTINUATIVE and EGRESSIVE conceptual classes. In the framework presented by Zeisler (2004), these conceptual classes are not fully explored. In fact, INGRESSIVE and EGRESSIVE are not in her diagrams of TENSE and ASPECT concepts for languages.

In English, these concepts are encoded using an aspectualiser followed by either a *to-infinitive* or an *–ing* gerundive.

> *Starts writing/starts to write*
> *Starting writing/starting to writing*
> *Started writing/started to write*
> *Has started writing/has started to write*

Freed (1979, p.1) argues that aspectualisers are full verbs and that the complement is a tenseless construction which is temporalized by the aspectualiser (Freed, 1979, p.19). It is possible for the aspectualiser to take the full gambit of English tense with its associated aspect. My conjecture is that this type of expression becomes an inherited event, modelled on the implementation of the whole event, in respect to an onomasiological framework for Tense

and Aspect in language even though it is a sub-interval of a complex event. The inclusion of these characteristics and this inheritance property is not specified in Zeisler's methodology. I will present a modified framework that incorporates PHASE for FRAMING languages.

Dik, S. C. (1989). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Freed, A. (1979). *The Semantics of English Aspectual Complementation*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Zeisler, B. (2004). *Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Language: A Comparative Study*.