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• reference to completed events: pf, but sometimes also ipf
• minimal pair (from Padučeva 2006):

(1a) *Anja vymyla pol.*
   A. cleaned.PF floor.ACC
   ‘Anja cleaned the floor.’

(1b) *Anja myla pol.*
   A. cleaned.IPF floor.ACC
   ‘Anja cleaned the floor.’
an attested pair (from the internet)

title of a video post:

(2a) *Krokodil prosto vzjal i s’el čerepachu.*
crocodile simply took.PF and ate.PF turtle
‘The crocodile just took and ate the turtle.’

below a comment from arkhangelmikhail:

(2b) *Ja kstati el čerepachu, na kuricu pochoža.*
I by-the-way ate.IPF turtle to chicken similar
‘I, by the way, have eaten a turtle. Tastes like chicken.’
well-known restrictions wrt referentiality of object-NP
(example from Vogeleer, discussed in Grønn 2004)

(3a)  Ty sʾel dve konfety, kotorye ležali na stole?
       you ate.PF 2 candies that lay on table
       ‘Did you eat the two candies that were lying on the table?’

(3b)  *Ty el dve konfety, kotorye ležali na stole?
       you ate.IPF 2 candies that lay on table
       ‘Did you eat the two candies that were lying on the table?’
to check for (i) number neutrality, (ii) narrow scope, (iii) discourse transparency (iv) support for pronouns, (v) establishedness effects:

(4a) *Ja s’el strausinoe jajco.*
    I ate.PF ostrich egg
    ‘I have eaten the ostrich egg.’

(4b) *Ja el strausinoe jajco.*
    I ate.IPF ostrich egg
    ‘I have eaten an ostrich egg.’
- a context to fix the intended reading (completed ipf)
- person A:

   Somnevajus’, čto ty chot’ raz v žizni el strausinoe jajco.
   I_doubt that you at_least once in life ate.IPF ostrich egg
   ‘I doubt that you have ever eaten an ostrich egg.’

- person B:

   A vot i net. ...
   but here and no ...
   ‘You are wrong! ...’
ipf version:

(5) A: Somnevajus’, čto ty chot’ raz v žizni el strausinoe jajco.
    ‘I doubt that you have ever eaten an ostrich egg.’

B: A vot i net. Ja el strausinoe jajco.
    but here and no I ate.IPF ostrich egg
    ‘You are wrong! I have eaten an ostrich egg.’

reactions:
- “B ate one or more eggs, or just tasted”
- “B ate only one egg, otherwise plural must be used”
pf version:

(6) A: Somnevajus’, čto ty chot’ raz v žizni el strausinoe jajco.
    ‘I doubt that you have ever eaten an ostrich egg.’

    B: A vot i net. Ja s”el strausinoe jajco.
        but here and no I ate.PF ostrich egg
    ‘You are wrong! I have eaten the ostrich egg.’

reactions:
- “inconsistent dialogue”
- “exactly one eaten egg”
- “egg must be given”
changing the example slightly:

(7) A: Somnevajus’, čto ty chot’ raz v žizni el omara.
   ‘I doubt that you have ever eaten a lobster.’

   B: A vot i net. Ja el omara.
      but here and no I ate.IPF lobster
      ‘You are wrong! I have eaten a lobster.’

reactions:
- “one eaten turtle, otherwise plural must be used”
- “also possible: just tasted”
ipf version:

(8) A: Somnevajus’, čto ty chot’ raz v žizni el strausinoe jajco.
    ‘I doubt that you have ever eaten an ostrich egg.’

B: Ty prava. Ja ne el strausinoe jajco.
    ‘You are right. I’ve never eaten an ostrich egg.’

reactions:
- “okay”
- “plural would sound a little bit better”
- no complaints about text coherence
Narrow scope?

pf version:

(9) A: Somnevajus’, čto ty chot’ raz v žizni el strausinoe jajco.
    ‘I doubt that you have ever eaten an ostrich egg.’

   B: Ty prava. Ja ne s’el strausinoe jajco.
    you right I not ate.PF ostrich egg
    ‘You are right. I have not eaten the ostrich egg.’

reactions:
- “inconsistent dialogue”
- “egg must be given”
Narrow scope?

- narrow scope wrt negation attested
- how about wide scope? a different context:

*Nedelju nazad Ivan dal mne strausinoe jajco. On skazal, week before I. gave.pf me ostrich egg. he said, čtoby ja ego s”el do segodnjašnega dnja. No ja ... that I it ate.pf until today’s day but I ‘A week ago Ivan gave me an ostrich egg. He said I should eat it until today. But I ...’

Olav Mueller-Reichau
Pseudo Incorporation in Russian? Aspectual Competition and
ipf version:

(10) *Nedelju nazad Ivan dal mne strausinoe jajco.*
   *On skazal, čtoby ja ego s’el do segodnjašneg* *o d* *nj*a...*
   ‘A week ago Ivan gave me an ostrich egg. He said I should eat it until today...’

   ...
   *No ja ne el strausinoe jajco.*
   but I not ate.IPF ostrich egg
   ‘...But I have never eaten an ostrich egg.’

reactions:
- “sounds very bad”
- “inconsistent”
there is a way to rescue ipf:

(11) *Nedelju nazad Ivan dal mne strausinoe jajco.*
    *On skazal, čtoby ja ego sʼel do segodnjašnego dnja...*
    ‘A week ago Ivan gave me an ostrich egg. He said I should eat it until today...’

    ...*No ja ne el ego. Bojusʼ probovatʼ.*
    but I not ate. IPF it fear tasting
    ‘...But I did not. I am afraid of tasting it.’
pf version:

(12) *Nedelju nazad Ivan dal mne strausinoe jajco.*
    *On skazal, čtoby ja ego s’*el *do segodnjašnego dnja*...
    ‘A week ago Ivan gave me an ostrich egg. He said I should eat it until today...’

    ...*No ja ne s’*el *strausinoe jajco.*
    but I not ate.PF ostrich egg
    ‘...But I have never eaten an ostrich egg.’

reactions:
- “okay, but repetition is not so elegant”
- “perfect”
Reduced discourse transparency?

- can the bare sg access a referent introduced in the preceding discourse?

Ja našel odno strausinoe jajco i dva kokosovych orecha...
I found. PF 1 ostrich egg and 2 coco nut
‘I found one ostrich egg and two coconuts.’

...
Reduced discourse transparency?

- ipf version:

(13) *Ja našel odno strausinoe jajco i dva kokosovych orecha...*
  
  I found.PF 1 ostrich egg and 2 coco nut
  
  ‘I found one ostrich egg and two coconuts.’

...*Ja el strausinoe jajco.*
  
  I ate.IPF ostrich egg
  
  ‘I ate the ostrich egg.’

- reactions:
  - “not so good”
  - “must mean that speaker was engaged in eating”
  - “text should go on with, e.g., *kogda na menja napol krokodil*” (=‘when I was suddenly attacked by a crocodile’)
Reduced discourse transparency?

pf version:

(14) *Ja našel odno strausinoe jajco i dva kokosovych orecha...*
    I found.PF 1 ostrich egg and 2 coco nut
    ‘I found one ostrich egg and two coconuts.’

    ...*Ja s”el strausinoe jajco.*
    I ate.PF ostrich egg
    ‘I ate the ostrich egg.’

reactions:
- “okay”
- “good”
Support for pronominal anaphora?

- can the bare NP be accessed by a subsequent pronoun?

...‘I ate an/the ostrich egg.’

...Ono bylo podarkom Ivana.
  it was.IPF gift I.
  ‘It was a present from Ivan.’
Support for pronominal anaphora?

- ipf version:

(15) *Ja el strausinoe jajco.*
   I ate.IPF ostrich egg
   ‘I ate an ostrich egg.’

   ...*Ono bylo podarkom Ivana.*
   it was.IPF gift I.
   ‘It was a present from Ivan.’

- reactions:
  - “okay, but it must mean that speaker was engaged in eating”
Support for pronominal anaphora?

pf version:

(16) *Ja s’el strausinoe jajco.*
    *I ate.PF ostrich egg*
    ‘I ate the ostrich egg.’

    *...Ono bylo podarkom Ivana.*
    *it was.IPF gift I.*
    ‘It was a present from Ivan.’

reactions:
- “okay”
- “fine”
Establishedness effects?

- effects like *green bottle* vs. *Coke bottle* in English generic definites (Krifka et al. 1995; Dayal 2004)

(17a) *Ja el strausinoe jajco.*
I ate.IPF ostrich egg
‘I have eaten an ostrich egg’

(17b) *Ja el černoe jajco.*
I ate.IPF black egg
‘I have eaten a black egg’ (intended reading: completed ipf)

- note: process reading (‘I was eating a black egg’) is possible without reservation
Establishedness effects?

(17c) V Amerike est’ kuricy, kotorye nesut černye jajca.
    in A. exist chicken which lay black eggs
Ja el černoe jajco.
    I ate/IPF black egg
‘In America there are chicken that lay black eggs.
    I have eaten (such) a black egg.’
Summary of the results

do bare sg-NPs in completed ipf show the typical properties of pseudo-incorporated constituents?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number neutral</td>
<td>O (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow scope only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduced discourse transparency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad support for pronominal anaphora</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishedness effects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grønn’s account of aspectual competition:

- single completed event? \(\rightarrow\) no \(\rightarrow\) ipf
- event presupposed? \(\rightarrow\) yes \(\rightarrow\) ipf
- target state relevant? \(\rightarrow\) no \(\rightarrow\) ipf
- target state reversible? \(\rightarrow\) yes \(\rightarrow\) ipf
(18) *Ty kogda-nibud’ razbival cennuju vazu?*
    you at some time broke.IPF valuable vase
    ‘Have you ever shattered a valuable vase?’ (from Padučeva 1996)

Grønn (2004:240ff.) about (18):
- the verb describes a target state
- the target state described by the verb is irreversible
- if the object was specific, the target state would be claimed to hold forever after
- that would call for the use of pf
- the verb is ipf, however
- therefore, the object must get a non-specific interpretation
(19) *Ja el strausinoe jajco.*
   I ate.IPF ostrich egg
   ‘I have eaten an ostrich egg’

- the same reasoning:
  - the verb describes a target state
  - the target state described by the verb is irreversible
  - if the object was specific, the target state would be claimed to hold forever after
  - that would call for the use of pf
  - the verb is ipf, however
  - therefore, the object must get a non-specific interpretation
(19) *Ja el strausinoe jajco.*
   I ate.IPF ostrich egg
   ‘I have eaten an ostrich egg’

- non-specificity would explain:
  - narrow scope only
  - reduced discourse transparency
  - bad support for pronominal anaphora

- but it cannot explain the establishedness effects
(20a) ?Ja el černoe jajco.
   I ate.IPF black egg
   ‘I have eaten a black egg’

(20b) Ja s’el černoe jajco.
   I ate.PF black egg
   ‘I ate the black egg’

- why should giving černoe jajco a non-specific interpretation cause any pragmatic turbulences?
- compare: John wants to eat a black egg.
a counterexample for Grønn:
- the verb describes a target state
- the target state described by the verb is irreversible
- ipf! the object-NP should be non-specific
- but there is an explicit referential anchor for the nominal within the sentence: Vam!
- hence the object-NP is specific! (cf. von Heusinger 2002)
(in a nutshell)

- aspect in Russian is sensitive to $<B,F>$ (Krifka 2006)
- completed ipf result from a particular $<B,F>$ at VP
- as an effect, arguments internal to V compose at the kind-level if they can
- Russian bare singular NPs can (underspecified wrt kind- or token-level)
- bare singular arguments in completed ipf are kind terms
- that would explain:
  - narrow scope only
  - reduced discourse transparency
  - bad support for pronominal anaphora
  - establishedness effects
\[ \text{AspP Asp [VP V NP \]} \]

\[ V \Rightarrow \lambda e [ |V(e)| \equiv \lambda e [e_k |V(e_k), R(e, e_k)] \]

VP delivers a structured meaning \(<B, F>\) which is input to Asp

application of Asp (Pf or Ipf) serves two functions:
- maps property of event tokens onto property of times
- transforms background part of input-VP into presupposition
• $V \Rightarrow \lambda e \ [e_k | V(e_k), R(e, e_k)]$

• morphological pf is a focus marker, it signals that a condition (completion) is in focus:

$$VP\text{-}pf \Rightarrow <\lambda P \lambda e [e_k | V(e_k), R(e, e_k), P(e)], \lambda e [t' | e \succ t'] >$$

• The step to AspP:
  - $Pf \Rightarrow \lambda P \lambda t [e | P(e), e \subseteq t]$
  - Background-Presupposition-Rule (=BPR) holds (cf. Geurts & Van der Sandt 2004)
  - Grønn-style notation: subscript = presupposition
VP-pf $\Rightarrow \langle \lambda P \lambda e[e_k|V(e_k),R(e,e_k),P(e)], \lambda e[t'|e>\prec t'] \rangle$

VP-pf\textsubscript{BPR} $\Rightarrow \lambda e[t'|e>\prec t'][e_k|V(e_k),R(e,e_k)]$

Pf $\Rightarrow \lambda P\lambda t[e|P(e),e\subseteq t]$

presupposed conditions require their arguments to be declared in presupposition universe

AspP-pf $\Rightarrow \lambda t[t'|e>\prec t',e\subseteq t][e,e_k|V(e_k),R(e,e_k)]$
VP-pf ⇒ ⟨λPλe[e_k|V(e_k),R(e,e_k),P(e)] , λe[t′|e≻≪t′]⟩

now let there be a bare sg argument-NP

pf focus marking is morphological, hence the NP will contribute to background

option 1: token-level composition; VP-pf ⇒
⟨λPλe[x,e_k|V(e_k),R(e,e_k),N(x),TH(e,x),P(e)] , λe[t′|e≻≪t′]⟩

option 2: kind-level composition; VP-pf ⇒
⟨λPλe[x_k,e_k|V(e_k),R(e,e_k),N(x_k),TH(e_k,x_k),P(e)] , λe[t′|e≻≪t′]⟩
in Russian, kind-level interpretations seem to be dispreferred for bare singulars:

(22a) *Mamont vymer.*
    mammoth died_out.PF
    ‘The mammoth died out’ (reaction: “no, it should be plural!”)

(22b) *Šerstistyj mamont vymer.*
    woolly mammoth died_out.PF
    ‘The woolly mammoth died out’ (reaction: “others still alive?”)

(22c) *Šerstistyj nosorog vymer.*
    woolly rhinoceros died_out.PF
    ‘The woolly rhinoceros died out’ (reaction: “okay”)
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therefore: \( VP-pf \Rightarrow \)
\[ \langle \lambda P \lambda e[x,e_k | V(e_k), R(e,e_k), N(x), TH(e,x), P(e)] , \lambda e[t'|e> \prec t'] \rangle \]

with BPR: \( VP-pf_{BPR} \Rightarrow \)
\[ \lambda e [t'|e> \prec t'][x,e_k | V(e_k), R(e,e_k), N(x), TH(e,x)] \]

\( Pf \Rightarrow \lambda P \lambda t [e|P(e), e \subseteq t] \)

\( AspP-pf \Rightarrow \)
\[ \lambda t [t'|e> \prec t', e \subseteq t][x,e,e_k | V(e_k), R(e,e_k), N(x), TH(e,x))] \]

the bare singular gets a definite token-level interpretation
• ipf morphology is compatible with any \(<B,F>\) at VP, except for the one triggered by pf

• completed ipf: focus on event realization (Padučeva 1996:36):

  \[ VP\text{-}ipf^3 \Rightarrow <\lambda P \lambda e[e_k|V(e_k),P(e)], \lambda e[|R(e,e_k)]> \]

• the input to Ipf:

  \[ VP\text{-}ipf_{BPR} \Rightarrow \lambda e[|R(e,e_k)] [e_k|V(e_k)] \]

• Ipf \Rightarrow \lambda P \lambda t [e|P(e),t \subseteq e]

• AspP-ipf \Rightarrow \lambda t [e|R(e,e_k),t \subseteq e] [e_k|V(e_k)]\]
what if there is a bare sg argument-NP?
since focus is on event realization, the NP will contribute to the background

token-level composition: VP-ipf³ ⇒
<λPλe[x,eₖ|V(eₖ),N(x),TH(e,x),P(e)] , λe[ |R(e,eₖ)]>

kind-level composition: VP-ipf³ ⇒
<λPλe[xₖ,eₖ|V(eₖ),N(xₖ),TH(eₖ,xₖ),P(e)] , λe[ |R(e,eₖ)]>
- bare sg as a token-level argument:
  \[ \text{VP-ipf}^3 \Rightarrow \lambda P \lambda e[x,e_k | V(e_k),N(x),\text{TH}(e,x),P(e)] , \lambda e[ | R(e,e_k)] > \]

- BPR gives:
  \[ \text{VP-ipf}_{BPR} \Rightarrow \lambda e [ | R(e,e_k)] [x,e_k | V(e_k),N(x),\text{TH}(e,x)] \]

- but this DRS is not verifiable!
bare sg as a kind-level argument:
VP-ipf$^3 \Rightarrow$
\[
<\lambda P \lambda e[x_k,e_k|V(e_k),N(x_k),TH(e_k,x_k),P(e)] , \lambda e[ |R(e,e_k)]>
\]
BPR gives:
VP-ipf$^{BPR} \Rightarrow \lambda e [ |R(e,e_k)] [x_k,e_k|V(e_k),N(x_k),TH(e_k,x_k)]$
this DRS is possible
with an existential \(<B,F>\), only those expressions can compose within VP that allow for a kind interpretation

(3b) *Ty el dve konfety, kotorye ležali na stole?
you ate.1PF 2 candies that lay on table
‘Did you eat the two candies that were lying on the table?’
to escape VP-internal composition: appear preverbally!
a particular horse is meant (from Academy Grammar 1980)

(23) *Konja poil?*
    horse.ACC watered.IPF
    ‘Did you water the horse?’
to escape VP-internal composition: become a pronoun!

(11) *Nedelju nazad Ivan dal mne strausinoe jajco.*
    *On skazal, čtoby ja ego s’el do segodnjašnego dnja...*
    ‘A week ago Ivan gave me an ostrich egg. He said I should eat it until today...’

    *...No ja ne el ego. Bojus’ probovat’.*
    but I not ate. IPF it fear tasting
    ‘...But I did not. I am afraid of tasting it.’
don’t change the kind with completed ipf!

(13’) Ja našel odno strausinoe jajco i dva kokosovych orecha...
‘I found one ostrich egg and two coconuts.’

...Ja el jajco.
I ate.IPF egg
‘I ate the egg.’

(5’) A: Somnevajus’, čto ty chot’ raz v žizni el strausinoe jajco.
‘I doubt that you have ever eaten an ostrich egg.’

B: ??? A vot i net. Ja el jajco.
but here and no I ate.IPF egg
‘You are wrong! I have eaten an egg.’
Concluding remarks

• AspP-ipf ⇒ λt [e|R(e,e_k),t⊆e] [e_k|V(e_k)]
• let tense be past: assertion time t will be located prior to t_o
• speaker claims the event token to realize a telic event kind
• completion implied, but not entailed:

overall I read.IPF V. although
po pravde, ja pročital tol’ko neskol’ko stranic.
after truth I read.PF only few pages
“In principle I have read ‘War and Peace’, but, honestly speaking,
I’ve read only a few pages.”
a problem: proper names are possible

(25) On kritikoval Putina.
    he criticized.IPFP P.
    “He has criticized Putin.”

(26) ?Moj djadja voschodil na Ėverest.  (from Padučeva 1996)
    my uncle climbed.IPF on E.
    ‘My uncle has climbed Mount Everest.’
Concluding remarks

- if they give rise to unique descriptions, proper names are out!
- kinds in general must have, at least potentially, more than one member

(27) *Brut ubil / *ubival Cezarja.
B. killed.PF / killed.IPF C.
“Brutus killed Caesar”