

Telicity and incremental theme

Терминативность и инкрементная тема

Elena Viktorovna Paducheva
(Елена Викторовна Падучева)

Published online: 21 November 2008
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2008

Abstract The paper deals with the notion of INCREMENTAL THEME and problems connected with the telicity/atelicity of Russian verbs and verb phrases (VPs). Verbs cannot be classified as telic or atelic once and for all—telicity must be determined on the level of a VP. The notion of incremental theme provides simple rules of ASPECTUAL COMPOSITION. For Russian, a definition of atelicity in terms of CUMULATIVITY (proposed in works of M. Krifka, D. Dowty and others) is helpful, while QUANTIZATION doesn't capture all the subtleties in the semantics of telicity.

The notions *telic/atelic* do not correspond to Russian *предельный/непредельный*. Telic is better rendered in Russian as *ограниченный* (i.e. *bounded, terminative*). The notion of telicity erases the difference between Vendler's accomplishments and achievements. This opposition corresponds to the important distinction of ПРЕДЕЛЬНОСТЬ/МОМЕНТАЛЬНОСТЬ and should be preserved.

One of the most insightful notions in the semantics of Russian aspect is PERSPECTIVE, or VIEWPOINT (Падучева 1986; Smith 1991). Only VPs belonging to the class of accomplishments are compatible with both perspectives, SYNCHRONOUS (for the imperfective form) and RETROSPECTIVE (for the perfective form). Viewpoint determines the combinability with adverbials and, thus, the telicity of a VP belonging to the class of accomplishments.

Аннотация Статья посвящена понятию ИНКРЕМЕНТНАЯ ТЕМА (иначе—НАКОПИТЕЛЬ) и проблеме терминативности/нетерминативности (*telicity/atelicity*) русских глаголов и глагольных групп (ГГ). Глагол не может быть аттестован раз и навсегда как терминативный или нетерминативный—терминативность определяется, в общем случае, на уровне глагольной группы. Накопитель участвует в правилах АСПЕКТУАЛЬНОЙ КОМПОЗИЦИИ, которые определяют терминативность ГГ через свойства составляющих ее частей. Для русского языка определение нетерминативности через КУМУЛЯТИВНОСТЬ (предложенное в работах М. Krifka, D. Dowty и других авторов) представляется

E.V. Paducheva (✉)
Alabjana 10-168, 125080 Moscow, Russia
e-mail: elena708@gmail.com

плодотворным, в то время как сведение терминативности к КВАНТИЗАЦИИ не отражает всех тонкостей семантики терминативности.

Английский термин *telic*, как он употребляется в рамках теоретико-модельной теории вида, нельзя переводить на русский язык как *предельный* (предлагается перевод *терминативный*). Понятие *telicity* стирает границу между вендлеровскими классами *accomplishments* и *achievements*, т.е. между предельными и моментальными глаголами и ГГ. Между тем, это противопоставление играет важную роль в семантике русского вида, и оно должно быть так или иначе сохранено.

Весьма важное понятие аспектуальной семантики русского языка—ПЕРСПЕКТИВА (Падучева 1986), или РАКУРС (Smith 1991). Только ГГ, принадлежащие к классу *accomplishments*, совместимы с двумя ракурсами—СИНХРОННЫМ (если глагол несовершенного вида) и РЕТРОСПЕКТИВНЫМ (если совершенного). Перспектива определяет сочетаемость с адвербиалами и, следовательно, *telicity* ГГ, принадлежащей к классу *accomplishments*.

0 Introduction

In Dowty (1991) it was demonstrated that a large class of verbs describes a situation which includes a participant Incremental Theme—having the property that affected or effected parts of the Incremental Theme stand in a homomorphic relation to parts of the situation as a whole (see also Krifka 1989, 1992). So if the NP in the position of the Incremental Theme is delimited (or BOUNDED), as is *the apple* in (2), then the situation has a natural end and the verb is TELIC; otherwise it is not, see *raspberries* in (1):

- (1) The bear *ate raspberries for half an hour* (atelic) (durative adverbial);
- (2) Mary *ate the apple in half a minute* (telic) (time of completion adverbial).

For reasons that will instantly become clear I omit the component “Theme” in Dowty’s term “Incremental Theme”. My Russian term is “накопитель”—from “накопитель эффекта”, lit. “accumulator of effect”; I translate it back to English as “Increment”.

In my paper I use the notion Increment in order to clarify some issues of Russian aspect (cf. Filip 1999 on Incremental Theme and aspect in Slavic languages). Look at the examples:

- (3) Медведь *ел* (Ipfv) малину *полчаса*
‘The bear *ate raspberries for half an hour*’ (atelic);
- (4) Маша *съела* (Pfv) яблоко *за полминуты*
‘Masha *ate the apple in half a minute*’ (telic);
- (4’) Маша *ест* (Ipfv) яблоко <уже> *полчаса*
‘Masha *eats the apple for half an hour <already>*’.

Sentence (4’) poses a question: it cannot be identified either as telic or atelic.

The notion of Increment seems to be of importance for Slavic aspectology. On the other hand, evidence from Slavic languages may contribute to the theory as a whole. But before I get down to that point I have to add several specifications to the picture outlined by Krifka and Dowty.

1 Specifications and reservations

1. *Accomplishment vs. achievement.* Dowty (1991, 567) identifies both accomplishments (*покрасить* ‘paint’, *построить* ‘build’, *открыть* ‘open’) and achievements (*дотрогнуться* ‘touch’, *разбиться* ‘break’, *упасть* ‘fall’) as telic verbs. In Russian aspectology only verbs of the first but not the second class are called telic. In fact, achievements, i.e. momentary (= punctual) verbs, have no temporal parts—no “distinguishable separate stages” (Dowty 1991, 568). If a verb is momentary it cannot be telic. For example, *нажать* ‘press’ is a momentary verb, so Ipfv *нажимать* does not denote an activity aimed at the goal *нажать*—it is a state that begins after the action is over:

- (5) *нажал* (Pfv) – *нажимаю* (*эму на*) (Ipfv) *кнопку*
 ‘I pressed—and now I press—the button’.

Dowty (1991, 568) acknowledges “homomorphism in a trivial sense” (for example, the verb *recognize* <a face> can be called homomorphic in this sense, though it describes a momentary action which has no temporary parts). If momentary verbs are claimed to be homomorphic then the notion of homomorphism cannot be used as a definition of “предельность”: ‘telic’ ceases to be the English counterpart of the Russian term ‘предельный’, which is indispensable in Slavic aspectology. Thus, for a linguist homomorphism is an interesting notion only if mathematically accepted trivial cases are not taken into consideration.

The opposition ‘momentary vs. durable’ is important for the Russian aspectual system. This point is discussed by V. A. Plungjan: ‘aspectual opposition in Russian is sensitive towards duration of time (protracted situations are opposed to momentary or short ones) rather than to time delimitation (as is the case with, e.g., Romance and Germanic languages); cf. fr. *il a parlé* / [**parlait*] *longtemps* ‘he spoke for a long time’ (Плунгян 2000, 215).

2. *Accomplishment vs. activity/process.* In Гловинская (1982, 78) a class of verbs was established, such as *есть* ‘eat’, *пахать* ‘plough’, *рубить* ‘chop’, *резать* ‘cut’, *строить* ‘build’, *таять* ‘melt’, which were defined ‘as verbs with accumulation of effect’. Situations denoted by verbs of this class include the participant Increment, with its concomitant homomorphism. In some contexts—namely, when the Increment is limited, as in (4),—the situation is bounded, in some it is not, as in (3). Dowty (1991) uses the term Increment restrictively—only in contexts where the noun phrase expressing the Increment is limited;¹ meanwhile it is, obviously, appropriate not only in contexts such as (2) but also in such as (1): the verb *eat* denotes an accomplishment in the context of a bounded Increment in (2) and activity otherwise, but it presupposes accumulation of effect in both uses. Both *apple* and *raspberries* are Increments.

The opposition quantized—cumulative is coined by Krifka. But the Increment is always cumulative: only a cumulative participant (consumed or removed or created, etc.) can give a non-trivial homomorphism. The terminological opposition quantized—cumulative is infelicitous.

3. *Syntactic position of the Increment.* Syntactically, the Increment prefers the position of the Object, cf. Tenny (1987); but it can also be a Subject, as *snow* in *Snow melted*; a participant OFF SCREEN, as *a painting* in *to paint Masha* = ‘create a painting of Masha’:

¹On p. 568 Dowty says that both in *John drank a glass of beer* and in *John drank beer* there is a homomorphic mapping; but he never said that *beer* in the second sentence is an Incremental Theme.

- (6) a. *The snow melted* (Increment = Subject);
 b. *I paint Masha* (Increment is off screen).

It can also be an INCORPORATED PARTICIPANT (Падучева 2004, 96), such as *clothes* in *раздеться* ‘take off <clothes>’; *dinner* for *обедать* ‘dine’; *saddle* for *оседлать* ‘saddle’; *body* for *вымыться* ‘wash the body’; *clothes* for *одеться* ‘dress oneself’; *things* for *собраться, уложиться* ‘pack up’; *hair* for *постричься* ‘cut one’s hair’. Implicit Increments of English and German verbs meaning ‘smoke’, ‘comb’, ‘clean up’ are discussed in Engelberg (2002).

There are problems with the syntactic realization of the participant Path which functions as the Incremental Theme in example (7) (from Dowty 1991):

- (7) *drive (a car) from New York to Chicago* (the path is determined by the Initial and Final points taken together).

Prototypically, the Increment occupies the object position, see Tenny (1987) and examples (1)–(4). Let us agree that the unaccusative *melt* is not a counterexample; but *погрузиться* ‘plunge’ in (8) (Increment = Subject) is not unaccusative:

- (8) Он *погрузился* в воду по пояс
 ‘He *plunged* into the water up to the waist’.

Thus, the syntactic position of the Increment is not strictly fixed, see examples (6)–(8). In (9) both *the bricks* and *the truck* are Increments, so there are verbs with two Increments:

- (9) He *loaded the bricks* onto *the truck*.

4. *Increment and semantic role.* Dowty treats the Incremental Theme as a role. Meanwhile Increments do not show any substantial correlation with semantic roles as they are usually understood. The increment can be identified as Patient in the context of examples (1)–(4); as Result in *построить дом*; as Image in *paint Masha* (note that verbs of performance—such as *play <a sonata>*—are, as well, verbs of image creation; hence their telicity); as Theme in Dowty’s example with a turtle who crosses the finish line, etc.:

- (10) a. *eat the apple* (Increment—Patient) (cf. other verbs of consumption);
 b. *build a house* (Increment—Result) (cf. other verbs of creation);
 c. *sweep up the flour* (Increment is something removed from the Place part by part);
 d. *paint Masha* (Increment—Image) (the image of Masha is created part by part);
 e. *cross the desert* (Increment—Path);
 f. The winning *turtle* crossed the finish line in 42 seconds (Increment—Theme, i.e. the moving object).

Clearly, the aspectual properties of the verb are determined by a participant whose role in the situation is not fixed—as well as its syntactic position (cf. Filip 1999, 96).

5. *Increment and scale.* In Hay, Kennedy and Levin (1999) it was shown that in the class of change of state verbs the scale functions as the Increment. For example, in (11a) it is the temperature scale. Many change of state verbs are derived from adjectives, so that the adjective sets the scale:

- (11) a. Иван *нагревает* воду
 ‘John *heats* the water’ (scale of temperature);
 b. Рабочие *расширяют* туннель
 ‘The workers *widen* the tunnel’ (scale of width).

Thus, accumulation of effect can be connected either with parts or with a scale (note that both variants are foreseen in ГЛОВИНСКАЯ 1982):

- (12) a. She *pours* the water into the bucket (increase of the effected part of water);
 b. She *heats* the water (raising on the scale of temperature).

No doubt, a part of an apple is a part of its volume, so accumulation of affected or effected parts can be reduced to ascending a scale (Levin 2000). But this generalization isn't welcome. The idea of part, though it doesn't embrace all verbs, provides a good model capturing the most essential features of the phenomenon.

Scales give less effective evidence of incrementality than part-whole relationships. For example, a scale (of dissolved clumps) can be detected in the semantics of *stir* <the soup> (discussed in Filip 1999, 96). In fact, Russian *мешать – помешать* 'stir' constitute an aspectual pair. Still *помешал за минуту* is hardly possible, though *размешал за минуту* is perfect.

6. *Telic vs. temporally bounded situations.* Dowty doesn't state explicitly that the homomorphism he has in mind is a mapping from parts of the Increment (in the simplest cases, such as (1), (2), these are spatial parts of some material object) to temporal parts of the situation as a whole, and this makes the situation temporally bounded. But a situation is telic if it is temporally bounded by the fact that its Increment is limited. If the restriction on the situation's development in time is formulated directly in temporal terms (as in case of delimitatives, such as *погулять, поплакать*) then there is no Increment and, correspondingly, no homomorphism.

The three terms—telic, bounded and quantized—are currently used as synonymous. But in Russian aspectology 'telic' is not the same as 'bounded'. For example, the verb *порубить* 'to chop for a while' in (13), though bounded, is not telic—in spite of the fact that the verb *рубить* belongs to the effect accumulating class:

- (13) Он *порубил* (Ирфv) дрова *полчаса* и устал
 'he *chopped* wood for half an hour and got tired'.

As for the term quantized, I do not know how to introduce it into Russian aspectological terminology. In fact, quantitatively bounded Increments constitute a separate problem for Russian, see Sect. 2, VI.

2 Evidence from Russian

I. *Telic verbs with no Increment.* In ГЛОВИНСКАЯ (1982) two types of Russian telic aspectual pairs are delimited: the type *завить* <звоздь> 'drive in <a nail>' and the type *убедить* 'persuade'. Verbs of the first type are provided with semantic decompositions presupposing accumulation of effect (in the Object). Verbs of the second type, such as *убедить* 'persuade', conceptualize the situation as not effect-accumulating. In Апресян (1980, 64) the following argumentation is adduced in favor of this division. The meaning of (14) does not imply that by doing so I was ascending the scale of her readiness to believe me; this becomes obvious from the meaning ascribed to (14')—when we compare it to (14''), which doesn't presuppose that I necessarily tried to take away the junk:

- (14) Я *убеждал* ее два часа
 'I was *engaged in persuading* her for two hours'.

- (14') Я не убедил ее \supset 'I tried to persuade her but did not succeed' (presupposition of attempt);
- (14'') Я не вынес мусор.

The activity took place, not necessarily accompanied by accumulation of Result. This presupposition of attempt delineates a subclass of verbs lacking accumulation of effect in the course of activity—these verbs can be called conatives. Conatives reveal themselves when we translate a Russian Imperfective verb into English:

- (15) Два раза *поступал* (Ipfv) в университет
'made two attempts to enter the university'.

Conatives count as telic—at least many of them co-occur with both durative and time of completion adverbials:

- (16) a. уговорил за полчаса
'persuaded *in half an hour*' (time span adverbial);
b. уговаривал полчаса
'persuaded *for half an hour*' (durative adverbial).
- (17) a. решил за пять минут 'solved *in five minutes*';
b. решал пять минут 'solved *for five minutes*'.

The presupposition of attempt in the Perfective under negation is unstable:

- (18) Почему ты не уговорил ее остаться?
'Why didn't you persuade her to stay?' (no presupposition of attempt).

Still, examples (14), (15) should make us acknowledge the existence of telic verbs with no Increment.

II. *Atelicity and stativity*. The verbs in (19) are telic, though there is no visible part of the Increment responsible for accumulating the effect of the activity of the subject; telicity is engendered by the fact that there is a succession of activities connected with the action denoted, i.e. by the fact that the activity is conceived as goal-oriented:

- (19) *купить* – *покупать квартиру* 'buy an apartment';
повесить – *вешать картину* 'hang the painting';
обсуждать – *обсудить диссертацию* 'discuss the dissertation'.

This is why stativity is an insurmountable obstacle for the telic interpretation of a verb. In (20) the situation described by the verbs is stative, and these verbs are not telic:

- (20) *защитить* 'defend' (in the context of a non-agentive subject), *сохранить, сберечь, уберечь* 'save'.

No wonder that they do not combine with time span adverbials:

- (21) a. Плащ защитил меня от дождя
'the cloak *protected* me from rain';
b. *Плащ защитил меня от дождя за полчаса,
lit. 'The cloak *protected* me from rain *in half an hour*'.

The verbs in (22) denote a situation in which the Agent is active only at the beginning and the end; all the rest is not activity but a state. Hence stativity—lack of accumulation of effect—and concomitant atelicity:

- (22) *зашел (*посетил, *навестил) за двадцать минут,
lit. ‘dropped in *in twenty minutes*’.

Let us pay attention to two important stative non-agentive verbs: *произойти* – *происходить*, *получаться* – *получиться*: they are atelic because the Imperfective is not associated with the idea of accumulation.

III. There are verbs which are atelic in spite of the idea of accumulation of effect inherent in their semantics. The fact is that the incremental process in the object is not simultaneous to the activity of the Agent. Two examples:

– Verbs of causation by impulse: *выстрелить* ‘shot’, *бросить* ‘throw’, *толкнуть* ‘push’.

– Verbs of process non-simultaneous with the activity of the Agent: *отравить* ‘poison’, *убить* ‘kill’, *взорвать* ‘blow up’.

In Падучева (1992) the following example is discussed in this connection. As is known, Pushkin was wounded by Dantes at one place and died two days afterwards in another. So the question *Where and when did Dantes kill Pushkin?* has no answer.

IV. *Compositional problems in aspectology*. The notion of Increment re-attracted attention to telicity dependent on the context, namely, to the interaction between the inherent semantics of the verb and the referential semantics of its arguments. For many verbs telicity (as reflected in co-occurrence with adverbials) depends on the diathesis—on the taxonomic class (in particular, on the count/mass distinction) and the referential status of the arguments (definiteness playing a crucial role, see Krifka (1989), Engelberg (2002, 377)).

- (23) a. Маша *вязала* (Ipfv) шарф
‘Masha *knitted* a scarp’
b. Маша *связала* (Pfv) шарф за два часа (bounded Increment, telic);
c. Masha *knitted for two hours* (no bounded Increment, atelic).

Verbs with unambiguously individual objects (*разбудить* ‘wake up’, *разрушить* ‘destroy’, *запереть* ‘close’) are unambiguously telic; for verbs with mass terms as objects telicity depends on definiteness, see example (3) in Sect. 0.

V. *The nature of telicity*. In the works of Dowty, Krifka and their followers telicity in English amounts to co-occurrence with adverbials: a verb in the context of a durative adverbial (e.g., *for half an hour*) is atelic; a verb co-occurring with a time span adverbial (e.g., *in half an hour*) is telic. In Russian telicity manifests itself not only in co-occurrence but also in morphology: both Perfective and Imperfective aspect are appropriate in the context of a telic verb, see examples (4) and (4’); but in the context of (3) the Perfective form is out of place, and this is the main point. I claim that verbal telicity is one thing, while an appropriate adverbial and the corresponding aspect is another. Perfective aspect and a time span adverbial settle the retrospective point of view on the situation. Imperfective, in its primary use, and a durative adverbial, are compatible with a synchronous perspective:

- (3’) Медведь *ест* (Ipfv) малину <уже> полчаса
‘The bear *eats* raspberries *for half an hour* <already>’ (synchronous perspective);
(4) Маша *съела* (Pfv) яблоко за полминуты
‘Masha *ate* the apple *in half a minute*’ (retrospective);
(4’) Маша *ест* (Ipfv) яблоко <уже> полчаса
‘Masha *eats* the apple *for half an hour* <already>’ (synchronous perspective).

A verb taken together with an Increment constitutes a PREDICATIVE COMPLEX. Both Dowty and Krifka rely upon the opposition of cumulative vs. bounded predicative complexes.

Meanwhile, a verbal complex can be either cumulative (= effect accumulating) or non-cumulative; and a cumulative complex can be either bounded or non-bounded. In fact, the cumulative nature of the process in the Increment is a prerequisite for a non-punctual character of the change:

- (24) She *ate raspberries; chopped wood* (cumulative and non-bounded; atelic);
- (25) She *knitted a scarf; saddled a horse* (cumulative and bounded; telic);
- (26) He *pressed the button; smiled; won the battle* (non-cumulative).

Russian examples show that there are two different semantic oppositions:

1) Inherent telicity of a verbal complex, which depends on the semantics of the verb and delimitating character of the Increment.

2) Perspective, that can be either synchronous or retrospective.

In English perspective depends only on the adverbial. In Russian it is expressed both by the adverbial and aspect: Perfective imposes retrospective, while Imperfective, in its primary meaning, gives a synchronous perspective. Thus, for examples (1)–(4') from Sect. 0 we get:

- (1) The bear *ate raspberries for half an hour* (atelic; synchronous);
Mary *ate the apple in half a minute* (telic; retrospective);
- (3) Медведь *ел* (Ipfv) малину *полчаса* (atelic; synchronous);
- (4) Маша *съела* (Pfv) яблоко *за полминуты* (telic; retrospective);
- (4') Маша *ест* (Ipfv) яблоко <уже> *полчаса* (telic; synchronous).

From this we see that the semantics of a verb is responsible for the telicity of the verbal complex, while aspect determines the perspective. The combinations (atelic, synchronous) and (telic, retrospective) are normal; the combination (telic; synchronous) sounds somewhat contradictory. But it is normal for Russian, see (4'), and not excluded in English either:

- (2') Mary ate the apple *for half an hour* and didn't finish.

In this way I avoid the paradox represented by examples (4') and (2') consisting in that a verb taking a bounded (= delimited) Increment fails to be bounded. It is a telic predicative complex taken in the synchronous perspective: a goal-oriented situation is viewed in the course of its development. What seems to be a non-telic use of a telic complex is better interpreted as a synchronous perspective taken for a telic complex.

The telicity of a verb complex does not depend on the adverbial: a telic complex may co-occur with both types of adverbials (in Russian—with a concomitant change of aspectual form: durative adverbial—Imperfective, time of completion adverbial—Perfective). On the other hand, an atelic complex combines only with durative adverbials.

VI. *Quantitatively bounded Increment*. A remarkable feature of Russian consists in that Perfective and Imperfective do not interchange in the context of a quantitatively restricted Increment:

- (27) *выпил* воды – **пьет* воды (Jakobson 1936);
- (28) *выпил* стакан воды – **пьет* стакан воды (Paducheva 1998).

It seems to be the case that in the context of a quantitatively bounded Increment the verb does not permit a synchronous perspective—though it cannot be called atelic in the terms accepted by Dowty and others.

Quantitatively bounded Increments pose a problem for typology: in English (and the same is true for French) a quantitatively restricted Increment does not constitute an obstacle for presenting a situation in a synchronous perspective:

- (29) a. John drank a glass of beer [retrospective];
 b. John is drinking a glass of beer [synchronous perspective].

So what's wrong with Russian? Is it possible to get a semantic explanation for this restriction? The problem of quantitatively bounded Increments is not easily solved. This co-occurrence restriction is of interest for typology, and the notion of Increment can contribute to its clarification.

As was suggested in Маслов (1973, 78) (see also Timberlake 1985 and Падучева 1996, 11), Imperfective presupposes potentially unlimited progress in the development of the situation. Thus, we may suggest that a quantitatively bounded Increment (with the limitation contained in the Increment) is excluded in the context of the Imperfective because it contradicts this presupposition.

I wonder whether non-interchangeability of Perfective and Imperfective has the same reasons in (29b) as in (30) where the Increment has the shape of a Path limited from both sides:

- (30) Джон проехал (*едет) на машине от Нью-Йорка до Чикаго
 'John went by car from New York to Chicago' [though *едет из Нью-Йорка в Чикаго* is OK].

What can Russian aspectology gain from the notion of Increment?

1. Definitions of aspectual meanings of different verb classes are substantiated: verbs with accumulation of effect are differentiated from verbs of attempt (conatives). We must accept that there are two semantic components in the meaning decomposition of an action verb: one reflects the activity of the subject going on step by step and thus having temporal parts and the other corresponds to accumulation of effect in the Increment—if there is any.

2. Compositional problems connected with telicity are clarified. The fact that the ambiguity telic/atelic is so widespread was not known to Slavic aspectologists, who used to divide verbs into telic and atelic. As Dowty (1979, 60) rightly says, verbs cannot be classified "once and for all" as activities or accomplishments. The notion of Increment helps in solving important problems related to Vendler's classification of predicates. In fact, *пить* 'drink' is an activity predicate in *пить пиво* and an accomplishment in *выпить кружку пива*.

3. The notion of telicity is clarified. Telicity cannot be reduced to co-occurrence with adverbials; in (31) a telic predicate complex co-occurs with a durative adverbial:

- (31) Я два часа писал статью, а потом пошел прогуляться.

On the other hand, imperfectivity cannot be equated with atelicity and perfectivity with telicity. So what is the role of the opposition 'telic/atelic' in the Russian grammar? My answer is as follows: only telic verb complexes may be looked upon in two perspectives and, correspondingly, take both durative and time of completion adverbials, while for atelic verb complexes time of completion adverbials are excluded:

- (32) a. Маша причесывалась (Ipfv) *пять минут*;
 b. Маша причесалась (Pfv) *за пять минут*.

A time of completion adverbial (and Pfv) is only at place in the context where the verb phrase denotes an accomplishment. For a durative adverbial in the context of a verb in the Pfv, as in example (4') from Sect. 0 two strategies of interpretation are possible:

- (4') Маша *ест* (Pfv) яблоко <уже> *полчаса*.
'Masha *eats* the apple *for half an hour* <already>.'

I. We can stipulate that one and the same verb complex in the Perfective denotes an action (or a telic process) and co-occurs with a time of completion adverbial, and in the Imperfective it denotes an activity (or an atelic process) and is compatible with a durative adverbial. Thus, aspect (and adverbial) may change the telicity of the verb.

II. We can stipulate that in the context of the Imperfective and a durative adverbial the eventuality of the predicate complex remains the same; what changes is not telicity but perspective.

In other words, a predicate complex may be interpreted as denoting either an activity (the predicate complex is atelic in the context of the Imperfective and a durative adverbial) or an accomplishment 'in development' (i.e. telic, in spite of the Imperfective and a durative adverbial: the inner structure takes the upper hand).

The latter analysis seems preferable. In fact, if we claim that a telic action verb in the Imperfective (as in *Маша ест яблоко*) denotes an activity then it must behave as an activity in some other respects. Which is dubious. Take, for example, combinability with a delimitative prefix. It is very rarely that the combination of a transitive verb with a delimitative prefix is possible, as in (33); sentence (34) is on the verge of grammaticality:

- (33) Они *пишут* статью—*писали* два часа и решили отдохнуть
'they write an article—they wrote it for two hours and then decided to have a rest';
(34) Она *оформляет* мне визу—*пооформляла* некоторое время и бросила.

More often than not the delimitative interpretation is excluded:

- (35) *вешает* картину – **повешал* картину;
обедает – **пообедал* пятнадцать минут.

4. The part-whole relationship revealing in the semantics of the Imperfective with the help of the Increment is fruitful from the typological point of view. In particular, it gives a semantic substantiation to a well known fact (see Томмола 1986) that the Russian opposition of aspects is reflected in Finnish as the opposition Accusative-Partitive.

References

- Апресян, Ю. Д. (1980). *Типы информации для поверхностно-семантического компонента модели "Смысл ⇔ Текст"* (Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, 1). Wien.
- Гловинская, М. Я. (1982). *Семантические типы видовых противопоставлений русского глагола*. Москва.
- Маслов, Ю. С. (1973). Универсальные семантические компоненты в содержании грамматической категории совершенного/несовершенного вида. *Советское славяноведение*, 4, 73–83.
- Падучева, Е. В. (1986). Семантика вида и точка отсчета. *Известия АН СССР. Серия литературы и языка*, 45(5), 413–424.
- Падучева, Е. В. (1992). *Глаголы действия: толкование и сочетаемость*. В Н. Д. Арутюнова (ред.), *Логический анализ языка. Модели действия* (стр. 69–76). Москва.
- Падучева, Е. В. (1996). *Семантические исследования. Семантика времени и вида в русском языке. Семантика нарратива*. Москва.
- Падучева, Е. В. (2004). *Динамические модели в семантике лексики*. Москва.

- Плунгян, В. А. (2000). 'Быстро' в грамматике русского и других языков. В Л. Л. Иомдин & Л. П. Крысин (ред.), *Слово в тексте и в словаре. Сборник статей к семидесятилетию академика Ю. Д. Апресяна*. Москва.
- Томмола, Х. (1986). *Аспектуальность в финском и русском языках* (Neuvostoliitto instituutin vuosikirja, 28). Helsinki.
- Dowty, D. R. (1979). *Word meaning and Montague grammar. The semantics of verbs and times in generative semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht.
- Dowty, D. R. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language*, 67(3), 547–619.
- Engelberg, S. (2002). Intransitive accomplishments and the lexicon: the role of implicit arguments, definiteness and reflexivity in aspectual composition. *Journal of Semantics*, 19, 369–416.
- Filip, H. (1999). *Aspect, eventuality types and nominal reference*. New York.
- Hay, J., Kennedy, Ch., & Levin, B. (1999). Scalar structure underlies telicity in "Degree achievements". *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 9, 127–144.
- Jakobson, R. (1936). Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus. *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague*, 6, 240–288.
- Krifka, M. (1989). *Nominalreferenz und Zeitkonstitution: zur Semantik von Massentermen, Pluraltermen und Aspektklassen*. München.
- Krifka, M. (1992). Thematic relations as links between nominal reference and temporal constitution. In I. Sag & A. Szabolcsi (Eds.), *Lexical matters* (pp. 29–53). Stanford.
- Levin, B. (2000). Aspect, lexical semantic representation, and argument expression. *Proceedings of the 26th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 413–429). Berkeley.
- Paducheva, E. V. (1998). On non-compatibility of partitive and imperfective in Russian. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 24(1), 73–82.
- Smith, C. S. (1991). *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht.
- Tenny, C. (1987). *Grammaticalizing aspect and affectedness*. Cambridge.
- Timberlake, A. (1985). The temporal schemata of Russian predicates. In M. S. Flier & R. D. Brecht (Eds.), *Issues in Russian morphosyntax* (pp. 35–57). Columbus.