Adam Biały (https://orcid.org/0000–0001–6283–2791)
University of Wrocław

Action and Result:
The Semantics and Pragmatics of Verbal Prefixation

1. Introduction

It is generally claimed in the literature that prefixed verbs in Slavic are compositional, and the prefixed verb is derived from a simple form, which is reflected in its morphology (e.g. Filip 2003). The morphological complexity is also correlated with semantic complexity as the prefix is considered to be a predicate of result (or completion) and contributes that element of meaning to the activity represented by the root verb (cf. Ramchand 2008). Consequently, in particular contexts, the semantics of the process that underlies the result complex verb is recoverable. We want to show that this view does not account for prefixed verbs in Polish in general because not all prefixed verbs are either morphologically or semantically complex. The characteristics under discussion is the behavior of such forms in the context of presupposition, entailment and implicature. In the case of lexicalized prefixed verbs, the activity component represented by the root verb is not presupposed, and the result is not entailed independently, nor is it part of an implicature. As we claim, this is the outcome of the fact that these verbs are not derived but constitute fossilized forms where the result is associated with the complex form, not introduced by the prefix itself. We use the notion of lexicalized meaning in the spirit of Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1999, 2006, 2013) and show that it is responsible for a wide range of features of these verbs. We also make a link between lexical information provided by the verb and pragmatic inference it may be associated with. The outcome of that discussion is the observation that in Polish result semantics is part of the lexical entry of the verb and is asserted by such a verb. This is to be contrasted with pure perfectivity, which is assigned at a post-lexical stage of the derivation, introducing an element of culmination (in line with Borik 2006; Borik and Reinhart 2004; Tatevosov 2015; Willim 2020, 2021). This is typical of perfective manner verbs where pragmatics reveals the absence of a lexicalized result. Finally, we make a note of the relation between telicity and perfectivity and indicate contexts in which telicity is implied pragmatically.

2. Presupposition of action

Prefixed verbs in Russian and possibly other Slavic languages are claimed to assert culmination and presuppose action (Zinova and Filip 2014). Their counterparts in Polish, as we will argue, do not behave uniformly in that respect. It is assumed that such verbs are semantically complex, and they consist of the underlying process event and culmination (Romanova 2006; Dočekal and Kučerová 2009). The proof for that lies in the proposal that when such a verb is negated or questioned, the process semantics remain intact, and only culmination is affected, as in the example below (Zinova and Filip 2014: (2)).

(1)   a.   Ivan ne pročitalPF ètu knigu.
           Ivan NEG PREF.readPAST.SG.M this book
           'Ivan did not read this book completely through.'
           Inference: Ivan started reading/read a part of this book.
           Assertion: Ivan did not finish reading this book.
      b.   Ivan pročitalPF ètu knigu?
           Ivan PREF.readPAST.SG.M this book
           'Has/Did Ivan read this book completely through?'
           Inference: Ivan started reading/ read a part of this book.
           Question: The speaker asks the addressee to confirm or deny whether Ivan finished reading this book.

Under negation, we get the interpretation that Ivan started but did not finish reading the book and the interrogative puts only the culmination part in question. What is crucial for our discussion is that presupposition is a pragmatic effect, which supplies elements of interpretation from context. We believe that the existence of these effects indicates a significant distinction between elements of meaning which are lexicalized and those that can be supplied in the course of derivation of a particular verb (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1999, 2006, 2013). The elements of meaning that are introduced pragmatically are only those that are not lexicalized.

3. Presupposition of action in Polish prefixed verbs

It appears that in Polish, not all prefixed verbs, even though they are perfective, reveal the effects presented in the previous section. Zinova and Filip (2014) imply that all prefixes are of the same type, and their primary function is perfectivizing an otherwise imperfective verb[1]. We would like to refer to another tradition in the discussion of Slavic prefixes, which distinguishes at least two types of those: internal and external prefixes (cf. Svenonius 2004; di Sculio and Slabakova 2005; Ramchand

---

[1]   This is in line with Filip's (2003, 2008) stand on verbal prefixation in Slavic, where all prefixes are taken to be perfectivizers retaining result semantics. In other words, on her approach all prefixes are of a lexical type and there is no need for purely perfectivizing prefixes.

2008). The former originate within the VP and influence the lexical semantics of the root verb by being predicates of result, whereas the latter originate outside the VP and make the verb perfective with possible additional quantization effect. We are going to argue that in Polish, only external prefixes (and, to be more precise, perfectivizing prefixes) meet the account presented by Zinova and Filip (2014). Internal prefixes represent a different category, which is not sensitive to those pragmatic effects as the meaning they contribute is not compositional. Let us have a look at some examples in Polish with respect to diagnosing the presupposition of action when a prefixed verb is negated or questioned.

(2) a. Pies zaczął jeść kość, ale jej nie zjadł do końca.
    dog begin-PST eat-INF bone but it not PREF-eat-PST to end
    'The dog started eating the bone but didn't eat it up.' (Google)
  b. Czy pies zjadł kość? Nie, chociaż zaczął ją jeść.
    Q dog PREF-eat-PST bone no but begin-PST it eat-INF
 ' Has the dog eaten the bone? No, but it started eating it.'
  c. Jak mam nową książkę i mnie zaciekawi czytam tak długo aż
    How have-PRES new book and me interest read-PRES as long as
    przeczytam.
    PREF-read-PRES
    'When I have a new book and I get interested I read for so long until
    I finish reading.' (Google)
  d. Jak byłem dzieckiem uczyłem się pływać, ale nie nauczyłem się.
    How was child learn-PST-IMPRF REFL swim but not PREF-learn-PST
    'When I was a child I learned to swim but I didn't master it.' (Google)

What the examples above indicate is that in their case, the process is asserted even though the result may be negated (2a) or questioned (2b). This reveals the derivational complexity of such verbs, where a sentence aspect feature of termination is added to a process predicate, making it perfect (cf. (2c) and (2d)).

 Not all prefixed verbs reveal the characteristics mentioned above. If we look at the following examples, we will notice that presupposition of action under negation and interrogation does not take place in these cases. This suggests that these forms do not assert action which results in culmination.

(3) a. ??Janek nie przejadł kieszonkowego, chociaż zaczął.
    Janek not PREF-eat-PST pocket money even though began-PST
    'Janek hasn't eaten through his pocket money even though he started.'
  b. Czy Janek przejadł kieszonkowe? *Nie, ale zaczął.
    Q Janek PREF-eat-PST pocket money no but began-PST
    'Has Janek eaten through his pocket money? No, but he started.'
  c. *Janek jadł / przejadał, aż przejadł kieszonkowe.
    Janek eat-PST / PREF-eat-IMPRF until PREF-eat-PRF pocket money
    'Janek was eating / eating through until he has eaten through his pocket
    money.'

(4) a. ??Dzieci nie wybiegły z budynku, chociaż zaczęły.
     Kids not PREF-run-PST from building even though start-PST
     'The kids haven't run out of the building, even though they started.'

   b. Czy dzieci wybiegły z budynku? *Nie, ale zaczęły.
     Q kids PREF-run-PST from building no but start-PST
     'Have the kids run out of the building? No, but they started.'

   c. ??Dzieci biegły, aż wybiegły z budynku.
     Kids run-PST-IMPRF until PREF-run-PRF from building
     'The kids were running until they ran out of the building.'

The examples above indicate that not all prefixed perfective verbs behave alike. In the case of (3) and (4), we can see that neither negation nor interrogation imply that the event was going on but failed to reach a result. We claim that with this type of prefixed verbs, the process element of meaning is not available, and these verbs are not compositionally derived by prefixation, where an activity verb becomes a result verb.

4. Lexicalized result

So far, we indicated that, in Polish, prefixed perfective verbs differ with respect to presupposed elements of meaning. In this section, we are going to account for this distinction by relating it to lexicalized meaning, which, following Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1999, 2005, 2006, 2013) determines verb classes at the level of event structure. The key distinction is between result and manner verbs. According to Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2006, 2013), any given event verb can lexicalize only one element of meaning, which is either result or manner. We claim that prefixed result verbs in Polish lexicalize results but they are not derived compositionally from a simple activity verb by prefixation. These forms are fossilized as a result of the prefix not being a derivational morpheme. What distinguishes these verbs is that they form aspectual pairs by suffixation, not prefixation. Aspectual pair formation is taken to be crucial in determining the aspectual paradigm of a verb (Młynarczyk 2004). The examples below illustrate aspectual pairs formed by prefixation in the case of manner verbs in (5) and those formed by suffixation in the case of result verbs in (6).

(5) a. jeść (Impf) – z-jeść (Perf) 'eat'
   b. pisać (Impf) – na-pisać (Perf) 'write'
   c. czytać (Impf) – prze-czytać (Perf) 'read'
   d. montować (Impf) – za-montować (Perf) 'fit'

(6) a. wbiec (Perf) – wbieg-ać (Imperf) 'run in'
   b. przejeść (Perf) – przejad-ać (Imperf) 'eat through'
   c. zapowiedzieć (Perf) – zapowiad-ać (Imperf) 'announce'
   d. nalać (Perf) – nalew-ać (Imperf) 'pour in'

This apparent inconsistency in the function of verbal prefixation is the result of the diachronic transition from the former function of prefixes as telicity markers to the present one of perfectivization (Dickey 2000, 2005, 2011, 2017). We believe that

in order to maintain the synchronic systemic integrity of verbal prefixes as perfectivizers, the former function of telicity marking by prefixation led to the emergence of fossilized morphologically complex verb forms characterized by result semantics. This claim goes against the grain of quite a lot of literature on prefixation in Slavic (Svenonius 2004; di Sculio and Slabakova 2005; Ramchand 2008), where verbs with internal prefixes are mistakenly considered to be derived from the unprefixed root. Following Dickey (2000), the uneven development of this diachronic change in Slavic has led to a typological distinction within Slavic languages themselves. As an effect of this distinction, prefixes are not uniformly telicity markers as claimed by (Borer 2005) and (Łazorczyk 2010) or markers of result as claimed by Filip (2003). The variable function of perfectivity in Polish is also advocated by Łaziński (2020), where the interpretation of perfectivity is dependent on verb aspectual classes. For Łaziński (2020), one of the core distinctions is into predicates that refer to events and non-events. This is in line with the distinction between telic and purely perfective prefixed verbs advocated for here.

5. Telicity vs perfectivity

The central question we would like to discuss here is what makes verbs with internal prefixes reveal different characteristics from verbs with external prefixes in the context of pragmatic effects. We have adopted a view where internal prefixes contribute to the lexical semantics of the verb by being associated with result, making the verb telic. External prefixes, on the other hand, are associated with culmination or quantization, which is the interpretation of pure perfectivity. Both are aspectual notions, but telicity is a characteristic of lexical aspect, while perfectivity is a characteristic of sentential aspect (Borik and Reinhart 2004; Tatevosov 2015; Willim 2020, 2021). We claim that in Polish, result semantics, which gives rise to telic interpretation, is lexicalized, while pure perfectivity is derived. This leads to a situation where verbal prefixation is not always tantamount to perfectivity. The examples in (7) represent verbs with lexicalized prefixes that are still imperfective. This reveals their major function, which is that of telicity marking, not perfectivization. The widely adopted test for telicity is compatibility with *in-X-time* adverbials but not *for-X-time* adverbials. Perfectivity is diagnosed by the inability to take the periphrastic future form and be a complement to phrasal verbs (Tatevosov 2015). These tests indicate that the verbs in (7) even though containing an identifiable prefix, are imperfective. This is not the case in (8) where we get examples of purely perfectivizing prefixes.

(7) a. W tym momencie dzieci wybiegają z budynku.
         In this moment kids PREF-run-PRES from building
         'This moment the kids are running out of the building.'
     b. Tomek zaczął przejadać oszczędności po utracie pracy.
         Tomek start-PST PREF-eat-PRES savings after losing job
         'Tomek started eating through his savings after losing his job.'

    c.   Jutro premier będzie odpowiadać na pytania dziennikarzy.
            Tomorrow PM will PREF-answer-PRES on questions journalists
            'Tomorrow the PM will be answering the journalists' questions.'

(8)   a.   *W tym momencie Janek zjada śniadanie.
            In this moment Janek PREF-eat-PRES breakfast
            'This moment Janek is eating his breakfast.'

    b.   *Tomek zaczął przeczytać książkę po obiedzie.
            Tomek start-PST PREF-read-PRES book after dinner
            'Tomek started reading the book after dinner.'

    c.   *Jutro uczniowie będą przeskanować swoje zdjęcia.
            Tomorrow pupils will PREF-scan-PRES self photos
            'Tomorrow the pupils will scan their photos.'

The examples above indicate that with some verbs, the prefixes are markers of telicity, as in (7), while in others, they mark perfectivity, as in (8). In the first case, the prefixed verb is not derived from an unprefixed base and the aspectual pair is formed by suffixation. In the case of purely perfectivizing prefixes, the prefix is added to the base verb to form an aspectual pair. Below we are going to link the notions of derived perfectivity and lexicalization with distinct pragmatic interpretations they are associated with. However, before we do that, let us take a closer look at the notion of lexicalized meaning itself.

6. Lexicalized meaning

As indicated earlier, prefixed telic verbs in Polish do not give rise to pragmatic effects that are proposed for prefixes in general by Romanova (2006); Dočekal and Kučerová (2009); Zinova and Filip (2014). We believe that the underlying reason is that verbs with internal prefixes in Polish lexicalize a different element of meaning than verbs with purely perfectivizing prefixes. Following Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) (L&RH), the key difference in lexicalization patterns of verbs is between result and manner. Result verbs are predicates consisting of activity and result, while manner verbs are simple predicates consisting of only one event predicate. The restriction introduced by L&RH is a complementarity, which states that a verb can lexicalize only one – either as a result or as a manner. The lexicalized element of meaning is constant and always entailed by the verb. Other elements of meaning may be added pragmatically, and their interpretation can be cancelled. We argue that in Polish, event verbs with lexicalized telic prefixes are result verbs, while other prefixed verbs are manner verbs. The examples of verbs with lexicalized prefixes below indicate that, in their case, neither result (cf. (9)) nor activity (cf. (10)) can be denied.

(9)   a.   *Dzieci **w**biegły do budynku, ale nie do końca.
            Kids PREF-run-PST into building but not to end
            'The kids ran into the building but not entirely.'

  b. *Tomek przejadł wypłatę, ale trochę zostało.
    Tomek PREF-eat-PST salary but some left
    'Tomek squandered his salary but some is left.'

  c. *Zosia zapowiedziała występ, ale zacięła się w połowie.
    Zosia PREF-say-PST show but stuck-PST refl in middle
    'Zosia announced the show but got stuck in the middle.'

(10) a. *Dzieci wbiegły do budynku, ale nie biegły.
    Kids PREF-run-PST into building but not run-PRES
    'The kids ran into the building but they weren't running.'

  b. *Tomek przejadł wypłatę, ale nie jadł / przejadał.
    Tomek PRED-eat-PST salary but not eat-PRES
    'Tomek squandered the salary but he wasn't squandering it.'

  c. *Zosia zapowiedziała występ, ale go nie zapowiadała.
    Zosia PREF-say-PST show but it not PREF-say-PRES
    'Zosia announced the show but wasn't announcing it.'

This is not the case with verbs which take purely perfectivizing prefixes, where only the activity is lexicalized, the culmination is not the core element of meaning. As the examples below indicate, the activity is asserted while the culmination may not.[2]

(11) a. Janek jadł śniadanie, ale go nie zjadł do końca.
    Janek eat-PRES breakfast but it not PREF-eat-PST to end
    'Janek was eating his breakfast but did not eat it up.'

  b. Janek pisał książkę, ale jej w końcu nie napisał.
    Janek write-PST book but it in end not PREF-write-PST
 ' Janek was writing a book but finally did not finish writing it.'

In these cases, the perfectivizing prefix adds an aspectual element of meaning which is that of termination. The lexical semantics of the root verb and its classification as a verb of manner is not affected. Termination of a verb of consumption or creation tends to be associated with a certain result having been reached. However, the examples below indicate that reaching the endpoint does not have to imply culmination. Such cases are what Martin (2019) calls non-maximal accomplishments.

(12) a. Janek **zjadł** śniadanie, chociaż część porcji została na talerzu.
    Janek PREF-eat-PST breakfast even though part portion stay-PST
    on plate
    'Janek ate his breakfast even though some of it was left on the plate.'

---

[2] The defeasibility of the result inference is proposed to be possible in quite a number of languages. It is argued to be possible in Mandarin Chinese (Soh and Kuo 2005), Hindi (Arunachalam and Kothari 2011), English (Hay et al. 1999). Slavic generally is believed to be exempt from that and enforces a strict culmination requirement on telic accomplishments. However, this strict requirement is questioned for Russian by Kasher and Hacohen (2023), who indicate that Russian native speakers show some degree of tolerance for perfective accomplishment verbs relating to partially completed events and also such verbs being followed by a result cancellation phrase.

b.   Student przeczytał książkę z pominięciem ostatniego rozdziału.
       Student PREF-read-PST book with leaving last chapter
       'The student read the book leaving the last chapter aside.'

The distinction between core and contextualized elements of meaning seems to be central in explaining when telicity is lexicalized, and when it is provided contextually. In the case of verbs with telic prefixes, result is lexicalized and it cannot be cancelled. The verbs that take purely perfectivizing prefixes are manner verbs, which can give rise to the inference of result. However, in this case, result is cancellable as it is not the core element of meaning.

7. Lexicalization and pragmatics

In this section, we focus on the relation between lexicalized meaning and pragmatics. The central claim is that perfective telic verbs assert culmination, while perfective manner verbs assert termination. Culmination is of a binary nature, that is it is either reached or not, but termination is incremental and may be non-maximal.

    In the case of purely perfectivizing prefixes, the activity component of meaning is also asserted under negation and in questions, as indicated by the examples in (13) and (14).

(13)   a.   Zosia nie **z**jadła lodów, chociaż je jadła.
            Zosia not PREF-eat-PST ice-cream even though them eat-PRES
            'Zosia hasn't eaten the ice-cream, even though she was eating it.'
       b.   Malarz nie **po**malował pokoju, chociaż zaczął go malować.
            Painter not PREF-paint-PST room even though start-PST it paint-INF
      '   The painter hasn't painted the room, even though he started painting it.'
(14)   a.   Czy Zosia **z**jadła lody? Nie, chociaż je jadła.
            Q Zosia PREF-eat-PST ice-cream no even though them eat-PRES
            'Has Zosia eaten the ice-cream? No, but she was eating it.'
       b.   Czy malarz **po**malował pokój? Nie, chociaż widziałem
            Q painter PREF-paint-PST room no even though saw-1ST-SING-MSC-PRES
            jak go malował.
            how it paint-3RD-SING-MSC-PST
            'Has the painter painted the room? No, but I saw him painting it.'

By contrast, verbs with lexicalized prefixes represent result verbs with no retrievable activity component. As the examples in (15) and (16) indicate, negating or questioning the culmination affects the whole predicate including the activity.

(15)   a.   *Dzieci nie **w**biegły do budynku, chociaż wbiegały.
            Kids not PREF-run-PST into building even though run-PST

'The kids haven't ran into the building even though they were running (in).'

b. *Janek nie przepił spadku, chociaż go przepijał.
Janek not PREF-drink-PST inheritance even though it PREF-drink-PST-IMPRF
'Janek hasn't spent the inheritance on booze even though he was doing it.'

c. *Czarodziej nie wypowiedział zaklęcia, chociaż je wypowiadał.
Wizard not PREF-say-PST spell even though it PREF-say-PST-IMPRF
'The wizard hasn't cast the spell even though he was casting it.'

(16) a. Czy dzieci wbiegły do budynku? ??Nie, ale wbiegały.
Q kids PREF-run-PST into building no but PREF-run-PST-IMPRF
'Have the kids ran into the building? No, but they was running in.'

b. Czy Janek przepił spadek? *Nie, chociaż przepijał go.
Q Janek PREF-drink-PST inheritance no even though PREF-drink-PST-IMPRF it
'Has Janek spent the inheritance on booze? No, but he was doing it.'

c. Czy czarodziej wypowiedział zaklęcie? Nie, chociaż je wypowiadał.
Q wizard PREF-say-PST spell no even though it PREF-say-PST-IMPRF
'Has the wizard cast the spell? No, but he was casting it.'

From the aspectual perspective, the difference between verbs with lexicalized telic and purely perfectivizing prefixes in Polish can also be captured by referring to the feature of cumulativity. Following Krifka (1998), cumulativity characterizes atelic events as standing in contrast to telic events. We adopt the following relation between telicity and perfectivity: a telic predicate is non-cumulative (e.g. *explode*), an atelic predicate is cumulative (e.g. *walk*), and a perfective verb is quantized, but it can be either cumulative (e.g. *John has walked in the park*) or non-cumulative (e.g. *The bomb has exploded*). Perfectivity is to be distinguished from telicity, with the former representing viewpoint (or sentential aspect) and the latter lexical aspect (Borik and Reinhart 2004). Since perfectivity is determined at the higher level of structural representation, it is not sensitive to the predicate structure of the event. Thus both telic and atelic verbs can be perfective: *Janek zamknął drzwi* (Perf, Telic) 'Janek closed the door', *Janek poleżał na kanapie* (Perf, Atelic) 'Janek lay on the couch'. Telicity requires the presence of the result predicate, which makes the event complex (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1999, 2005, 2006, 2013). Quantization is a way of singling out a complete event irrespective of whether it ends in a result (telic) or just stops (atelic), and this is what perfectivity does. Cumulativity is sensitive to the internal buildup of the event: only events with no inherent endpoints (i.e. atelic events) can be cumulative. A cumulative event expands linearly, so an event such as sleeping or reading a book can be continued after a break and combined with the previous instance of that event and still constitute a single event. Non-cumulative events do not have this property. Lexicalized prefixed verbs in Polish are non-cumulative

and hence telic (cf. ((17)), while those which take purely perfectivizing prefixes are cumulative and atelic (cf. (18)).

(15) a. ??Janek przepijał, aż przepił wypłatę.
        J   anek PREF-drink-PST-IMPRF until PREF-drink-PST-PRF salary
        '   Janek was spending his salary on booze until he spent it.'
      b. ??Dzieci wbiegały, aż wbiegły do budynku
         kids PREF-run-PST-IMPRF until PREF-run-PST-PRF into building
         'The kids were running until they ran into the building.'

(18) a. Student czytał, aż przeczytał książkę.
         Student read-PST until PREF-read-PST book
         'The student was reading until he read the book.'
      b. Wąż jadł, aż zjadł mysz.
         Snake eat-PST until PREF-eat-PST mouse
         'The snake was eating until it ate the mouse.'

As we claimed earlier, the main meaning the purely perfectivizing prefix introduces is the culmination of an activity and the associated result is supplied pragmatically as an implicature. Hence, the natural culmination of the process of reading a book is when one has read the whole text. If we look once again at examples similar to those in (11), we can note that the implicature is already present with the imperfective unprefixed verb in the context of a definite object. Thus, *Janek czytał tą książkę* 'Janek was reading this book' would be interpreted with an implied result (he has read it) but the result can be cancelled, as in *Janek czytał tą książkę, ale jej przeczytał do końca* 'Janek was reading this book but hasn't finished.' *nie*

8. Conclusion

In this paper, we contrasted a set of perfective verbs in Polish with their Russian counterparts in terms of their semantic and pragmatic interpretation. We indicated that the claim made by Zinova and Filip (2014) for Russian concerning the pragmatic effects of perfective verbs works for manner verbs, which take purely perfectivizing prefixes, but not for telic verbs with lexicalized prefixes. We related this difference to the notion of lexicalized meaning and the distinction into manner and result verbs respectively, in the spirit of Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1999, 2005, 2006, 2013). This view is also in line with Łaziński's (2020) account of perfectivity in Polish as being determined by the aspectual profiles of verbs. We linked the type of assertion a given verb leads to with lexicalized meaning and contrasted it with meaning that is supplied contextually. Lexicalized telic verbs assert result, while purely perfective verbs assert endpoint and imply result. The asserted result cannot be contradicted, while the implied result is subject to pragmatic effects. This distinction corresponds to the two functions of perfectivity in Slavic specified by Dickey (2000), which is that of totality and temporal definiteness. Our lexicalized telic verbs are indicative

of totality, while perfective manner verbs express temporal definiteness. In this way, Polish reveals the characteristics of what Dickey (2000) calls a transition zone language with respect to the categorization of perfectivity in Slavic. By relating the two interpretations of perfectivity to verb classes, we are able to account for this distinction in a systematic way.

The way in which the discussion above can be expanded is by replicating the research referred to in Kasher and Hacohen (2023) on Polish respondents. On the one hand, it would reveal the degree of acceptability of non-maximal accomplishments, and on the other hand, it would verify the research methodology presented there. Such research would shed more light on the interpretation of the two types of perfective prefixed verbs and the proposals concerning those presented here.

References

S. Arunachalam, A. Kothari, *An experimental study of Hindi and English perfective interpretation*, "Journal of South Asian Linguistics" 2011, 4(1): p. 27–42.

H. Borer, *The Normal Course of Events*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2005.

O. Borik, *Aspect and Reference Time*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006.

O. Borik, T. Reinhart, *Telicity and Perfectivity: Two Independent Systems*, "Proceedings of the Eighth Symposium on Logic and Language (LOLA)" 2004, p. 13–34.

S. M. Dickey, *Parameters of Slavic Aspect*, Stanford 2000.

S. M. Dickey, *S-/Z- and the grammaticalization of Slavic aspect*, "*Slovene Linguistic Studies*" 2005, 5, p. 3–55.

S. M. Dickey, *The varying role of PO- in the grammaticalization of Slavic aspectual systems: sequences of events, delimitatives, and German language contact*, "Journal of Slavic Linguistics" 2011, 19(2), p. 175–230.

S. M. Dickey, *Prefixation is the Rise of Slavic Aspect*, [in:] *The role of prefixes in the formation of aspectuality in formation of aspectuality*, ed. R. Benacchio, A. Muro, S. Slavkova, Firenze: Firenze University Press 2017, p. 85–102.

M. Dočekal, I. Kučerová, *Bound Ability Readings of Imperfective Verbs: A Case for Presupposition*, [in:] *Czech in Formal Grammar*, ed. M. Dočekal, M. Ziková, Munich: Lincom GmbH 2009, p. 39–51.

H. Filip, *Aspect, eventuality types and nominal reference*, New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group (Garland) 1999.

H. Filip, *Prefixes and the delimitation of events*, "Journal of Slavic Linguistics" 2003, 11(1), p. 55–101.

H. Filip, *Events and maximalization*, [in:] *Theoretical and crosslinguistic approaches to the semantics of aspect*, ed. S. Rothstein, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins 2008, p. 217–256.

J. Hay, Ch. Kennedy, B. Levin. *Scalar structure underlies telicity in Degree Achievements*, [in:] *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* (*SALT*) 9, ed. T. Matthews, D. Strolovitch, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University 1999, p. 127–144.

N. Kasher, A. Hacohen, *A star is drawn: Testing the culmination inferences of Russian perfective accomplishments*, "Glossa: a journal of general linguistics" 2023, 8(1), p. 1–14.

M. Krifka, *The origins of telicity*, [in:] *Events and grammar*, ed. S. Rothstein, Dordrecht: Kluwer 1998, p. 197–235.

B. Levin, M. Rappaport Hovav, *Two Structures for Compositionally Derived Events*, "SALT 9" 1999, p. 199–223.

B. Levin, M. Rappaport Hovav, *Argument Realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005.

B. Levin, M. Rappaport Hovav, *Constraints on the Complexity of Verb Meaning and VP Structure*, [in:] *Between 40 and 60 Puzzles for Krifka*, ed. H.M. Gärtner, R. Eckardt, R. Musan, B. Stiebels, Berlin 2006, p. 1–5.

B. Levin, M. Rappaport Hovav, *Lexicalized Meaning and Manner/Result Complementarity*, [in:] *Subatomic Semantics of Event Predicates*, ed. B. Arsenijević, B. Gehrke, R. Marín, Dordrecht: Springer 2013, p. 49–70.

M. Łaziński, *Wykłady o aspekcie polskiego czasownika* [Lectures on Polish Verbal Aspect]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 2020.

A. Łazorczyk, *Decomposing Slavic aspect: The role of aspectual morphology in Polish and other Slavic Languages*, Los Angeles: University of Southern California (Ph.D. dissertation) 2010.

F. Martin, *Non-culminating accomplishments*, "Language and Linguistics Compass" 2019, 13(8), p. 1–20.

A. Młynarczyk, *Aspectual pairing in Polish*. Utrecht: Utrecht University LOT Dissertation Series 2004.

G. C. Ramchand, *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon. A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2008.

E. Romanova, *Constructing Perfectivity in Russian*, University of Tromsø (Ph.D. dissertation) 2006.

A. M. di Sciullo, R. Slabakova. *Quantification and aspect*, [in:] *Perspectives on aspect*, ed. H. Verkuyl, H. de Swart, A. van Hout, Dordrecht: Springer 2005, p. 61–80.

H. L. Soh, J. Yi-Chun Kuo, *Perfective aspect and accomplishment situations in Mandarin Chinese*, [in:] *Perspectives on aspect*, ed. H. Verkuyl, H. de Swart, A. van Hout, Dordrecht: Springer 2005, p. 199–216.

P. Svenonius, *Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP*, "Nordlyd" 2004, 32(2), p. 194–242.

S. Tatevosov, *Severing imperfectivity from the verb*, [in:] *Slavic Grammar from a Formal Perspective*, ed. G. Zybatow, P. Biskup, M. Guhl, C. Hurtig, O. Mueller-Reichau, M. Yastrebova, Frankfurt: Peter Lang 2015, p. 465–494.

E. Willim, *On scalarity in the verbal domain. The case of Polish psych verbs. Part 1: Polish perfective psych verbs and their prefixes*, "Studies in Polish Linguistics" 2020, 15(4), p. 221–247.

E. Willim, *On scalarity in the verbal domain. The case of Polish psych verbs. Part 2: The Aspectual Classes of Polish Psych Verbs, Perfectivity, and Scales*, "Studies in Polish Linguistics" 2021, 16(1), p. 41–72.

Y. Zinova, H. Filip. *Meaning components in the constitution of Russian verbs: Presuppositions or implicatures?*, "Proceedings of SALT 24" 2014, p. 353–372.

Abstract

The paper is a contrastive discussion on perfective prefixed verbs in Polish in relation to Zinova and Filip's (2014) account of their equivalents in Russian. It indicates that even though both are Slavic languages, the perfective is categorized differently in Polish, which bears different semantic and pragmatic outcomes. This distinction is linked to the typological differences in the categorization of perfectivity as specified by Dickey (2000). The non-uniform derivation of perfective prefixed verbs in Polish is taken to be the source of different interpretations of action and result in such verbs. It is proposed that result semantics associated with telicity is lexicalized and asserted, but it is supplied by pragmatic implicature in the case of purely perfective verbs. The two scenarios are correlated with verb classes in a systematic way in line with Łaziński (2020).