

- a. $\bigcup\{i, j, k \dots n\} = h$
- b. $\forall i, j \in \mathcal{R}_h \rightarrow i \cap j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$
- c. $\forall i, j \in \mathcal{R}_h \rightarrow \mu(i) = \mu(j)$ (where $\mu(x)$ stands for the Lebesgue measure of x).

\mathcal{E} is a domain of eventualities. A function τ from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{I} gives the time span of an eventuality. Arguments to aspectual operators are predicates of eventualities – *sentence radicals* (saturated event descriptions) or of intervals – sentence radicals modified by Q-adverbs and quantified PPs.

Proposal: Imperfective marking realizes the aspectual operator IMPF, while progressive marking realizes the semantically narrower aspectual operator IMPF_{prog} . IMPF applies to a predicate P over eventualities/intervals to yield a set of intervals i s. t. every inertial history continuing i contains a j where $i \subset_{nf} j$ and every subinterval k of j that is also a member of a contextually provided regular partition of h , \mathcal{R}_h^c , COINCIDES with P , where COIN is a relation defined as in (3). The context provides the measure (e.g. weeks, months, centuries...) for equimeasured subsets of \mathcal{R}_h .

$$(2) \quad \text{IMPF} = \lambda P \lambda i \forall h \in \text{Inr}(i) \rightarrow \exists j [i \subset_{nf} j \subseteq h \wedge \forall k \in \mathcal{R}_h^c [k \subset j \rightarrow \text{COIN}(P, k)]]$$

$$(3) \quad \text{COIN}(P, i) = \begin{cases} \exists e [P(e) \wedge \tau(e) \circ i] & \text{if } P \subseteq \mathcal{E} \\ P(i) & \text{if } P \subseteq \mathcal{I} \end{cases}$$

The assumption that the domain of the universal quantifier is a subset of \mathcal{R}_h^c as specified, allows us to overcome each of the shortcomings listed above. Imperfective sentences may be judged true despite exceptions because the domain of quantification guarantees a regular distribution of P events in time, not an exclusive correlation between (possibly implicit) Q events and P events. (1) is true even if Niša makes bread outside the kitchen, or if she makes pasta instead of bread, on some days, as long as there is a salient partition whose every member ($k \subset j$) overlaps with a bread-making event by Niša. Quantification over subintervals of alternative futures of the reference interval captures the intensional *expected continuation* element of the imperfective.

The progressive reading of IMPF arises when the measure for the partition is set to an *infinitesimally small* length. \mathcal{R}_h^{inf} (called an **I-partition**) is the set of subsets of h of infinitesimally small measure. The progressive operator IMPF_{prog} is just such a function. The setting of the partition to subsets of infinitesimal measure guarantees that P COINCIDES with *every* subinterval of the reference interval i . This generates the ongoing event reading for accomplishment and activity predicates.

$$(4) \quad \text{IMPF}_{prog} = \lambda P \lambda i \forall h \in \text{Inr}(i) \rightarrow \exists j [i \subset_{nf} j \subseteq h \wedge \forall k \in \mathcal{R}_h^{inf} [k \subset j \rightarrow \text{COIN}(P, k)]]$$

Imperfectivity is associated with two distinct operators – IMPF and IMPF_{prog} – either (or both) of which may be realized morphologically cross-linguistically. IMPF allows for both characterizing and ongoing event readings; the measure for the partition (non-infinitesimal or infinitesimal) being contextually determined. The partition for IMPF_{prog} , in contrast, is obligatorily set to be an I-partition and can only be associated with the ongoing event reading. The paper will also show how the habitual, temporally contingent reading for IMPF_{prog} arises in languages like English (c.f. *John was eating only Ramen noodles until he developed Ulcerative Colitis.*).

Additional advantages: This proposal also provides an elegant account of the interaction between Q-adverbs and IMPF (assuming the default scope to be $\text{IMPF} < \text{Q-adverb}$), and presents an argument against the necessity of positing covert operators like GEN/HAB at least in some cases, assigning the semantic load they carry to the frequently morphologically overt IMPF.

Selected References: **Bonomi, A.** (1997). Aspect, quantification, and *when*-clauses in Italian. *L&P* 2-0:5 469-514. **Dowty, D.** (1979). Word Meaning & Montague Grammar. **Cipria A. & Roberts C.** (2000). Spanish Imperfecto and Preterito: Truth Conditions and Aktionsart Effects in a Situation Semantics. *NLS* 8: 297–347.