In Russian it is possible for (transitive) verbs to appear without their obligatory object(s) in certain discourse contexts. An example is given in (1) (from Gribanova 2009, 2010):

1) A. --Ty poznakomil Mašu s Petej?

   you [introduced Masha with Petya]
   “Did you introduce Masha to Petya?”

   B. --Konečno, poznakomil Ø

   Of course introduced Ø
   “Of course, (I) introduced [Masha to Petya]”

Gribanova (2009, 2010) analyzes such Russian constructions as “Verb-stranding vP ellipsis” (VSVE), following similar analyses of Hebrew, Irish and other languages (Goldberg 2006). On Gribanova’s account, the Russian verb (indicated in bold) raises to an AspP head located above vP, after which the entire vP elides, stranding V as the only survivor of vP. (Ø indicates the claimed vP ellipsis site)

In this talk, I argue against the specific claim that Russian has VSVE, while maintaining the spirit of Gribanova’s analysis that there are two distinct processes available in Russian to allow for missing objects, one an entirely discourse-licensed process (a form of discourse-licensed Argument Drop), and the other a true syntactic process of ellipsis (requiring a linguistic antecedent). Crucially, however, I show that the ellipsis in V-stranding constructions is not full vP-ellipsis, as argued by Gribanova, (which Kazenin 2006 shows Russian does allow in other contexts), but ellipsis of something smaller than vP. In particular, I contrast 2 possibilities, siding with the latter: (i) that these cases instantiate NP/DP ellipsis within VP and (ii) that these cases instantiate ellipsis of the (lexical) complement of Pred⁰ (Bowers 1993), here VP (and crucially not vP), but in other instances AP, PP, or NP/DP.
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