Stephen M. Dickey and Susan C. Kresin[*]

Verbal Aspect and Negation in Russian and Czech

Глагольный вид и отрицание в русском и чешском языках

Abstract. This article compares aspectual usage in contexts of negation in Russian and Czech narratives. It examines the four possible aspectual correspondences: Russian imperfective : Czech imperfective (common), Russian perfective : Czech perfective (common), Russian imperfective : Czech perfective (frequent), and Russian perfective : Czech imperfective (infrequent). The data is argued to support the hypothesis that aspect in Czech primarily expresses a distinction in totality, whereas aspect in Russian expresses a distinction in temporal definiteness. Aspectual usage in contexts of negated repetition is also examined. The question of grounding is considered in light of the comparative data, and it is found that previous views of grounding with regard to aspect and negation can be replaced by a more nuanced sense of grounding that accommodates variation across languages. Finally, data from other Slavic languages are adduced, which indicate that the differences discussed between Czech and Russian are symptomatic of the overall east-west division in Slavic aspect established by dickey (2000).

Аннотация. В статье сравнивается употребление вида в контексте отрицания в русском и чешском повествовании. Рассматривается четыре

возможные видовые соотношения: русский несовершенный : чешский несовершенный (распространенный вариант), русский совершенный : чешский совершенный (распространенный вариант), русский несовершенный : чешсий совершенный (часто встречающийся) и русский совершенный : чешский несовершенный (редко встречающийся). Данные, собранные в статье, поддерживают гипотезу о том, что вид в чешском языке главным образом выражает различие в целостности, в то время как вид в русском выражает различие во временной определенности. В статье также рассматривается употребление вида в контекстах отрицания повторяющегося действия. Рассмотрение вопроса фоновых различий в свете сравнительных данных указывает на то, что предыдущие воззрения на эти различия и их взаимоотношения с видом и отрицанием могут быть заменены на более нюансированное понятие фоновых различий, допускающее языковые вариации. Наконец, в статье приведены данные из других славянских языков, указывающие на то, что рассмотренные выше различия между чешским и русским отражают различия между видом в западных и восточных славянских языках, установленные Dickey (2000).

1. Introduction

The interaction of negation and aspect in Russian with respect to various utterance types has been discussed frequently in the aspectological literature (cf., e.g., Forsyth 1970, Merrill 1985, Chaput 1985, Rappaport 1985, Akimova

1992 and Mehlig 1999). In most discussions, the meaning of the Russian perfective aspect has been either explicitly or implicitly assumed to be closure, totality, or some equivalent notion that focuses on the synoptic construal of the situation expressed by the verb in question. However, some recent discussions of negation and aspect have departed from the exclusively synoptic definitions of the Russian perfective: Galton (1976), Leinonen (1982), Barentsen (1998) and Zelʹdovič (2002) employ definitions that emphasize the construal of a situation as being in a temporal succession and/or uniquely locatable in a context. Though clausal negation is in principle a simple phenomenon, one can expect analyses of the interaction of aspect and negation that employ differing theories of aspect to differ greatly regarding virtually all points of the issue.

This paper analyzes differences in the interaction of aspect and negation[1] exhibited by Russian and Czech primarily on the basis of the first fourteen chapters of Anatolij Rybakov's *Deti Arbata* (*Children of the Arbat*) and its Czech translation,[2] as well as Jan Otčenášek's *Romeo, Julie a tma* (*Romeo, Juliet and Darkness*) and its Russian translation, with additional examples taken from the Internet. The data are shown to support the differential cross-Slavic view of aspect offered in Dickey (2000) that, while aspect in Czech may be characterized as expressing a distinction in totality, Russian aspect also involves a sense of temporal specification. In our view, the comparative approach gives one a perspective on Russian that allows for a more convincing evaluation of various theories of the meaning of aspect in Russian

than does an analysis based on monolingual language data (and though Czech seems to be less controversial in aspectology, the same principle nevertheless applies).

Any discussion of Slavic aspect must make reference to the related category of situation type, which interacts with aspectual markers in numerous ways and which has been the subject of a great amount of research in recent aspectology. Classifications of situation types have been developed by Ryle (1949), Vendler (1957), Kenny (1963) and Dowty (1979). The currently most widespread taxonomy, based on Vendler (1957), divides verbs into four classes: states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements. States are "nondynamic situations without natural conclusions" (e.g., *know, hate*); activities are "dynamic processes where any part is of the same nature as the whole" (e.g., *dance, read*); accomplishments are "goal directed situations […] characterized by the presence of an activity preceding the end-point" (e.g., *read a book, walk a mile*); achievements are "instantaneous leaps from one state into another without an accompanying activity" (e.g., *notice, begin*).[3] Accomplishments and achievements are telic, i.e. they contain inherent limiting end-points, whereas activities and states do not, and are thus atelic.

There are various syntactic diagnostics for determining the situation class of a given verb or predicate in the Slavic languages (Rus[4] will be taken as representative). In general, telic verbs can be classified as accomplishments or achievements according to whether their impf forms can refer to a situation

as occurring in process (cf. Bulygina 1982: 63–65 and the references cited there). Impf verbs of accomplishment predicates can do this, whereas impf verbs of achievement predicates cannot (e.g., Rus *On čital[i] stat'ju, no ne pročel[pf] ee* 'He was reading the article, but he didn't finish it' vs. **On naxodil[ipf] ključ, no ne našel[pf] ego* 'He was finding the key, but he didn't find it'). Likewise, pf accomplishment verbs can be used with the adverbial phrase *za* + measure nominal (e.g., *za čas* 'in an hour'), whereas pf achievement verbs cannot (cf., e.g., Rus *On pročel[pf] stat'ju za čas* 'He read the article in an hour' vs. **On našel[pf] ključ za čas* 'He found the key in an hour'). These two tests have served to distinguish between accomplishments and achievements in this study.

Another concept relevant for an analysis of aspect and negation is that of grounding, i.e., the distinction between f o r e g r o u n d and b a c k g r o u n d in narratives. According to Hopper (1979: 213–214), the foreground of a narrative consists of events presented in chronological sequence, which form the "actual story line" or "skeletal structure of the discourse", i.e. the essential plot-line events. Foreground events almost invariably occur in strict sequence, and tend to be coded as pf. A widely recognized quality of the pf is its sequencing force; as Forsyth (1970: 64) observes, "[t]he expression of a sequence of actions is one of the most characteristic functions of [Rus] pf verbs in an extended context". The background consists of "supportive" materials which "are not in sequence to the foreground events, but are concurrent with them [and] amplify or

comment on the events of the main narrative" (Hopper 1979: 213–214). Hopper gives data for several languages which indicate that pf morphemes typically encode foreground events, whereas impf morphemes encode background events.

As this investigation is limited to past-tense narratives, and in particular to indicative forms, the issue of grounding is an important one. Here we should point out that though Rus and Cz generally display the aforementioned correlations between foregrounding and the pf on the one hand, and backgrounding and the impf on the other, there is no full compliance. Dickey (2000) demonstrates that the Cz pf frequently expresses backgrounded events (e.g., habitual events, general statements of fact, etc.), and the Cz impf frequently occurs in the denotation of foregrounded events (the so-called contextually-conditioned impf past). Though Rus aspect more closely resembles a paradigm example of Hopper's correlations, one is well advised to heed Chvany's (1990) suggestion that foregrounding and backgrounding should be viewed as a matter of degree. She proposes a saliency hierarchy to account for deviations from expected patterns of grounding, such as pf flashbacks that may be sequential and narrative-forwarding within the local episode, yet are presented as background material to the primary narrative line.

With negation, a fundamental question arises: does it make sense to speak of the foreground-background distinction with regard to negated predicates, i.e., can the non-occurrence of an event belong to the foreground

of a narrative? This is an important issue, and, if we show that the Rus pf under negation occurs primarily in sequences of narrated events, then we are justified in linking the negated Rus pf with some type of foregrounding. Negated events would thus appear to be quite eligible as narrative foreground in at least one language. The three-way interface between aspect, negation and grounding is discussed in detail in section 6.

2. Theoretical Preliminaries

This investigation takes as its point of departure the aspect theory developed by Dickey (2000), according to which the Slavic languages break down into two distinct aspectual types: an eastern type (Rus, Ukr, Blr, Blg) and a western type (Cz, Slk, Sln). Pol and B/C/S are transitional zones between these two groups; for the parameters examined by Dickey (2000) Pol tends to pattern more like the east and B/C/S more like the west. On the basis of the observed differences, Dickey (2000) constructs a theory of the meanings of the pf and impf aspects in each group (for convenience referred to here as the e a s t - w e s t   a s p e c t   t h e o r y), according to which the meaning of the pf aspect in the western group is t o t a l i t y , whereas the meaning of the pf in the eastern group is a concept labeled t e m p o r a l   d e f i n i t e n e s s .

Totality, which is familiar from the aspectological literature (e.g., Comrie 1976), refers to the synoptic construal of a situation, i.e., as an indivisible whole.[5] Temporal definiteness, however, requires some explanation. A situation is temporally definite if it is unique in the temporal fact structure of a discourse, i.e., if it is viewed as both (a) a complete whole

and (b) qualitatively different from preceding and subsequent states of affairs (the uniqueness condition). In other words, it can be located in time inasmuch as it is differentiated from the situations in preceding and subsequent temporal intervals. This notion has theoretical motivations which need not concern us here (for details, see Leinonen 1982 and Dickey 2000); of primary relevance for the present discussion is the fact that temporal definiteness has as a practical effect the limitation of pf verbs in the eastern languages to contexts of (e x p l i c i t or i m p l i c i t) sequentiality. In this respect, Dickey (2000) shares Barentsen's (1998) view that "sequential connection" is the constant inherent semantic feature of the Rus pf (as well as the pf in the other eastern languages; the differences between Dickey 2000 and Barentsen 1998 are largely theory-internal).

Space considerations preclude a detailed explanation of how the hypothesized meanings for the pf aspect in the respective groups motivate the differing aspectual usage in the parameters considered in Dickey (2000). As an illustration, let us briefly consider two of these parameters, taking Rus and Cz as representative of the eastern and western languages (respectively). The first parameter is habituality: as shown in (1), the eastern languages strongly prefer the impf aspect in habitual utterances, whereas the pf aspect is quite common, and often preferred, in the western languages.

(1) a. Každyj den′ on *$\textbf{vyp′et}^{pf}$/$\textbf{vypivaet}^{ipf}$ po odnoj rjumke vodki.   (Rus)

   b. $\textbf{Vypije}^{pf}$ denně jednu skleničku vodky.   (Cz)

      'He drinks a glass of vodka every day.'

The analysis is fairly simple: in the west, a habitual situation viewed on the basis of a single representative instance event can be coded pf if that situation is viewed in its totality (as a complete whole); in (1) the quantification of the object correlates with a construal of the situation as a totality. In contrast, the temporal definiteness of the Rus pf aspect renders it unacceptable in cases of habituality, because a habitually repeated situation cannot be viewed as uniquely locatable in time; nor is there any sequentiality present on the level of the single representative instance. This analysis is supported by the fact that the pf aspect in all the eastern languages is generally acceptable in the expression of habitual *sequences* of events:

(2) On vsegda tak — **vyp′et**^{pf} kofe i **pojdet**^{pf} na rabotu.

'He's always like that—drinks his coffee and goes to work.'   (Rus)

In (2), the drinking situation is presented as the first of two sequential situations on the level of the representative instance. This fulfills the uniqueness condition (b), and the pf aspect is acceptable.

Another illustrative parameter involves the impf general-factual. Although the impf aspect occurs in the general-factual function in all Slavic languages, differences do exist: one is that in the western languages, the impf aspect is unacceptable in the denotation of a single achievement in the past;[6] in the eastern languages, however, it is acceptable. Compare the examples in (3):

(3) a. Jednou už **dostal**^{pf}/*__dostával__^{ipf} napomenutí za zpoždění.

'He has already once received a reprimand for being late.'   (Cz)

9

b. **Zakopnul**[pf]/***Zakopával**[ipf] ses někdy na ulici?

'Have you ever stumbled on the street?' (Cz)

c. Odnaždy on uže **polučal**[ipf] vygovor za opozdanie. (Rus; = 3a)

d. Ty kogda-nibud′ **spotykalsja**[ipf] na ulice? (Rus; = 3b)

In the west, the totality of the pf aspect renders it acceptable in the denotation

of a single achievement, which is necessarily a totality, regardless of the

overall context. As for Rus, the general-factual function is inherently

incompatible with the temporal definiteness of the pf aspect, as the situation in

question cannot be viewed as unique in the fact structure of the discourse;

note also the lack of any explicit sequentiality.

Let us now turn to the impf aspect. According to the east-west aspect

theory, the impf aspect in each group has its own distinct (positive) meaning.

In the west, the impf aspect expresses q u a n t i t a t i v e   t e m p o r a l

i n d e f i n i t e n e s s : the assignability of a situation to more than one

conceptual point in time in the fact structure of a discourse, which has the

practical effect of limiting the Cz impf to non-punctual predicates in cases of a

single situation. In (3a–b), this meaning contradicts the context of a single

achievement, which must be assigned to a single (conceptual) point in time,

with the result that the impf aspect is unacceptable in Cz. The meaning of the

eastern impf aspect is q u a l i t a t i v e   t e m p o r a l

i n d e f i n i t e n e s s : the inability of a situation to be assigned to a single,

unique point in time relative to other states of affairs. Habitual events

obviously cannot be located at a single, unique point in time and are thus

qualitatively temporal indefinite, hence the acceptability of the eastern impf aspect in (1) above. General-factual contexts such as (3c–d), in which a single achievement is not uniquely located relative to other states of affairs, also sanction the qualitative temporal indefiniteness of the eastern impf aspect.[7]

A more recent theory of Rus aspect offered by Zelʹdovič (2002) is in many ways compatible with the theory of the Rus pf aspect offered by Dickey (2000), and formalizes the uniqueness condition of the Rus pf aspect in a very interesting way. According to Zelʹdovič (2002: 29), a pf verb expresses the meaning given in (4):

(4) "(a) the speaker conceives of one or more sets *M* of situations, and in every *M* there is a situation expressed as '*P*' or '*P* + *A*' (*A* is some [adverbial] comment about *P*) such that (b) within *M* (every individual *M*) the situation expressed by '*P*' or '*P* + *A*' occupies a single temporal interval; (c) *P* [i.e., the lexical content of the verb—SMD & SCK]."

Zelʹdovič's formulation of the meaning of the Rus pf aspect has specific consequences: Since the speaker conceives of a (contextual) set of situations *M* in which the situation in question *P* occupies a single (unique) temporal interval, when using a pf verb the speaker must have in mind some situation(s) *other* than *P*, which Zelʹdovič (2002: 31) labels *P′*. According to Zelʹdovič, it is "indeed the request to reconstruct *P′* [that] determines the main traits in the behavior of the pf aspect." Here Zelʹdovič is developing the idea that sequentiality is central to the pf aspect, which was originally hypothesized by Galton (1976). Though Zelʹdovič's (2002) theory of Rus aspect differs in

11

some small ways (including terminology and theoretical framework) from that of Dickey (2000), the two theories are close enough for our purposes to be used interchangeably (any relevant differences are discussed as necessary); we consider Zel′dovič's theory to be more successfully formalized than the definition of temporal definiteness given by Dickey (2000), and for this reason Zel′dovič's definition of the pf is used readily where applicable.

Returning to the comparison of Rus and Cz, the basic hypothesis of this article is that the observed differences in aspectual usage in contexts of negation evident in the Rus and Cz data can be easily explained if one assumes the meanings of the aspects posited by the east-west aspect theory, i.e., that the semantic opposition expressed by the Rus pf and impf is that of temporal definiteness vs. qualitative temporal indefiniteness, whereas the semantic opposition of the Cz pf and impf is one of totality vs. quantitative temporal indefiniteness. In order to argue this hypothesis, section 3 reviews selected works on aspect and negation in Rus; section 4 analyzes the possible correspondences in aspectual usage (Rus impf : Cz impf, Rus pf : Cz pf, Rus impf : Cz pf, and Rus pf : Cz impf); section 5 discusses the three-way interaction between aspect, negation and repetition; section 6 reconsiders the relationship between negation and grounding based on the comparative data presented; section 7 discusses limited data from other Slavic languages; section 8 presents concluding remarks.

3. Selected Previous Literature on Negation and Slavic Aspect

This section does not present a comprehensive review of the literature on aspect and negation in Slavic, which is vast and cannot be discussed in detail here. Rather, what follows provides the background necessary for understanding the arguments developed in sections 4–7 and briefly discusses some treatments we consider generally relevant to our investigation.

Forsyth (1970: 103–4) points out that in Rus a negated pf verb signals the "[n]on-performance of a potential single action a t   a   s p e c i f i c   j u n c t u r e " (emphasis ours—SMD & SCK), and gives examples such as the following:

(5) a. — Predupreždal ja tebja ili net? Otvet′…

     No Ven′ka ničego **ne otvetil**[pf] i načal′niku.   (Rus)

     '"Did I warn you or not? Answer…"

     But Ven′ka did not answer the chief, either.'[8]

     b. Načal′nik šagnul k arestovannomu i vdrug rvjaknul: — Vstat′!

     Arestovannyj **ne poševelilsja**[pf].   (Rus)

     'The chief stepped toward the prisoner and bellowed: "Stand up!"

     The prisoner did not stir.'

In these examples there is a specific single moment in the fact structure of the text when the potential events could take place: there was a single moment or occasion after the posing of the question when Ven′ka would or would not answer the question; there was a single relevant juncture after the chief's request when the prisoner would or would not get up. The negated pf forms indicate that the actions did not take place at the specific single occasions on

13

which they might have. In other words, the negated pf does not signal the non-occurrence of an action over an extended interval of time (in Rus this function is reserved solely for the impf).

Merrill (1985) equates Forsyth's (1970: 103) "specific juncture" and Galton's (1976: 66) "particular point in the time series" with Reichenbach's reference time (R). We consider this equation to be erroneous, certainly with regard to Galton's concept: Reichenbach's R is a point in time identifiable relative to the time of an event (E) and the speech event (S) whereas Galton's particular "point in the time series" involves narrated events in sequence, but not necessarily the moment of speech. In other words, Galton's concept involves a succession of events in the fact structure of a discourse or narrative, where the "particular point" is one conceptual moment in a concatenation of events on the time line including preceding and succeeding states of affairs. Merrill then also backs away from these discourse-oriented concepts and concentrates on the evaluation of realized telicity at R. In this manner, the semantic characterization of the Rus pf aspect is kept to the minimum of completion, or totality. Consider the following example:

(6) Alik napisal novoe pis′mo, serdečno poblagodaril otca, skrupulezno perečislil svoi minimal′nye rasxody i pokazal, kak èto malo. Otec s prokljatijami dobavil desjat′ rublej. Bol′še iz nego Alik **ne vyžal**[pf].

(Rus; Merrill 1985: 132–33)

'Alik wrote a new letter, thanked his father sincerely, scrupulously enumerated his minimum expenses and showed that it [the sum given

him] was too little. His father, cursing, added ten rubles. Alik didn't

squeeze even another kopeck from him.'

Analyzing this example, Merrill (133) emphasizes completion or c l o s u r e : "the final goal of the squeezing—some larger sum of money—[was] not realized. This then, is an instance where only the closure of an event is negated", thus motivating the pf. However, it is easy to see even from the minimal context given that the failure to squeeze out more money occurred at a specific juncture in the narrative. It is for this reason, and also due to the comparative facts that we present, that mere closure or totality is rejected as the relevant feature of the Rus pf.

Stunová (1993) presents a comparative analysis of aspect in Rus and Cz, but does not treat negation as a separate category. She observes that Cz employs the pf much more than Rus in the negation of repeated events, a fact that is corroborated by our data in section 5. As we will find, however, her view that aspect operates on the "discourse level" in Rus but on the "lexical level" in Cz ignores discourse considerations that are also essential to Cz. Moreover, such a view is hampered by theoretical problems concerning the interaction of aspectual categories and "levels" of language, which we would prefer to avoid.

Leinonen (1982: 256–259) takes the broader discourse structure into account and analyzes aspectual usage under negation with reference to the "context-creating" (1982: 257–258) force of the pf aspect, i.e., the correlation of pf predicates with concrete contexts. She observes that negation, which

indicates a non-event or lack of change, is "pragmatically associated with continuity" (1982: 258), and thus inherently favors the use of the impf in a broader range of contexts than the corresponding affirmative statements. In her view, the negated pf aspect indicates the presence of a "precondition", i.e., an expectation of the corresponding affirmative predicate at a particular juncture in the discourse. Her suggestion is reminiscent of Givon's (1978: 105–108) view that negative propositions have a marked presuppositional status: taken from the infinite set of non-events that could potentially be mentioned, a particular non-event becomes relevant as a figure only when the corresponding positive event is presupposed as a ground. Givon (1978: 108) observes that this occurs in two cases: (1) when the speaker believes that the hearer erroneously believes in the corresponding affirmative, or (2) when the background expectation for the report was the affirmative action itself. According to Leinonen (1982), this marked presuppositional status of negation combines with the temporal locatability of a predicate at a particular point in a narrative signaled by the pf aspect to override the underlying sense of continuity associated with negation, thereby allowing the use of pf under negation in certain contexts in Rus.

Mehlig (1999) discusses Rus aspect and negation in conversational discourse. He considers the referential status of negated impf and pf predicates in Rus, and demonstrates that negated pf predicates such as in the answer in (7) refer definitely (i.e., they refer to situations about which the speaker assumes that the listener knows):

(7) — Kto perevel tekst? Igor'?

— Net, Igor' ego (ešče) **ne perevel**^{pf}.   (Rus; Mehlig 1999: 192)

'"Who translated the text? Igor'?"

"No, Igor' has not translated/did not translate it (yet)."'

In this case, the second speaker is referring to the same contextually relevant translation event as the first speaker, i.e., *the* translation event has not occurred. In contrast, an impf answer such as *Net, Igor' ego **ne perevodil**^{ipf}* 'No, Igor' did not translate it' does not refer definitely, i.e., to the same contextually relevant translation event as the first speaker. Rather, it simply states that *no* translation event by Igor' has taken place. Mehlig's discussion is important in that it suggests that Rus aspect under negation r e f e r s b a s i c a l l y   a c c o r d i n g   t o   t h e   s a m e   p r i n c i p l e s   t h a t i t   d o e s   i n   a f f i r m a t i v e   u t t e r a n c e s . Though our investigation is concerned with narrative texts and not conversational discourse, we also suggest that negation affects the referential properties (as we formulate them) of aspect fairly infrequently.

Zel'dovič (2002) also writes very informatively about temporal parameters in the interaction of negation and aspect in Rus, in a way that is reminiscent of Leinonen's hypothesis, although it was developed independently. Recall his definition of the meaning of the pf given above in (D), according to which for some set(s) of events M the speaker conceives some event '"*P*' or '*P + A*' (*A* is some [adverbial] comment about *P*) such that within M (every individual M) the situation expressed by '*P*' or '*P + A*'

occupies a single temporal interval". Zel′dovič (2002: 28) includes negation as one of the possible adverbial comments about the event *P*. In other words, the potential for the negation of an event is "built into" the meaning of the pf aspect, and n e g a t i o n   i s   n o t   a n y   k i n d   o f   i n d e p e n d e n t s e m a n t i c   " o p e r a t o r "   t h a t   a l t e r s   a s p e c t u a l   c o d i n g . Following up on this idea, on p. 184 he observes that the most basic phenomenon relating to the use of the aspects with negation is "the fact that negation of the perfective aspect is, so to speak, local, whereas negation of the impf aspect is general." This fact is tied in with the common notion that a negated pf verb expresses a situation that was expected at a specific, localized moment, but that did not occur. Further, however, on p. 187 Zel′dovič argues that the association of negated pf verbs with the idea that the action was expected is not quite accurate. He points out that "[i]t is more correct, at least for the majority of cases, to speak about the fact that simply the presence or absence of a given situation is more important only for some s i n g l e instance and that the speaker is correlating the given situation with some others, and mentally places it in a s e q u e n c e   o f   e v e n t s".

From the preceding discussion it should be clear that there has been a recognition of the correlation between the negated pf in Rus and the failure of an event to occur at a single point in a narrative, on the descriptive level (e.g., Forsyth 1970) or on the explanatory level in terms of the hypothesized meaning of the Rus pf (e.g., Leinonen 1982, Zel′dovič 2002). The following sections present Rus-Cz comparative evidence for the view that meaning of

the Rus pf is more than closure or even totality, and show how the behavior of aspect in contexts of negation can be straightforwardly explained by assuming a meaning of temporal definiteness for the Rus pf, and a meaning of totality for the Cz pf. In general, our analysis of Rus comports with the approaches taken by Leinonen (1982), Mehlig (1999) and Zelʹdovič (2002), as opposed those of Merrill (1985) and Stunová (1993).

4. The Aspectual Correspondences

The data and discussion presented in this section constitute the core of the present analysis. As mentioned before, we find the comparative analysis of aspectual usage in Rus and Cz very useful in making claims about the interaction of aspect and negation in each of these languages. Comparing the Rus data to Cz allows one to see more clearly that something beyond the simple synoptic view of a situation must be expressed by the Rus pf.

The following sections discuss contexts favoring each possible correspondence: section 4.1 examines cases in which both Rus and Cz employ the impf; section 4.2 examines cases in which Rus favors the impf and Cz the pf; section 4.3 examines cases in which both Rus and Cz employ the pf; section 4.4 examines cases in which Rus favors the pf and Cz the impf. Cases in which both Rus and Cz employ the impf or the pf do not play a crucial role in a differential analysis of their aspectual semantics; more important are the other two correspondences involving the pf in at least one of the languages. However, cases of identical usage are important for related points, such as the idea that negation does not "alter" aspectual usage.

4.1.   Contexts favoring Rus—impf : Cz—impf

The main case when the impf occurs under negation in both Rus and Cz

involves Vendler's states. State predicates, e.g., 'love', 'fear', involve

unchanging continuity over time, and therefore cannot be viewed either as

situations occurring in their totality on a given occasion or as being temporally

definite, in a clear sequence with other qualitatively different states of affairs.

In purely abstract terms, the negation of a state is also a state (cf. in this regard

Galton 1984: 26–27, who observes that a state "n o t obtaining is itself a

state"; this presumably trivial view has consequences in section 5).

Accordingly, such predicates are regularly impf in both affirmative and

negative statements:

(8) a. A ona po-prežnemu **bojalas′**^{ipf} ego daže na rasstojanii.   (Rus; DA: 70)

   b. Ale ona **se** ho pořád ještě **bála**^{ipf}, i na dálku.   (Cz; DAu: 63)

      'But she [Saša's mother] still feared him, even from a distance.'

(9) a. Varja nikogo **ne bojalas′**^{ipf}, ne stesnjalas′.   (Rus; DA: 140)

   b. Varja **se** nikoho **nebála**^{ipf} a neostýchala se.   (Cz; DAu: 142)

      'Varja did not fear anyone and was not shy.'

The predicates in (8–9) serve to c h a r a c t e r i z e individuals in the

narrative (Saša's mother and Varja respectively). This characterization takes

place in the same way regardless of the fact that (8) contains an affirmative

state predicate and (9) contains a negative state predicate: negation is simply a

variation—a possible parameter, if you will—in the characterization of an

individual with respect to a given predicate (e.g., 'fearing'). It should be

pointed out that such stative characterizations are always background; moreover, negation does not change the status of the information as background information.

If we now turn to an examination of the state predicates in (8–9) with regard to the semantics of aspect in Rus and Cz, we may motivate the impf in each language in a twofold manner: in terms of the semantics of the impf in each language and in terms of the pf in each language. The impf occurs in Rus in (8) because the predicate, 'fearing' is presented as unchanging over time. It is thus qualitatively temporally indefinite, i.e., it cannot be located at a single point in time relative to other qualitatively different situations in the narrative. This does not mean that Saša's mother's fear of her husband cannot necessarily be assigned to some interval on a "forensically" constructed timeline of *Children of the Arbat*, but rather that the narrator has no reason to activate this kind of (possible) knowledge when the predicate occurs in the narrative episode. By the same token, the narrator would not use the possible delimitative pf verb *pobojat'sja*[pf] 'fear for a while', because that would entail presenting the fear as temporally definite in the fact structure of the narrative, i.e., as having a definite beginning, limited duration and endpoint relative to other events in the narrative (events that are eligible as P' in terms of Zel'dovič 2002).

Turning to Cz, we may motivate the impf in (9) in a similar though not identical manner. The situation 'fail to fear' is presented as an ongoing characteristic, assignable to more than one point in time in the narrative. It is

thus quantitatively temporally indefinite. The Cz pf aspect is inappropriate, because the situation cannot be meaningfully presented as a totality in the narrative. (NB: a pf delimitative of *bát*[ipf] *se* does not exist in Cz, so there is not even a possibility of coding a limited duration of the situation by means of a pf verb in Cz.[9])

Negated activity predicates, as they are atelic like the states discussed above, are also regularly impf under negation. Negated activities tend to characterize characters as well as the situations in which they find themselves, providing the background against which the essential foreground events of a narrative episode unfold. Examples (10–11) show that both Rus and Cz code negated activities as impf:

(10) a. Xitrja pri polučenii narjada, oni nikogda **ne lovčili**[ipf] meždu soboj,

ničego ne perekladyvali na tovarišča. (Rus; DA: 46)

b. Ale při všech svých pracovních fintách se nikdy navzájem **nešidili**[ipf]

ani jeden na druhého nic nesváděli. (Cz; DAu: 58)

'Though they used their cunning when receiving duties, they never

teased one another, and did not pass the buck to a comrade.'

(11) a. I xotja Saša **ne učastvoval**[ipf] v vypivkax, ne rasskazyval

kazarmennyx anekdotov, **ne sostjazalsja**[ipf] v poxabnyx pribautkax,

oni otnosilisʹ k nemu xorošo. (Rus; DA: 46)

b. A i když Saša **nevysedával**[ipf] na jejich vypíjendách, nevyprávěl

sprosté anekdoty a **nepřidával**[ipf] se k jejich oplzlým vtípkům,

chovali se k němu přátelsky. (Cz; DAu: 58)

'And though Saša did not participate in their drinking binges, did not tell dirty jokes, did not compete in their dirty catchphrases, they [the workers] got along with him well.'

As far as the motivation for the impf in the respective languages is concerned, the explanations for (8) and (9) above apply, *mutatis mutandis*. It should be pointed out that had the workers and Saša engaged in these activities, the corresponding postive predicates would be impf as well. As in the case with states, negation is not "affecting" or "altering" the aspectual coding of a predicate.

Verbs that are properly classified as accomplishment and achievement predicates are also regularly coded impf under negation in both languages in characterizations and descriptions, provided that the negation of the predicate is construed as having validity over time, as in the following examples.

(12) a. Teprve ted' na světle si povšiml, že je vlastně hezká. Tvář pod temnými vlasy byla neskutečně bledá, postrádala souměru, ale drobné nesoulady ji jen zvýražnovaly. **Nerušily**[ipf].   (Cz; RJT: 28)

  b. Tol′ko teper′, pri svete, on zametil, čto ona krasiva. Lico pod temnymi volosami bylo udivitel′no belym, ono ne otličalos′ klassičeskoj pravil′nost′ju, no melkie nedostatki ne tol′ko **ne portili**[ipf] ego, no delali bolee vyrazitel′nymi.   (Rus; RDžT: 26–27)

      'Only now in the light did he notice that she was beautiful. Her face below her dark hair was impossibly pale, it lacked symmetry, but its small imperfections only accented it. They did not spoil it.'

(13) a. Otec **ne razrešal**[ipf] emu privodit′ v dom devušek, no doč′

narodnogo komissara — šutka skazat′! *Takoj* u Jurija ne bylo.

(Rus; DA: 40)

b. Otec Jurovi **nedovoloval**[ipf], aby si vodil domů děvčata, ale dcera

lidového komisaře, to je něco jiného! *Takovou* ženskou Jura ještě

neměl. (Cz; DAu: 50)

'His father did not permit him to bring girls into the house, but the

daughter of a people's commissar—that's not so easy! Yuri had not

had *such* a girlfriend.'

The verbs *portit′*[ipf]/*isportit′*[pf] 'spoil' and *razrešat′*[ipf]/*razrešit′*[pf] 'permit' are

lexically telic, but in both of these examples the depicted situation is ongoing

and unchanging at the relevant juncture of the narrative: the negated predicate

ne portili[ipf] 'did not spoil' is used to present a description of the main female

protagonist that applies throughout the story, and, likewise, the negated

predicate *ne razrešal*[ipf] 'did not permit' characterizes the relations between the

boy Yuri and his father. Ongoing and unchanging, and thus temporally

indefinite both quantitatively and qualitatively, statements of this type require

the impf aspect in both Cz and Rus.

The impf aspect is also used with all Vendlerian types in negated

predicates applying continuously within a narrative episode, since such

duratives also involve extension in time during which no qualitative change

takes place.

24

(14) a. Doma, leža na ego ruke, ona snova sprosila, čto ego trevožit. On

   otvetil, čto ničego osobennogo, prosto osložnjaetsja otzyv ego na

   zavod.

   — Esli xočešʹ, ja pogovorju s papoj, — predložila Lena.

   — Ivan Grigorʹevič sdelal vse, čto mog.

   Ona **ne nastaivala**[ipf], ponimala, čto otec ne sdelaet bolʹše togo, čto

   sdelal.   (Rus; DA: 43)

   b. Doma, s hlavou na jeho rameni, se znovu zeptala, co ho trápí.

   Odpověděl, že nic zvláštního, jenom jsou nějaké komplikace s jeho

   nastoupením v továrně.

   „Jestli chceš, promluvím s tatínkem," nabídla mu.

   „Tvůj otec už udělal, co mohl."

   Lena **nenaléhala**[ipf], věděla, že otec už nic víc nepodnikne.

                                                                (Cz; DAu: 55)

   'At home, resting on his arm, she asked again what was bothering

   him. He answered that it wasn't anything in particular, just that the

   arrangement for him to go to the factory was getting complicated.

   '"If you like, I'll talk to Papa," she suggested.

   '"Ivan Grigorʹevič has already done everything he can."

   'She [Lena] did not insist, she understood that her father would not

   do more than he had already done.'

The impf is used in such cases to extend the predicate's temporal validity over
the entire episode: Lena did not insist throughout the ongoing conversation,

not only after Yuri's remark. In contrast, while grammatically possible, the pf

would impart a sense of an immediate reaction to his words: at that specific,

narrowly defined moment, she did not insist (though she might have at

another point during the same episode). Both the Russian author and the

Czech translator favor the impf aspect here, to underscore the sense of a

uniform extension over time, i.e., both qualitative and quantitative temporal

indefiniteness respectively.

In the examples cited above, negation has no effect on either aspectual

or narrative properties: the corresponding affirmative statements would also

be made with the impf aspect. In other contexts, however, negation may create

a sense of durativity that would not exist in an affirmative statement. For

example, asking a question implies a limited duration in time, but not asking a

question can continue over an extended (and infinitely extendable) duration.

Our corpus contains several examples of this type, with the impf used in both

languages. In the following example, an end to the shooting would have been

depicted with affirmative pf verbs, but the author chose instead to present the

fact that shooting did not end as a static background in a descriptive passage.

(15) a. Střelba **neustávala**[ipf], po odmlkách se znovu rozpoutávala racháním

          pušek, dalším bubnováním kulometu, přerývaným otřásajícím

          duněním které páralo oblohu a plašilo ptáky na věžích.   (Cz; RJT: 123)

      b. Strel′ba **ne prekraščalas**′[ipf]. Posle zatiš′ja snova vzryvalsja groxot,

          sypalas′ barabannaja drob′ pulemeta, vozdux sotrjasali gulkie

          vzryvy. Oni rasparyvali nebo, sryvali s bašen stai ptic.

(Rus; RDžT: 109)

> 'The shooting did not cease, after pauses the roar of guns erupted
> again, the machine guns kept rattling, interrupted by ear-shattering
> drones that tore open the sky and frightened the birds on the
> towers.'

Pf verbs would be more appropriate if the predicates served as triggers to events in the narrative story line; the use of the impf instead provides a descriptive background.

In general, negated impf statements tend to have broad temporal scope, extending beyond the level of the individual sentence to the broader episode or beyond. The use of the impf aspect supports a perception that the statement's validity is unchanging and extended in time, not bound to any specific point in the current discourse. As such, the impf aspect is particularly well suited for the presentation of background material in narrative: the predicates do not present key elements of the main "action" or plot-line, but instead provide descriptions, characterizations or explanations of the foregrounded actions of the various characters (cf. Hopper 1979: 213–214). This issue is discussed further in section 6.

4.2.   Contexts favoring Rus—pf : Cz—pf

The most frequent cases of negated pf verbs occurring in both Cz and Rus involve contexts of sequencing. Sequenced events, whether positive or negative, are "bounded by one another" (Hopper 1979: 13), and thus carry the necessary features of totality, for Cz, and temporal definiteness, for Rus.

Negated sequencing often occurs in "action-reaction" pairs, when a n

e x p e c t e d   r e s p o n s e   f a i l s   t o   t a k e   p l a c e . Recall Forsyth's

(1970) examples in (5), repeated here as (16):

(16) a.   — Predupreždal ja tebja ili net? Otvet′…

No Ven′ka ničego **ne otvetil**[pf] i načal′niku.   (Rus)

'"Did I warn you or not? Answer…"

But Ven′ka did not answer the chief, either.'

    b.   Načal′nik šagnul k arestovannomu i vdrug rvjaknul: — Vstat′!

Arestovannyj **ne poševelilsja**[pf].   (Rus)

'The chief stepped toward the prisoner and bellowed: "Stand up!"

The prisoner did not stir.'

Forsyth observes that the negated pf verbs *ne otvetil* 'did not answer' and *ne poševelilsja* 'did not stir' indicate that each of the actions did not take place at the specific single occasion on which it might have. In our narratives, negated pf verbs occur in Rus almost exclusively in the expression of events that fail to occur at specific junctures in the narrative. The failure of an event to occur at such a specific juncture in time, bound by other events, renders the predicates in question temporally definite and in turn sanctions the use of the Rus pf aspect. As Givon (1978) notes, the negative polarity is the key semantic component of sentences of this type: the previous predicate sets up expectations of a certain response, which are then denied. Thus, there is a sense in which, in these examples, the specific semantic content of the verb is less important than its negative polarity.[10]

In action-reaction pairs of this type, if Rus has a negated pf verb, the Cz version does as well. The Cz pf is motivated simply because the action is negated in its totality. Examples are given in (17).

(17) a. Na lice D′jakova mel′knula grimasa. No on ničego **ne skazal**[pf],

tol′ko skosil glaza na svoego načal′nika, točno priglašaja ego

ubedit′sja, s kem on, D′jakov, imeet delo, a možet, ožidaja, čto tot

sam čto-libo skažet. No čelovek s èskimosskim licom ničego **ne**

skazal[pf], gruzno podnjalsja i vyšel.　　　　　　(Rus; DA: 121)

b. Na Djakovově tváři se mihl úšklebek. **Neřekl**[pf] ale nic, jen střelil

okem po svém představeném, jako by se dovolával jeho svědectví, s

kým se musí on, Djakov, párat, a snad jako by očekával, že se do

toho sám vloží. Ale muž s eskymáckými rysy **neřekl**[pf] nic,

těžkopádně vstal a odešel.　　　　　　　　　　(Cz; DAu: 150)

ʻA grimace flashed across D′jakov's face. But he did not say

anything, he only glanced at his superior, as if inviting him to see

for himself who he — D′jakov — was dealing with, and perhaps

expecting him to say something himself. But the man with the

Eskimo face did not say anything, he got up awkwardly and went

out.ʼ

The first negated predicate of this example involves D′jakovʻs failure to respond to a prisonerʻs questions; the second notes failure of D′jakov's supervisor to comment. first, immediately following the prisoner's questions and second, after D′jakov's inquiring glance. In each case, the situation that

does not occur is temporally definite within the narrative, as it is located at a particular juncture in the episode. The negated predicate is relevant only at this point: the statement that the interrogator D′jakov "did not say anything" would clearly be false if it were evaluated over the whole episode of the interrogation. Thus, the pf is used in Rus, as in Cz.

The following example shows a direct contrast between prototypical impf and pf usage in both languages.

(18) a. Usadil se tedy opatrně a čekal. Čekal[ipf]. Čas vlekl[ipf], **nevnímal**[ipf] jej

[…]

Ani **si nevšiml**[pf], když se zakmitaly její řasy.   (Cz; RJT: 37)

   b. On sel rjadom i ždal. Ždal[ipf]. Vremja šlo[ipf], no on **ne zamečal**[ipf] ego

[…]

Pavel **ne zametil**[pf], kak zatrepetali ee resnicy.   (Rus; RDžT: 35)

'He sat down carefully and waited. He waited. Time passed, but he did not notice it. He did not even notice when her eyelashes started quivering.'

When the relevant interval of a negated predicate is presented as simultaneous to another situation, the impf aspect is used: as Pavel was waiting, he didn't notice how time was passing. As we show in section 4.3, Cz allows the negated pf in cases of the failure of an event to occur over some span of time, but the impf is preferred when there is clear simultaneity with some other predicate. In (18), the impf aspect presents the two events of waiting and "not noticing" as ongoing and simultaneous, in direct parallel to one another. When

the same action fails to occur at a specific juncture in the narrative, however, negated pf verbs are used: the predicate *nevšiml*pf *si/ne zametil*pf 'did not notice' marks Pavel's failure to notice a specific change in the girl's state w h e n   i t   c h a n g e d , and at that point in time only. The change in her state is also encoded with the pf aspect (*zakmitaly*pf/*zatrepetali*pf 'started quivering'), and the juxtaposition of two pf forms presents the two telic events of 'beginning to quiver' and 'not noticing' as sequenced in time.

Other types of temporal specification also favor the use of the pf aspect. In the following example*,* the impf aspect is used in the clause with the adverb *kogda-to/kdysi* 'at some time', due to the sense of temporal indefiniteness. This clause then provides a temporal frame, sanctioning the use of a negated pf verb in the following clause.

(19) a. Golos i slux on unasledoval ot materi, kogda-to ee priglašali pet′ na

      radio, no otec **ne pustil**pf.   (Rus; DA: 12)

    b. Hlas i sluch zdědil po matce, kdysi jí nabízeli, aby zpívala v

      rozhlase, ale otec to **nedovolil**pf.   (Cz; DAu: 17)

      'He had inherited his voice and ear from his mother; at some time

      she had been invited to sing on the radio, but his father did not

      allow it.'

Russian native speakers' comments on this example are illuminating. The pf *pustil* is preferred here, and it is the only possible choice if the adverbial phrase *ni razu* ('not once') is added (for a discussion of Rus *ni razu*, see section 5 on repetition). The corresponding impf *puskal* 'didn't allow' would

imply that more than one offer was made: on all occasions when Saša's mother was invited to sing, his father forbade it. Only the impf would be admissible if this repetitive, temporally indefinite sense were reinforced by the insertion of the adverb *nikogda*.[11] In a non-repetitive sense, the clause with *kogda-to* 'sometime' still requires the impf aspect due to the inherent sense of temporal indefiniteness. This clause, however, provides the temporal anchor that sanctions the use of the pf aspect in the following clause, which completes the mini-narrative begun with the impf *priglašali*[ipf]/*nabízeli*[ipf] 'invited'.

While the majority of examples with matching pf forms involve sequences of juxtaposed predicates, the pf is also used in both languages in a broader totalizing sense: the failure to perform a telic action can be relevant at a broader, episodic level. In (20), Rjazanov (Mark Aleksandrovič) expected his collocutor (Stalin) to mention a "fourth foundry" at some point during their conversation. Although the action expressed by the predicate is not realized at any point, it is temporally grounded by the expectation that it would occur at some specific point during the episode, perhaps between the mentions of metallurgy, the East, the five-year plan, and so on.

(20)   a.   On zagovoril[pf] o metallurgii, o Vostoke, o vtoroj pjatiletke, ob

oborone strany. […] No o četvertoj domne **ne upomjanul**[pf], kak by

ne želaja vyzyvatʹ Marka Aleksandroviča na vozraženija, […]

— Vy kogda uezžaete? — sprosil[pf] Stalin, vstavaja.   (Rus; DA: 18)

b. Rozhovořil se o hutnictvé, o Východě, o druhé pětiletce, o obraně

země. […] Ale o čtvrté vysoké peci **se nezmínil**[pf], jako by nechtěl

Rjazanova vyprovokovat k námitkám […]

„Kdy chcete odjet?" otázal[pf] se a vstal.   (Cz; DAu: 24)

'He [Stalin] started talking about metallurgy, about the East, about

the second five-year plan, about the defence of the country. […] But

he did not mention the fourth foundry, as if not wishing to provoke

an objection from Mark Aleksandrovič, […]

"When are you leaving?" Stalin asked, getting up.'

In this example, the action of "not mentioning" is bound not by an

immediately following predicate (*P'*), but it is bound at the level of the

broader episode. The episode is bounded by two pf predicates: Stalin's

beginning to speak (*zagovoril*[pf]) and a concluding question that he poses at the

end (*sprosil*[pf]). These two predicates provide the necessary temporal frame for

the use of pf *ne upomjanul* 'didn't mention', which summarizes the action

with regard to this temporal frame (for a similar discussion regarding ex. 49,

see section 5).

A totalizing sense also combines frequently with perfect meaning. In

such contexts, the pf aspect shows that the result of a telic action is relevant to

a subsequent temporal interval (Bondarko 1971: 61, 94–102). Temporal

definiteness is established on the basis of the "actuality" (relevance) of the

action's result to this subsequent, clearly defined temporal reference point

(which thereby serves as *P′*). In (21), the narrator notes that the sun has not yet risen.

(21) a. Světlo dne. Ale slunce ještě **nevyšlo**^{pf}. (Cz; RJT: 132)

b. Svet! No solnce ešče **ne vzošlo**^{pf}. (Rus; RDžT: 118)

'The light of day. But the sun had not yet risen.'

The reference point anchoring the pf predicate is the current narrative: the narrator assumes the voice of a character in the ongoing narrative who is surprised that, despite the bright light, as of that particular moment the sun had not yet risen. The emphasis on the action's result provides a sense of totality, and the current moment in the narrative anchors the predicate with temporal definiteness. Therefore, the pf aspect is used in both languages.

Similarly, the pf is sanctioned in the Rus of (22) by the relevance of the predicate to the current narrative line. The pf sums up and frames the local passage, and the impf then develops the space within this frame.

(22) a. — Znakomstvo, znakomstvo nado iskat′, — poučal on Juru.

Odnako ni na zavode, ni v institute Jurij **ne priobrel**^{pf} druzej.

Privodit′ v dom tovariščej zapreščalos′. Rodstvenniki byli bedny,

ničego, krome obuzy, v nix ne videli, k nim **ne xodili**^{ipf}, u sebja **ne**

prinimali^{ipf}. (Rus; DA: 24)

b. „Konexe, konexe musíš hledat,“ poučoval Juru.

Jenže Jurij si ani v továrně, ani na fakultě **nezískal**^{pf} přátele.

Vodit si kamarády domů měl zakázáno. Příbuzní byli chudí, těm by

byli jen na obtíž, **nechodili**^{ipf} k nim a k sobě je **nezvali**^{ipf}.

(Cz; DAu: 30–31)

'"Contacts, contacts, you must make contacts," he urged Yuri.

But Yuri hadn't made friends, either in the factory or at the institute.

Friends were not permitted in the [Šarok] household. Their relatives

were poor and Šarok saw them only as an additional burden, so they

were neither visited nor invited.'

By the point of the current discourse, Yuri had not acquired any friends. As in example (21), the current discourse serves as the anchoring *P′,* sanctioning the use of the pf in Russian.

In conclusion, it is important to emphasize that although Rus and Cz both employ the pf aspect to express the failure of a situation to occur at a specific juncture in a narrative, our claim is that in fact they each employ the pf for different reasons. Cz simply allows the pf aspect when telic predicates, which can only be construed in their totality, are negated. In Rus, a negated predicate is only eligible to be coded pf when the temporal-definiteness condition is satisfied, i.e., when the occurrence of the predicate is negated at a particular juncture in the narrative. Thus, the overlap in aspectual usage examined here is the result of the conceptual proximity of the meaning of the pf in the two languages; it should not be taken to mean that Cz and Rus share the very same meaning for the pf aspect, which is only clear when one takes the negation data in its entirety. As Dickey (2000) demonstrates, the same relationship holds for the use of the pf aspect in these two languages in affirmative contexts.

4.3. Contexts favoring Rus—impf : Cz—pf

This correlation occurs frequently, and involves negated telic situations (accomplishments and achievements), whether single events or habitual events. Before discussing the negation data, it is important to point out that this aspectual correspondence in cases of negation (Rus impf, Cz pf) directly parallels the variation in aspectual usage in affirmative habitual statements (as well as the non-actual present, cf. Dickey 2000, Kresin 2000 and Stunová 1993): Cz easily allows the pf to express habitual situations, whereas Rus shows a strong preference for the impf. For example, characterizations, though inherently associated with a sense of continuity, may be encoded with pf verbs in Cz if the feature of totality is an essential part of the predicate. Recall that in (1), repeated here as (23), the telicity imposed by the specific quantity of the object requires a synoptic view of the situation; therefore, the pf aspect is strongly favored in Cz, whereas the inability to assign a repeated situation to a single point conditions the impf in Rus.

(23) a. Každyj den′ on ***vyp′et**^{pf}/**vypivaet**^{ipf} po odnoj rjumke vodki.   (Rus)

      b. **Vypije** denně jednu skleničku vodky.   (Cz)

          'He drinks a glass of vodka every day.'

Likewise, in (24), though both languages encode the first predicate with the impf aspect, Cz shifts to the pf for the second, which is the negation of a telic repeated event:

(24) a. V te vremena, kogda emu **ne podavali**^{ipf} otdel′nogo vagona i

          dobiralsja on do Moskvy v tepluške, v tambure, na kryše vagona, v

šineli s meškom za plečami, emu i v golovu **ne prixodilo**[ipf]

opasat′sja čego-to. (Rus; DA: 85)

b. V dobách, kdy mu **nepřidělovali**[ipf] zvláštní vagón a kdy jezdil do

Moskvy v hytláku, na plošině nebo na střeše, v plášti a s batohem na

zádech, nikdy ho **nenapadlo**[pf], aby se něčeho bál. (Cz; DAu: 106–107)

'In those times, when they did not allot him a separate car and he

went to Moscow in a heated goods van, on a flatcar, or on the roof

of a boxcar, in his overcoat with a bag over his shoulder, it did not

occur to him to fear anything.'

The impf aspect of the first predicate *ne podavali*[ipf]/*nepřidělovali*[ipf] 'did not

allot' establishes a sense of continuity by characterizing the structure of the

world in 'those times', a broad temporal space in which the relevant situation

uniformly and unchangingly applies. Consistently and unchangingly, the

character was not given any special treatment during this period. The second

predicate 'occur to someone' is an achievement in both Rus (*prixodit*[ipf]/*prijti*[pf]

v golovu komu-libo 'come to one's head') and Cz (*napadat*[ipf]/*napadnout*[pf]

někoho 'fall to someone'); it failed to take place on each of the numerous trips

to Moscow. The fact that the idea of fearing anything never occurred to Saša

throughout the period of 'those times' conflicts with the temporal definiteness

of the Rus pf (and in Zel'dovič's terms there is no other situation that could

function as *P′*), and requires the qualitative temporal indefiniteness of the Rus

impf: the failure of this idea to occur to him cannot be located at a single

juncture in the fact structure of the narrative. The Cz pf aspect, in contrast,

requires only a sense of totality, a condition met by the inherent telicity of the achievement verb *napadati*[ipf]/*napadnout*[pf] 'fall to'. Temporal specification is unnecessary, and the pf aspect aptly emphasizes the non-occurrence of a situation that can only be construed as a totality. Note that Cz divides the aspectual labor very neatly between the individual elements of the clause: the negated pf verb *nenapadlo* 'didn't fall to' simply negates the completion of the predicate in question, and the adverbial *nikdy* 'never' distributes it over the period indicated in the context. Although Cz does allow the use of impf achievement verbs in characterizations, this particular statement emphasizes a sense of totality over the interval in question and is thus a quintessential pf context for Cz.

Whether repetition is implied or not (and cases of repetition are treated in more detail in section 4), when an accomplishment or achievement situation is negated over some span of time, Cz very often employs a pf verb under negation, in contrast to Rus, which requires the impf. Two more examples are (25) and (26):

(25) a. Potrjasenie, kotoroe ispytala Varja na vokzale, uvidev Sašu, ne

        proxodilo[ipf].   (Rus; DA: 206)

   b. Otřes, který Varja zažila na nádraží, když spatřila Sašu,

        nevyprchal[pf] beze stopy.   (Cz; DAu: 250)

        'The shock that Varja had felt at the station when she saw Saša was

        not passing [Cz version: did not vanish without a trace.]'

(26) a. Do instituta ja rabotal na ximičeskom zavode, im nužen jurist.

Svjazi s zavodom ja **ne terjal**[ipf], vot oni i zaprosili.   (Rus; DA: 41)

   b. Než jsem šel na vysokou, pracoval jsem v chemické továrně.

Potřebují tam právníka. **Neztratil**[pf] jsem spojení s podnikem, tak by

tam chtěli mě.   (Cz; DAu: 53)

'Prior to attending the institute I [Saša] worked in a chemical plant,

they needed an attorney. I did not lose contact with the plant, and

that's why they've asked me.'

The predicate *proxodit*[ipf]*/projti*[pf] 'pass by', *vyprchávat*[ipf]*/vyprchat*[pf] 'vanish' in

(25) are accomplishments, and *terjat*[ipf]*/poterjat*[pf], *ztrácet*[ipf]*/ztratit*[pf] 'lose' in

(26) is an achievement. In these examples there is no single point in time at

which Varja's feeling of shock failed to pass or Saša did not lose contact with

the chemical plant—the nonoccurrence of these predicates is true over a

continued, indefinite span of time in each narrative. Cz simply negates these

situations for the time period in question by negating the respective pf verbs:

as the pf aspect signals the totality of the situations, negating the pf negates

them *in toto*. As the Rus pf expresses not only the totality of the situation but

also its unique location in time relative to other situations, it is incompatible

with the indefinite duration of the non-occurrence of these situations, which

requires the temporal indefiniteness of the impf.

In the following example, the non-occurrence of the situation in question

is not located at any particular point in time, only prior to the narrative time.

The use of the negated impf predicate *ne soveršal*[ipf] 'did not commit/do'

resembles the general-factual use of the Rus impf aspect in affirmative

contexts: it indicates the lack of a specific point in time at which Saša might

have committed the infraction.

(27) a. Mark Aleksandrovič vsegda vydeljal Sonju sredi drugix svoix

sester, ljubil i žalel ee, osobenno bespomoščnuju sejčas, kogda ot

nee ušel muž. I Sašu ljubil. Za čto pridralis′ k mal′čiku? Ved′ on

čestno skazal, a emu lomajut dušu, trebujut raskajanija v tom, čego

ne soveršal[ipf].   (Rus; DA: 14)

b. Mark dával vždycky přednost Soně před ostatními sestrami, měl ji

rád a litoval ji pro její bezradnost, zvlášt' ted', když od ní odešel

muž. I Sašu měl rád. Proč si na toho chlapce tak zasedli? Vždyt'

mluvil pravdu, a oni mu křiví charakter, chtějí po něm, aby si sypal

popel na hlavu za něco, co **neudělal**[pf].   (Cz; DAu: 19)

'Mark Aleksandrovič always singled Sonja out from his other

sisters, loved and pitied her, especially now, helpless as she was

since her husband had left her. He also loved Saša. Why were they

picking on the boy so much? He had told the truth, but they were

crushing his soul, demanding repentance for something he had not

done.'

The examples in (27) also reflect the basic differences between Rus and Cz

regarding the impf general-factual in affirmative contexts (cf. the discussion

of the data in ex. 3 in section 2): in many cases when Rus employs the impf

aspect in this function, Cz prefers the pf, encoding a sense of totality without

regard to duration or other temporal factors. Thus again, negation seems to be mirroring aspectual usage in affirmative contexts.

An important context in which Rus shows a negated impf verbs while Cz shows a negated pf verb is the failure of a telic situation to occur over some explicitly mentioned interval of time. Though this case is not in principle different from that of the previous examples, the explicit mention of a duration of time in the context allows us to see more clearly what is involved. Consider the following examples:

(28) a. […] a vysokij povernul obratno, uvidel menja, zlobno tak posmotrel

i potom dva dnja **ne pojavljalsja**[ipf] […]   (Rus; DA: 62)

b. Dlouhán se obrátil nazpátek, uviděl mě, podíval se ti na mě tak

vztekle a pak **se** dva dny **neobjevil**[pf] […]   (Cz; DAu: 78)

'[…] but the tall one turned around, saw me, gave me a dirty look

and then did not appear for two days […]'

(29) a. On iščet ssory, **ne zvonil**[ipf] dve nedeli.   (Rus; DA: 104)

b. Vyhledává hádky, čtrnáct dní jí **nezavolal**[pf].   (Cz; DAu: 129)

'He was looking for a fight, he had not called [her] for two weeks.'

This seemingly odd juxtaposition of a durative temporal adverbial with a totalizing pf verb in Cz can be explained in the following manner. The time intervals mentioned (two days and two weeks, respectively) are much longer than the time it would take for the corresponding situations to occur ('appearing' and 'calling', respectively). Thus, we are dealing not with a processual meaning of the verbs, but with the failure of situations to occur at

any given point of a series of points in time. Since each potential point involves a sense of totality ("appearance" versus "non-appearance" and "calling" versus "non-calling" respectively), the pf aspect is used in Cz. The Rus pf aspect, however, requires not only a sense of totality, but also its location at a specific point in time relative to other, qualitatively different situations. It is therefore unsuited to express any situation that continues unchanged over an interval of time (recall the elementary textbook rule that the pf cannot be used when duration is stressed).[12] The same principle applies in cases of negation: if the failure of a situation to occur is not located at a single point in time relative to other events in the narrative, the pf is inappropiate, and thus the impf aspect is required in Rus. Here again we see that negation does not in fact "alter" aspectual choice in Rus as frequently as one might think: states of affairs that are assessed as being true over several points in time (whether they have positive or negative polarity) require the temporally indefinite impf. However, this is a clear case in which negation does affect aspectual usage in Cz: pf verbs of accomplishment and achievement predicates cannot combine with adverbials of duration, as this would be contradictory to their inherently telic meaning, i.e., Cz *čtrnáct dní jí nezavolal*[pf] 'did not call for fourteen days' but **čtrnáct dní jí zavolal*[pf] 'called her for fourteen days'.

In (28) and (29), negation is similarly assessed with regard to an interval over which a telic event failed to take place. Rus selects aspect on the basis of the extended temporal interval, while Cz focuses instead on the inherent

telicity of the predicate. The feature of totality is so dominant in Cz that negated achievement verbs can appear in the pf aspect with what appears to be a discourse-level sense of simultaneity. In (30), for example, it is very difficult to determine for which period of time the negated predicate *nepohnula*[pf] *se* 'didn't move' is valid—simultaneous to saying that Nina arrived, or only immediately afterward:

(30) a. —Ninka prišla, **ne dvigajas′**[ipf] s mesta, ob″javila[pf] Varja, — opjat′

          ključi zabyla.   (Rus; DA: 52)

     b. "Ségra je tu," řekla[pf] Varja, ale **nepohnula**[pf] **se**, "zase zapomněla

          klíče."   (Cz; DAu: 65)

          '"Nina has arrived," announced Varja, not moving [Cz version: but

          did not move], "she forgot the keys again."'

The Rus usage is easy to motivate. Varja announces Nina's arrival w h i l e   n o t   m o v i n g , with the sense of simultaneity signaled by the impf verbal adverb.. Substitution of pf *ne dvinulas′*[pf] would lead to an interpretation that the action occurred subsequently in time to the failure to move. In the Cz translation, however, the negated predicate is pf (and the order of the predicates is reversed), and it is irrelevant whether the speech event and the failure to move are sequential or not.[13] This example provides an excellent illustration of the tendency in Cz for each predicate to be assessed individually, only with regard to its own totality or lack thereof, regardless of the overall fact structure of the discourse/text.

To sum up, cases in which Cz employs the pf whereas Rus employs the impf involve accomplishment and achievement predicates. The negated telic predicates in question are true over relatively long periods of time, whether they are indefinite or specific. Cz simply negates the pf verb to express the failure to achieve totality during the relevant span of time; in Rus, the duration of the predicate involved conflicts with the uniqueness condition required by the pf—(negative) totality does not suffice. Rather, the duration involved means that the predicate cannot be located at a single, unique point in time in the narrative, and the impf occurs regularly. In these examples, negation does not alter Rus aspectual usage itself, but rather the temporal frame of the context. A positive action would take place at a certain, specifiable point in the narrative, but the failure of an action to take place occurs over an interval of time.

One fact that emerges from the data in 4.2 and this section is that under negation the Rus pf is primarily restricted to "action—reaction" pairs, and is thus more tied to causality than the Cz pf. This tie to causality corresponds to facts from aspectual usage in affirmative habitual contexts (cf. 23 above): the Cz pf occurs widely in the expression of habitually repeated events, but as Zelʹdovič (2002: 52) points out, the use of the pf in Rus in contexts of habituality tends not only to express sequencing on the level of a single episode, but a causal connection as well. Regardless, we cannot emphasize enough the fact that Rus is more restrictive than in Cz with regard to the use of the pf aspect under negation. The resulting entailment relationship—if Rus

employs a negated pf verb, Cz almost certainly will as well (but see the data in

4.4)—corresponds to the relationship to the meaning of the pf aspect in each

language assumed here: The notion of totality expressed by the Cz pf aspect is

conceptually a component of the meaning of temporal definiteness expressed

by the Rus pf aspect.

The differences in aspectual usage under discussion here raise

considerable problems for a unified account of aspect and its interrelationships

with negation and grounding in Rus and Cz. Most accounts simply equate pf

with foreground and impf with background, but what is to be done in cases in

which aspect usage in two languages does not match? Despite the use of the pf

in Cz, most of the negated predicates here involve indefinite duration in time

and are not in clear sequences of events with other foreground events;

therefore, they do not seem to be strong candidates for foreground material.

These examples support the claims made in Dickey (2000) that the Cz pf is

less tied to foregrounding than is the Rus pf. We return to a detailed

discussion of the issues that negation poses for grounding in section 6.

4.4. Contexts favoring Rus—pf : Cz—impf

As we have seen, negated states and activities tend to condition the impf in

both languages, and negated accomplishments and achievements tend to

condition the pf in both languages if the negated situation is presented as

failing to occur at a particular juncture in the narrative, or the impf in Rus and

the pf in Cz if the underlying sense of totality is not accompanied by a sense

of temporal definiteness. What happens, however, if the context provides a

sense of temporal definiteness but the predicate lacks totality? The examples

in our corpus indicate that in Russian the factor of temporal definiteness can

override a lack of totality: when presented in a sequence, activities and even

states can be encoded with the pf aspect.

Consider (31) and (32). In these examples a certain state of affairs that

was expected to exist at a specific juncture did not materialize.

(31) a. Niny doma **ne okazalos**^{pf}.   (Rus; DA: 70)

'Nina did not turn out to be home.'

b. Nina doma **nebyla**^{ipf}.   (Cz; DAu: 88)

'Nina was not home.'

(32) a. Prazdnika **ne polučilos**^{pf}.   (Rus; DA: 74)

'There didn't turn out to be a celebration.'

b. Žádná velká sláva to **nebyla**^{ipf}.   (Cz; DAu: 92)

'There was no celebration.'

In (31), the other characters in the novel arrive at Nina's home, but, contrary

to their expectations, she is not there. In (32) an expected celebration fails to

materialize. The Rus original uses pf unaccusative constructions in order to

locate the lack of the existence at a specific juncture in the narrative, and in

particular to show that a state of affairs that was expected to exist at a specific

juncture did not. Because the actions are relevant at a certain juncture in the

fact structure of a discourse, they can be viewed as temporally bound, and

therefore located as temporally definite, "coerced" into a construal as pf

events (cf. De Swart and Molendijk 1999: 33 on the "coercion" of negated

states into events within narrative discourse, as discussed in section 6). The pf

aspect foregrounds the events, underscoring the fact that they contribute to the

causal flow of the narrative, and implies the existence of further, differentiated

predicates: Nina's absence and the lack of a celebration lead to other (pf)

events in the narrative. In contrast, Cz simply negates impf *byt* 'be'. In our

view, the frequent use of such pf unaccusative constructions in Rus may be

considered to be the product of an overall systemic pressure for situations

whose existence or non-existence is relevant only at a certain juncture in the

fact structure of a discourse to be expressed as temporally definite by pf verb

forms.

We may connect these facts to Stunová's (1988) observation of a

preference for the pf aspect in Rus, as opposed to the impf in Cz in affirmative

contexts of ingressivity, terminativity and temporal delimitation, all of which

inherently involve temporal boundedness, but not the closure/completion of a

telic event. Cz frequently employs impf verbs to express the occurrence of an

action in a sequence of events, whereas Rus strongly prefers either special

ingressive verbs (e.g., *zagovorit*[pf] 'start talking') or phase verb constructions,

frequently the ingressive phase verb *stat*[pf] 'start/begin'. Dickey (2000: 203–

233) explains the Cz preference for the "contextually-conditioned

imperfective past" (CCIP), on the one hand, and the Rus preference for pf

constructions (ingressive procedurals and phase verbs), on the other, in terms

of the different meanings of the pf aspect in Rus and Cz assumed here. This difference is exemplified in (33):

(33) a. „Lže,“ řekl[pf] Švejk a **čekal**[ipf].   (Cz; Stunová 1993: 149)

'"He's lying" Schweik said and waited.'

b. — Vret! — skazal[pf] Švejk i **stal**[pf] **ždat′**.   (Rus; Stunová 1993: 149)

'"He's lying!" said Schweik and started waiting.'

In (33) a pf predicate ('said') is followed by the start of another situation ('waiting'), marked by pf in a phase-verb construction (*stal*[pf] *ždat′* 'started waiting'). Cz, however, employs the CCIP (*čekal*[ipf] 'waited') due to the lack of totality of the individual predicate.

Negative usage in our corpus directly parallels the trend in affirmative contexts of the Czech CCIP versus the pf in Rus. Consider (34):

(34) a. Sklonil[pf] rychle hlavu nad talíř kouřící bramboračky. Ani **se**

nesháněl[ipf] po obvyklých novinách, ani **neotevřel**[pf] rádio na

kredenci.   (Cz; RJT: 112)

b. On bystro opustil[pf] golovu nad tarelkoj dymjaščegosja kartofel′nogo

supa. **Ne stal**[pf], kak obyčno, **iskat′** gazetu, **ne vključil**[pf] radio.

(Rus; RDžT: 98)

'He quickly bent his head down over a bowl of steaming potato

soup. He didn't even look/start to look as usual for his newspaper,

nor did he turn on the radio on the shelf.'

Ex. (34) has the distinctive structure of the CCIP: a pf predicate ('lowered his head') is followed by the failure of the beginning of another action ('start

looking for newspaper'). While Cz freely mixes the aspect of the two negated predicates, Rus requires parallel usage of the pf to indicate the lack of (the onset of) each action. At the same time, however, the precise sense of sequencing concomitant to the use of the Rus pf aspect is not focal to this example. Dickey (2000: 220–221) notes that the use of Rus *stat′* expresses that "the precise beginning of the action is not clearly focused upon as an independent entity"; the choice of this verb allows for a "smooth, seamless flow from one event into the beginning of the next, possibly involving a small overlap of the actions." In other words, by virtue of its aspect *stat′*^{pf} 'start' encodes the necessary feature of temporal definiteness, but lexically, it avoids a specific focus on sequentiality.

Commenting on the fact that ingressivity is often explicitly encoded in Rus but not in Cz, Křížková (1963: 287) observes that [i]n cases when it is impossible in Russian […] to leave ingressivity unexpressed, in the Czech linguistic consciousness ingressivity does not come to the fore […] What a speaker of Russian […] conceptualizes as an ingressive action is felt by a speaker of Czech to be neutral with respect to ingressivity, lacking an explicit meaning of inception. Between perfective actions, which are projected onto the time axis as points, imperfective verbs appear as linear stretches; the speaker actually stylizes the action in such a way that it is impossible to be conceived complexively with its beginning and end, we are as it were in the middle of it. (Translation from Dickey 2000: 205.)

Even when an action is temporally bound by surrounding pf predicates, it need not necessarily be viewed in its totality: it can be presented as occurring over an unspecified span of time, without apparent beginning or end. Although sequencing necessarily involves the temporal definiteness of some portion of a process, it does not necessarily involve the entire process as a totality. A view of continuity, as opposed to totality, is presented in Cz by the impf aspect, regardless of the aspectual/temporal status of the surrounding predicates. While in the Rus of (34) the pf is conditioned by the predicate's appearance at a specific juncture in the narrative, Cz opts instead for the imperfective, as the failure to look for the newspaper is ongoing, simultaneous to other situations. It bears pointing out that once again we see that negation is not affecting aspect usage; rather, usage under negation seems largely to parallel affirmative usage.

A full treatment of the issues involved in the Cz CCIP versus pf constructions in Rus cannot be given here. However, it should be pointed out that the necessity of focusing on the moment of inception with pf verbs in Rus is to a considerable extent a function of the overall system of sequencing events discreetly in narratives in Rus by means of pf verbs. Rus does not tolerate ambiguity concerning the overlap of events to the extent that Cz does. This fact accounts for other differences between Rus and Cz aspectual usage under negation, in cases that are not in a narrow sense instances of the CCIP, such as the following, in which the underlying sense of sequencing requires the pf in Rus, but allows for a choice in Cz:

(35) a. Posadil[pf] se na samý okraj lavičky, uvědomuje si bez zájmu, že na

druhém konci kdosi sedí. Byl v první chvíli tak zahrabaný do svých

myšlenek, že ji ani **nevnímal**[ipf]. Byla pro něho jen stín, obrys cizího

těla, nic víc.   (Cz; RJT: 18)

b. On prisel[pf] na samyj kraj skamejki, otmetiv bez vsjakogo interesa,

čto na drugom konce kto-to sidit. On byl naskolʹko nagružen v svoej

mysli, čto daže **ne obratil**[pf] vnimanija na devušku. On byla dlja

nego ten-ju, siluètom čužoj figury, ne bolʹše.   (Rus; RDžT: 17)

'He sat down on the edge of the bench, noting without interest that

someone was sitting on the other end of it. At first he was so caught

up in his own thoughts that he didn't pay any attention to her. She

was just a shadow to him, a silhouette of another person's body,

nothing more.'

Russian native speakers comment that two verb pairs are possible here: pf
prisel 'sat down' and *ne obratil* 'did not pay [attention]'**,** as in the published
translation, or impf *sidel* 'sat' and *ne obraščal* 'was not paying [attention]'. In
other words, Rus forces an explicit choice between sequencing, with the pf,
and simultaneity, with the impf. It appears impossible to express solely
through aspect a mixed situation of sitting down and continually not paying
attention: given the onset of 'sitting down', the onset of the action of 'not
paying attention' must also be expressed in Rus in sequence. In contrast,
Czech native speakers comment that either aspect is possible for the *verbum
percipendi*, but that the meaning would differ, as follows. The impf, as

published, indicates that the boy sat down and continued not to notice the girl. The onset of 'not noticing' is irrelevant and therefore unexpressed. Switching to the pf *všimnout si* 'notice' would create an explicit sense of sequencing, by totalizing the event of 'not noticing' with respect to a specific moment: the boy didn't notice the girl at the precise moment when he first sat down (though he may have noticed her later). This example shows that in Cz, while a context of sequencing does not require the pf, substituting the pf aspect can c r e a t e a sense of immediate sequencing, by totalizing the event relative to one specific moment.

Similarly, in example (36), the negated Cz impf *nechápal* both lexically and aspectually indicates a lack of comprehension that is not specifically precipitated by the previous statement; in contrast, the pf *porozuměl* indicates an understanding of the girl's words at a specific juncture. Russian requires the pf aspect for both predicates, due to their appearance at specific points in the narrative.

(36) a. Ukázal prstem na její kuffík. „Co tam vlastně máte?"

„Všechno. Nic zvláštního… Zdaleka to neváží ani těch padesát kilo, které povolili, ale já ani víc nemám."

Nechápal[ipf]**.**

Vyložila mu všechno strbatými větami, zmateně a na přeskáčku, ale hlavnímu **porozuměl**[pf]. (Cz; RJT: 24)

b. On pokazal na čemodančik.

— A čto u vas tam?

— Vse. Ničego lišnego... Zdes′ gorazdo men′še pjatidesjati

kilogrammov, no menja bol′še ničego net.

On **ne ponjal**[pf].

Devuška vyložila emu vse, sbivčivo, vzvolnovanno, perebivaja

sama sebja, no osnovnoe on **ponjal**[pf].   (Rus; RDžT: 22)

'He pointed at her suitcase with his finger. "What do you have

there?"

"Everything. Nothing extra… It doesn't weigh anything near the

fifty kilos they permitted, but I don't have anything else."

He didn't comprehend.

The girl explained everything to him in convoluted sentences,

confusedly and skipping over things, but he understood the main

points.'

Czech native speakers comment that while pf *nepochopil* 'didn't comprehend'

could potentially substitute for *nechápal*[ipf], it would apply to a specific

moment in the narrative, implying the likelihood of the boy's asking a

question to clarify what he had just heard (a further *P′*, in Zel′dovič's terms).

The use of the impf presents the situation as an extended lack of

understanding, the inability of the boy to make sense of what he has heard,

with no relevant beginning or end within the current episode. In other words,

the choice of impf over pf avoids presenting the lack of understanding as part

of a prototypical action-reaction pair. In contrast, since *porozuměl*[pf]

'understood' is a direct and expected reaction to the girl's immediately

preceding explanation, the pf is required to express the totalized view of a successful event of understanding at a particular point in the narrative.

Another kind of case that we would not identify as the CCIP involves the modal 'to be able', Cz *moc*[ipf], Rus *moč′*[ipf]/*smoč′*[pf]. As Barentsen (2002: 22–23) observes, Rus *smoč′*[pf] localizes the dynamic modality of the verbs to a juncture in a sequence of events. The situation in (37) occurs the day after the girl is persuaded by the boy to undergo an abortion at his apartment. There is a break in the narrative, and then the first sentence of (37) forms the beginning of a new episode.

(37) a. Utrom ona **ne mogla**[ipf] natjanut′ čulki.

— Bol′no.

Potom **ne smogla**[pf] nadet′ botinki, ne nalezali. On prines valenki, bol′šie, podšitye, s razrezannymi goleniščami.   (Rus; DA: 110)

   b. Ráno si **nemohla**[ipf] natáhnout punčochy.

„Bolí to.“

Pak si **nemohla**[ipf] obout střevice, nohy se jí do nich nevešly. Jura přinesl válenky, velké, s rozříznutými holeněmi.   (Cz; DAu: 136)

'In the morning she was not able to pull on her stockings.

"It hurts."

Then she [Lena] was not able to put on her shoes, they wouldn't come on. He [Yuri] brought fur boots, big ones, lined, with torn tops.'

The first sentence of (37a) sets the stage of a new episode, and as such is background information for the set of events that are to follow. Lena's inability to put on her stockings is presented in a new episode, in isolation from the previous night's events (qualitatively temporally indefinite). Therefore, the first sentence of (37a) contains the impf *ne mogla*[ipf]. A pf verb, *ne smogla*[pf], would link the situation directly to the events of the night before; but the point of the new episode is to show the unexpected/uncertain outcome of the unfortunate procedure, and thus the temporal and causal link profiled by a Rus pf verb is inappropriate. Note that the one-word utterance *Bol'no* 'Painful' is contemporaneous to the inability to put her stockings, i.e., we have an overlapping of (implicitly expressed) situations. Then the aspect switches, as the next verb form is the negated pf *ne smogla*[pf] 'was not able'. Why the switch to the pf *ne smogla*[pf]? Synoptic theories of Rus aspect get us nowhere here: it is almost impossible to assess either one of these negated situations with regard to their totality, let alone completion. The theory of temporal definiteness motivates the switch very neatly: as opposed to the introductory *ne mogla*[ipf] *natjanut' čulki* 'was not able to put on her stockings', the verb phrase *ne smogla*[pf] *nadet' botinki* 'was not able to put on her shoes' expresses a situation of 'not being able', in a clear temporal and causal sequence with other events in the episode, i.e., a reaction to Jura's bringing her the fur boots (which is pf for the same reason). Note that after the initial sentence, Jura does not act on Lena's inability to put on her stockings; therefore, *ne mogla*[ipf]

natjanut' čulki 'was not able to put on her stockings' is not presented as being

in a clear temporal (and causal) sequence with other foregrounded events.

Another important factor in the switch from impf to pf is that the

second occurrence of the predicate 'not be able' is a qualitatively different

situation from the first: it involves shoes as opposed to the already mentioned

stockings. So there is a motivation to mark the second as unique from the first,

which sanctions the uniqueness condition of the Rus pf. In this respect,

consider the following two examples from Zel′dovič (2002), which together

help illustrate the point:

(38) a. — Čto ty budešʹ delatʹ?

— **Posplju**[pf].

— A ešče čto?

— [??]Govorju že tebe — **posplju**[pf].   (Rus; Zel′dovič 2002: 45, fn. 25)

'— What are you going to do?

— I am going to sleep for a while.

— And what else?

— I'm telling you, I'm going to sleep for a while.'

b. Ja **udaril**[pf] po gvozdju m o l o t k o m , potom k u v a l d o j .

(Rus; Zel'dovič 2002: 27)

'I hit the nail w i t h   a   m a l l e t , and then w i t h   a

s l e d g e h a m m e r .'

Zel′dovič observes that in (38a), the oddity of *posplju*[pf] 'I will sleep some' in

the repeated assertion is caused by the fact that a Rus pf verb expressing

predicate *P* requires that the speaker have in mind another situation *P′* in the contextual set of situations *M*, yet in (38a) the speaker replies that there is no other situation, only 'sleeping for a while', which violates the aforementioned condition. In terms of Dickey (2000), temporal definiteness requires the presence of other qualitatively different situations, and a continuation of the same situation does not fulfill that condition. But how can (38b) be acceptable, for we have the same situation repeated twice? The answer lies in Zel′dovič's (2002: 27–29) stipulation that it is not necessarily the predicate *P* that is unique in the set of events *M*, but rather *P* as modified by some adverbial, i.e., *P + A*. Thus, in (38b) we have one predicate *udarit′ molotkom* followed by another, *udarit′ kuvaldoj*; in other words, we have two unique *P + A* combinations, *P + molotkom* and *P + kuvaldoj*. Returning to (37a), we have (leaving negation aside for a moment) two qualitatively different and thus unique events in the context, *P + natjanut′ čulki* and *P + nadet′ botinki*. This motivates the coding of the second predicate 'not be able to put on shoes' as pf, as it is unique within the episodic set of events; as pointed out above, the first predicate 'not be able to put on stockings' is nevertheless coded impf due to its background status within the episode (in this respect the main difference between (38b) and (37a) is the fact that in (38b) both situations are foregrounded and in a temporal/causal sequence with one another).

Turning to the Cz translation (37b), we may explain the continuity in aspect fairly easily. On a lexical level, Cz has no pf correlate of *moc*[ipf] 'to be able'. This lexical oddity of Cz vis-à-vis Rus can be explained according to

the aspect theory advocated here: while Rus employs *smoč'*[pf] to satisfy the

aspectual needs conditioned by temporal definiteness, in Cz, the pf aspect is

concerned primarily with assessing the totality of a situation, a feature that is

in contradiction to the inherent meaning of the modal auxiliary. Thus, Cz has

no semantic motivation to have a pf correlate of *moc*[ipf] in the first place. To

express totality, a different verb would have to be used, such as *(ne)dokázat'*[pf]

'(not) to manage', which places greater focus on the underlying attempt (an

event that can be totalized). In order to translate Rus *ne smogla*[pf] with a

perfective verb, the translator would have to opt for a shift in meaning.

     Our corpus records similar data for another stative predicate, 'be

afraid'. Rus has an aspect pair for this predicate, i.e., *bojat'sja*[ipf]/*pobojat'sja*[pf]

'be afraid', but Cz does not derive a pf verb for this predicate, as its inherently

stative meaning precludes a sense of totality (cf. *bát*[ipf] *se* 'be afraid'). In cases

where Rus employs the pf *pobojat'sja*[pf] 'be afraid (at a particular point in

time)', Cz must either leave the temporal definiteness unexpressed, or use a

different lexical item, such as *leknout'*[pf] *se* 'to get frightened'.

(39) a. Net, nastojal na svoem, **ne pobojalsja**[pf] nastojat′, **ne pobojalsja**[pf]

        narušit′ moj prjamoj zapret. Počemu **ne pobojalsja**[pf]?

        Professional'noe dostoinstvo peresililo.   (Rus; DA: 449)

    b. Ale ne, on stál na svém, **nebál**[ipf] **se** naléhat, **nebál**[ipf] **se** překročit

        můj přímý zákaz. Proč **se nebál**[ipf]? Zvítězila v něm profesionální

        hrdost.   (Cz; DAu: 544)

'No, he stood his ground, he was not afraid to, he was not afraid to

violate my direct prohibition. Why wasn't he afraid to do so? His

professional dignity proved stronger.'

Since the Cz system is set up for a predicate to be assessed for totality, the pf

is incompatible with the basic stative meaning of 'be afraid', and unless a

lexical switch is made, the option of aspectual variation never even comes into

play.

A last case of this type involves delimitatives, which are highly

productive in Rus but much less so in Cz (and those that exist are used much

less frequently to perfectivize sequences of events), cf. Dickey and Hutcheson

(2003). In Rus, *po-* delimitatives perform an important function of allowing

atelic activities to be coded pf in sequences of events, in which the negated

activity is limited to a single juncture in the fact structure of a narrative. In

contexts such as (40), Czech codes impf.

(40)   a.   Zarjadiv noč′ju PSP ja vzjal ee na rabotu… spat′ utrom xotelos′

žutko, v metro ja **ne poigral**[pf] uže ne pomnju počemu… priexal na

rabotu vovremja, samomu ud[i]vitel'no bylo.   (Rus; Internet)

b.   Poté co jsem přes noc nabil PSP, vzal jsem si ho do práce. Ráno se

mi opravdu chtělo spát, v metru jsem **si** s PSP **nehrál**[ipf], nepamatuju

si proč… do práce jsem přijel včas, co mě překvapilo.   (Cz; = 40a)

'Having recharged my PSP I took it to work… I really felt like

sleeping in the morning; in the metro I did not play it, I can no

longer remember why… I got to work on time, I myself was

amazed.'

Ex. (40) calls to mind the Cz CCIP discussed above, and like ex. (34) appears

to be its direct negative counterpart. While pf *pohrát*[pf] *si* 'play for some time

[to one's satisfaction]' does exist, there is no compelling reason for its use in

(40), since Cz impf predicates, be they affirmative or negative, may occur

freely in sequences of events.

To sum up, we may say that although there are relatively fewer cases of

Rus pf—Cz impf than of Rus impf—Cz pf, those that do occur can be

motivated by the theory advocated here, that the Rus pf expresses temporal

definiteness whereas the Cz pf expresses totality. The overwhelmingly

dominant narrative strategy of Rus, i.e., sequentializing all manner of events

(including negated events) and coding them pf, yields some instances in which

Cz, as it aspectually assesses each predicate individually, codes a

corresponding negated atelic predicate impf regardless of issues of narrative

structure. We have examined three important subtypes of this patterning. In

the first type, exemplified in (34–36), the negated equivalent of the Cz CCIP

correlates to a sequenced negated event in Rus. In the second type,

exemplified in exx. (31–32, 37, 39) Rus negated pf verbs of stative predicates

(e.g., unaccusatives such as *okazat'sja*[pf] 'turn up/out to be', the modal *smoč*[pf]

'be able to', and *pobojat'sja*[pf] 'be afraid [at a particular point in time]')

necessarily correspond to Cz negated impf stative verbs, as Cz generally has

no corresponding pf verbs, relying solely on stative impf verbs (e.g., *byt*[ipf]

'be', *moc*[ipf] 'be able to', and *bát*[ipf] *se* 'be afraid'). A third type, exemplified in ex. (40), involves Rus *po-* delimitatives, which regularly occur to code activities in sequences of events, and under negation, which does not occur in Cz. It is noteworthy that in the latter cases, the theory offered here not only explains the facts of aspect usage under negation, but also sheds light on the particular facts of aspect in the lexicon in each language, a further argument in its favor over synoptic theories of Rus aspect.

5. Aspect and Negation in Contexts of Repetition

As such, the category of repetition may involve any of several types of context: repetition can be either explicitly stated or merely contextually implied, and it can involve multiple participants, multiple occurrences of a situation within a single episode (i.e., iterativity), multiple occurrences of a situation on different occasions (i.e., habitual repetition), or some combination of these elements. Negative repetition further complicates the issue, as it never involves the assertion of such events actually happening, but rather the non-occurrence of situations. Thus, in some sense the negation of repeated events would seem to automatically defocus the actuality of any individual token of such events beyond that ordinarily conditioned by the contextual element of repetition. Consider, for example, Langacker's (1997) account of (positive) habitual repetition: on the basis of specific observed instances, a speaker generalizes such events as a part of the structural plane of his/her world view, i.e., how the world is structured. Turning to negation, if a speaker makes the same kind of inference based on the non-occurrence of some event, then it

seems intuitively true that such a negative element of one's (abstracted) structural knowledge of the world can only have some maximally indefinite status. At the same time, however, following Langacker's account, a generalization of negative habituality emerges on the basis of specific non-occurrences of the event, and thus the negation of that event in the structural plane is based on observed concrete (albeit non-occurring) situations, in a manner completely parallel to affirmative habitual statements.

Negative habitual repetition can thus be conceptualized in two ways: 1) as a "higher-order process comprising multiple [non-]instances of the same event type" (with an emphasis on the type of situation, rather than the token instantiations), or 2) in terms of a single representative instance of the [non]-occurrence of the situation in question (with an emphasis on the token) (Langacker 1997: 210, 215). In the first construal, in which habitual repetition is presented as a continuous state of the non-occurrence of a situation,[14] both Cz and Rus employ the impf aspect: both quantitative temporal indefiniteness (Cz) and qualitative temporal indefiniteness (Rus) are tailor made to profile the multiplicity of similar potential instantiations.[15] In the second construal, i.e., conceptualization in terms of a single representative instance, aspectual selection is not such a straightforward issue. Depending on the aspectual properties of the subevent serving as the representative instance, it may be coded either impf or pf. In this section, we show that the conceptualization of various types of negative repetition is conditioned in part by language-specific

tendencies inherent to the semantics of aspect in each language, and in part by the needs of a particular discourse.

Past studies (cf., e.g., Bondarko 1971: 214–217, Eckert 1985, Kresin 2000, Stunová 1986 and Petruxina 2000) have found that in contexts of positive repetition Rus is more likely to employ the first construal (repetition as continuity), while Cz tends to favor the second (singularization of a representative instance).[16] This difference in profiling leads to differences in both verbal and nominal sentence components: as observed by Kresin (2000), Rus has a strong tendency to favor a combination of impf aspect and pluralizing quantifiers, while Cz favors the pf aspect and singularizing (particularizing) quantifiers:

(41) a. **Každý** sem **přijede**^{pf} s něčí vizitkou.   (Cz; Karel Čapek, *R.U.R*)

‘Each person comes here with a visiting card.’

b. **Vse priezžajut**^{ipf} sjuda s č′ej-nibud′ vizitnoj kartočkoj.   (Rus; = 41a)

‘Everyone comes here with someone’s visiting card.’

In negative contexts, too, our corpus shows that Rus has a tendency to profile the higher-order process, favoring the impf aspect, while Cz often emphasizes the level of a single representative instance. Consider example (42).

(42) a. „Máš hlad, viď?“

Potřásla hlavou, až jí vlasy zatančily po ramenou.

Nikdy **se** mu ke svému hladu **nepřiznala**^{pf}.

„Lžeš! Já vím že máš.“   (Cz; RTJ: 78)

b. — Progolodalas′, da?

Ona otricatel′no motala golovoj, volosy poprygivali po plečam.

Ona nikogda **ne priznavalas′**[ipf] v ètom.

— Nepravda! Ja znaju, čto ty golodnaja.   (Rus; RDžT: 66)

'"You're hungry, aren't you?"

She shook her head so vehemently that her hair seemed to dance on

her shoulders.

She never admitted her hunger to him.

"You're lying! I know you're hungry."'

The impf aspect in Rus reflects construal of the multiple instances as a higher-order process, in which no qualitative change takes place: the girl continually, unchangingly denies her hunger. Although on each individual occasion the denial is complete (total), the pf aspect cannot be used in Rus, since there is no situational specification anchoring the reference to a uniquely locatable point in time. In Zel′dovič's terms, the situation P of the girl's denial does not occupy a single temporal interval which could be contrasted with some other situation P' within the episode. Lacking temporal definiteness, this context excludes the possibility of the pf in Rus.

Cz, however, selects aspect on the basis of a representative instance, with the pf form reflecting the inherent sense of totality of the achievement verb *přiznávat*[ipf] *se/přiznat se* 'confess, admit'. Although the adverb *nikdy* 'never' emphasizes that there were many occasions when the girl might have admitted to being hungry, Cz profiles the totality of her denial on any given

occasion when it might have been expected, i.e., in terms of a representative instance, rather than the higher-order set. In this example, the same information is encoded in both languages, but the relative prominence of the individual instantiation (token; representative instance) and the set (type, higher-order process) differs in the linguistic construal dictated by the aspectual semantics of each language.

While Cz tends to favor the pf aspect in examples of this type with achievement and accomplishment predicates, the impf does occur in somewhat similar contexts. Though substitution of the impf in example (43a) is unacceptable to native speakers, (43b) is completely acceptable.

(43) a. $^{??}$Nikdy **se** mu ke svému hladu **nepřiznávala**^{ipf}. (Cz)

'She would never admit her hunger to him.'

b. Nikdy se k ničemu **nepříznávala**^{ipf}. (Cz)

'She never admitted to anything.'

Example (43b) is viewed as a characterization of the girl: a continuously applicable predication, with a sense of quantitative temporal indefiniteness. Note that negative polarity has no influence on aspectual selection: a positively stated characterization would also be encoded with the impf aspect.

Similarly, in (44) the verb *prinosit*^{ipf}/*prinesti*^{pf} 'bring' is an inherently telic verb, with a sense of totality at the level of the individual representative instance. However, the sense of a continuously applicable characterization, unbound in time, overrides in both languages.

(44) a. Vozvrativšis′ s zavoda, Saša uvidel v dyročkax počtovogo jaščika

sinij konvert. Pis′mo ot otca, ego počerk. Nikogda èti pis′ma **ne**

prinosili[ipf] radosti.   (Rus; DA: 50)

 b. Když se vrátil domů, viděl Saša dírkami v poštovní schránce

prosvítat něco modrého. Dopis od otce, jeho písmo na obálce. Ty

dopisy nikdy **nepřinášely**[ipf] nic radostného.   (Cz; DAu: 63)

'Returning home from the factory, Saša noticed through the holes of

the mailbox a blue envelope. A letter from his father, it was his

handwriting. These letters never brought any happiness.'

The immediately continuing text briefly mentions the contents of the specific

letter, but in the broader discourse the focus is instead on Saša's family

relations and the absence of joy in his relationship with his father. The

mention of the letter appears primarily as part of this temporally extended,

unbound characterization, and consequently, native speakers of both Russian

and Czech favor the impf here. Note that a corresponding affirmative

statement (Rus *Èti pis'ma vsegda **prinosili**[ipf] radost'*/Cz *Ty dopisy vždy

přinášely[ipf] radost* 'Those letters always brought happiness') would similarly

emphasize a sense of background continuity, and therefore also condition the

use of the impf aspect in both languages. Negation does not affect aspect

usage in either language.

 Focusing on Rus, Timberlake (1982: 315–317) observes that in contexts

of repetition, the impf is generally favored when the macroevent is "open,"

with a broad temporal frame that includes numerous repetitions ("high

cardinality"). This applies in the previous example, in which relationships within Saša's family are characterized against a unbound temporal frame. In contrast, the pf becomes more acceptable when the macroevent is closed, with a limited number of subevents that "occur in a delimited temporal interval and form a collective unit" (315), which in fact resembles a r e p e t i t i v e (i.e., repetition of actual events in a single episode) in terms of Langacker (1997). In (45), for example, the telephone is broken and repaired three times during the course of one evening, a narrow temporal interval.

(45) Tri raza za odin večer **ubil**^{pf} svoj telefon, i tri raza ego **vosstanovil**^{pf} s

pomošč′ju bekapa.   (Rus; Internet)

'Three times in one night he broke his telephone line, and three times

he got it working again with the help of "backup".'

This view of a repeated action as a unitary and distinct event, occurring in a tightly bound temporal interval relative to other predications (*P′,* here, *vosstanovil*^{pf}) provides the necessary sense of temporal definiteness for the Rus pf.

In contrast, (46) emphasizes the cardinality of the murders, which were separated in time by the repeated convictions and incarcerations.

(46) Pomnju čital ob ubijce v SŠA, kak on tri!!! raza **vyxodil**^{ipf} iz tjur′my i

ubival^{ipf} snova.   (Rus; Internet)

'I remember reading about a murderer in the USA, how he escaped

three times from prison and each time murdered again.'

The pf aspect is not possible in (46), as it would semantically contradict the focus on the (relatively) high cardinality of the murders.

Under negation, the same basic parameters apply. In (47a), the reference is temporally unbound: the security guard didn't shoot as required three times in an unspecified period of time. Given this open temporal interval, the impf is obligatory. In contrast, examples (47b) and (47c) are temporally bound by the phrases *za odin den'* 'in one day' and *za odin god* 'in one year'.

(47) a. On tri raza **ne streljal**[ipf], kogda sledovalo, poètomu ego uvolili. (Rus)

'He didn't shoot when he was supposed to three times, and

therefore they fired him.'

b. On za odin den′ tri raza **ne vystrelil**[pf], kogda sledovalo, poètomu

ego uvolili. (Rus)

'In the course of a single day he didn't shoot when he was supposed

to three times, and therefore they fired him.'

c. On za god tri raza **ne vystrelil**[pf], kogda sledovalo, poètomu ego

uvolili. (Rus)

'Within a year he didn't shoot when he was supposed to three times,

and therefore they fired him.'

As (47b) and (47c) show, the actual duration of the temporal frame can be irrelevant to aspect choice: what is important here is the existence of a temporal boundary, which enables the event of 'not shooting' to be placed in a temporally definite sequence.

Note that examples such as (47b) and (47c) are at variance with Galton's (1984: 27) view that it is irrelevant how many times an event does not occur ("It would make no sense to ask how many times Jane did not swim a length last week"). In a discourse-based account the "failure of an event to occur" (in Galton's terms) can indeed display some very event-like properties (primarily serving as the motivation for further events in a causal chain). De Swart and Molendijk (1999) offer a solution to this problem, by stipulating that such situations can be "coerced" into a presentation as events where they are relevant at specific junctures of a narrative. We will return to this issue in Section 6.

Returning to our comparative corpus, in (48), two attempts at opening a car door are made; they occur in a uniquely defined, closed interval of time, forming a distinct unit. Interestingly, Rus allows both pf and impf, while Cz admits only the pf.

(48)   a.   Oni ostanovilis′ u Delovogo kluba. Jura ne znal, kak otkryt′ dver′

mašiny, povernul odnu ručku, druguju, dver′ **ne otkryvalas′**[ipf].

Togda Lena, peregnuvšis′ čerez nego, nažala nužnuju ručku i,

mjagko ulybajas′, skazala,

— V ètoj mašine očen′ neudobnye ručki.   (Rus; DA: 30)

   b.   Zastavili se před Obchodním klubem. Jura nevěděl, jak se otvírají

dvířka, otočil jednu kliku, pak druhou, ale dveře **se neotevřely**[pf].

Lena se přes něj natáhla, stiskla správnou kliku a jemně se usmála:

„Tenhle vůz má hrozně nešikovné kliky."   (Cz; DAu: 38)

'They stopped at the Business Club. Yuri didn't know how to open

the car door, he turned one handle, and another, the door didn't

open. Then Lena, leaning past him, pressed on the necessary handle,

and with a slight smile, said:

"The handles are pretty troublesome on this car."'

In ex. (48a) the pf aspect obligatorily occurs in Cz, reflecting the sense of

totality at the level of each subevent. Given the high telicity of the

accomplishment verb *otevřít*[pf] 'open' and the limited number of repetitions

within a closed temporal interval, the impf aspect is not possible in Cz. In the

Rus original, however, the author manipulates aspectual expectations:

expressing the same situation of limited repetition, he opts for the impf aspect

instead. This slows down the narrative, creating a sense of an extended

temporal interval simultaneous to Yuri's two separate attempts to open the

door. In this manner, the author emphasizes the span of time during which

Yuri failed to do the expected (and seemingly simple) action, characterizing

him as awkward and unfamiliar with basic aspects of privileged life. Although

the pf aspect is also possible here, it would present a different view of the

action, summing up Yuri's combined attempts with the two handles as a

single event situation (*P*). Sandwiched between two other pf verbs *povernul*

'turned' and *nažala* 'pressed', his failure would then be presented in quick

succession as part of a sequence of temporally limited events.

As (48b) shows, in contexts of repetition, as in single events, the choice

of aspect can influence whether the negated action is viewed sequentially or

simultaneously. This flexibility in the use of aspect is particularly noteworthy in Rus, with its strong linkage of the pf aspect with the discourse function of sequencing. Note that the sense of simultaneity of the door repeatedly not opening correlates with a lack of causation of the desired result; the failure for an action to cause its intended consequence is a strong impediment to the coding of the subsequent situation as pf in Rus. The Cz equivalent does not allow for aspectual manipulation of this type.

The sense of a closed macroevent can be emphasized by the adverbial phrase *ni razu* 'not once', which tends to condition the pf in Russian. In (49) the author emphasizes the fact that the situation in question did not take place at a n y   m o m e n t   w i t h i n   t h e   b o u n d a r i e s   o f   a c o n v e r s a t i o n   i n   w h i c h   i t   w a s   e x p e c t e d .

(49) a.   Mark Aleksandrovič zašel i k Budjaginu. Iz-za nego Budjagin

popal v dvusmyslennoe položenie — xlopotal za čeloveka, kotoryj

teper′ arestovan.

Budjagin byl mračen, n i   r a z u   **ne upomjanul**[pf] o s″ezde,

rešal dela budnično, kak obyčno. Možet byt′, obižen, čto ne vybran

na s″ezd? No on delegat s soveščatel′nym golosom tak že, kak i

mnogie drugie členy CK i CKK, nikakoj v ètom obidy net, takov

davnij porjadok. Vozmožno, dlja nego s″ezd ne prazdnik, a ešče

bolee tjaželaja, xlopotlivaja rabota? I vse že...Čuvstvovalas′

segodnja v nem osobennaja ugrjumost′, sosredotočennost′,

neprivetlivost′.

— Vy znaete o moem plemjannike? – sprosil Mark

Aleksandrovič.   (Rus; DA: 89–90)

b.   Rjazanov zašel k Buďaginovi. Kvůli němu se Buďagin octl v

trapné situaci, když se přimlouval za člověka, který teď sedí za

mřížemi.

Buďagin byl ve špatné náladě, a n i   j e d n o u **se nezmínil**[pf] o

sjezdu, vyřizoval úřední záležitosti jako v kterýkoli jiný všední den.

Cítí se asi ukřivděn, že ho nepozvali za sjezd. Ale Buďagin je

delegát s poradním hlasem jako mnoho jiných členů ústředního

výboru a ústřední kontrolní komise, není v tom nic ponižujícího, tak

to platí odedávna. A přece… Rjazanov dnes vycítil zvláštní

zasmušilost, odmítavost, nevlídnost.

„Víte, co se stalo mému synovci?" zeptal se.   (Cz; DAu: 111)

'Mark Aleksandrovič also stopped in to see Budjagin. Budjagin

had gotten into a dubious situation on his account—he was making

efforts on behalf of someone who had been arrested.

Budjagin was gloomy, he didn't mention the congress even

once, he dealt with matters in a quotidian fashion, as usual. Perhaps

he was offended that he had not been chosen for the congress? But

he was an advisorial delegate like many other members of the CK

and the CKK, this was nothing to get offended at, that was the way

things had been done for a long time. Perhaps the congress wasn't a

vacation for him, but an even more difficult, busy job? But

72

nevertheless… One could sense in him today a special moroseness, concentration, ungraciousness.

"Do you know about my nephew?" asked Mark Aleksandrovič.'

While Budjagin's failure to mention the congress continues throughout the conversation, the phrase *ni razu* 'not once' emphatically focuses attention on a single moment of its potential, though unrealized instantiation. While existing only in the realm of the potential, the sense of temporal definiteness created by the phrase *ni razu* sanctions the use of the pf aspect in Rus. Furthermore, in the larger scope of the narrative, Budjagin's reticence serves as a causal trigger for the next action: Mark Aleksandrovič asks Budjagin about his nephew Saša, thinking this might be the cause of Budjagin's reticence toward him. The sequence of foreground events is thus as follows:

(50) 1. Mark Aleksandrovič c a m e   i n to see Budjagin too.

2. Budjagin was gloomy, and d i d   n o t   m e n t i o n the congress o n c e .

3. "Do you know about my nephew?" a s k e d Mark Aleksandrovič.

Although background material intervenes, the three pf verbs form a clear sequence of events that carry the narrative forward. It is worth pointing out that in terms of Zelʹdovič (2002) each event is eligible to serve as *P′* for the previous event, i.e., each event is unique within the context of the episode relative to at least one other event therein. This means, in our terms, that the condition of temporal definiteness is satisfied. In Cz, of course, the underlying

telicity of the achievement verb *zmínit se* 'mention' sanctions the pf regardless of temporal considerations.

As a final example, consider (51), with multiple participants:

(51) a. Prázdnota ji obklíčila. Nahmatala ji, kamkoli vztáhla rukou. Pravda, většina lidí z městečka a okolí se chovala dobře; dávali jim potají, ale zřetelně najevo, že s tím vším nesouhlasí, že je považují za své. Zvláště ti nejchudší pacienti **nezapomněli**[pf] na svého „pana doktora!", i když jeho bělostná ordinace zela prázdnotou. Vždy se našlo dost přátelských slov i ochotných rukou pomoci, ale to divné, nepochopitelné vzduchoprázdno nebylo možno zabydlet jen účastí.

(Cz; RJT: 86)

b. Èster okružila pustota. Ona oščuščala ee vezde, kuda ni protjagivala ruku. Pravda, bol′šinstvo žitelej gorodka i ego okrestnostej deržalis′ po otnošeniju k nim druželjubno, tajkom, no vyrazitel′no davaja ponjat′, čto oni ne soglasny so vsem proisxodjaščim, čto sčitajut ix svoimi. Osobenno pacienty pobednej, te **ne zabyvali**[ipf] svoego «pana doktora», xotja ego belosnežnyj kabinet nikto teper′ ne poseščal. Vsegda naxodilos′ družeskoe slovo i dobraja ruka pomošči. No ètu strannuju, neponjatnuju pustotu nel′zja bylo zapolnit′ odnim liš′ učastiem.   [Rus; RDžT: 73]

'Emptiness surrounded her. She felt it everywhere, wherever she put her hand. True, the majority of the people from the town and the environs conducted themselves well; they secretly let them know

> that they agreed with none of it, that they considered them their
> own. In particular, the poorer patients did not forget their doctor,
> even though his snow-white office was empty. Enough kind words
> and helping hands could always be found, but that strange,
> incomprehensible emptiness could not be filled with empathy
> alone.'

In the Cz original, the pf totalizes the situation, summing up its relevance to the continuing discourse: not having forgotten the doctor and their special relationship to him (indicated by the words *svůj* 'one's own' and the title *pan*, a sign of respect), the residents of the city continued to act toward his family in a certain way. The negative telicity of "not forgetting" is presented as a condition, or "prerequisite" (Hopper 1979), for the elaboration given in the following sentence. While the impf would be possible on the level of the individual proposition, on the broader discourse level this sense of connectedness, or contingency, emphasizes the feature of totality associated with 'not forgetting', favoring the use of the pf.

The Rus translator chose the impf, since the statement applies as a description of the doctor's ongoing relationship with the residents of the city: they continued not to forget him, as reflected in their behavior toward his family. In a slightly different reading, a summative sense would also be possible, sanctioning the pf: they 'had not forgotten' him relative to the moment currently relevant in the discourse. Despite the fact that the action of 'not forgetting' took place over an extended period of time and applied to

multiple, distinct actors, the situation described in current discourse anchors the reference temporally, providing the necessary P' for the use of the pf.

As this section shows, in contexts of negated repetition, as in positive repetition, Russian strongly favors a construal that is based on the higher-order level of the macrocontext of repetition, which necessarily involves both a span of time during which the individual repetitions take place, and a sense of continuity of qualitatively like situations. This inherent sense of temporal indefiniteness tends to condition the impf regardless of features of the subevent. However, when the macroevent involves a clearly delimited number of subevents that occur within a narrowly defined temporal interval, a totalizing, delimiting view of the action may be taken, particularly if a causal connection is clearly established in the overall narrative structure, as in (47b–c). The strong causal link to an immediately following event establishes a sense of temporal definiteness that is critical to the use of the pf in Rus.

Cz tends to favor a construal based on an individual representative instance, Thus, regardless of features of the macroevent, a sense of totality at the level of the microevent favors the pf. Quantification at the higher-order level does not necessarily affect Cz aspectual preferences, as it does not annul a sense of totality at the level of the individual subevent. At the same time, however, Cz does not automatically exclude the possibility of a broader aspectual focus in characterizations and descriptions, where the focus is on a sense of continuity over an extended duration of time (quantitative temporal indefiniteness). In such cases, the impf aspect can be used even with highly

telic predicates, such as 'bring' (cf. ex. 47). Thus, while the pf tends to be favored when the underlying subevent involves realized telicity, the choice of aspect may be determined by considerations of the particular discourse. It should be stressed that in both languages, aspect under negation tends to display direct parallels to aspect usage in positive contexts: negation, though it may appear to reinforce the sense of non-actuality already inherent in contexts of repetition, generally does not appear to have a significant effect on aspectual coding.

The discourse-based flexibility in aspect in the two languages indicates that the distinction of subevent vs. macroevent may not provide the most effective basis for explaining aspectual usage. Instead, we find more compelling the claim that the construal of repetition that each language tends to favor is influenced by systemically grounded features of totality, temporal definiteness and (both types of) temporal indefiniteness, which operate in ways that are specific to each language. Cz, most sensitive to the feature of totality, tends to encode this feature whenever possible, unless specific discourse factors condition otherwise. For Rus, the feature of totality is insufficient: in our examples, unless a causal link within a repeated situation type specifically establishes a temporal anchoring, the overarching sense of qualitative temporal indefiniteness prevails. Thus, prior explanations of the distinctions between Cz and Rus aspect under repetition based on levels of analysis (subevent vs. macroevent) can be effectively superceded by a more

systemically based explanation based on the semantics of aspect as differentiated for each language.

6. Aspect, Negation and Grounding

This section addresses the three-way relationship between aspect (impf vs. pf), negation (affirmative vs. negative) and grounding (foreground vs. background). First, we characterize the correlation between aspect and grounding; then we discuss an innovative approach to the status of negated statements with regard to grounding on the basis of Rus data; finally, we discuss differences between Rus and Cz in this regard.

6.1. Aspect and Grounding

As was mentioned in section 1, the literature on grounding notes a strong cross-linguistic correlation between the pf aspect categories and the narrative function of foregrounding: the dynamic, essential plot-line events, those which form the "actual story line", are said to be encoded most felicitously by the pf aspect (cf. Hopper 1979). Most typically, the foreground is comprised of sequenced events in temporal and causal succession, as Timberlake (2004: 400) observes for Rus: "Narrative presumes a dynamic by which events follow each other in sequence. Each event starts from the prior situation and proceeds to a new result, which in turn becomes the starting point for the next subsequent event. Narrative, then, involves both temporal succession and modal causality."

Narrative sequencing, with its inherent sense of both totality and temporal definiteness, is in our view a prototypical function of the pf in Rus

and a very important one in Cz: a sequenced event encoded with the pf aspect
is viewed as a complete unit (totality), and in a direct syntagmatic relation to
preceding and subsequent events (temporal definiteness). Further, as
Timberlake implies, narrative necessarily involves the causes of the changes
of state in the world that the narrator deems relevant to the protagonist; in this
respect a narrative may be said to form a c a u s a l   n e t w o r k in the sense
of Croft (1990). Change of state is a critical element of the foreground of a
narrative inasmuch as the latter notion refers to the indispensable core events
comprising a narrative: w h a t   h a p p e n s in a narrative is the set of
causally induced changes of state that the protagonist(s) undergo. The
following example, narrating a part of Saša Pankratov's arrest in *Children of
the Arbat*, is typical in this respect:

(52) a. Zvonok, otčetlivo prozvenevšij v koridore, srazu **razbudil**$^{pf}_{(i)}$
ego. […] V trusax i majke Saša **vyšel**$^{pf}_{(ii)}$ v koridor, **snjal**$^{pf}_{(iii)}$
cepočku.

— Kto?

— Iz domoupravlenija.

Saša **uznal**$^{pf}_{(iv)}$ golos dvornika Vasilija Petroviča i **povernul**$^{pf}_{(v)}$
ključ.

V dverjax stojal Vasilij Petrovič, za nim neznakomyj molodoj
čelovek s malinovymi petlicami. **Otstraniv**$^{pf}_{(vi)}$ snačala Vasilija
Petroviča, potom Sašu, molodoj čelovek **vošel**$^{pf}_{(viia)}$ v kvartiru, odin

krasnoarmeec **ostalsja**^{pf}(viib) u dverej, drugoj vsled za Vasiliem

Petrovičem **prošel**^{pf}(viic) na kuxnju i **stal**^{pf}(viii) u černogo xoda.

— Pankratov?

— Da.

— Aleksandr Pavlovič?

—Da.

Ne svodja s Saši nastorožennogo vzgljada, molodoj čelovek

protjanul^{pf}(ix) emu order na obysk i arest graždanina Pankratova

Aleksandra Pavloviča, proživajuščego po Arbatu…   (Rus; DA: 77–78)

b.   Zvonek, který ostře zazněl v předšíni, ho rázem **probudil**^{pf}(i).

[…] V trenýrkách a v tričku **vyšel**^{pf}(ii) do předsíně, **sundal**^{pf}(iii) ze

dveří řetěz.

„Kdo je to?“

„Z domovní správy.“

Saša **poznal**^{pf}(iv) hlas domovníka a **otočil**^{pf}(v) klíčem.

Ve dveřích stál domovník Vasilij Petrovič, a za ním neznámý

mladý muž v kabátě a čepici a dva vojáci v pláštích s malinově

červenými výložkami. Civilista **odstrčil**^{pf}(vi) napřed domovníka,

potom Sašu a **vstoupil**^{pf}(viia) do bytu, jeden voják **zůstal**^{pf}(viib) u

dveří, druhý **vešel**^{pf}(viic) v patách za domovníkem do kuchyně a

postavil^{pf}(viii) **se** k zadnímu vchodu.

„Vz jste Pankratov?“

„Ano.“

„Alexandr Pavlovič?“

„Ano.“

Civil nespouštěl ze Saši pohled. **Podal**$^{pf}_{(ix)}$ mu příkaz k

domovní prohlídce a zatykač na občana Pankratova Alexandra

Pavloviče, bytem na Arbatu…   (Cz; DAu: 97)

'The bell, having sounded crisply in the vestibule, immediately

woke$_{(i)}$ him. […] He went out$_{(ii)}$ into the vestibule in his underpants

and t-shirt and removed$_{(iii)}$ the door chain.

"Who's there?"

"The building management."

Saša recognized$_{(iv)}$ the voice of the custodian Vasilii Petrovič

and turned$_{(v)}$ the key.

Vasilii Petrovič was standing in the doorway, and behind him

were an unknown young man in a coat and hat and two Red Army

soldiers in overcoats with crimson collar tabs. Having first

pushed$_{(vi)}$ Vasilii Petrovič out of the way, and then Saša, the young

man entered$_{(viia)}$ the apartment; one Red Army soldier remained$_{(viib)}$

at the door, and the other [went in] after Vasilii Petrovič went

over$_{(viic)}$ to the kitchen and positioned himself$_{(viii)}$ by the rear

entrance.

"Pankratov?"

"Yes."

"Alexander Pavlovič?"

"Yes."

Without taking his guarded gaze from Saša, the young man

held out$_{(ix)}$ to him a warrant for the search and arrest of citizen

Alexander Pavlovič Pankratov, residing in the Arbat…'

In (52), the pf foreground events, indicated by numbered subscripts, are in a clear sequence and also stand in clear cause-effect relationships. The causal relationships, which tend to receive a lesser degree of attention in discussions of foregrounding, deserve comment. Starting from the beginning of (52), the noise of the bell wakes (i) Saša, which causes him to go out (ii) into the vestibule, which in turn puts him in a position to remove the chain (iii) and ask who is there (the latter action rendered without a narrative *verbum dicendi*); during the verbal exchange Saša recognizes (iv) a trusted voice, which leads him to turn the key (v), which metonymically expresses the opening of the door; the opening of the door in turn motivates the young man to push Vasilii Petrovič out of the way (vi) and allows him and the officials to enter (vii*a*) and set up security (vii*b-c*, viii) for the encounter; the establishment of security allows the civilian official to proceed through the arrest script, the next step of which is to present the arrest warrant (ix). The bundle of events numbered (vii), i.e., (vii*a–c*), involves no internal sequencing; the actions of the three officials are not mutually ordered among themselves, but nevertheless are in a c l e a r s e q u e n c e with the preceding events (v–vi) and subsequent event (viii). In both Rus and Cz the pf aspect profiles the sequentially and causally linked events of the foreground,

establishing an expectation of further events, which are also encoded with the pf aspect. Note that this set of events directly leads to Saša's detention, the circumstances and consequences of which comprise the major theme of the novel.

An equally strong correlation exists between the impf aspect and background events, which serve to "amplify or comment on the events of the main narrative" (Hopper 1979: 213–214). The use of the impf aspect creates a sense of continuity, supporting a view that the statement's validity is unchanging and extended in time, not bound to any specific point in the local narrative. Moreover, such situations are rarely involved in clearly causal relations with other events. Accordingly, the impf aspect is typically used in descriptions, characterizations, elaborations of various foregrounded events, and other types of information that support the main narrative line but are not directly part of it. The following example is representative; it describes the posture of Saša's mother when the officials enter to arrest him:

(53) a. Mama **sidela**[ipf] na krovati, sgorbivšis′, **priderživaja**[ipf] na grudi

    beluju nočnuju soročku, sedye volosy **padali**[ipf] na lob, na glaza, i

    ona iskosa, ostanovivšimsja vzgljadom **smotrela**[ipf] na

    upolnomečennogo, vošedšego vsled za Sašej.   (Rus; DA: 78)

  b. Maminka **seděla**[ipf] shrbeně na posteli, bílou noční košili **se**

    přidržovala[ipf] na prsou, šedé vlasy jí **padaly**[ipf] do čela, do očí,

    utkvělým pohledem ze strany **zírala**[ipf] na mladíka, který vešel hned

    za Sašou.   (Cz; DAu: 98)

'Mother sat on her bed, hunched over, clutching her white nightgown on her breast, her gray hair fell onto her brow and eyes; she was looking askance at the official who had entered behind Saša.'

The predicates comprising the description in (53) are background because they are neither in a clear sequence with other events, nor are they causally related to each other or the events of the arrest in any way. As Galton (1976: 51) observes, the impf aspect "lifts an event out of the temporal succession of preceding and following happenings and concentrates on the state it describes"; here her bodily position, the state of her hair, and her observation of the scene are unchanging events not related in any crucial way to each other (despite occurring in the same sentence) or to the arrest itself. Put in more concrete narrative terms, Saša's mother is at this point simply a bystander present at the main events of this narrative episode. In both Rus and Cz, the impf aspect clearly predominates in the presentation of background material.

It must be pointed out that (52), with pf marking, is a prototypical example of the combination of sequencing and causality in narrative foreground, and (53), with impf marking, is a prototypical example of a static narrative background. These correlations are strong tendencies rather than absolute rules in both Rus and Cz. The structure of all but the simplest, shortest narratives is to a considerable extent a function of the narrator's (often creative) construal of the events involved—in a fashion not unlike aspectual usage in general—and accordingly we may only speak in terms of

tendencies, or prototypical cases, or in Chvany's (1985) terms an "idealized norm". Chvany discusses certain exceptions in Rus, such as backgrounded pf predicates with perfect meaning. The correlation between backgrounding and the impf aspect does seem to be somewhat stronger than the correlation between foregrounding and the pf aspect in Rus. In addition, as we will see in section 6.3, the foreground-pf/background-impf correlation is more prominent in Rus than in Cz.[17]

6.2. Negation and Grounding

Negation presents a special challenge to theories of grounding, particularly with regard to foregrounding: How can the non-occurrence of an event provide the sense of temporal and causal succession that is essential to foregrounding? Past literature on negation has generally treated negation as creating a sense of stativity (Galton 1976: 51, Leinonen 1982: 207, Thelin 1990: 68, Timberlake 1985: 45). Timberlake (1985: 45) observes that negation and iteration are "operators that, in effect, create new predicates that are specifically stative," while Leinonen (1982: 258) states that "negation is pragmatically connected with stativity." This sense of stativity would appear to contradict the requirement that each foregrounded event provide a new, qualitatively different point of departure for subsequent events.

In her analysis of aspect and foregrounding in Russian, Chvany (1985) presents a scale of grounding based on features of a saliency hierarchy (developed on the basis of Hopper's and Thompson's 1980 transitivity scale) including individuation features of the participants (e.g., referential,

anthropocentric), iconic features of the clause (e.g., main clause, transitive), gestalt principles of predicates (e.g., event type), and two features "tentatively related to causality" (i.e., affirmative/negative and realis/irrealis; Chvany 1985: 255). However, she does not consider negated predicates in great detail. In her analysis of grounding in the Rus story "Three Bears", she marks the pf predicate *ne našla* 'didn't find' as foreground; she likewise marks the pf *ne ponjal* 'didn't understand' in Chekhov's story "Sleepy" as foreground, without further commentary. However, elsewhere in her analysis she indicates that she considers negated pf predicates to be relatively low on the foregrounding scale, due to the apparent low saliency and transitivity of such predicates (Chvany 1985: 263). Her evaluation of negated predicates as low in saliency and transitivity basically follows Hopper and Thompson's (1980) judgments. In their view, affirmative/negative comprises a transitivity distinction on a par with other distinctions such as two or more participants/one participant, action/non-action, telic/atelic, etc., of which the high-transitivity values are correlated with foregrounding. They comment on affirmative/negative the least, suggesting only that "asserted" events are higher on the transitivity scale than negated events, which are "digression[s] into a possible but non-real world."

In our view, however, the matter is not so easily closed. Let us consider transitivity first. Though an affirmative predicate apparently refers to some actual energy transfer to an individualized object (in the prototypical case) in contrast to a negative predicate, it is in our view erroneous to speak of negated

predicates as clearly less transitive than their affirmative counterparts.
Language reflects the cognitive construal of reality, and not reality itself , and
the formal evidence is that a negated transitive predicate is just as
syntactically transitive as its affirmative counterpart. Though it may be
objected that the Rus genitive of negation evidences a lower level of
transitivity in negated predicates, this objection need not distract one from
maintaining that in Rus (and Slavic) n e g a t e d   p r e d i c a t e s   w i t h
a c c u s a t i v e   o b j e c t s are not syntactically any less transitive than
their affirmative counterparts. Moreover, the correlation between affirmative
verbs and accusative objects on the one hand and negated verbs and genitive
objects on the other is currently on the decline in Rus (cf. Timberlake 2004:
323–324) and practically non-existent in Cz. Perhaps most importantly,
according to statistics given by Hopper and Thompson (1980) the correlation
between foreground and affirmation, and background and negation
(respectively) is much lower than the correlations between foreground and
other high transitivity phenomena (e.g., two participants, telic predicates, etc.),
and background and other low transitivity phenomena (e.g., one participant,
atelic predicates, etc.). For instance, in Hopper's and Thompson's (1980) data
sample, 76% of the foreground clauses had two participants compared to only
18% of background clauses (a relative difference of 54%), and 88% of
foreground clauses had telic predicates compared to only 27% of background
clauses (a relative difference of 61%). In contrast, 100% of foreground clauses
were affirmative, not significantly higher than the figure for background

clauses: 92% of background clauses in their corpus are also affirmative

(yielding a relative difference of only 8%). In fact, the 8% relative difference

between foreground and background clauses with regard to affirmation is the

lowest percentagewise difference between foreground and background clauses

for any of the transitivity features that Hopper and Thompson consider. This is

a considerable piece of evidence against the assumption that

affirmation/negation is a canonical parameter of transitivity (particularly

inasmuch as transitivity is involved with the foreground/background

distinction).

It is even more difficult to claim that negative predicates are low on the

saliency scale. On the contrary, recent treatments of negation and grounding

make claims that run directly counter to this assumption. Leinfellner-

Rupertsberger (1991) argues that negation contributes significantly to text

coherence and also produces "foregrounding effects" (she understands

"foregrounding" as a semantic or semantic-pragmatic emphasis—distinct

from the narrow definition employed here, but nevertheless relevant for issues

such as salience). It would take us too far afield to discuss adequately much of

her analysis here, but some general points may be taken from a few

representative examples. She observes that in the following examples, the

added elliptical negated clauses are not redundant repetitions of the ideas

contained in the initial clauses, but instead reinforce them and give the

utterances a considerable increase in rhetorical force:

(54)   Die Armen verlieren ihr Dach über dem Kopf, nicht die Reichen!

'It's the poor that are losing the roofs over their heads, not the rich!'

(Leinfellner-Rupertsberger 1991:133)

(55) Dieser Mann hieß Piepsam, Lobegott Piepsam, und nicht anders.

'The man's name was Piepsam, Lobegott Piepsam, and nothing else.'

(Leinfellner-Rupertsberger 1991:133)

It might be added here that in such cases the negated clauses have specific information value: saying that the poor are losing the roofs over their heads does not necessarily mean that the rich are not also losing theirs, and saying that the man's name was Lobegott Piepsam does not necessarily exclude middle names or nicknames.

Leinfeller-Rupertsberger also argues that the semantically underspecified nature of negated utterances creates an expectation of something to come, and in this way negation crucially provides texts with coherence. This is shown in the following example.

(56) Derart rückversichert, benötigte Apis nur noch geeignete Attentäter […]. Es dürften keine serbischen Staatsbürger sein […].

Apis mußte seinen "Tyrannenmörder" nicht lange suchen. In Belgrad hatte inzwischen die Nachricht vom bevorstehenden Besuch Franz Ferdinands unter bosnischen Emigranten Empörung hervorgerufen.

'With such assurances, all that Apis still needed were suitable assassins […]. They could not be Serbian citizens […].

Apis did not have to look long for his "tyrannicide". In Belgrade the

news of Franz Ferdinand's upcoming visit had in the meantime

provoked dismay among Bosnian émigrés.'

(Leinfellner-Rupertsberger 1991:135–136)

The remark that the assassins could not be Serbian citizens not only provides

that information, but also creates an expectation that information on the

identity of the future assassin will follow (i.e., Bosnian émigrés). According to

Leinfellner-Rupertsberger, the subsequent information fills the informational

gap created by the semantic underspecification in the negated clause (and

thereby indicates the scope of the negation). Note that the text would be

incoherent if it ended with the statement that the assassin could not be a

Serbian citizen. Leinfellner-Rupertsberger also observes that it is the element

of expectation introduced by negation that is responsible for the frequent use

of negation in article headers in the German press, exemplified in (57).

(57) Nicht auf Gewißheit warten

'No waiting on certainty'   (Leinfellner-Rupertsberger 1991: 113)

A similar point regarding the importance of negated clauses for text

coherence and narrative structure in particular is made by De Swart and

Molendijk (1999). They observe that negated clauses are often indispensable

from a narrative standpoint, as in (58):

(58) John invited all his friends. They didn't show up. John decided to go

out into the street and bring in all the homeless from the neighborhood.

(De Swart and Molendijk 1999: 7)

De Swart and Molendijk point out that if the negated clause *They didn't show up* is omitted, the narrative loses its coherence, as it is the failure of the friends to show up that compels John to go outside and gather the homeless. This causal indispensability clearly indicates the foreground status of the clause *They didn't show up.* Accordingly, it seems unwarranted to dispute the foreground status of negated clauses in principle. As this example shows, the failure of an event to take place can just as easily entail consequences as the occurrence of an event. Thus, it is unnecessary in our view to interpret negated events as "digression[s] into a possible but non-real world," as do Hopper and Thompson (1980: 287). Rather, negated events are in fact real world descriptions with a negative polarity (at least where Slavic aspect is concerned); note that this view is compatible with Zelʹdovič's (2002) suggestion that negation combines with pf verbs to express unique situations on a par with other adverbials.

The view outlined above comports with some other important points in Leinfellner-Rupertsberger's (1991) analysis of negated phrases, which in turn allows a novel interpretation of negated pf verbs in Rus. In contrast to the traditional truth-semantic view of negation, Leinfellner-Rupertsberger (1991: 115–124) analyzes negation in terms of complementarity: negation does not change the truth value of a predication, but transforms the predication to its complementary value. Apart from cases of binary complementarity (e.g., *alive* vs. *dead*), the "complementary value" of an expression is a set of values, and thus the negation of an expression is underspecified. For example, *The wall is*

not red does not have a contradictory value in respect of *The wall is red*, but

rather contrary value, i.e., it ultimately in fact communicates *The wall has*

/color/. In this respect, Leinfellner-Rupertsberger considers (in non-binary

cases) the negation of an expression to be a categorical expression, i.e., an

expression concerning the category of the expression in the scope of negation:

The wall is not red is an expression about the category of color, i.e., that the

wall has some color other than red. The discourse-organizing force of negative

statements produces an expectation that some relevant information will be

given, i.e., information corresponding to the information under the scope of

negation. Thus, the *The wall is not red* by itself is not a complete discourse, in

contrast to *The wall is not red, but green*. Considering the categorial,

underspecified nature of negative statements (i.e., *The wall is not red*

signaling *The wall has /color/*), the last sentence in fact is more or less

equivalent to the following, which contains an increase in information: *The*

wall has /color/; it is green.

Let's apply this approach to clausal negation with pf verbs in Rus.

According to Leinfeller-Rupertsberger's approach, in (59), from the narrative

of the "Three bears" discussed by Chvany (1985), the negated clause

expresses the complementary value of *našla*[pf] 'found'.

(59) […] i stala iskat′ dorogu domoj, da **ne našla**[pf] […]   (Rus)

　　 '[…] and she started looking for the way home, but did not find it […]'

Thus, the negated clause not only tells that she didn't find the path home (contradiction) but also communicates the contrary information as paraphrased in (60):

(60) […] i stala iskat′ dorogu domoj, no /**čto-to slučilos**^{pf}/ […]   (Rus)

    '[…] and started looking for the way home, but /something happened/

    […]'

It may seem gratuitous at first blush to posit an underspecified complementary set of 'something happened other than finding the way', but the text behaves exactly as Leinfellner-Rupertsberger predicts: the next clause in the narrative fills in the blank of what did happen:

(61) […] a **prišla**^{pf} v lesu k domiku […]   (Rus)

    '[…] and came to a little house in the forest […]'

The clause *a prišla*^{pf} *k domiku* 'and came to a little house' provides the specific information lacking in the categorial, underspecified clause */čto-to slučilos*^{pf}/ 'something happened' (note that it is a perfect match for the scope of the negation, here: the clause). Notably, just as *The wall is not red* is not a complete discourse, it would be absurd to end the three bears with *da ne našla*^{pf} 'did not find [it]'—the next clause and subsequent narrative are essential. One might object that a property of background material is that it does not form a complete discourse; however, ordinary background material differs from such negated clauses in that it does not create an expectation that particular kinds of information will immediately follow.

This approach has two great advantages: First, it allows us to explain the slightly lower foreground value of negated pf clauses, without grasping at a dubious transitivity correlation, as the effect of the categorial *underspecificity* of negated clauses: */čto-to slučilos^{pf}/* '/something happened/' is not a canonical foreground event (but it should be pointed out that it is not background either, as mentioned in the previous paragraph). We can explain such negated pf clauses as a kind of underspecified "pro-foreground event" requiring specification. Second, it allows us to make sense of the fact that while in Rus negated pf events seem very much in temporal sequence with preceding events (i.e., *da ne našla^{pf}* 'did not find' clearly occurs after *stala^{pf} iskat'* 'began to look for'), there is no strict sequentiality between the negated *da ne našla^{pf}* 'did not find' (i.e., */čto-to slučilos^{pf}/* '/something happened/') and *a prišla^{pf} k domiku* 'and she came to a house', because according to the hypothesis given above these two clauses in fact express the same event, only coding it differently. The micro-simultaneity of */čto-to slučilos^{pf}/* '/something happened/' and *a prišla^{pf} k domiku* 'and she came to a house' is not a real exception to the restriction of the pf to narrative sequencing, as these clauses are in fact two different descriptions of t h e s a m e e v e n t ; likewise, they do not violate the restriction of the pf to the expression of unique situations in a context, because the different descriptions each refer to the event uniquely, cf. the discussion of Zelʹdovič's (2002: 27) approach in section 4.4.

To conclude, the facts presented in this section indicate that negation does not necessarily correlate with background in Rus pf clauses. Rather,

negated pf clauses can function as essential, plot-advancing foreground clauses. Rus negated pf clauses are often, however, informationally underspecified, expressing only that some expected event did not occur and creating an expectation that information as to what did occur will be given; such information typically follows. It is the underspecificity of Rus negated pf clauses that distinguishes them from canonical foreground clauses and results in their slightly lower degree of foregrounding. However, such negated pf clauses do maintain narrative coherence by introducing the event that did happen. Thus, it appears that just as negation does not necessarily alter aspectual coding in Rus, it also does not necessarily significantly affect narrative structure, either. While not canonical foreground events, negated pf predicates can, nevertheless, be essential parts of the foreground of a narrative.

6.3. Aspect, Negation and Grounding in Russian and Czech

Having established that negation does not necessarily lead to backgrounding, we now examine some examples from our corpus that exhibit various types of grounding patterns in Rus and Cz. In many cases, negation has little or no effect on grounding properties. In contexts of narrative sequencing, for example, a negated predicate may function in direct parallel to a corresponding positive statement, serving, without subsequent specification, to move the narrative forward both temporally and causally. Not surprisingly, both Rus and Cz encode such predicates as pf. Consider example (62).

(62)　a.　S grubovatoj famil′jarnost′ju starogo tovarišča Jurij pritjanul ee k

　　　　sebe. Ona **ne otstranilas′**[pf].

　　　　— Rebjata prišli?　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Rus; DA: 24)

　　b.　S obhroublou familiárností starého kamaráda ji k sobě přivinul.

　　　　Lena ho **neodstrčila**[pf].

　　　　„Už jsou tu kluci?"　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Cz; DAu: 31)

　　　　'Jurij drew her to himself with the rude familiarity of an old

　　　　associate. She did not push away.

　　　　"Are the guys here?"'

In this example, the pf predicate *ne otstranilas′* 'did not push away' directly

follows Yuri's (also pf) action *pritjanul ee k sebe* 'drew her to himself', and,

furthermore, motivates the following event in the immediate narrative: having

just arrived, Yuri's response to the girl's choosing not to push him away is to

confirm that they were alone. Had she responded differently, with the

affirmative predicate *otstranilas′*[pf] *ot nego,* for example, his response would

clearly have been different. The girl's compliance serves as a direct causal

trigger to the following actions, no less than the corresponding positive

statement would. Thus, despite its negative polarity, the predicate is a fully

specified, integral part of the foregrounded discourse.

　　　　Likewise, in characterizations and other narrative functions involving an

extended temporal span, negation influences neither aspect nor grounding.

The following characterization, cited previously as example (44), is typical:

(63) a. Vozvrativšis′ s zavoda, Saša uvidel v dyročkax počtovogo jaščika

sinij konvert. Pis′mo ot otca, ego počerk. Nikogda èti pis′ma **ne**

prinosili[ipf] radosti.   (Rus; DA: 50)

    b. Když se vrátil domů, viděl Saša dírkami v poštovní schránce

prosvítat něco modrého. Dopis od otce, jeho písmo na obálce. Ty

dopisy nikdy **nepřinášely**[ipf] nic radostného.   (Cz; DAu: 63)

‘Returning home from the factory, Saša noticed through the holes of

the mailbox a blue envelope. A letter from his father, it was his

handwriting. These letters never brought any happiness.’

The information in the negated statement characterizes Saša's

relationship with his father. Anchored in the current discourse by the letter

just received, it provides background information that is essential to

understanding Saša's subsequent actions: it supports the foregrounded actions

of the narrative, but itself presents a static situation that is unbound in time.

Despite the strong tendency in Cz to present inherently telic actions with pf

verbs, both languages freely use the impf aspect with accomplishment and

achievement verbs in this canonical background function.

These examples show that the prototypical correspondences of the pf

aspect with foregrounding, and the impf with backgrounding, may apply not

only in affirmative contexts, but also under negation, in both Rus and Cz. In

these examples, the negated statements are directly parallel to corresponding

affirmative statements in both aspect and grounding. In other cases, negation

affects the underlying temporal contour of the predicate, and, correspondingly,

both aspect and grounding: while a corresponding positive action could be isolated and pinpointed in time, serving as a foregrounded trigger for an immediately following action, the negated statement applies over an unchanging duration of time. Consider example (64):

(64) a. Sašu nikuda **ne vyzyvali**[ipf], **ne doprašivali**[ipf], **ne pred″javljali**[ipf]

obvinenija. On znal, čto obvinenie dolžno byt′ pred″javleno čerez

opredelennyj srok. No, kakov ètot srok, ne znal i uznat′ ne mog.

Inogda emu kazalos′, čto pro nego zabyli…   (Rus; DA: 95)

b. Nikam ho **nevolali**[ipf], **nevyslýchali**[ipf] ho, **nevznášeli**[ipf] proti němu

obvinění. Věděl, že žaloba musí být podána v určité lhůtě. Ale jak

dlouhá je to lhůta, nevěděl a neměl možnost to zjistit. Někdy se mu

zdálo, že na něj zapomněli…   (Cz; DAu: 118)

'Saša wasn't summoned anywhere, he wasn't interrogated, he

wasn't charged. He knew that charges weres supposed to be

presented within a certain amount of time. But what this period was,

he didn't know, and he couldn't find out. Sometimes it seemed to

him that they had forgotten about him.'

In this example, impf predicates create a sense of an extension over time, a background against which the character Saša reflects on his situation. A corresponding affirmative statement would condition the use of the pf aspect: a prisoner's summons, interrogation and indictment would necessarily take place at definable points in time, and have a causal effect on further events. Negation itself does not lead directly to a shift in aspect; rather, it creates a

sense of stativity, changing the basic temporal parameters of the situation,

which in turn influence aspectual selection.

In the previous example, the negated context triggers a shift in aspect in

both Rus and Cz. In many other cases, however, negation involves a shift

from pf to impf in Rus only. As noted previously, Cz freely employs the pf

aspect to indicate a sense of subevent-level totality in various types of

characterizations, in both affirmative and negative statements. Ex (65),

repeated from section 4.3, is typical.

(65) a. V te vremena, kogda emu **ne podavali**[ipf] otdelʹnogo vagona i

dobiralsja on do Moskvy v tepluške, v tambure, na kryše vagona, v

šineli s meškom za plečami, emu i v golovu **ne prixodilo**[ipf]

opasatʹsja čego-to.   (Rus; DA: 85)

b. V dobách, kdy mu **nepřidělovali**[ipf] zvláštní vagón a kdy jezdil do

Moskvy v hytláku, na plošině nebo na střeše, v plášti a s batohem na

zádech, nikdy ho **nenapadlo**[pf], aby se něčeho bál. (Cz; DAu: 106–107)

'In those times, when they did not give him a separate car and he

made it to Moscow in a heated goods van, on a flatcar, or on the

roof of a boxcar, in his overcoat with a bag over his shoulder, it did

not occur to him to fear anything.'

This example characterizes a prominent politician's former mindset. While

Rus requires the impf for both of the highlighted verbs, Cz selects the aspect

of the second, an achievement verb, on the basis of its totality. The pf aspect is

used under negation, just as it would in the corresponding affirmative

statement *vždycky ho napadlo*[pf] 'it always occurred to him'. At the same time,
this information, while presented with the pf aspect, contributes nothing to the
main narrative line: it holds relevance to the narrative only as background
material. The frequency of examples of this type in our corpus indicates a
much weaker correlation between aspect and grounding in Cz than in Rus.

    Although sequencing and causality across predicates are closely
associated with the pf in Rus, speakers can manipulate aspectual expectations
in various ways. Recall ex. (48), from section 5, repeated here as (66).

(66) a. Oni ostanovilis′ u Delovogo kluba. Jura ne znal, kak otkryt′ dver′

        mašiny, povernul odnu ručku, druguju, dver′ **ne otkryvalas**′[ipf].

        Togda Lena, peregnuvšis′ čerez nego, nažala nužnuju ručku i,

        mjagko ulybajas′, skazala,

            — V ètoj mašine očen′ neudobnye ručki.   (Rus; DA:30)

    b. Zastavili se před Obchodním klubem. Jura nevěděl, jak se otvírají

        dvířka, otočil jednu kliku, pak druhou, ale **dveře se neotevřely**[pf].

        Lena se přes něj natáhla, stiskla správnou kliku a jemně se usmála:

        „Tenhle vůz má hrozně nešikovné kliky.“   (Cz; DAu: 38)

        'They stopped at the Business Club. Jura didn't know how to open

        the car door, he turned one handle, and another, the door didn't

        open. Then Lena, leaning past him, pressed on the necessary handle,

        and with a slight smile, said:

        "The handles are pretty troublesome on this car."'

While Cz requires the pf here, Rus allows for a choice of aspect. Although Yuri's inability to open the door directly triggers Lena's subsequent action, and can thus be viewed as a narrative-forwarding event, the author chose instead to create a momentary sense of stativity, focusing on Yuri's incompetence. The statement thus simultaneously moves the narrative forward by virtue of its foregrounding content, and slows it down, presenting a focus on characterizing, background information through the use of the impf aspect.[18]

These examples and the analyses of negation offered by Leinfellner-Rupertsberger (1991) and De Swart and Molendijk (1999) suggest that grounding is best viewed as a matter of degree. The feature of positive polarity is canonically associated with a higher degree of foregrounding than is negative polarity; however, negation does not automatically impart a sense of backgrounding, nor, as example (62) shows, does it necessarily even diminish the sense of foregrounding. Rather, a negative construal may influence temporal features such as dynamicity vs. stativity, and the perception and relevance of causality within a given context. These features are closely associated with temporal definiteness vs. indefiniteness, the defining feature of aspect in Rus, and grounding is thus closely interrelated with, though not absolutely bound, to aspect in Rus. In contrast, since Cz aspect is most sensitive to the (primarily) predicate level feature of totality, it is less closely associated with grounding functions, and allows for greater

deviation from prototypical patterns of grounding, in both positive and negative contexts.

7. A Brief Cross-Slavic Excursus

As pointed out in section 1, the choice of Rus and Cz for a comparative study of aspect and negation was not accidental, but was motivated by the findings of Dickey's (2000) east-west aspect theory: Rus and Cz consistently pattern as exponents of the eastern and western groups, respectively. Recall that the east-west aspect theory divides Slavic into an eastern group (Rus, Uk, Blr, Blg), a western group (Cz, Slk, Sln) and two transitional zones, B/C/S (which consistently patterns closer to the western group) and Pol (which for the parameters examined by Dickey 2000 tends to pattern closer to the eastern group). According to this theory, the meaning of the pf in the west is totality, whereas in the east it is temporal definiteness. If this is true, then we should expect the other languages of the eastern and western groups to exhibit the same tendencies in aspect usage in contexts of negation as Rus and Cz (respectively). Likewise, we should perhaps expect Pol to pattern closer to Rus and B/C/S closer to Cz.

A full investigation of the other six languages mentioned would be an enormous undertaking, not in the least because of the effort involved in procuring parallel texts. However, some preliminary observations may be made based on limited data from translations of Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* and Kundera's *Valčík na rozloučenou* (*Farewell*

Waltz). The east-west aspect division can be seen very easily in the following examples, where an event is presented as never having occurred:

(67) a. Garri nikogda prežde **ne zamečal**[ipf], kak krasiva derevnja Xogsmid.

(Rus; GPOF: 336)

b. Dosi j Garri **ne pomičav**[ipf], jake preharne selo cej Hogsmid.

(Ukr; HPOF: 330)

c. Nikoga dosega Xari **ne beše zabeljazval**[ipf] kakvo prekrasno selo e Xogsmijd. (Blg; XPOF: 349)

d. Harry nikada do sada **nije primijetio**[pf] koliko je lijepo selo Hogsmeade. (B/C/S)

e. Harry še nikoli doslej **ni opazil**[pf], kako lepa je vas Hogsmeade. (Sln)

f. Harry si do té doby nikdy **neuvědomil**[pf], jak jsou Prasinky nadherná vesnice. (Cz; HPFŘ: 326)

g. Harry nigdy przedtem nie **zauważył**[pf] jak piekną jest wioska Hogsmeade.[19] (Pol)

'Harry had never before appreciated [noticed] just how beautiful the village of Hogsmeade was.' (HPOPh: 349[20])

The original English uses the verb 'appreciated', which is difficult for Slavic languages to render exactly, and thus all the Slavic translations except the Srb[21] opt for 'notice', which is an achievement predicate; a Croatian equivalent with this verb has been substituted. In accordance with the east-west aspect theory, Rus, Ukr and Blg prefer the impf in this context of temporal indefiniteness, whereas B/C/S, Sln and Cz allow the pf on the basis

of the predicate-level feature of totality; note that in this particular case, Pol

patterns with the western group (see below).

Consider also the examples in (68), which are typical representatives of

the case analyzed in section 4.3, where an achievement situation fails to take

place over a specified interval of time. In the published translations, Cz, Sln

and B/C/S code the predicate pf, while Rus, Ukr, Blg and Pol have the impf.

(68) a.   Růžena namítla, že **se** jí trumpetista dva měsíce vůbec **neohlásil**^{pf}, a

        že se jí tedy nezdá, že by na ni příliš vypomínal.   (Cz; VNR: 49)

  b.   Ružena mu je ugovarjala, da **se** ji dva meseca sploh **ni oglasil**^{pf} in

        da se ji torej ne zdi, da bi pretirano obujal spomine na njo.

                                             (Sln; VZS: 50)

  c.   Ružena je primijetila da **se** dva mjeseca **nije javio**^{pf} i kako zbog

        toga nije baš uvjerena da je mnogo na nju mislio.   (B/C/S; OV: 50)

  d.   Ružena zametila, čto dva mesjaca trubač voobšče **ne daval**^{ipf} o sebe

        znat′, i poètomu prosto ne veritsja, čto on tak mnogo dumal o nej.

                                          (Rus; VNP: 67)

  e.   Ružena skazala, ščo trubač zovsim **ne zhološuvavsja**^{ipf} dva misjaci

        i tomu dlja neji vyhljadalo tak, ščo vin ne duže dumav pro neji.   (Ukr)

  f.   Ružena vâzrazi, če trompetistât dva meseca **ne ì se e obaždal**^{ipf} i

        zatova ne ì se vjarva mnogo-mnogo da e mislil za neja. (Bgl; VNR: 43)

  g.   Róża pozwoliła sobie na uwagę, że trębacz przez dwa miesiące

        wcale **się nie odzywał**^{ipf}, więc nie wydaje się jej, by wspominał ją

        nazbyt często.   (Pol; WP: 39)

'Růžena remarked that the trumpet player had not gotten in touch at
all for two months, and that it thus didn't seem to her that he was
thinking about her all that much.'

Here, as in the previous example, B/C/S patterns with the western group. Note
that in this case Pol patterns with the eastern group, unlike in (67), in which it
patterns with the western languages. Such vacillating patterning is why Pol
cannot be assigned to either group. Here we should point out that the impf Pol
translation *się nie odzywał*[ipf] 'did not make oneself heard/get in touch' is
according to Marek Łazinski (p.c.) conditioned by the adverbial *wcale nie* 'not
at all', which seems to negate possible repetition; he and Barbara Bacz note
that other adverbials (*ani razu* 'not once', *zupełnie* 'completely') would result
in a preference for the pf *się nie odezwał*[pf]. Our other Polish consultants
exhibit a similar preference for the pf when translating examples (28) and
(29), which also involve an explicit temporal interval, as shown, for example,
in (69):

(69) a. … lecz ten wysoki mężczyzna odwrócił się, zobaczył mnie i zrobił

się srogi, a potem **nie pokazał**[pf] **się** przez dwa dni. (Pol; = 28)

'[…] but the tall one turned around, saw me, gave me a dirty look

and then did not appear for two days […]'

b. Szukał zaczepki, **nie zadzwonił**[pf] do niej przez dwa tygodnie.

(Pol; = 29)

'He was looking for a fight, he had not called [her] for two weeks.'

One speaker accepted both aspects in ex. (69b), and Łazinski notes that his comment above about the aspectual effect of *wcale nie* vs. *ani razu* applies to these examples as well; nonetheless the overall patterning for these speakers seems to correlate more with Cz pf usage rather than Rus impf usage.[22] Likewise, in (70) we see another case in which Pol codes the negated predicate pf along with the western languages, as opposed to Rus, Ukr and Blg.

(70)　a.　Jakub ne byl vračom i nikogda **ne perestupal**[ipf] poroga

　　　　　ginekologičeskogo kabineta.　　　　　　　　　　(Rus; VNP: 92)

　　　b.　Jakub ne buv likarem i raniše nikoly **ne zaxodyv**[ipf] vseredynu

　　　　　ginekologičnoho kabinetu.　　　　　　　　　　　　(Ukr)

　　　c.　Jakub ne beše lekar i do tozi den **ne be stâpval**[ipf] v ginekologičen.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Blg; VNRd: 55)

　　　d.　Jakub nie był lekarzem i nigdy jeszcze **nie przekroczył**[pf] progu

　　　　　gabinetu ginekologicznego.　　　　　　　　　　(Pol; WP: 53)

　　　e.　Jakub nebyl doktor a do gynekologické ordinace dosud nikdy

　　　　　nevstoupil[pf].　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Cz; VNR: 67)

　　　f.　Jakub nije bio liječnik i još nikada **nije zakoračio**[pf] u ginekološku

　　　　　ordinaciju.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(B/C/S)

　　　g.　Jakob ni bil zdravnik in doslej **ni** še nikoli **stopil**[pf] v ginekološko

　　　　　ordinacijo.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Sln; VZS: 69)

　　　'Jakob was not a doctor and had never stepped into a gynecological

　　　office.'

Although in this example the adverb 'never' provides a clear context of temporal indefiniteness, the sense of totality inherently associated with the achievement verb *przekraczać*[ipf]/*przekroczyć*[pf] 'cross' conditions the use of the pf in Pol. Thus, it appears that for the parameter of negation Pol in fact patterns closer to the western languages, somewhat contrary to expectations. In this sense, the patterning of Pol for negation resembles its patterning for the derivation of aspectual pairs of verbal nouns, in which case it groups clearly with the western languages (cf. Dickey 2000).

Overall, however, the data adduced in this section indicate that negation is another aspectual parameter that divides the Slavic languages into two groups. In particular, they support the view that in the eastern languages Ukr and Blg, the category relevant for the pf appears to be temporal definiteness, as it is in Rus. In Cz and Sln, as well as B/C/S, the pf is a category based essentially on totality, and it interacts with negation accordingly.[23] Pol acts similarly to the western languages, though with some vacillation and a greater allowance of the impf, supporting its classification by Dickey (2000) as transitional in its aspectual patterning. Given the complexities of aspect usage with individual lexical items in the various languages, such conclusions may seem simplistic; however, what we are concerned with here is a broad typological picture, which, despite its apparent reductionism, does demonstrate a clear geographical isogloss of aspectual patterning. Though a fuller cross-Slavic investigation is certainly required, the available parallel data suggests that the differences between Cz and Rus aspect usage under

negation examined in sections 4–6 are not particular to those two languages, but characteristic of the east-west aspect division in general. To the extent that these differences are significant in the broader cross-Slavic context, aspect usage under negation should be added to the parameters examined by Dickey (2000) that both confirm the overall east-west aspect division in Slavic and also demonstrate the validity of semantic analysis offered in the east-west aspect theory for an general theory of Slavic aspect.[24]

8. Conclusions

This paper has presented a detailed comparative analysis of Rus and Cz aspect usage in contexts of sentential negation. Examples of the four possible aspectual correspondences (Rus impf : Cz impf, Rus pf : Cz pf, Rus impf : Cz pf, and Rus pf : Cz impf) have been examined in their narrative contexts with the aim of shedding light on the influence of negation on aspect usage. The choice of Rus and Cz for such a comparative analysis is not random, but based on the east-west aspect theory set up by Dickey (2000); we believe that a comparative analysis of aspect under negation allows a considerably more informed evaluation of some of the currently available theories of aspect in Slavic languages.

We have arrived at three main conclusions in the course of this investigation. First, in narrative discourse negation often does not affect aspect choice in either Rus or Cz.[25] For instance, the negation of stative predicates entails no change in the impf aspect from corresponding affirmative sentences (cf. section 4.1); likewise, the negation of an event that could only occur at a

specific point in a narrative (triggered by some immediately preceding event) keeps the pf aspect of the corresponding affirmative sentences (cf. section 4.2). A more complex case involves the negation of an event over a specific interval of time. Here, Rus does not allow the pf, unlike Cz (cf. section 4.3). This is due to the fact that negation in such cases generally precludes a view of the negated event as temporally definite. For example, a positive statement about making a phone call within a span of time involves (in narrative discourse) some more specific temporal anchor, the point at which the call is made, and its immediate consequences. Negation, however, eliminates this temporal anchor. At first glance it may seem that negation directly affects aspect usage in Rus: for example, the predicate *didn't call for two weeks* must be impf, whereas *called (once)* tends to be pf. However, the predicate *called for two weeks*, either as a habitual or (less likely) as a continuous call, is also impf. Thus, a more precise explanation is that in such cases a negative construal affects temporal parameters that in turn may influence aspectual selection. Finally, Rus has derived special pf procedural verbs to present atelic predicates in sequence, such predicates may occur as pf under negation, corresponding to affirmative usage; Cz codes such predicates impf under negation, reflecting their underlying atelicity, also in correspondence with affirmative contexts as well (cf. section 4.4).

This brings us to the second conclusion, which is that aspect usage under negation in Rus and Cz can be explained with the semantic categories established by Dickey (2000) on the basis of other aspectual differences

between the two languages. As in affirmative statements, aspect usage under negation in Rus can be motivated in terms of the opposition between the categories of t e m p o r a l   d e f i n i t e n e s s (pf) and q u a l i t a t i v e t e m p o r a l   i n d e f i n i t e n e s s (impf). In contrast, aspect in Cz involves an opposition between the categories of t o t a l i t y (pf) and q u a n t i t a t i v e   t e m p o r a l   i n d e f i n i t e n e s s (impf). In many contexts of sequenced events, temporal definiteness and totality coincide, and both languages code such negated events pf (cf. section 4.2); likewise, under the common combination of qualitative and quantitative temporal indefiniteness, both language encode the impf. (cf. section 4.1). As mentioned above, the differences between Rus and Cz aspect usage under negation arise from contexts in which a single event (a telic situation, e.g., *make a phone call*, *admit to something*), which is necessarily conceived as a totality, is negated not at a specific juncture in a narrative when it would have been expected to occur, but over some larger interval within which the non-occurrence of the event is not uniqely located (e.g., *didn't call for two weeks*, or *never admitted to her hunger*). These contexts involve qualitative temporal indefiniteness as the dominant temporal element of the context (section 4.3). In such cases, the event in question is conceived in its totality, thus conditioning the pf in Cz, but totality is not sufficient for the pf in Rus, and the uniqueness condition imposed by temporal definiteness is not satisfied, disallowing the Rus pf. A similar case of temporal indefiniteness coinciding with a sense of totality arises in contexts of negated repetition, which,

likewise, often show a contrast of Rus impf : Cz pf (section 5). In contrast, when the context involves an atelic situation that is temporally definite by virtue of its place in a sequence of events, Rus often uses some kind of pf verb correlating with an unprefixed Czech impf verb (section 4.4).

Our third conclusion is that the data refute the possibility of a simple equation between negation and backgrounding in Slavic, and suggest that a more nuanced, scalar view of grounding is necessary. They support the approach taken by Leinfellner-Rupertsberger (1991) and De Swart and Molendijk (1999), according to which negated events can be crucial elements of a narrative. While often informationally underspecified (see section 6.2), negated events contribute to the causal networks essential to textual coherence and narrative forwarding. In general, we find that foregrounding is a graded category, and may be decomposed into three distinct yet interrelated elements: totality, temporal definiteness (sequencing), and causality (cf. Timberlake 2004: 400). The prototypical foreground event will have all three features, with the pf encoded in both Rus and Cz. In our corpus, this most frequently involves negated events in action-reaction pairs, in which one telic event leads temporally and causally to the next. The prototypical background event, encoded with impf in both languages, is atelic, stative and lacks relevance to the causal networks of the discourse; in narrative, this most typically involves characterizations and descriptions. In intermediate cases, some, but not all, of the features are present; we propose to term such cases *mid-grounding*. For example, in a habitual or potentially repeated action, the overarching temporal

frame is indefinite, yet the feature of totality may be present at the level of an individual subevent. In such cases under negation, Cz typically encodes pf, and Rus impf. Likewise, Rus often chooses to present a sequenced atelic action as temporally definite, using various kinds of pf forms, while Cz encodes the impf due to the lack of inherent totality in the predicate. Not surprisingly, it is typically in such cases of mid-grounding that we find discrepancies in aspect usage between Rus and Cz.

Past claims regarding aspect and grounding in Slavic languages have been based primarily on Rus (Hopper 1979, Chvany 1985, Thelin 1990). Our data show that a view of grounding in Slavic based on a broader, cross-linguistic corpus provides a more accurate analysis, as grounding interacts variously with different aspectual features. In Rus and other "eastern" languages (according to the east-west aspect theory), aspect has a distinctly temporal basis. It is not surprising, thus, that narrative foregrounding, which involves direct syntagmatic relations between events, is more closely associated with the pf in Rus than it is in Cz, in which the pf aspect derives its meaning from a largely predicative sense of totality. Thus, in examples such as (17), with an achievement verb (Cz pf *nenapadlo* versus Rus impf *ne prixodilo v golovu*, both ʿdidn't occur [to him]'), Cz freely employs the pf even in contexts with a clearly characterizing, background function.

The data of a preliminary investigation across a fuller range of Slavic languages support the larger claim that the differences between Rus and Cz aspect usage under negation are characteristic of the east-west aspect division

in general. According to this investigation, a group of western Slavic languages (including Sln) follow the Cz pattern, whereas a group of eastern Slavic languages (including Ukr and Blg) follow the Rus pattern. The two transitional zones (according to Dickey 2000), B/C/S and Pol, tend to pattern with the western languages with regard to the parameter of negation (despite other features that associate Polish with the eastern languages). This evidence supports the theory of the east-west aspect division developed by Dickey (2000); moreover, it demonstrates the validity of a crosslinguistic methodology utilizing closely related languages not only for the analysis of typologically unusual phenomena such as Slavic aspect, but also for investigating more universal phenomena such as negation and grounding.

[1] By negation we mean clausal negation (e.g., *Ivan ne prišel* 'Ivan did not come') and not constituent negation (e.g., *Ne Ivan prišel, a Mitja* 'It wasn't

Ivan that came, but Mitja'). As constituent negation does not directly affect the aspectual coding of a predicate, it is irrelevant to this discussion.

[2] In the examples, the language of the original is presented first, followed by the translation into Czech or Russian.

[3] The descriptions here are Brecht's (1985: 10–11) concise formulations of the categories.

[4] The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

Rus Russian	Ukr Ukrainian	Blr Belarusian	Blg Bulgarian
Cz Czech	Slk Slovak	Sln Slovene	Pol Polish
B/C/S Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian	Srb Serbian		
pf perfective	impf imperfective		

In examples, the superscripts ^{ipf} and ^{pf} are used to mark imperfective and perfective verbs respectively.

[5] Klein (1995) objects to the concept of totality as the category of the Rus pf, and though as pointed out above we do not consider the meaning of the Rus pf to be totality either, Klein's argument must be addressed by a theory that claims totality to be the meaning of the pf in any Slavic language. Klein's objection is based on the fact that one can say *Včera Severin rabotala*^{ipf} *s dvux do pjati* 'Yesterday Severin worked from two to five', in which the impf is coextensive with a closed (total) interval of time. Klein suggests that his time-relational theory of aspect is superior, according to which in the previous example totality is irrelevant and what is crucial is that the impf signals that

the asserted time (from two to five) does not include the target state. For our part, we consider his reasoning flawed for the following reasons. First, our view of totality as a linguistic concept is based on the principles of cognitive grammar, according to which a figure that is perceived as a bounded region (totality) cannot entirely fill the base/viewing frame; in such cases the entity can only be perceived as ground (and indeed the function of Klein's example above would be a background utterance in real discourse), cf. Langacker's (1990: 65) treatment of viewing a red spot at a distance and up close. Such a cognitive grammar approach vitiates his objection that the occurrence of a temporal measure adverbial entails "totality" in examples such as the preceding with an impf verb; sentences with pf verbs imply a construal with a base that is greater than the interval of time profiled by the pf verb, which gives a totality approach as much explanatory power as Klein's time-relational theory. Second, Klein does not even consider the possible comparable pf example *Severin prorabotal*[pf] *s dvux do pjati* 'Severin worked from two to five' as well as the issue of what the asserted time would be in such a pf example with the very same time adverbial. In view of the above, we see no reason to discard the notion of totality, especially in a comparative study like the present paper.

[6] Note, however, that Cz (and the western languages in general) do employ the impf general-factual for accomplishment predicates:

(i) a. Nač jsi mi to **psal**[ipf]? (Cz; Bareš 1956: 573)

'Why did you write this to me?'

b. Ten obraz **maloval**[ipf] Repin. (Cz; Bareš 1956: 570)

'This painting was painted by Repin.'

However, if the totality of the action is emphasized in any way, Cz requires the pf aspect nevertheless, in contrast to Rus, which requires the impf:

(ii) a. **Přečetli**[pf] jste někdy nějakou scifi či fantasy knížku na jeden zátah?

(Cz; Internet)

'Have you ever read a science fiction or fantasy book in one go?'

b. Ty **pročityval**[ipf] ee [Bibliju] celikom kogda-nibud'? (Rus; Internet)

'Have you ever read it [the Bible] in its entirety?'

[7] It should be mentioned that according to this theory the processual use of impf verbs, e.g., Rus *Kogda ja vošel Ivan čital gazetu* 'When I went in Ivan was reading the newspaper', is also temporally indefinite in both language groups. Though in the above example some phases of the reading event are uniquely located, i.e., they occur simultaneous to the entering event, t h e e n t i r e   r e a d i n g   e v e n t   c a n n o t   b e   u n i q u e l y   l o c a t e d r e l a t i v e   t o   o t h e r   s t a t e s   o f   a f f a i r s . Native speakers confirm that in the example above the reading must have been occurring for at least one conceptual "point" in time before the entering, and that it is impossible to determine how long the reading continued after the entering except by deduction based on a kind of forensic examination of the entire narrative. Corresponding to the indeterminacy of the reading event is the fact that such usage qualifies as background by all accounts. In terms of quantitative temporal indefiniteness, the processual reading event occupies

more than one "point" in time, albeit in the context of the single episode: the moment before the entry, the moment of the entry, and possibly some unknown quantity of moments after the entry. As according to this view the reading event occupies more than one point in time, it is also necessarily a case of qualitative temporal indefiniteness, as it is not located at a single point in time.

[8] All translations of Forsyth's examples are his own.

[9] For more discussion of the productivity of delimitatives in Rus versus the lack thereof in Cz, see Dickey and Hutcheson (2003). Even in Russian, stative verbs have no canonical perfective partners to begin with (cf., e.g., Rus *ljubit*[ipf] 'love' and its prefixed form *poljubit*[pf], which has an inchoative meaning 'fall in love').

[10] Cf. in section 6.2 Leinfellner-Rupertsberger's (1991) view that negated clauses are underspecified, and indicate a lack of information that will be filled in the immediately following dicourse.

[11] Note that the impf *priglašali* (as well as its Cz equivalent *nabízeli*, apparently) does not imply repetition. Rather, the impf signals that the invitation was not accepted, cf. Israeli (2001), who explains such usage in terms of an unfulfilled pragmatic contract.

[12] Rus productively derives special pf verbs (delimitatives and perduratives) to express the occurrence of atelic situations over intervals of time, but these verbs have special properties and therefore are not relevant here.

---

[13] For a parallel discussion of similar concerns regarding contexts of Russ pf :

Czech impf, see 4.4, particularly the discussion surrounding the quote by

Křížková (1962).

[14] Various scholars have noted the interrelations of habituality and stativity.

For example, see Galton (1976: 161) on iterativity as a "continuing state",

Merrill (1985: 141) on "derived duration", Forsyth (170: 107), Kučera (1981:

183–184) on Cz iteratives as "quantified states", Timberlake (1985: 45); cf.

also Zelʹdovič (2002: 72–74) on the durative and repetitive meanings of Rus

postojanno 'constantly/continually',

[15] Thelin (1990: 50–54) suggests that iteration itself creates a sense of

temporal indefiniteness.

[16] In her extensive corpus of examples of habitually repeated events (primarily

affirmative), Stunová (1993) finds 13 instances of the pf past and 717

instances of the impf past in Rus. In contrast, parallel Cz texts yield a much

higher frequency of the pf: 292 instances of the pf past and 457 of the impf

past. The present tense, which is inherently more open-ended, allows the pf in

Rus more frequently than the past, but here too its occurrence is still far less

common than in Cz.

[17] Cf. Dickey's (2000) observation on the basis of affirmative aspect usage.

[18] See also Chvany (1990: 266) on "sequence-retarding" impf verbs and

idealized norms vs. stylistic effects.

[19] HPZF: 390 has a different translation employing the achievement verb

wydać[pf] *się* 'appear', which nevertheless evidences the same principles of

aspect usage: *Wioska Hogsmeade jeszcze nigdy nie **wydała**[pf] **się** Harry'emu tak cudnownym miejscem* 'The village of Hogsmeade had never appeared to Harry to be such a wonderful place',

[20] With the exception of bracketed material, the English versions of the examples from *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* are taken from Rowlings' original text.

[21] The Srb version uses a more literal translation: *Harry nikad pre nije toliko cenio…* 'Harry had never before so valued…' (HPRF: 361). As this is a stative predicate, it is ineligible to be coded pf, which is the reason that we obtained a B/C/S translation lexically parallel to the other Slavic versions.

[22] Bacz (p.c.) suggests that on the whole Dickey's (2000) characterization of Pol as transitional but closer to the eastern type is overstated, and that the patterning for negation demonstrated here is a case in point. In this regard we should point out that Dickey's characterization of Pol as pattering "closer to the eastern type" is necessarily somewhat reductivist, but is nevertheless accurate inasmuch as Pol is i n   a n y   c a s e closer to the eastern type for all of Dickey's (2000) parameters except verbal nouns than is B/C/S. The characterization is relative with regard to B/C/S. The case here is not much different in that the pf occurs freely with negation in B/C/S, whereas it seems that in many cases Pol is somewhat more limited in this regard, and the pf with negation is to some degree tied to *ani razu* 'not once' (which in fact approximates Rus usage to an extent).

---

[23] It is on the basis of other parameters discussed by Dickey (2000) that we consider B/C/S a transitional zone.

[24] Additional support for the theory at the level of the interface of case and aspect has recently been presented by Richardson (2007), who discusses the use of instrumental case marking in Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian in connection with eventualities that are bounded in time, namely depictive secondary predicate constructions (e.g., Rus *Ivan prišel domoj iz bol'nicy zdorovym* 'Ivan came home from the hospital healthy'), predicative participle constructions (e.g., *Ja videla Ivana prygajuščim čerez ručej* 'I saw Ivan jumping across the stream'), and copular constructions (e.g., Rus *Maksim byl vračom* 'Maksim was a doctor'). She finds that "an instrumental Case-marked predicate is bounded in time; it is a totality that can be qualitatively different from prior and/or subsequent eventualities" (227). In such constructions, the temporal boundedness, which Richardson links to temporal definiteness, influences case selection in all of the eastern Slavic languages that have retained a rich morphological case system (Blg and Mac, as they have almost no case, are not treated; see Richardson 2007 for a full discussion).

[25] We should note, however, that the situation may be different in conversational discourse.

References

Akimova, T. 1992. 'The Perfective Aspect and Negation in Russian', *Russian linguistics* 16, 23–51.

Barentsen, A. A. 1998. 'Priznak «sekventnaja svjaz′» i vidovoe protivopostavljenie v russkom jazyke', Čertkova, M. Ju. (ed.), *Tipologija vida: Problemy, poiski, rešenija,* Moscow, 43–58.

_____. 2002. 'O russkix glagolax *smoč′* i *sumet′′*', Ivanickij, V. V. (ed.), *Osnovnye problemy slavjanskoj aspektologii,* St. Petersburg, 7–29.

Bareš, K. 1956. 'Ke konkurenci vidů v českém a ruském jazyce', *Československá rusistika: Časopis pro slovanské jazyky, literaturu a dějiny SSSR* **1**(4), 566–579.

Bondarko, A. V. 1971. *Vid i vremja russkogo glagola,* Moscow.

Brecht, R. D. 1985. 'The Form and Function of Aspect in Russian', Flier, M. S. and R. D. Brecht (Eds.), *Issues in Russian Morphosyntax,* Columbus, 9–34.

Bulygina, T. V. 1982. 'K postroeniju tipologii predikatov v russkom jazyke', Seliverstova, O. N. (ed.), *Semantičeskie tipy predikatov,* Moscow, 7–85.

Chaput, P. R. 1985. 'On the Question of Aspectual Selection in Denials', Flier M. S. and A. Timberlake, (Eds.), *The Scope of Slavic Aspect,* Columbus, 224–233.

Chvany, C. 1985. 'Backgrounded Perfectives and Plot Line Imperfectives: Toward a Theory of Grounding in Text', Flier, M. S. and A. Timberlake (Eds.), *The Scope of Slavic Aspect,* Columbus, 247–273.

_____. 1990. 'Verbal Aspect, Discourse Saliency, and the So-Called "Perfect of Result" in Modern Russian.' Thelin, N. B. (ed.), *Verbal Aspect in Discourse,* Amsterdam, 213–235.

Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*, Cambridge.

Croft, W. 1990. 'Possible Verbs and the Structure of Events.' Tsohatzidis, S. L. (ed.), *Meanings and Prototypes. Studies in Linguistic Categorization*, London, 48–73.

De Swart, H. and A. Molendijk. 1999. 'Negation and the Temporal Structure of Discourse', *Journal of Semantics* **16**, 1–42.

Dickey, S. M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach,* Stanford.

Dickey, S. M. and J. Hutcheson. 2003. 'Delimitative Verbs in Russian, Czech and Slavic', Maguire, R. A. and A. Timberlake (Eds.), *American Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists,* Columbus, 23–36.

Dowty, D. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar,* Dordrecht.

Eckert, E. 1985. 'Aspect in Repetitive Contexts in Czech and Russian', Flier, M. S. and A. Timberlake (Eds.), *The Scope of Slavic Aspect,* Columbus, 169–180.

Forsyth, J. 1970. *A Grammar of Aspect,* Cambridge.

Galton, A. 1984. *A Logic of Aspect,* Oxford.

Galton, H. 1976. *The Main Functions of the Slavic Verbal Aspect,* Skopje.

Hopper, P. J. 1979. 'Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse', Givon, T. (ed.), *Discourse and Syntax* (= *Syntax and Semantics* 12), New York, 213–241.

_____. 1982. 'Aspect between Discourse and Grammar: An Introductory Essay for the Volume', P. J. Hopper (Ed.), *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantcs and Pragmatics* (pp. 3–18). Amsterdam.

Hopper, P. J. and S. A. Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse', *Language* 56(2), 251–299.

Israeli, A. 2001. 'The Choice of Aspect in Verbs of Communication: Pragmatic Contract', *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 9(1), 49–98.

Kenny, A. 1963. *Action, Emotion, and Will,* London.

Klein, W. 1995. 'A Time-relational Analysis of Russian Aspect', *Language* 71(4), 669–695.

Kresin, S. 2000. 'Aspect, Singularization, and Pluralization in Czech and Russian', *Slavic and East European Journal* 44(3), 393–412.

Křížková, H. 1963. 'K ingresívnosti v češtině', *Slovo a slovesnost* 24, 286–291.

Kučera, H. 1981. 'Aspect, Markedness and t_0', Tedeschi, P. and A. Zaenen (Eds.), *Tense and Aspect* (= *Syntax and Semantics* 14), New York, 177–189.

Langacker, R. W. 1990. *Concept, Image and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar,* Berlin.

_____. 1997. 'Generics and Habituals', Athanasiadou, A. and R. Dirven (Eds.), *On Conditionals Again,* Amsterdam, 191–222.

Leinfellner-Rupertsberger, E. 1991. 'Die Negation im monologischen Text: Textzusammenhang und "Foregrounding"', *Folia Linguistica* **25**(1–2): 111–140.

Leinonen, M. 1982. *Russian Aspect, "temporal'naja lokalizacija" and Definiteness/Indefiniteness,* Helsinki.

Mehlig, H. R. 1999. 'Kommunikativnaja funkcija obščego i častnogo otricanija', Greń, Z. and V. Koseska-Toszewa (Eds.) *Semantyka a konfrontacja językowa* **2**, Warsaw, 181–195.

Merrill, P. 1985. 'Aspect as Evaluation: The Case of Negation', Flier, M. S. and A. Timberlake (Eds.), *The Scope of Slavic Aspect,* Columbus, 129–152.

Petruxina, E. 2000. *Aspektual'nye kategorii glagola v russkom jazyke v sopostavlenii s češskim, slovackim, pol'skim i bolgarskim jazykami,* Moscow.

Rappaport, G. C. 1985. 'Aspect and Modality in Contexts of Negation', Flier, M. S. and A. Timberlake (Eds.), *The Scope of Slavic Aspect,* Columbus, 194–223.

Richardson, Kylie. 2007. *Case and Aspect in Slavic*, Oxford.

Ryle, G. 1949. *The Concept of Mind,* London.

Stunová, A. 1986. 'Aspect and Iteration in Czech: A Contrastive Study', Barentsen, A. A., B. M. Groen and R. Sprenger (Eds.), *Dutch studies in Russian linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* **8**), Amsterdam, 467–510.

_____. 1988. 'Aspect and Sequence of Events in Russian and Czech', Barentsen, A. A., B. M. Groen and R. Sprenger (Eds.) *Dutch Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists,* Amsterdam, 507–534.

_____. 1993. *A Contrastive Study of Russian and Czech Aspect: Invariance vs. Discourse,* Amsterdam.

Thelin, N. B. 1990. 'Verbal Aspect in Discourse: On the State of the Art.' Thelin, N. B. (ed.), *Verbal Aspect in Discourse,* Amsterdam, 3-88.

Timberlake, A. 1982. 'Invariance and the Syntax of Russian Aspect', Hopper, P. J. (ed.), *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics,* Amsterdam, 305–31.

_____. 1985. 'The Temporal Schemata of Russian Predicates', M. S. Flier and R. D. Brecht (Eds.), Issues in Russian Morphosyntax (UCLA Slavic Studies 10) (pp. 35–57), Columbus.

_____. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian,* Cambridge.

Vendler, Z. 1957. 'Verbs and times', *The Philosophical Review* **66**, 143–160.

Zelʹdovič, G. 2002. *Russkij vid: Semantika i pragmatika,* Toruń.

Sources

DA = Rybakov, Anatolij. 1988. *Deti Arbata,* Moscow.

DAu = Rybakov, Anatolij. 1989. *Děti Arbatu,* translated by V. Tafelová, Prague.

GPOF = Rowling, Joan K. 2005. *Garri Potter i orden feniksa,* translated by V. Babkova, V. Golyševa and L. Motyleva, Moscow.

HPFŘ = Rowling, Joan K. 2004. *Harry Potter a Felixův řád,* translated by P. Medek, Prague.

HPOF = Rowling, Joan K. 2005. *Harri Potter i orden feniksa*, translated by V. Morozov, Kiev.

HPOPh: Rowling, Joan K. 2003. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix,* New York.

HPRF = Rowling, Joan K. 2003. *Harry Potter i red feniksa,* translated by V. and D. Roganović, Belgrade.

HPZF = Rowling, Joan K. 2003. *Harry Potter i Zakon Feniksu,* translated by A. Polkowski, Poznań.

OP = Kundera, Milan. 2001. *Oproštajni valcer,* translated by N. Kršić. Zagreb.

RDžT = Otčenášek, Jan. 1960. *Romeo, Džul'etta i t'ma,* translated by V. Petrova, Moscow.

RJT = Otčenášek, Jan. 1967. *Romeo, Julie a tma,* Prague.

VNP = Kundera, Milan. 2001. *Val's na proščanie,* translated by N. Šul′gina. Saint Petersburg.

VNR = Kundera, Milan. 1997. *Valčík na rozloučenou,* Brno.

VNRd = Kundera, Milan. 1992. *Vals na razdjala,* translated by M. Lozkova, Varna.

VZS = Kundera, Milan. 1978. *Valček za slovo,* translated by Dušan Baran, Maribor.

WP = Kundera, Milan. 2001. *Walc pożegnalny,* translated by P. Godlewski, Warsaw.

XPOF = Rowling, Joan K. 2005. *Xari Potâr i ordenât na feniksa,* translated by E. L. Maslarova, Sofia.