

Studies in Language Companion Series (SLCS)

This series has been established as a companion series to the periodical *Studies in Language*.

Editors

Werner Abraham
University of Vienna

Elly van Gelderen
Arizona State University

Editorial Board

Bernard Comrie
Max Planck Institute, Leipzig
and University of California, Santa Barbara

William Croft
University of New Mexico

Östen Dahl
University of Stockholm

Gerrit J. Dimmendaal
University of Cologne

Ekkehard König
Free University of Berlin

Christian Lehmann
University of Erfurt

Brian MacWhinney
Carnegie-Mellon University

Marianne Mithun
University of California, Santa Barbara

Heiko Narrog
Tohoku University

Johanna L. Wood
University of Aarhus

New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion

Edited by

Victoria Hasko
University of Georgia

Renee Perelmutter
University of Kansas

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia

Volume 115

New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion
Edited by Victoria Hasko and Renee Perelmutter

- Hodgson, W. H. 1994. Golos v noči. In *Šedevry anglijskogo gotičeskogo rasskaza*, I. N. Vasiljeva, (ed.), 511–530. Slovo.
- Horn, L. R. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Išačenko, A. V. 2003. *Grammatičeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavljenii s slovačkim*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kultury.
- Jakobson, R. 1984. *Russian and Slavic Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Kagan, O. 2007a. On the semantics of verbs of motion in Russian. In *Proceedings of Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics 23 (IATL 23)*: 1–15.
- Kagan, O. 2007b. On the semantics of aspect and number. In *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Stony Brook Meeting*, A. Antonenko et al. (eds.), 185–198. Ann Arbor MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Klein, W. 1995. A time-relational analysis of Russian aspect. *Language* 71: 669–695.
- Krifka, M. 1992. Thematic relations as links between nominal reference and temporal constitution. In *Lexical Matters*, I. Sag & A. Szabolcsi (eds.), 29–53. Stanford CA: CSLI.
- Padučeva, E. V. 1996. *Semantičeskie issledovanja*. Moscow: Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury.
- Romanova, E. 2007. Constructing Perfectivity in Russian. PhD dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- Sauerland, U. 2003a. A new semantics for number. In *Proceedings of SALT 13*, R. Young & Y. Zhou (eds.), 258–75. Ithaca NY: CLC, Cornell University.
- Sauerland, U. 2003b. Implicated presuppositions. Paper presented at *Polarity, Scalar Phenomena, Implicatures*. University of Milan Bicocca.
- Smith, C. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Timberlake, A. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Zaliznyak, A. A. & Shmelev, A. D. 2000. *Vvedenie v russkuju aspektologiju*. Moscow: Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury.

Appendix 1. URLs of Internet examples, listed by example number

- (17) <http://vesti70.ru/stats/full/?id=10202>.
- (18) <http://www.hunter.ru/read.php?f=4&i=13400&t=13393&v=f>

Appendix 2. Abbreviations used in interlinear glosses

DET	determinate
GEN	genitive
INDET	indeterminate
INSTR	instrumental
IPFV	imperfective
PFV	perfective

CHAPTER 7

Verbs of motion under negation in Modern Russian

Renee Perelmutter
University of Kansas

This article examines the behavior of Russian motion verbs under negation. Negated motion constructions differ from affirmative motion constructions in two respects: (1) frequency of high manner verbs, as well as verbs that specify path through prefixation; (2) aspect marking. Using detailed statistical frequencies gathered from the web as well as analysis of specific constructions, I show that negated motion events are significantly less detailed in terms of the specification of manner and certain types of path. In addition, the common assumption that imperfective is predominant under negation is not supported by the data. Aspectual choice for motion verbs depends on spatial relations between the moving figure and an observer of motion at goal or origin of the motion trajectory.

1. Introduction

In this article, I show that lexicalization patterns of motion events in Modern Russian differ significantly depending on whether the motion events are negated or not. Modern Russian is classified as a satellite-framed and high-manner language by Talmy (1985, 2000) and Slobin (2004); verbs specifying path (in the prefix) and manner of motion (in the verb) are expected to appear frequently. Under negation, however, the frequency of high-manner and path-specifying verbs of motion (VoM) is significantly lower than in affirmative contexts.

Examples (1) and (2) demonstrate relative frequencies for a high-manner verb *kovyľjat* 'to waddle':

- (1) *Odnadždy teplym sirenevym utrom kovyľjal po doroge utenok*
once warm purple morning waddle.IPFV upon road duckling
Krjachik
Krjachik

'Once upon a time, on a warm purple morning, Krjachik the duckling waddled on the road.'

(M. Pljatskovskij. "Romashki v janvare")

(*kovylyjal* 'waddled': 56,500 hits in *google.com*)

- (2) *On ne kovylyjal po savanne, sognuvshis' kak ego predok* –
he NEG waddle.IPFV upon savannah bent like his ancestor
avstralopitek.

Australopithecus

'He did not waddle upon the savannah, bent like his ancestor the *Australopithecus*.'

(L. N. Erdakov. "Čelovek v biosfere")

(*ne kovylyjal* 'did not waddle': 50 hits in *google.com*)

Using frequency counts and data from a large untagged corpus (*google.com*), I ask and propose answers to the following questions: (a) what kind of motion verbs tend to appear under negation, and why? and (b) how does verbal aspect interact with lexicalization patterns under negation?

1.1 Corpus and statistical data

The data for this article was gathered using the open web accessed through *Google.com*, rather than a corpus of selected and edited texts, such as the Russian National Corpus (<http://ruscorpora.ru>). According to Meyer (2004), any artificially created and controlled corpus can provide only a "snapshot" of the speakers and writers of any particular language, even if the corpus is large and contains full texts rather than text excerpts. The Russian National Corpus (RNC) has a number of important disadvantages, which include:

1. Size: the sample of texts in RNC is significantly smaller than those available on the web, thus it does not represent the variety of usages that can be retrieved through the open web.
2. Uniformity: the selection of registers (mostly literary texts) available through the RNC limits the kind of results that will be obtained;
3. Control: since this corpus is carefully edited and balanced, new and non-standard usages will not be reflected in RNC.

The open web as a corpus has the following advantages over RNC or any other closed corpus:¹

1. Size: mining the web for data is advantageous since this is the largest dataset available for natural language processing (Keller & Lapata 2003).
2. Heterogeneity of registers: the open web retrieves a wide variety of registers, including literary texts, newspaper articles, analytical/scientific writing, as well as colloquial writing genres (on-line forums and weblog articles).
3. Lack of control: since the open web is not edited, new and evolving usages will be retrieved.

The open web searches also have a number of disadvantages, which have to be taken into account when analyzing the examples and compiling statistics, including the following:

1. Statistical noise: web counts contain more noise than counts obtained from a well-edited, carefully balanced corpus (Keller & Lapata 2003: 460) due to such factors as page repetitions and citations. The web contains replicated documents, such as mirror sites (one or more copies of a collection of pages) and multiple URLs referencing the same file. The computational linguists who view the web as content-centered suggest that for statistical purposes page duplicates should be excluded (Thelwall 2005: 521).
2. Statistical results are unstable: unlike data in a closed corpus, the amount and nature of texts retrieved by Google or other search engines varies greatly over time, both due to the dynamic nature of web content and to the fact that changes can be made to the index and the database of the search engine, and depending on which Google server is accessed (Keller & Lapata 2005: 5).

Statistical processing involving the open web presents unique challenges that did not confront scholars working with traditional methodologies. Taking into account the instability of the results retrieved and the possibility of noise, to what extent can we ever trust the numbers retrieved by statistical examination of the open web? Keller and Lapata (2003) give a partial answer when they show that the results generated by Altavista and Google are highly correlated with frequencies obtained from two standard closed and edited corpora for English.

Given the limitations offered by the different kinds of corpora, the importance of statistical study using the open web lies not in exact numbers themselves, but in relative frequencies, i.e. proportions of the results for different morphological realizations relative to each other. Simple statistics such as word counts, or simple frequency estimations, are useful for linguistic research by providing suggestive answers, even if the statistics are not entirely accurate (Thelwall 2005: 518; Meyer et al. 2003). Statistics are suggestive, for example, when an unexpected scarcity of

1. On web as corpus, see Thelwall (2005); Kilgariff and Grefenstette (2003).

a certain construction is observed under negation.² Some of those correlate with a certain verbal aspect.

Modern Russian verbs usually distinguish two aspects, perfective and imperfective. Perfective aspect involves a temporal boundary, most often an end-point/goal that is reached, thus *prochital* 'finished reading.PF'. On the other hand, the imperfective aspect does not involve such a boundary, thus *chital* 'read for a while, was engaged in reading.IPFV'. Verbs tend to be classified into aspectual pairs, perfective and imperfective; prefixed verbs of motion such as *prijti-pri-xodit* 'to arrive.PR.IPFV' follow this pattern (on the category of aspect in Russian, see overviews by Forsyth 1970; Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000; Timberlake 2004). However, simplex (unprefixed) motion verbs are deviant in that they are usually grouped not in pairs, but in groups of three: for example, the basic meaning 'to go' can be expressed by the perfective *pojti* 'to go.PF', determinate imperfective *idti* 'to go in a single direction.DET.IPFV', and indeterminate imperfective *xodit* 'to go in multiple directions. INDET.IPFV'.³ One example of statistical deviance correlating with aspect is determinate imperfective under negation. For example, the determinate imperfective *plyl* 'swam (towards a goal)' accounts for 38.8% of all basic swimming verb usages in affirmative clauses; however, under negation *ne plyl* 'did not swim (towards a goal)' accounts for only 2.8% percent. I use relative frequencies rather than exact numbers to discuss specific patterns of usage of VoM in affirmative and negative contexts for different aspects of both simplex and prefixed VoM.

The following verbs have been examined for statistical frequency (listed in order INDET.IPFV-DET.IPFV-PFV):⁴

- *xodit*-*idti*-*pojti* 'to go'
- *ezdit*-*exat*-*poexat* 'to go by vehicle'
- *begat*-*bežat*-*pobežat* 'to run'
- *plavat*-*plyt*-*poplyt* 'to swim' and prefixed verbs based on that stem
- *letat*-*letet*-*poletet* 'to fly' and prefixed verbs based on that stem

2. The term *construction* is used in this article following Construction Grammar (Fillmore and Kay 1993; Goldberg 1995), in which a construction is defined a basic linguistic unit of form and meaning, where the form may be as small as a morpheme or as large as a phrase, and the meaning may include syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic elements.

3. Although competing theories have been advanced, asserting that VoM are not deviant in the verbal system of Russian (see Janda, this volume).

4. High manner verbs were chosen from Dan Slobin's (2006) unpublished list of manner verbs in four languages *Verbs of Manner of Human Motion*. These verbs were chosen since they do not appear in idiomatic expressions which could skew the statistical count.

- *polzat*-*polzti*-*popolzti* 'to crawl' and prefixed verbs based on that stem
- non-basic manner verbs: *melkat* 'to flicker', *plestis* 'walk dragging one's feet', *kovylyjat* 'waddle'

The verbs examined range from basic motion verbs such as *xodit*-*idti*-*pojti* 'to go' to prefixed VoM *obpolzti-obpolzat* 'crawl around [something]'; and high-manner motion verbs such as *plestis* 'drag one's feet'. Verbs were sampled: for basic VoM, the determinate and the indeterminate imperfective and the perfective, for prefixed VoM, the perfective and the imperfective.

Data usage in this paper follows the Principles of Reuse and Enrichment of Linguistic Data as outlined in Lewis et al. (2006). While not all internet sources are attributed to specific authors, when available, author and title of work are cited immediately following an example. When neither the author nor the title are available (in case of some forum posts and short newspaper articles), the website name is cited. Full URLs of all examples gathered online are documented in Appendix 1.

2. Negative spaces are less detailed

Negation is said to be more complex than affirmation, since every negative expression involves the supposition of its affirmative counterpart (Clark 1974; Gazdar 1979; Horn 1989; Lambrecht 2000). However, this presupposed affirmative counterpart differs from a 'real' affirmative construction in that it involves a lesser degree of detail for both manner and path of motion. Table 1 shows statistics for affirmative and negated motion verbs from basic ('go') to higher manner specifying verbs ('waddle').⁵

As Table 1 shows, the amounts and relative frequencies of negated VoM decrease the more manner-specific a verb is. Negation is less frequent with high-manner verbs of motion; basic manner verbs are more likely to appear under negation than manner-specific verbs.

The picture is less clear for path-specifying verbs. Table 2 shows the statistical distribution for verbs specifying path through prefixation, with four stems *xod*- 'go', *let*- 'fly', *plav*- 'swim', *polz*- 'crawl'. Seven path prefixes were tested: *u*-, *ot*-, *pri*-, *do*-, *pod*-, *pere*-, *ob*-, and data for both imperfective and perfective aspects was collected. Note that all seven prefixal combinations are possible for manner stems examined, but not all are compatible with higher manner verbs, e.g., *prikovylyjal*

5. Please note that while the data for aspectual distribution appears in Tables 1 and 2 in this section, discussion of aspect is postponed to Section 5.

Table 1. Degrees of manner specificity

	Negative		Affirmative		Total
Basic motion verb 'to go'					
<i>xodil</i>	661,000	11.74%	4,970,000	88.26%	5,631,000
<i>shel</i>	383,000	4.94%	7,370,000	95.06%	7,753,000
<i>poshel</i>	1,100,000	8.53%	11,800,000	91.47%	12,900,000
all aspects	2,144,000	8.16%	24,140,000	91.84%	26,284,000
Basic manner of motion 'to swim'					
<i>plaval</i>	32,900	6.49%	474,000	93.51%	506,900
<i>plyl</i>	982	0.15%	674,000	99.85%	674,982
<i>poplyl</i>	747	0.13%	589,000	99.87%	589,747
all aspects	34,629	1.95%	1,737,000	98.05%	1,771,629
High manner 'to waddle'					
<i>kovylyal</i>	49	0.09%	56,500	99.91%	56,549
<i>pokovylyal</i>	66	0.38%	17,500	99.62%	17,566
High manner 'to walk slowly'					
<i>plylsya</i>	289	0.34%	84,700	99.66%	84,989
<i>poplylsya</i>	96	0.06%	156,000	99.94%	156,096

Table 2. Prefixed VoM

	Affirmative		Negative		Total
'to go' – imperfective					
<i>shel</i>	5,580,000	94.75%	309,000	5.25%	5,889,000
'went.DET.IPFV'					
<i>xodil</i>	4,390,000	88.01%	598,000	11.99%	4,988,000
'went.INDET.IPFV'					
<i>uxodil</i>	1,510,000	85.89%	248,000	14.11%	1,758,000
'went away'					
<i>otxodil</i>	401,000	77.12%	119,000	22.88%	520,000
'went away'					
<i>doxodil</i>	306,000	81.10%	71,300	18.90%	377,300
'reached'					
<i>prixodil</i>	1,850,000	84.90%	329,000	15.10%	2,179,000
'came'					
<i>podxodil</i>	1,010,000	81.72%	226,000	18.28%	1,236,000
'came close' matched'					
<i>perexodil</i>	522,000	89.22%	63,100	10.78%	585,100
'crossed'					
<i>obxodil</i>	218,000	95.69%	9,820	4.31%	227,820
'walked around'					

Table 2. (continued)

	Affirmative		Negative		Total
'to go' – perfective					
<i>poshel</i>	10,300,000	90.67%	1,060,000	9.33%	11,360,000
'went'					
<i>ushel</i>	8,750,000	94.12%	547,000	5.88%	9,297,000
'went away'					
<i>otoshel</i>	1,280,000	93.31%	91,700	6.69%	1,371,700
'went away'					
<i>doshel</i>	1,660,000	77.32%	487,000	22.68%	2,147,000
'reached'					
<i>prishel</i>	12,900,000	92.61%	1,030,000	7.39%	13,930,000
'came'					
<i>podoshel</i>	4,430,000	91.51%	411,000	8.49%	4,841,000
'came close' matched'					
<i>pereshel</i>	3,310,000	96.78%	110,000	3.22%	3,420,000
'crossed'					
<i>oboshel</i>	926,000	89.38%	110,000	10.62%	1,036,000
'walked around'					
'to fly' – imperfective					
<i>letel</i>	825,000	97.62%	20,100	2.38%	845,100
'flew.DET.IPFV'					
<i>letal</i>	810,000	86.45%	127,000	13.55%	937,000
'flew.INDET.IPFV'					
<i>uletal</i>	131,000	90.66%	13,500	9.34%	144,500
'flew away'					
<i>otletal</i>	37,300	96.51%	1,350	3.49%	38,650
'flew away'					
<i>priletal</i>	125,000	92.89%	9,570	7.11%	134,570
'reached by flying'					
<i>podletal</i>	26,900	96.97%	841	3.03%	27,741
'approached flying'					
<i>doletal</i>	54,800	84.05%	10,400	15.95%	65,200
'flew close, arrived'					
<i>pereletal</i>	18,500	98.56%	271	1.44%	18,771
'crossed by flying'					
<i>obletal</i>	24,300	98.57%	353	1.43%	24,653
'flew around'					
'to fly' – perfective					
<i>poletel</i>	945,000	94.65%	53,400	5.35%	998,400
'flew'					
<i>uletel</i>	830,000	94.35%	49,700	5.65%	879,700
'flew away'					

Table 2. (continued)

	Affirmative		Negative		Total
<i>otletel</i> 'flew away'	234,000	98.60%	3,320	1.40%	237,320
<i>priletel</i> 'reached by flying'	1,100,000	96.67%	37,900	3.33%	1,137,900
<i>podletel</i> 'approached flying'	147,000	99.45%	811	0.55%	147,811
<i>doletel</i> 'flew close, arrived'	248,000	80.36%	60,600	19.64%	308,600
<i>pereletel</i> 'crossed by flying'	121,000	98.19%	2,230	1.81%	123,230
<i>obletel</i> 'flew around'	84,700	98.27%	1,490	1.73%	86,190
'to swim' – imperfective					
<i>plaval</i> 'swam.INDET.IPFV'	482,000	93.45%	33,800	6.55%	515,800
<i>plyl</i> 'swam.DET.IPFV'	438,000	98.01%	8,900	1.99%	446,900
<i>uplyval</i> 'swam away'	27,400	97.34%	749	2.66%	28,149
<i>otplyval</i> 'swam away'	12,200	94.21%	750	5.79%	12,950
<i>priplyval</i> 'reached by swimming'	7,480	94.92%	400	5.08%	7,880
<i>podplyval</i> 'approached swimming'	17,700	97.19%	512	2.81%	18,212
<i>doplyval</i> 'swam close, arrived'	4,880	94.68%	274	5.32%	5,154
<i>pereplyval</i> 'crossed by swimming'	24,900	97.51%	636	2.49%	25,536
<i>obplyval</i> 'swam around'	423	99.76%	1	0.24%	424
'to swim' – perfective					
<i>poplyl</i> 'started swimming'	399,000	98.23%	7,200	1.77%	406,200
<i>uplyl</i> 'swam away'	163,000	94.85%	8,850	5.15%	171,850
<i>otplyl</i> 'swam away'	94,800	98.95%	1,010	1.05%	95,810
<i>priplyl</i> 'reached by swimming'	143,000	97.27%	4,020	2.73%	147,020
<i>podplyl</i> 'approached swimming'	74,800	99.03%	736	0.97%	75,536

Table 2. (continued)

	Affirmative		Negative		Total
<i>doplyl</i> 'swam close, arrived'	50,600	84.98%	8,940	15.02%	59,540
<i>pereplyl</i> 'crossed by swimming'	69,100	98.27%	1,220	1.73%	70,320
<i>obplyl</i> 'swam around'	633	99.84%	1	0.16%	634
'to crawl' – imperfective					
<i>polzal</i> 'crawled.INDET.IPFV'	201,000	92.58%	16,100	7.42%	217,100
<i>polz</i> 'crawled.DET.IPFV'	285,000	98.66%	3,880	1.34%	288,880
<i>upolzal</i> 'crawled away'	13,800	93.32%	988	6.68%	14,788
<i>otpolzal</i> 'crawled away'	11,800	91.83%	1,050	8.17%	12,850
<i>pripolzal</i> 'reached by crawling'	7,100	96.45%	261	3.55%	7,361
<i>podpolzal</i> 'approached crawling'	16,000	97.91%	342	2.09%	16,342
<i>dopolzal</i> 'crawled close, arrived'	4,430	86.51%	691	13.49%	5,121
<i>perepolzal</i> 'crossed by crawling'	10,300	98.35%	173	1.65%	10,473
<i>obpolzal</i> 'crawled around'	1,240	99.92%	1	0.08%	1,241
'to crawl' – perfective					
<i>popolz</i> 'started crawling.PFV'	346,000	99.30%	2,450	0.70%	348,450
<i>upolz</i> 'crawled away'	163,000	97.85%	3,580	2.15%	166,580
<i>otpolz</i> 'crawled away'	61,500	99.25%	464	0.75%	61,964
<i>pripolz</i> 'reached by crawling'	76,100	97.55%	1,910	2.45%	78,010
<i>podpolz</i> 'approached crawling'	156,000	99.64%	556	0.36%	156,556
<i>dopolz</i> 'crawled close, arrived'	118,000	92.32%	9,810	7.68%	127,810
<i>perepolz</i> 'crossed by crawling'	39,000	98.24%	698	1.76%	39,698
<i>obpolz</i> 'crawled around'	704	99.86%	1	0.14%	705

'came waddling' is possible, but **ukovyľjal* 'went away waddling' is not. Verbs are bolded if the percentage of hits under negation is comparatively high; note that these verbs are usually prefixed with *do-* 'until' which involves goal-reaching.

As can be seen from Table 2, in general nonprefixed VoM are more frequent than prefixed ones under negation. Among the VoM specifying path through prefixation, negated verbs which mark the goal or the origin of motion (with prefixes such as *u-*, *ot-*, *pri-*, *do-*) are more frequent than verbs with a specification of path which does not involve goal or origin (i.e., prefixes such as *pere-*, *ob-*). As can be seen in Table 1, high-manner stems rarely combine with prefixes of path; prefixes that do appear with high-manner stems tend to specify goal of motion rather than origin or goal-less path. In conclusion, statistical data shows that (a) negated motion tends to be less specific regarding manner than affirmative motion; (b) when path is specified, negated motion tends to specify path towards a goal or less frequently, origin.

3. Prefixation and motion trajectory in negated VoM

Prefixed VoM can specify goal, origin, or movement along a trajectory that involves neither goal nor origin. In this section I will show that the specification of goal is most frequent under negation, and that the presence of an observing entity closely correlates with negated motion events.

3.1 Trajectory involving goal of motion

Motion events specifying goal (involving verbs with prefixes *do-*, *pri-*, *pod-*) are frequent in affirmative clauses as well as in negative clauses. However, affirmation differs from negation in the type of goal and the level of detail in which the goal is described.

In affirmative clauses, the goal of motion can be either a physical locus or a person in a locus. In negated clauses, the goal is predominantly a person in locus. This goal is not reached (hence the negation), but it is set up with an expectation to be reached; there is a person in the locus who is waiting for the arrival of the moving figure. The person in the locus has the semantic role of *observer* (Padučeva 1992, 1997, 2004). In this section, I will show that the presence of *observer* is crucial for understanding negated motion verb constructions, but not as important for affirmative clauses.

3.1.1 Locus in affirmative clauses

When a physical locus is involved, prefixed motion often occurs with detailed description of this locus. Thus, in (3), the speaker describes the goal of motion (his dacha) in great detail:

- (3) *Byla rannaja vesna, kogda ja priexal na dachu, i na dorozkax*
 was early spring when I arrived.PFV to dacha and on paths
eše. ležal prošlogodnij temnyj list. [...] ja odin brodil sredi
 still lay.IPFV last year's dark leaf I alone wandered among
pustyx dač, otažavšix steklami aprelskoe solnce
 empty dachas reflected.GEN.PL glass.INSTR.PL April.ADJ sun
 'It was early spring when I arrived to the dacha, and the dark leaves of last
 year still lay on the paths. I wandered alone between the empty dachas, which
 reflected the April sun in the glass of their windows.'

(L. Andreev. "Na stancii")

Similarly in (4), the speaker plans to spend the night in Umhausen, which is the goal of motion. Unlike in (3), where the locus itself becomes the focus of the narrative, Umhausen of (4) is important because an event takes place there – the camping ground is full.

- (4) *Ja dovolno bystro doexal do gorodka Umhausen,*
 I rather fast reached.PFV to little.town Umhausen
no v kempinge, v kotorom ja planiroval zanočevat,
 but in camping-site in which I planned.IPFV spend.night.INF.PFV
mne skazali, čto on zakryt.
 me.DAT said.3PL that it closed.ADJ
 'I reached Umhausen rather quickly, but at the camping site where I planned
 to spend the night I was told that it was closed, and I had to move on.'

(E. A. Luchin. "S Vizborom v Alpax")

Though there are people at the locus, they do not have an important part to play in the narrative (thus the impersonal reference).

Goal-oriented motion towards a person at a certain locus is possible with affirmative clauses, thus in (5), the commander arrives at the battalion in order to speak with the soldiers (goal of motion). The speaker is among these soldiers:

- (5) *Čerez neskolko dnej komandir divizii priletel k nam v*
 after few days commander division.GEN flew.PFV to us into
polk. On proizvel razbor našix dejstvij.
 battallion he accomplished.PFV analysis our actions
 'After a number of days the division's commander arrived (by flying) to our
 battalion. He analyzed our actions.'

(A. G. Litvin. "Vykhod iz mertvogo prostranstva")

Thus for affirmative motion events, movement towards the goal may involve: (a) focalized physical locus as goal, described in detail; (b) physical locus as goal, which is important because of events occurring in that locus; (c) a person as goal.

3.1.2 Locus in negated clauses

Since the moving figure does not arrive at the physical destination, it is highly unlikely that the locus will be focalized. As a rule, loci of negated clauses specifying goal are generic and do not involve detailing. The lush description of the dacha in (3) would be impossible under negation. Frequent loci of negated motion events include well-established locations such as *domoj* '(to) home', *sjuda* 'hither', *na rabotu* 'to work', et cetera. In (6), the locus is simply stated as the city of Riga.

- (6) *Tolja ne priexal v uslovennyj den' v Rigu.*
 Tolja NEG come.PFV in appointed day in Riga
Ja zabespokoilas', pozvonila dočeri i zjatju.
 I became.worried.PFV called.PFV daughter and son.in.law
 'Tolya did not arrive on the appointed day in Riga. I became worried, called
 my daughter and my son-in-law.' (O. Bulkina. "Kak oni umerli")

For negated motion events, physical locus as goal of negated motion usually involves a person expecting the arrival of the moving figure, as in (6), where the speaker expects Tolya. The speaker has the semantic role of an *observer*, or a perceiving entity (a person, often the speaker of the utterance) who expects the appearance of the moving figure in the locus which he/she occupies.

The notion of observer as a semantic category was introduced and developed by Padučeva (1992, 1997, 2004), and has been used by Borschev and Partee (2002) and Perelmutter (2005) among others to discuss the distribution of genitive versus nominative case under negation. The statistically prevalent genitive of negation (*mamy ne bylo na rabote* 'mother-GEN wasn't at work') involves, according to Padučeva, a perceiving entity/agent who is expecting the appearance of the absentee in the locus. The notion of 'observation' is similar to 'expectation,' a regular feature of negated clauses according to Tottie (1991), Horn (1989), and others. The presence of an observing entity is more prominent for negated motion, since

such an observer occupies the locus which the moving figure fails to reach; the observer is often the goal of motion. Thus in a joke (7), a hunter is expecting the arrival of a sloth at his locale:

- (7) *Šizu ja v zasade, – načal oxotnik, – polzet ko mne lenivec...*
 sit.1SG I in blind began hunter crawls to me.DAT sloth
Den' polzet, dva polzet, tri polzet... Tak i ne dopolz do zasady!
 day crawls two crawls three crawls so and NEG crawl.PFV to blind
 'I am sitting in a blind, the hunter began, and a sloth is crawling towards me...
 He crawls for a day, he crawls for two, he crawls for three... He never did reach
 (by crawling) the blind!' (Anekdoty pro oxotnikov")

In (8), a moving object (tomato) thrown by other girls routinely does not reach the observer, Maria, who therefore has no reason to participate in the ensuing fights:

- (8) *Marija ne učastvovala v potasovkax, možet byt' potomu,*
 Maria NEG participated.IPFV in skirmishes may be.INF because
čto pomidor nikogda ne doletal do ee uglovoj kojki.
 that tomato never NEG flew.PFV until her corner bed
 'Maria did not participate in the skirmishes, maybe because the tomato never
 reached (by flying) her corner bed.' (N. Čertkova. "Mjagkij mir")

The moving object's failure to materialize in the locus impacts other events in the narrative, usually influencing the observer's later actions. Thus in (8), Maria does not participate in fights because she hasn't been hit by a flying tomato. In (9), a failure of a rock star to appear on a concert enrages fans, who subsequently have to be pacified by the police:

- (9) *Jurij Antonov ne prišel... na sobstvennyj concert*
 Jurij Antonov NEG come.PFV to self concert
vo MXAT imeni Čexova,
 into Moscow-Artistic-Academic-Theatre name.GEN Chekhov.GEN
čem vyzval vozmuščenje poklonnikov
 by which provoked.PFV outrage fans.GEN
 'Yuri Antonov did not show up to his own concert in Chekhov's MXAT
 (Moscow Art Academic Theatre), by which he provoked the outrage of his
 fans.' (Novosti NEWSru.com)

The failure of Antonov to appear provokes an emotional reaction from the observers. I show in Perelmutter (2005) that such an emotional response to unexpected absence is frequent also with the genitive of negation, as in (10), where regret connected with the absence is expressed:

- (10) *Žaleju, što v oktjabre 1993 goda menja ne bylo v Moskve*
 sorry.1SG that in October 1993 year me.GEN NEG was in Moscow
i sredi zaščitnikov belogo doma.
 and among defenders.GEN white.ACC house.ACC
 'I am sorry that in October 1993 I wasn't in Moscow, among the defenders of
 the White House.'
 (BBC News forum)

Negated *be*-clauses with the absentee in genitive and negated motion events are comparable, since both involve absence – failure to reach the locus – which is observed by somebody in the locus. Absence, expressed through genitive of negation or through negated motion towards a goal, can impact other events and provoke emotions in the observer/narrator.

While both affirmative and negated clauses allow a person to be the goal of motion, the person as goal in affirmative clauses is not an observer: he/she is not, as a rule, majorly impacted by the arrival of the moving figure, and there is usually no emotional reaction. In narratives, arrival of a person at goal (be it a physical locus or a person) is often just one event in a sequence of other events. On the other hand, failure of the moving figure to arrive at goal is often focalized in narratives due to the fact that (1) other events in the narrative are impacted by the absence, and (2) observer's feelings about the absence are made known. In this respect, negated motion events with observer at goal are semantically similar to negated *be*-clauses with genitive of negation.

3.2 Trajectory that specifies origin

As can be seen from Table 2, prefixes of origin (*u-*, *ot-*) are rarer under negation than the prefixes of goal; in addition, their distribution under negation depends on aspect (see Section 5 for discussion). Perfective that marks origin usually involves a successful departure from the observer's locus. Negated or failed departure can provoke emotional reactions from the observer(s), as in example (11), where the tourist's failure to board the plane provokes feelings of surprise from the travel agency workers:

- (11) *ja poexal v J.K. Tour Travels. Rabotniki etoj firmy*
 I went.by.driving.PFV in J.K. Tour Travels employees this.GEN agency.GEN
byli očen' udivlenny, počemu ja ne u-leteh, polučil
 were very surprised why I NEG away-flew.PFV received.PFV
ot nix kuču izvinenij.
 from them heap excuses.GEN

- 'I went to J. K. Tour Travels. The agency's employees were very surprised that I hadn't flown away, and I received many apologies from them.'
 (turizm.ru forum, "Ulet v Goa")

Most negated VoM specifying origin of departure occur in temporal clauses where the act of motion does indeed take place, as in (12), where a grandmother is experiencing intense emotions while sending her grandchildren away:

- (12) *Babuška dolgo stojala na kraju šljuza, poka paroxod*
 grandmother long stood on edge dock.GEN until steamer
ne ot-plyl tak daleko ot berega, što passažirov,
 NEG from-sailed.PFV so far from shore that passengers.GEN.PL
stojavšix na palube, stalo ne vidno
 standing on deck began NEG seen
 'Grandmother waited for a long time on the edge of the dock, until the
 steamer sailed so far away from the shore that one could no longer see the
 passengers standing on the deck.'
 (O. Uvarkina. "Suxar")

Even though the construction here employs negation, the motion away from the observer does indeed take place; this aspectual idiom does not universally appear with negation (cf., English 'until it sailed away').

3.3 Motion trajectory specifying neither goal nor origin

In Russian, some prefixes of path specify neither goal nor origin, but rather give additional detail about the trajectory. Some prefixes include *ob-* 'around' and *pere-* 'across'. Verbs with these prefixes are rare under negation. The infrequent negative clauses with these verbs usually involve a pre-planned trajectory that for some reason does not take place. In (13), the only example of *ob-* 'around' with *plyt'* 'to swim', the speaker dreams about swimming around the Adalary rocks, but this does not come to pass. Note the affirmative *ja objazan ix obplyt'* 'I have to swim around them' in the following clause:

- (13) *Ja ne ob-plyl Adalary (eto byla moja mečta s togo*
 I NEG around-swam.PFV Adalary this was my dream from the moment
momenta kak ja ix vpervye uvidel ja rešil što prosto
 moment that I them first saw.PFV I decided that simply
objazan ix ob-plyt').
 obligated them.ACC around-swim.INF.PFV
 'I did not swim around the Adalary rocks (it was my dream from the moment
 I saw them, I decided that I really have to swim around them).'
 (Artek.org forums)

Similarly in (14), we find denial of trajectory with the prefix *pere-* 'over' that was previously suggested in an affirmative clause:

- (14) *Pere-bros' ego v ogorod, – posovetovala tetka.*
 over-throw.PFV him into vegetable.patch advised auntie
Ja podošel k izgorodi i švyrnul ego okamenevšimi rukami.
 I approached to fence and threw him stony.INSTR.PL hands.INSTR.PL
Prokljatie! On, konečno, ne pere-lete! čerez zabor, a uselsja
 curse he certainly NEG over-fly.PFV over fence but sat.REFL.PFV
na nego, rasplastav tjaželye krylja.
 on it having.spread heavy wings
 'Throw [the rooster] over to the vegetable patch, – the woman advised. I
 approached the fence and threw him with stony hands. Damnation! He didn't,
 of course, fly over the fence but perched upon it, spreading [his] heavy wings.'
 (F. Iskander. "Petux")

Since appearance of negated motion events closely correlates with the appearance of observer at a boundary of motion (either arrival or departure), it is not surprising that prefixed verbs that specify movement along the path and do not involve an observer don't often appear under negation.

To summarize, path-specifying VoM appear under negation most often when they encode movement towards a goal, which is either the observer or a location where the observer expects the moving figure to appear. VoM specifying origin rather than goal are less prominent, and VoM specifying trajectory which does not involve either goal or origin are rare.

4. Aspect and VoM under negation

Isačenko (1962) among other scholars points out that the imperfective is preferred under negation. Merrill (1985: 130) remarks that "even a relatively cursory examination shows that the imperfective is relatively more frequent than it is in positive declarative contexts."⁶ Forsyth writes that both perfective and imperfective can occur under negation, but "there is a certain tendency to switch to the imperfective in negative statements in past tense" (Forsyth 1970: 103).

According to Forsyth, perfective under negation is a non-performance of a potential single action, whereby an expected or desired result is not produced: *my*

6. My own statistical examination of verbs under negation shows no pronounced preference for either aspect with 'base' verbs; there are idiosyncratic preferences depending on lexicalization patterns, as will be shown below.

ne pročitali etu knigu 'we did not read this book', where the reading was planned but for some reason was not accomplished. The negated imperfective, on the other hand, indicates an action that has never taken place at any time: *my ne čitali etu knigu* 'we did not read this book', where the action was not planned. Imperfective is used with negation that is "general, comprehensive and vehement" (Forsyth 1970: 117).

A number of scholars propose that aspectual choice involves the same or similar contextual considerations for affirmative and negative statements (e.g., Šigurov 1993; Timberlake 2004). Timberlake (2004: 418) points out that aspectual choice "revolves around the way in which the speaker conceptualizes the possible occasions for an event." The perfective places a bounded event, whether it had occurred (positive clause) or not (negated clause) into a sequence of events. The imperfective allows for further change.

According to Forsyth, VoM follow the general pattern for negation ('kinetic' presentation of the perfective vs. general denial of imperfective), but the possibility of using the indeterminate imperfective "provides a third stage further removed from the reality of performance" (Forsyth 1970: 339). The *negated perfective* denotes non-performance of the action at a specific juncture: a departure which a subject does not make at a specific time:

- (15) *On ešče ne poexal v Leningrad. Ego poezdka namečena tol'ko na*
 he yet NEG go.PF to Leningrad his trip planned only on
buduščij mesjac.
 next month
 'He hasn't gone to Leningrad yet. His trip is planned only for next month.'
 (Forsyth 1970: 340)

The determinate imperfective implies an absence of motion at a given moment, or absence of the tendency to perform it:

- (16) *Zdes' ljudi ne šli, a stojali.*
 here people NEG walk.DET.IPFV but stood.IPFV
 'Here people did not walk, but stood.'
 (Forsyth 1970: 340)

The indeterminate imperfective denotes negation of any of the meanings associated with these verbs, such as general motion in unspecified direction or a habitual motion. It implies a total denial of a hypothetical journey:

- (17) *V voskresenje ja nikuda ne ezdil.*
 on Sunday I nowhere NEG went.INDET.IPFV
 'On Sunday I did not go anywhere.'
 (Forsyth 1970: 341)

How do these aspectual differences play out in the statistical distribution? This depends on whether the verb of motion is prefixed or simplex.

4.1 Prefixed VoM

For prefixed verbs of motion, the perfective is significantly more frequent than imperfective for all manner verbs examined (fly, swim, crawl), and especially for those specifying the goal of motion. Table 3 showcases the breakdown for three prefixed verbs: 'to fly', 'to swim', and 'to crawl' (for additional data see Table 2).

The perfective is more frequent with manner verbs specifying goal or origin. The perfective reports an expected arrival or departure of the moving figure in the observer's locus; predictably, the failed arrival/departure triggers further events or emotional reactions. Thus in (18), the absence triggers an event (consumption

Table 3. Prefixed VoM under negation

Verb.IPFV-PF	Imperfective		Perfective	
'to fly'				
<i>uletal-uletel</i> 'flew away'	13,500	21.36%	49,700	78.64%
<i>otletal-otletel</i> 'flew away from'	1,350	28.91%	3,320	71.09%
<i>priletal-priletel</i> 'flew to'	9,570	20.16%	37,900	79.84%
<i>podletal-podletel</i> 'flew near'	841	50.91%	811	49.09%
<i>doletal-doletel</i> 'reached by flying'	10,400	14.65%	60,600	85.35%
<i>pereletal-pereletel</i> 'flew across or over'	271	10.84%	2,230	89.16%
<i>obletal-obletel</i> 'flew around'	353	19.15%	1,490	80.85%
'to swim'				
<i>uplyval-uplyl</i> 'swam away'	749	7.80%	8,850	92.20%
<i>otplyval-otplyl</i> 'swam away from'	750	42.61%	1,010	57.39%
<i>priplyval-priplyl</i> 'swam to'	400	9.05%	4,020	90.95%
<i>podplyval-podplyl</i> 'swam near'	512	41.03%	736	58.97%
<i>doplyval-doplyl</i> 'reached by swimming'	274	2.97%	8,940	97.03%
<i>pereplyval-pereplyl</i> 'swam over'	636	34.27%	1,220	65.73%
<i>obplyval-obplyl</i> 'swam around'	1	50.00%	1	50.00%
'to crawl'				
<i>upolzal-upolz</i> 'crawled away'	988	21.63%	3,580	78.37%
<i>otpolzal-otpolz</i> 'crawled away from'	1,050	69.35%	464	30.65%
<i>pripolzal-pripolz</i> 'crawled to'	261	12.02%	1,910	87.98%
<i>podpolzal-podpolz</i> 'crawled near'	342	38.08%	556	61.92%
<i>dopolzal-dopolz</i> 'reached by swimming'	691	6.58%	9,810	93.42%
<i>perepolzal-perepolz</i> 'crawled across-over'	173	19.86%	698	80.14%
<i>obpolzal-obpolz</i> 'crawled around'	1	50.00%	1	50.00%

of alcohol). The observer (Ljoša) is expecting the arrival of the figure (Saša) and tries to save some vodka for him. However, the vodka is drunk by others because of Saša's absence and despite Ljoša's protests:

- (18) *Ljoša pereodevaetsja, dostaet butylku i vypivaet bol'she*
 Ljoša changes.clothes.REFL takes.out bottle and drinks.PFV more
poloviny. Narod ego javno ne odobryaet, no ostatok
 half people.SG him clearly NEG approve.SG but rest
do-pivajet, nesmotrja na to, čto Ljoša gromko kričit pro
 completely-drinks.PFV despite on that that Ljoša loudly yells about
Sašu, kotoryj ešče ne pri-plyl, i kotoromu vodka
 Saša that yet NEG arrived-sailed.PFV and which.DAT vodka
nuzhnee.
 more.needed
 'Ljoša ... changes his clothes, takes out a bottle and drinks more than half. People are not approving, but finish the bottle despite Ljoša's loud protests about Saša, who had not arrived here (by sailing/swimming) yet and who needs the vodka more.' (A. Savvateev. "Polomet' – "El'ba" – tri otčeta")

Example (19) showcases an example of negated departure from a locus originally shared by the figure and two observers. In this example, the two observers discuss the figure (a secret agent nicknamed "Professor"). One observer believes that Professor flew away on the plane, as scheduled, while the other explains how this secret agent tricked the surveillance into believing he flew away, while in reality the planned departure did not occur. Due to the presence of two observers who hold opposing opinions about the departure, we find both the expected affirmative event ("Professor departed") and the expected negated event ("Professor didn't fly away"):

- (19) *Professor ne u-letel. [...] A vam Artist s čistoj*
 professor NEG away-flew.PFV but you.DAT Performer with clean
sovest'ju doložil, čto ob'ekt nabljudenija otbyl v Moskvu.
 conscience reported that object surveillance.GEN departed for Moscow.
Vy xotite sprositi, otkuda ja eto znaju? Skažu. Ja sam za nim
 You want ask.INF from.where I this know Tell.1SG.PF I self after him
sledil. Ja ne veril, čto Professor u-letit.
 followed I NEG believed.IPFV that Professor away-fly.PFV
 'The Professor did not fly away. And Artist told you in all honesty that the object of surveillance left for Moscow. You want to know how I know this? I will tell you. I followed him myself. I did not believe that he would fly away.'
 (V. Levashov. "Ubit' Demokrata")

So far in examples (18) and (19), we saw that perfective is used with failed arrival/departure when an observer is present at the locus to remark on the failure of the figure to arrive or depart. Perfective can also be used when the figure does arrive/depart, but fails to arrive or depart by predictable means. This is exemplified by (20), a narrative interval in which a man is supposed to be killed by a charging rhinoceros. At the last moment, the man escapes by magical means. The figure's movement away from the locus which is shared with another being (in this case, the enraged rhinoceros) does happen, however, the escape does not occur through the expected modes of motion such as crawling or running.

- (20) *Zver' nastig ego i [...] vonzil svoi roga. No [...] roga*
 beast caught.up him and stuck self horns but horns
nosoroga votknulis' ne v čeloveka, a v glinu, v dno.
 rhinoceros.GEN.SG struck NEG in man but in clay in bottom
I vovse ne potomu, čto on promahnulsja, a potomu, čto
 and at.all NEG because that he missed.REFL but because that
čeloveka na etom meste vdrug ne okazalos' Net, on
 man.GEN on this place suddenly NEG located.REFL no he
ne ot-prygnul v storonu, ne ot-polz i
 NEG away-jumped.PFV to side, NEG away-crawl.PFV and
ne ot-bezhal. On prosto-naprsto ischez.
 NEG away-run.PFV He simply-simply disappeared
 'The beast reached him and impaled the man. But the rhinoceros's horns
 stuck not the man but the mud at the bottom. And not because the rhinoceros
 missed, but because the man suddenly wasn't there. No, he did not jump away,
 did not crawl away and did not run away. He simply disappeared.'
 (G. Razumov. "Kosmičeskij majak")

To summarize, negated motion verbs appear in perfective when an expectation of motion is thwarted – either when the motion itself does not take place, or when the motion happens in the manner unexpected by the observer.

The imperfective of prefixed motion verbs is different from the perfective in that the motion might indeed have happened at some point in time, and that the lack of motion at this specific temporal juncture may become an attribute of the whole situation, rather than an event. As a rule, an observer is not involved in this situation.

Imperfective negated motion often appears with specifications of time, such as *davno* 'for a while', *pjat' let* 'five years', etc. In (21), a woman complains that her husband has not come home for a while. This is canonical use of the imperfective, i.e. a situation of absence which continues at the moment of speech; and a canonical use of the negated motion event as described above: the failure of the moving

figure to arrive at the woman's locus is combined with an emotional reaction. However, the ongoing absence of the husband in the wife's locus is an attribute of her daily life rather than a sudden event of absence when motion is expected:

- (21) *Inoj raz požaluetsja žitel'nica poselka sosedke,*
 other time complain.REFL.PFV dweller village.GEN neighbor.DAT
čto muž davno ne pri-ezžal domoj a deti
 that husband long-time NEG arrived-drove.IPFV home and children
rastut, i trudno ej odnoj upravljat'sja s nimi.
 grow and hard her.DAT alone.DAT manage.REFL with them
 'At times a village woman would complain to her neighbor that her husband
 didn't come home in a long time, and the children are growing and she is
 having hard time taking care of them.'
 (Russia-today.ru news)

In example (22), a negated motion event with *davno* 'for a while' has a slightly different meaning. Motion does take place, but after a significant temporal interval:

- (22) *V takie "zavedenija" davno ne pri-ezžal*
 into such establishments long.time NEG arrived-drove.IPFV
i, kak pokazala praktika, lučše by voobščee tam ne
 and as showed.PFV practice better would at.all there NEG
pokazyvalsja
 showed.up.REFL.IPFV
 'I haven't arrived at such establishments for a long time, and as practice
 showed, I would have been better off not going there at all.'
 ("Prodavcam ne nužny den'gi")

In (23) and (24), the figure does indeed arrive at the locus, and the negated motion refers to the time lapsed since the last visit. The fact that the negated motion does in fact take place accounts for the extremely detailed description of the locus – something which does not happen when the negated motion does not take place (as discussed in Section 4).

- (23) *Davno ne pri-letal v Šeremet'ëvo-2, no tam ničego*
 long.time NEG arrived-flew.IPFV into Šeremet'ëvo-2 but there nothing
ne menjaetsja smotriš' na vse, kak v sovetskom kino
 NEG changes.REFL look.2SG.IPFV on everything like in Soviet movie
[...] bolšie priemnye, patriarxal'no-otečeskie, bezlično-zabotlivye,
 big reception.rooms patriarchal-fatherly faceless-caring
surovo-spravedlivye vorota Sovka. I daže vrode kislymi
 strict-just gates Sovok.GEN and even seems sour.INSTR
ščami kak-to potjanulo
 cabbage.soup.INSTR somehow wafted.PFV

I haven't flown into Sheremet'yevo-2 airport for a while, but nothing changes there: you are looking at everything like in a Soviet movie – big reception-rooms, patriarchal, faceless but caring, strict but just gates of the Soviet Union. And even the smell of sour cabbage soup wafted from somewhere.'

(turizt.livejournal.com)

The negated motion here describes the properties of the absentee (he was absent from Russia/Moscow for a long time). Such an imperfective negated motion event is functionally similar to the nominative of absence construction *ne byl 'wasn't' + NOM*, such as *mama ne byla na rabote* 'mother.NOM wasn't at work', as opposed to the genitive of absence *mamy ne bylo na rabote* 'mother.GEN wasn't at work' (Perelmutter 2005). In the nominative of absence construction, the focus is on the properties of the absent individual, and specifications of a temporal interval, such as *davno* 'for a long time' are frequent. Example (24) shows an example of nominative with the *ne byl 'wasn't' + NOM* construction. Here, a young dentist returns to Moscow after a 1.5 year absence, and describes his impressions of the locus:

- (24) *Rejsom Los-Andželes-Moskva pri-leteli neskol'ko čelovek [...]*
 flight.INSTR Los-Angeles-Moscow arrived-flew.PFV few people
Vrač Artur –v tom čisle. On ne byl v Moskve poltora goda:
 doctor Artur in that number. he.NOM NEG was in Moscow 1.5 years
"Očen' zdes' veselo. Prosto neverojatno. Vse krasivye,
 very here joyful simply unbelievable all beautiful.PL
ulybajutsja, u vseh zuby xorošie".
 smile.PL.REFL to everybody teeth good
 'A couple of people flew in on the Los-Angeles-Moscow flight – and immediately (went) to the Vogue Café. Arthur, the doctor, was among them. He wasn't in Moscow for a year and a half: "It's very happy here. It's incredible. Everybody is beautiful, smiling, and they all have good teeth."

(E. Egereva. "Glamorama")

The two constructions in (23) and (24) are similar. Both the negated imperfective motion event and the negated *be*-event include a person who didn't visit a locus for a long time, finally arrives at this locus, and gives a detailed description of the locus.

The focus on absentee and his/her experiences and properties often coincides with the first person viewpoint, where the moving figure and the observing entity are one and the same, as in (23) and (24). However, first person is not a requirement. In the third person account of (25), the absentee's arrival after a long temporal interval emphasizes the importance of his arrival for the observers. Negated imperfective is used here to indicate that the figure arrived after a long absence:

- (25) *Neskol'ko let ne pri-ezžal v Kursk [...]* professor iz
 few years NEG arrived-drove.IPFV to Kursk professor from
Kolomny Aleksandr Auer. Teper' on poznamomil kolleg so
 Kolomna Alexandr Auer now he acquainted colleagues.ACC with
svoimi naučnymi poiskami poslednego
 self.INSTR.PL scientific.INSTR.PL searches.INSTR.PL recent.GEN.SG
vremeni.
 time.GEN.SG

'Alexandr Auer, a professor from Kolomna and a regular participant of the Fet readings, did not come to Kursk for a number of years. Now he shared his most recent research with his colleagues.' (T. Antipenko. "Fetovskie čtenija")

Both the imperfective and the perfective aspects can appear in one sentence, as in (26), where the observer expects the appearance of a young boy, his friend: after the thwarted expectation of the perfective *ne prišel* 'did not come', the observer continues to wait. The appearance of the imperfective *celuju nedelju ne prixodil* 'did not come all week' signals that the boy did come after all. Note the emotional reaction of the observer:

- (26) *Ravno nedelju nazad, malyš ne pri-šel na alleju,*
 exactly week ago boy NEG arrived-came.PFV to boulevard
ne pri-šel i na sledujuščij den', i vsju nedelju
 NEG arrived-came.PFV and on next day and all week
ne pri-xodil. Nikogda ne dumal, čto budu tak.
 NEG arrived-came.IPFV never NEG thought.IPFV that will.1SG so
pereživat' i ždat' ego
 worry and wait him
 'Exactly a week ago, the boy did not come to the boulevard, did not come the next day, did not come all week. I never thought that I would worry so much and wait for him.'
 ("Monetki")

To summarize, the perfective of prefixed VoM indicating goal and origin appears in situations of thwarted expectation where an observer is usually present; the imperfective appears in situations of sustained non-arrival in the locus, where the non-arrival becomes a property of the situation rather than a singular event; or in situations where a long non-arrival implies eventual arrival, and where the previous non-arrival is a property of an absentee. Thus, the negated motion events described in the imperfective often involve motion events that actually do take place. The constructions involving negated prefixed VoM of goal are semantically similar to the genitive and nominative absence constructions with *byt'* 'to be'. Negated perfective is similar to genitive of negation in that it involves thwarted expectations, observers, and an impact of absence on the observer, such as an

emotional reaction; the negated imperfective is similar to nominative of negation in that it focuses on the absentee's properties and often includes a temporal specification.

4.2 Simplex VoM

Table 4 tests five VoM for aspectual distribution: *xodit'-idti-pojti* 'to go', *ezdit'-exat'-poexat'* 'to go by vehicle', *letat'-letet'-poletet'* 'to fly', *plavat'-plyt'-poplyt'* 'to swim', *polzat'-polzti-popolzti* 'to crawl'.

For the five VoM examined, in affirmative clauses indeterminate imperfective, determinate imperfective and determinate perfective are more or less equally distributed, with a slight preference towards the perfective for three out of five verbs ('to go', 'to fly', and 'to crawl') or towards the indeterminate imperfective for two verbs ('to go by vehicle', 'to swim'). Under negation, indeterminate imperfective is significantly more prominent for manner verbs 'to swim', 'to fly', 'to crawl'. Determinate imperfective is significantly less prominent (under 20%) for all five VoM examined.

Indeterminate imperfectives of simplex VoM do not involve an observer, and usually signal "a total denial of a hypothetical journey" (Forsyth 1970: 341) – however, it is not a journey that is denied (which would imply an intent or a destination), but the fact that a motion of this kind takes place in a specific time period:

Table 4. Basic VoM under negation – aspect

	Affirmative		Negative	
	Count	%	Count	%
<i>xodil</i> 'went.INDET.IPFV'	4,390,000	21.66%	598,000	30.40%
<i>šel</i> 'went.DET.IPFV'	5,580,000	27.53%	309,000	15.71%
<i>pošel</i> 'went.PFV'	10,300,000	50.81%	1,060,000	53.89%
<i>ezdil</i> 'went by vehicle.INDET.IPFV'	3,240,000	35.22%	320,000	44.08%
<i>exal</i> 'went by vehicle.DET.IPFV'	2,600,000	28.26%	59,900	8.25%
<i>poexal</i> 'went by vehicle.PFV'	3,360,000	36.52%	346,000	47.66%
<i>letal</i> 'flew.INDET.IPFV'	810,000	31.40%	127,000	63.34%
<i>letel</i> 'flew.DET.IPFV'	825,000	31.98%	20,100	10.02%
<i>poletel</i> 'flew.PFV'	945,000	36.63%	53,400	26.63%
<i>plaval</i> 'swam.INDET.IPFV'	482,000	36.54%	33,800	67.74%
<i>plyl</i> 'swam.DET.IPFV'	438,000	33.21%	8,900	17.84%
<i>poplyl</i> 'swam.PFV'	399,000	30.25%	7,200	14.43%
<i>polzal</i> 'crawled.INDET.IPFV'	201,000	24.16%	16,100	71.78%
<i>polz</i> 'crawled.DET.IPFV'	285,000	34.25%	3,880	17.30%
<i>popolz</i> 'crawled.PFV'	346,000	41.59%	2,450	10.92%

- (27) *V etot den' nikto ne plaval. Otdyxali, tancevali.*
 in that day nobody NEG swam.INDET.IPFV rested.3PL, danced.3PL
 'That day nobody was swimming. [People] rested, danced.'

(Forsyth 1970: 341)

A total denial of motion often involves motion towards a specific destination, as in (28), where the rock star Boris Grebenschikov never goes to vote:

- (28) *Boris Grebensčikov nikogda ne xodil na vybory*
 Boris Grebensčikov never NEG went.INDET.IPFV to elections
 'Boris Grebenschikov never voted.' (V. Zvereva. "Ne chastyj greben")

Or movement on a specific type of vehicle, or even a single named vehicle, as in (29),

- (29) *Belgorodskij gubernator ne plaval na «Titanike»*
 Belgorod.ADJ governor NEG swam.INDET.IPFV on Titanic
 'The governor of Belgorod never sailed on the "Titanic".'

(M. Bukov. "MK proigral")

This type of denial of motion is extremely rare with prefixed VoM, and has different semantics when it appears. For example, a search for *ne xodil na vybory* retrieved 10,200 hits; a search for *ne prixodil na vybory* retrieved 14 hits, which involved an expectation of observers in the locus and their adverse reaction to absence, as in (30), where a deputy is so upset that people do not vote that she mentions mutilation as a means of encouraging voters:

- (30) *deputat Dinara Moldoševa otmetila, čto ranše otrubali ruki*
 deputy Dinara Moldoševa noted that previously cut.3PL hands
i primerjali različnye sankcii k tem, kto ne pri-xodil
 and applied.3PL different sanctions to those who NEG arrived-came.IPFV
na vybory
 to elections

'Deputy Dinara Moldoševa remarked that in the old days [they] cut hands and applied various sanctions to people who did not come to the elections.'

(CIS-news.info)

When total denial of motion is needed, only the imperfective of a simplex VoM can be used, which explains the greater frequency of indeterminate imperfectives of the simplex VoM versus the determinate imperfectives, since a type of motion expressed by the determinate imperfective can also be expressed by an imperfective of prefixed VoM. Thus, the formula of absence of motion for a period of time, followed by motion towards a locus, with observer present, appears

in (31). In this example, a kitten does not go to its new owners (the observers), despite expectation; it is implied that the motion does eventually take place:

- (31) *Pervye dni on daže ne šel k nam na ruki,*
 first days he even NEG went.DET.IPFV to us to hands
sil'no kričal, vidimo emu bylo bol'no, seičas on stal
 strongly screamed, apparently he.DAT was painful now he became
gorazdo spokojnee.
 considerably calmer
 'During the first days he didn't even come to our hands, cried hard – apparently he was in pain, now he has become much calmer.'
 (L. Kuranova. "Kotiku 4 goda")

What is the difference between the indeterminate imperfective of a simplex VoM and the imperfective of the prefixed VoM? From the data, it appears that the difference lies in the intent of the moving figure. For the prefixed VoM, there is no intent for the figure to move despite the expectation of an observer in the locus. For the simplex VoM, the intent to move is there, together with the reasoning why the movement does not happen. When a prefixed VoM is used, the focus is on the interaction between the observer and the absentee. In (32), the young man wants to apologize to the observer for his absence, but does not know what to say, since he did not want to come:

- (32) *Prosti, ja ne pri-xodil k tebe vsë èto vremja, ja ...*
 forgive.2SG I NEG arrived-came.IPFV to you all this time I
Zapnuvšis', on zamolčal. On ponjal, čto [...] na samom
 faltering he fell.silent.PFV he understood that on real.PREP
dele on prosto ne hotel obščat'sja.
 thing.PREP he simply NEG wanted.IPFV communicate. INF
 'I am sorry I did not come to you all this time, I ... Faltering, he fell silent. He realized that ... he just did not want to talk [to her]:' (Ya. Zorin. "Istočnik")

Similarly in (33) – if a child did not yet arrive to ask for a dog, the desire to come is not yet there. Note the observer's expectation of future arrival:

- (33) *Esli vaš malyš ešče ne pri-xodil k vam s pros'boj*
 if your little.one still NEG arrived-came.IPFV to you with request
zavesti sobaku to ne rasslabljajtes'. Vse ešče vperedil!
 acquire.pet.INF dog.ACC then NEG relax.REFL. everything yet before
 'If your little one has not yet come.ipfv to you asking to get a dog, don't relax – everything is still in front of you!'
 (A. Bisembaeva. "Vybiraez zverja")

On the other hand, if the determinate imperfective of *šel* 'went' is used, the focus is on the moving figure rather than on the interaction between the figure and the observer; the desire to move is present, but is not acted upon for various reasons. For example in (34), the speaker recalls that when as a young boy he considered telling his mother about his toothache, he often did not go to her:

- (34) *Ja ne šel k nej vot po kakoj pričine: ne somnevajas'*
 I NEG went.DET.IPFV to her here on which reason: NEG doubting
v tom, čto ona dast mne aspirin, ja v to že vremja
 in that.PREP that she give.PFV me.DAT aspirin, I in this PART time
znał, čto ona [...] na sledujuščee utro povedet menja k
 knew that she on next morning lead.PFV me.ACC to
zubnomu vraču.
 dental doctor
 'I did not go to her (my mother) for the following reason: not doubting that she would give me aspirin, I knew that she would not stop at that, and the next morning would take me to the dentist.' (C. Lewis. "Vo čto eto obxoditsja")

Forsyth's example *zdes' ljudi ne šli, a stojali* 'people did not walk.DET.IPFV here, but stood' which he takes to illustrate an absence of motion at a given moment, or absence of the tendency to perform it, I believe illustrates a different construction, namely 'figure moved not in manner A, but in manner B'. This construction is not frequent, but when it does occur, determinate imperfective is indeed used for the denied manner of motion, as in (35):

- (35) *On šel na rabotu, daže ne šel, a bežal,*
 he went.DET.IPFV to work even NEG went.DET.IPFV but ran.DET.IPFV
Eži voobšče redko xodjat.
 hedgehogs at.all rarely walk.INDET.IPFV
 'He walked to work, or rather [he] didn't work but ran. Hedgehogs rarely walk.'
 ("Ežik, kotoryj čto-to ponjal")

To summarize, the determinate imperfective of simplex VoM is not frequent under negation since it usually appears in a single construction, that of an absence of expected/planned motion for a period of time; a similar meaning is more frequently expressed for VoM with prefixes of goal/origin which emphasize an observer towards whom the figure moves, and the observer's expectations. The indeterminate imperfective expresses a total denial of motion which routinely cannot be expressed with prefixed verbs. The perfective of basic simplex verbs (*pojti* 'to go.PFV', *poexat* 'to go.PFV by vehicle') is statistically more prominent than the imperfective, which is due to a large number of fixed collocations/idioms that exist with these verbs, such as *ne pošel na pol'zu* 'did not help/did not go well for...' as in (36):

- (36) *Kakim budet mir bez detskogo smexa i plača?*
 What.INSTR will.be world without children.ADJ laughter and tears
Interesno, togda posmotrite etot fil'm. Skažu, čto čelovečestvu
 Interesting then see.2PL.PFV this movie say.1SG that mankind.DAT
otsutstvie detej ne pošlo na pol'zu.
 lack children.GEN NEG went.PFV to help
 'What would the world be like without children's laughter and tears? If this
 interests you, then go see the movie. I will say that the absence of children did
 not benefit mankind.'
 ("Ditja Čelovečeskoe")

The number of perfectives falls sharply for the simplex VoM which do not participate in idioms (such as *popolzti* 'to crawl'), and the indeterminate imperfective becomes the most frequent.

5. Conclusions

Two kinds of motion events are possible under negation: the most frequent is the motion event that never occurred. The less frequent is a motion event that occurred but appears in a negated construction for a reason other than denial that the motion ever took place (e.g., motion after a significant temporal interval).

Motion events that did not take place tend to be less detailed in terms of the specification of manner and path of motion. High-manner verbs such as *kovyliat* 'to wobble' are extremely rare; prefixed VoM tend to describe a movement towards goal, or from an origin, rather than a detailed specification of the ground covered by the moving figure. In addition, detailed descriptions of a locus do not appear with negated motion events which did not happen. This is to show that although a negative statement must always reference a corresponding affirmative statement, this 'paired' affirmative space shows less detail than a regular affirmative space depicting an actual motion event.

Motion events that did not happen usually involve not only the moving figure but an observer who is either at goal or at origin of motion, and who is expecting the motion or is otherwise involved in it. The observer imagines the motion event and its non-occurrence can impact him/her. Both imperfective and perfective aspects are possible with this construction, though perfective is preferred. The observer at locus and his/her expectation occurs with most perfective VoMs describing events which did not take place.

In some negated VoM constructions the motion actually does take place – such is the usage of the imperfective to indicate motion that takes place after a significant interval. Motion in this case becomes an attribute of the moving figure

or of the whole situation. Motion that did take place can have more detailed specification of path and manner than motion which did not take place.

References

- Borschev, V. & Partee, B. H. 2002. The Russian genitive of negation in existential sentences: The role of theme-rheme structure reconsidered. In *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 4, E. Hajicova & P. Sgall (eds.), 185–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clark, H. H. 1974. Semantics and comprehension. In *Current Trends in Linguistics* 12, T. Sebeok (ed.), 1291–1498. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fillmore, C. J. & Kay, P. 1993. *Construction Grammar Coursebook*. Ms, University of California-Berkeley.
- Forsyth, J. 1970. *A Grammar of Aspect: Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gazdar, G. 1979. *Pragmatics: Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Form*. New York NY: Academic Press.
- Goldberg, A. E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Horn, L. R. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Isačenko, A. V. 1962. *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart. Formenlehre*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Keller, F. & Lapata, M. 2003. Using the Web to obtain frequencies of unseen bigrams. *Computational Linguistics* 29(3): 459–484.
- Keller, F. & Lapata, M. 2005. Web-based models for natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Speech and Language Processing* 2(1): 1–31.
- Kilgariff, A. & Grefenstette, G. 2003. Introduction to the special issue on the Web as corpus. *Computational Linguistics* 29(3): 333–347.
- Lambrecht, K. 2000. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lewis, W. D., Farrar, S. & Langendoen, T. 2006. Linguistics in the internet age: Tools and fair use. In *Proceedings of the EMELD06 Workshop on Digital Language Documentation: Tools and Standards: The State of the Art*. Lansing MI.
- Merrill, P. 1985. Aspect as evaluation: The case of negation. In *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*, M. Flier & A. Timberlake (eds.), 129–152. Columbus OH: Slavica.
- Meyer, C. F. 2004. Can you really study language variation in linguistic corpora? *American Speech* 79 (4): 339–355.
- Meyer, C. F., Grabowski, R., Han, T., Mantzouranis, K., & Moses, S. 2003. The World Wide Web as linguistic corpus. In *Corpus Analysis: Language Structure and Language Use*, C. F. Meyer & P. Leistyna (eds.), 241–254. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Padučeva, E. V. 1992. O semantičskom podxode k sintaksisu i genitivnom subjekte glagola BYT'. *Russian Linguistics* 16(1): 53–63.
- Padučeva, E. V. 1997. Roditelnyj subjekta v otricatel'nom predloženi: sintaksis ili semantika? *Voprosy Iazykoznanija* 2: 101–116.
- Padučeva, E. V. 2004. *Dinamičeskie modeli v semantike leksiki*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Perelmutter, R. 2005. Case choice in Russian genitive/nominative absence constructions. *Russian Linguistics* 29(3): 319–346.

- Slobin, D. I. 2004. The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In *Relating Events in Narrative*, Vol. 2: *Typological and Contextual Perspectives*, S. Strömquist & L. Verhoeven (eds.), 219–257. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Slobin, D. I. 2006. Verbs of Manner of Human Motion. Ms, University of California-Berkeley.
- Šigurov, V. V. 1993. *Tipologija upotreblenija atributivnyx form russkogo glagola v uslovijax otricanija dejstvija*. Saransk: Izdatelstvo moskovskogo universiteta.
- Talmy, L. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, T. Shopen (ed.), 57–149. Cambridge: CUP.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Thelwall, M. 2005. Creating and using Web corpora. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 10(4): 517–541.
- Timberlake, A. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Tottie, G. 1991. *Negation in English Speech and Writing: A Study in Variation*. San Diego CA: Academic Press.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. & Šmelev, A. D. 2000. *Vvedenie v russkuiu aspektologiju*. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Appendix 1. Sources of Internet examples, listed by example number

1. <http://bookz.ru/authors/mihail-plackovskii/d45968cf82ef1-d45968cf82ef.html>
2. <http://ecoclub.nsu.ru/isar/books/erdakov/4.htm>
3. http://leonidandreev.ru/rassказы/na_stantsii.htm
4. http://turizm.lib.ru/l/luchin_ewgenij_anatolxewich/cvizboromvalpach2.shtm
5. <http://www.victory.mil.ru/lib/books/memo/litvin/13.html>
6. http://kulichki.com/akter/publ/papanov_a1.htm
7. http://anekdoti.ru/jokes.php?joke_category=99
8. <http://topos.ru/article/6162>
9. <http://www.newsru.com/cinema/07jun2007/antonov.html>
10. http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/russian/talking_point/newsid_1451000/1451670.stm
11. <http://www.turizm.ru/india/stories/p-2056.html>
12. <http://www.wplanet.ru/index.php?show=text&tid=5258>
13. <http://phorum.artek.org/showthread.php3?threadid=522>
14. http://lib.krnet.ru/alt/FISKANDER/isk_rassk5.txt
18. <http://lib.ru/TURIZM/HITCHHIKE/elba98.txt>
19. <http://www.levashov-book.ru/levashov/3/1/546/>
20. http://world.lib.ru/r/razumow_g/pravdaivimisel.shtml
21. http://www.russia-today.ru/2004/no_16/16_local_admin_2.htm
22. <http://mk.ru/44800.html>
23. <http://turizt.livejournal.com/34000.html>
24. <http://www.afisha.ru/article/1004/>
25. <http://www.old.kurskcity.ru/events/fetch.html>
26. <http://www.cirota.ru/forum/view.php?subj=79459>
28. <http://www.mkset.ru/news/music/7108/>
29. http://www.compromat.ru/page_17656.htm

30. <http://www.cis-news.info/read/80565/>
31. <http://forum.vetby.ru/index.php?showtopic=6276&mode=threaded&pid=11031>
32. <http://www.likefeo.narod.ru/avtor9.html>
33. <http://www.detki.kz/kids/sorvanec/zver/>
34. <http://wap.zavet.ru/book/02apol/002/031.htm>
35. <http://lifeizlife.aha.ru/rabb/skazka1.html>
36. <http://www.blogus.ru/pop/blogs/blogdetail.aspx?id=5059&pid=402055>

Appendix 2. Abbreviations used in interlinear glosses

ACC	accusative
ADJ	adjective
DAT	dative
DET	determinate
GEN	genitive
INDET	indeterminate
INF	infinitive
INSTR	instrumental
IPFV	imperfective
NEG	negation
NOM	nominative
PART	particle
PFV	perfective
PL	plural
PREP	prepositional
REFL	reflexive
SG	singular