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Russian schoolchildren have to work their way through a large body of spelling exercises. One recurrent problem is the correct spelling of the negative particle ne, which must be written either as a separate word or as a part of a compound. For example: ne pravda (not the truth) versus nepravda (the not-truth, lie). A number of manuals for teachers attempt to explain the logic of current spelling conventions, and the issue is regularly discussed in the consultation section of language journals. The mere existence of this practical problem throws suspicion on linguistic theories of negation which take it for granted that a sharp borderline exists between non-affixal (or syntactic) and affixal (or morphological) types of negation: the orthographic problem clearly points to a semantic problem here. And the latter becomes really interesting only at the point where spelling rules capitulate: combinations of ne plus verb. Whereas it is relatively easy to understand the semantic difference captured by the graphic distinction between, e.g., ne pravda and nepravda, all proposals to express graphically a similar distinction in the case of ne plus verb have been rejected; ne is written separately from a subsequent finite verb, irrespective of the semantic impact of the combination, unless the verb does not occur without ne- (but see 4.2). This solution wisely protects children and their teachers from additional frustrations and nervous breakdowns, but it ought to be a challenge to linguists: why was it felt to be impossible to arrive here at a semantically motivated rule for spelling?

The present paper explores this question, and a number of related problems, in terms of the model of information structure introduced in Keijsper 1985 (henceforth: K 1985). Chapter One below summarizes the features of this model which are relevant to the issues at hand. The rest of the paper applies the model to negative sentences; conversely, the discussion of negative sentences enables me to add some points to K 1985.

Chapter Two briefly gives some general basic information about the functioning of ne in Russian. Most points are probably redundant for Slavist readers, but I hope that such readers will understand the necessity of restating well-known facts if a new framework is being used.

Chapter Three examines a simple string of the form ne - subject noun - verb, with various accentuations and syntactic organizations. The string is simple in the sense that it allows only a relatively small number of readings, once an accentuation has been chosen.

Next, Chapter Four discusses the causes of the fact that the number of readings increases if ne precedes the verb rather than the subject. In so doing, the chapter explains why the spelling problem has no real solution here. Also, the chapter calls attention to the fact that strings adverb - ne - verb correspond to at least three different syntactic organizations. I hope that this part of the reasoning contributes to bridging the gap which seemingly exists between information structure in my sense and problems of time and negation as traditionally studied by aspectologists.

Finally, Chapter Five introduces three further points. First, some examples are given of combinations of vs- (all) plus ne (in this order); such combinations have two distinct readings, rough-
ly: "all - not" and "not - all". Secondly, the chapter explains why combinations of a negation and, e.g., many, have two readings: "less than many" and "the thing meant is a quantity other than many". The third point is about gradable adjectives.

The conclusion warns against a simplistic attempt to differentiate between morphological and syntactic types of negation. The discussion in no way exhausts the problem of negation in Russian, but it hopefully provides a basis for further extensions.

As the reader will notice, my treatment of negation is quite different from traditional approaches. Basically, I hold the view that "ne" is a meaning like any other meaning which enters into various combinations. This view is diametrically opposed to the opinion that negation functions in the way a logical operator does. This difference has important consequences. For example, the question as to what is "the" negation of a given positive sentence has no role to play in my approach, although I recognize, of course, that "ne" has different effects in different constellations. Further, given the devices available for the analysis of accent and word order (K 1985), the notion "scope of negation" and the traditional distinction between "sentential" and "constituent" negation become redundant. In fact, I find these notions highly confusing, "scope of negation" because it ascribes to an innocent word what must in reality be ascribed to accents and their scope, and "sentential"/"constituent" negation because it draws a borderline which does not always correspond to the semantic distinction which is probably meant.

These fundamental differences ensure that discussing the literature on negation would be confusing rather than helpful here, so I leave this discussion for another occasion.

CHAPTER ONE:

SOME NOTIONS FROM INFORMATION STRUCTURE

1.1 Projection time

A speaker of a language X has at his disposal a permanent stock of linguistic knowledge from which he draws when he utters a sentence. The permanent stock of knowledge includes the meanings of his language. Let me indicate these meanings by "a", "b", "c", "d", etc.:

permanent stock of meanings "a" "b" "c" "d" etc.

When the speaker utters the sentence b d he uses the meanings "b" and "d" from this stock. The act of using a meaning may be compared to making a photocopy of a picture: when we do so, we produce a second picture, identical to the original one, but we do not destroy the original picture, so that we can produce as many copies as we wish. In the same way, a meaning does not disappear from our permanent stock of knowledge when we use it in a given utterance. I shall call the copies of meanings "projections". Thus, when uttering the sentence b d, a speaker copies the meanings "b" and "d", so that he has the projections "b" and "d":

permanent stock of meanings "a" "b" "c" "d" etc.

projections "b" "d"
Once we have acquired the meanings of our language, we have them in mind until we die or become demented: our stock of meanings is timeless, as indicated by the term "permanent" used above; all meanings are present constantly and simultaneously. Projections, in contrast, are temporary phenomena: this moment we have one thought, then we forget it and have another; projections appear and disappear in time, they may follow one another or be present simultaneously. Projection time is the time in which projections exist.

1.2 Accent; backward link

A copying machine supplies a new piece of paper for every copy we wish to make; if e.g. a whole book were copied on a single piece of paper, the result would be incomprehensible. The flow of projection time can be compared to this paper supply: every now and then we need a new moment of projection time in order to put into it the next chunk of information. The regulation of this flow, i.e. the introduction of subsequent moments of projection time, is basically effectuated by accents in the speech we utter. (But not all accents introduce a new moment of projection time, and not all moments of projection time are introduced by accents.)

The ability of an accent to introduce a new moment of projection time is a consequence of its meaning, which is "not not". This meaning cannot be used (copied) in isolation, just as an accent (the corresponding form) cannot exist without something else which carries the accent.

Let us assume that in our sentence, \( d \) is accented; this will be indicated as: \( d \) ("" = accent); our sentence is, then, \( b \ d \). The combination of "not not" and "d" gives "not not d". The combination reads "not (not d)"; the projection "d" combines with one part of "not not" into "not d", and then this combination is negated, the result being a new projection "d". This operation is capable of introducing a new moment of projection time with respect to "b", as indicated in the following diagram:

Here, the "d" in "not d" is the copy of the meaning "d"; the copy of "not not" is the "not" in "not d" plus the upward arrow; the "d" in moment 2 is the result of the operation:

permanent stock of meanings "a" "b" "not not" "d" etc.

projections in projection time

The act of introducing moment 2 by negating "not d" may be compared to taking a new piece of paper for "d".

Since the following chapters will be about negation, it is useful to keep in mind that during the procedure described, no meaning "not d" from the permanent stock is copied. In fact, the "not d" in "not (not d)" cannot be expressed in natural language: "d" can be expressed, by \( d \), "not not" can be expressed, by an accent, but "not d" cannot be expressed; more specifically, it is not the meaning of the English form \( \overline{\text{not}} \ d \). Moreover, "not not d" simply states the above-mentioned procedure; it says "the negation of the negation of d", or \( (\overline{\text{d}})^{-1} \), or \( \overline{\text{d}} \), or still another formula in the language one uses for describing meanings. In contrast, the English word \( \text{not} \) is an element of a natural language one may be describing. Thus, the present article is about Russian \( \text{not} \); it is written in English; both Russian and English have the meaning "¬"(¬)¬/"the negation of the negation"/"not not"/etc.'

The effect of placing "d" in a new moment of projection time with respect to "b" is that the information "d" is added to the (already present) information "b", rather than the other way round. This direction of adding "d" to "b" (rather than "b" to "d") I call a "backward link":

Here, the "d" in "not d" is the copy of the meaning "d"; the copy of "not not" is the "not" in "not d" plus the upward arrow; the "d" in moment 2 is the result of the operation:
This backward link may be compared to the usual procedure while photocopying: we copy "b" on one piece of paper, then "d" on the next piece of paper, and we pile the new piece of paper on top of the preceding one.

1.3 Unaccented elements; forward link; scope

Whereas accented elements can introduce new moments of projection time, unaccented elements are parasitic: they group with another element in some moment of projection time. Suppose that our sentence is \( a \ b \ c \ d \), and that both \( b \) and \( d \) introduce new moments of projection time:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
| & | & | \\
|---|---|---| \\
| d | not d | not b |
\end{array}
\]

In principle, unaccented elements may group with the positive or with the negative member of a pair "x"/"not x"; thus, in the example, with "b" or with "not b", and with "d" or with "not d". Let us assume that in the sentence \( a \ b \ c \ d \), "a" goes with "b", and "c" with "d": "a" is added to "b" in the moment defined by "b", and "c" is added to "d" in the moment defined by "d":

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
| & | & | \\
|---|---|---| \\
| a\ b | c\ d | not b |
\end{array}
\]

Here, "a" is linked forwards to "b", and "c" is linked forwards to "d": "a" goes with "b" which follows it in the sentence \( a \ b \ c \ d \), and "c" goes with "d" which follows "c". If "c" were grouped with "b", we would have a backward link, because "c" follows "b" in the speech chain:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
| & | & | \\
|---|---|---| \\
| a\ b | c\ not d | not b |
\end{array}
\]

Some terms which can be used to apply to this configuration are the following:

Projection "a" concurs with "b", and "c" concurs with "d" (cf. written on the same piece of paper). Further, \( a \) is included in the scope of the accent on \( b \), and \( c \) is included in the scope of the accent on \( d \): when "not b" is there (moment 1), "a" is absent, but as soon as "b" is there (moment 2), "a" is also there; when "not d" is there (moment 2), "c" is absent, but as soon as "d" is there (moment 3), "c" is also there. The complexes "a b" and "c d" are two chunks of information. For example: My friend is ill ("a" = "my", "b" = "friend", "c" = "is", "d" = "ill"). Compare: My friend is ill (no accent on \( b \)):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
| & | & | \\
|---|---|---| \\
| a\ b | c\ not d | not b |
\end{array}
\]

Here, the entire sentence is included in the scope of the accent on friend: all unaccented elements concur with "b". Further: My friend is ill (no accent on \( b \)):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
| & | & | \\
|---|---|---| \\
| a\ b | c\ d | not b |
\end{array}
\]

Here, is is included in the scope of the accent on ill ("c" concurs with "d"); my friend is not included in the scope of the accent on ill: "a" and "b" do not concur with "d" (but with "not d").
1.4 Coinciding and non-coinciding projections

A normal copying machine has a button which we push when we wish to make a copy of e.g. a picture. When we do so, a piece of paper appears with a replica of the original picture. So far, we have seen examples of this normal procedure. In e.g. My friend is ill we have pushed the button twice, producing one piece of paper with "my" and "friend" and one piece of paper with "is" and "ill"; in e.g. My friend is ill, we have pushed the button only once, the result being one piece of paper with all information on it. Always, a piece of paper appeared simultaneously with the picture reproduced on it.

In contrast to a normal copying machine, our mind is capable of disassociating these two: we may produce a piece of paper first (a moment of projection time), and, subsequently (in the next moment of projection time), reproduce a meaning from our permanent stock. Thus, two processes which normally go together, the act of producing a piece of paper and the act of reproducing a picture on it, can follow each other in our mind. I call the normal case (two simultaneous processes): "coinciding projections"; the abnormal case is called "non-coinciding projections".

The clean piece of paper which we separately produce in the non-coinciding case is a projection which has no formal correlate in the sentence we utter; it is a non-linguistic perception of something, e.g. of an entity. Suppose, for example, that we know somebody called John. Normally, when we think of this person, we think "John": the projection of the person and the projection "John" are not distinguished. This is a case of coinciding projections. The negation of "John", i.e. "not John", refers in this case to the absence of the person:

```
["person" = "John" ]  --- moment 2
["absence of person" = "not John"]  --- moment 1
```

However, when somebody points at a person he sees and asks who it is, we first think of the person and then may identify him as John. This is a case of non-coinciding projections, the projections "person" and "John" are disassociated, the former preceding the latter. In this case the negation of "John", i.e. "not John", refers to the absence of the property /John/ of the given person; the projection of the absence of the person per se already belongs to the past:

```
["person without property /John/" = "not John"]  --- moment 3
["absence of person"]  --- moment 2
```

Here, the projection "John" which follows "not John" fills in the missing property of the person we are thinking of. Non-coincidence of projections may also take the following form:

```
["group of persons minus John" = "not John"]  --- moment 3
["absence of group of persons"]  --- moment 2
```

Here, "John" fills in the person John who is missing among the group of persons we are thinking of.

As can be seen in the diagrams, non-coinciding projections occupy an additional moment of projection time, as compared with the corresponding coinciding case (in the example: 3 moments instead of 2).
Non-coincidence of projections plays an important role in negative sentences, which, as is well-known, basically remove something which is first thought to be present at least potentially. This basic idea consists of two steps (3 moments of projection time), the first one introducing the thing involved, the second one removing it again, either partially or entirely. Normally, the first step already belongs to the past when the act of removal is done; this is the so-called "presuppositional character" of negative sentences. The size of the thing which is removed varies. For example, in *Ne Ivan čitaet* (Lit. Not John reads) (ne/not now being the Russian/English word ne/not) we remove the property /Ivan/ of the person who is reading but not the entire person. In *Ivan ne čitaet* (Lit. John not reads), in contrast, we may remove the identifying property of the thing John is doing (what he is doing is not reading but something else), but we may also remove his activity entirely (John's potential reading is absent). The interpretational possibilities are governed by a simple principle, which will be stated in 4.1 below.

1.5 Figure/ground and part/whole organizations; attention; scope

The distinction between coinciding and non-coinciding projections enables us to describe, in terms of time and negation, some linguistically relevant conceptual organizations which have to do with attention. As mnemonic labels for the relevant organizations, I use the terms figure/ground and part/whole. The terminological distinction figure/ground is well-known from studies of visual perception; the part/whole relation is the primitive notion of the branch of logic called mereology.

Looking at some picture illustrating the well-known phenomenon of figure/ground reversals, one may come to realize that the perception of an element of such a picture as the figure equals the idea that this element can be lifted up without affecting the rest of the picture, and that, if we do so, the ground fills the space which was occupied by the figure before we lifted it up. The perception of an element as the ground equals the idea that, if we lift up this element, the entire picture disappears. In other words, we organize the picture to the effect that what we call the figure is placed on top of what we call the ground. In terms of projection time this says that the projection of the ground precedes the projection of the figure:

- "figure" = "ground plus figure"
- "ground" = "not figure" = "ground without figure"
- "not ground" = "absence of ground and figure"

A part/whole organization, in contrast, is the idea that, if we remove the part, the rest of the whole remains, but without filling the space which was formerly occupied by the part (in contrast to a ground):

- "part" = "entire whole (including part)"
- "whole minus part" = "not part" = "whole without part"
- "not whole" = "absence of whole"

A part/whole organization results if we spread the perception of one member of a figure/ground organization over two moments of projection time. This spreading is the phenomenon of non-coinciding projections introduced in 1.4 above.

We can now state the following about the person John example of 1.4:

The person John is a figure in what may be called "the world" ("the scene", "the background", etc.); the world is the ground for this figure. If the projections "person" and "John" are disassociated (non-coinciding projections, "spreading of perception"), it is the person as such which is a figure in the world; the property /John/ is a part of the person, the person being a whole. Thus, "John" is a projection of a figure in the coinciding case (figure = person = John; ground = world), and "John" is a projection of a part in the non-coinciding case (part = /John/; whole = person and figure = person; ground = world). The size of the part and of the whole may vary; thus, on the level "group of persons", also given
in 1.4, the part is the person John, the whole is the group of persons; this group is also a figure with respect to "the world". The size of the combination can also be stated in terms of truth (cf. 3.1, 4.1, 4.3 and 5.2 below).

This terminology is related to the notion of attention in the following way. If the projections "person" and "John" coincide ("person" = "John" and "absence of person" = "not John") the accent on John focuses attention on the person John. Thus, I claim that the act of focusing attention on the person John is the act of negating a projection of the absence of this person John. If the projections "person" and "John" do not coincide (if John fills in a missing property of somebody we are thinking of) it is the person as such which is the focus of attention. In other words, in a figure/ground organization (here: ground = world; figure = person John), it is the figure which is the focus of attention. In a part/whole organization (here: whole = person as such; part = property /John/ of this person), it is the whole which is the focus of attention.

The issue as to what constitutes the focus of attention is relevant, inter alia, because of its consequences for the scope of accents. As we saw in 1.3, unaccented elements concur with some other element in the moment of projection time defined by this other element. Now, they concur, more specifically, with the thought which refers to the focus of attention, i.e. with the thought of the figure in a figure/ground combination, and with the thought of the whole in a part/whole combination. For example, the accent in Ivan priechal (John arrived) may include priechal in its scope (cf. What happened?) because "Ivan" may refer to a figure here (the person John). In contrast, the accent in Ne Ivan priechal (not John arrived) does not include priechal in its scope because "ne Ivan" does not refer to a figure here: we remove the property /John/ of the person who arrived, which implies that the person is construed as a whole and is the focus of attention (see further Chapter Three).^ Further, in terms of attention, the step from ne pravda (not the truth) to nepravda (the not-truth) consists in transferring the focus of attention from the thing mistakenly referred to by "pravda" to the thing referred to be "nepravda" (ibid.). Tragically, this transfer renders the combination positive. The following chapters discuss various strategies for precluding such a transfer, i.e. for ensuring that a ne+x combination remains negative.

In terms of a diagram of the type introduced earlier, the scope effect of non-coinciding projections is the "lowering" of a projection by one level. Consider our model-example a b c d. We saw that e.g. "c" may group with "d":

```
... "c" "d" "not d"
```

This organization can occur only if "d" coincides with the non-linguistic perception of what it refers to, say with "p":

```
... "c" "d" = "p"
"not d" = "absence of p"
```

If "d" and "p" do not coincide, i.e. if the non-linguistic perception "p" precedes "d", "c" no longer concurs with "d" (but with "not d"), because it concurs with "p" (the whole):

```
"d"
"c" "not d" "p"
"absence of p"
```

Thus, although "c" is linked forwards here, it need not be included in the scope of the accent on d (it need not concur with "d"); it does so only if "d" coincides with "p". In either case, "c" concurs with "p": "c" is written on the piece of paper "p" also if the accent on d, which can in principle supply this piece of paper, fails to do so in the given case.
1.6 Parallel link

The phenomenon of non-coinciding projections explained in the foregoing affects one accent, more precisely the last accent; it has consequences for the surrounding unaccented elements: these are "lowered" by one level as compared with the corresponding coinciding case.

There is, in addition, an application of non-coinciding projections which affects two accents. It has the effect of "lowering" some projection, say "x", as well as the negation, "not x". Just as in the one-accent case, a non-linguistic projection "p" is involved.

Starting from a normal backward linking scheme, or from a normal forward linking scheme:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"x"} \\
\text{"not y"} \\
\text{"not x"} \\
\text{"not y"} \\
\end{array} \]

both "y" and "not y" (in the former case), or both "x" and "not x" (in the latter case), may sometimes be lowered, so that "x" concurs with "y" and "not x" with "not y"; a non-linguistic "p" precedes "x" and "y":

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"p"} \\
\text{"x"} \\
\text{"y"} \\
\text{"not x"} \\
\text{"not y"} \\
\end{array} \]

I call this configuration: "a parallel link"; its symbol is a double arrow (see the diagram). It may be compared to taking a piece of paper ("p") and, subsequently, putting both "x" and "y" on this piece of paper (simultaneously). Projection "p" is a non-linguistic thought of some state of affairs; it makes this state of affairs the focus of attention; all other projections involved in the sentence apply to that state of affairs.

The main field of application for parallel links is that of negative sentences. Roughly, if one has the impression that a negation occurring in a sentence "applies to" some element x while the (surface) structure of the sentence says it belongs to an accented element y, probably a parallel link is involved.

1.7 Concurrent and non-concurrent negation; word order

In all diagrams presented so far, a negation of some projection, say "not x", was written under the corresponding "x": "not x" preceded "x" in projection time. Such a "not x" is a non-concurrent negation. A concurrent negation is a "not x" which belongs to the same moment of projection time as "x" itself:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"not x"} \\
\text{"x"} \\
\end{array} \]

An accent which negates a concurrent negation is a "topic"-accent, in one of the many senses of "topic"; an accent which negates a non-concurrent negation is a "comment"-accent, in one of the many senses of "comment". The semantic difference is the following.

An accent negating a concurrent "not x" selects the referent of "x" from among other referents, "not x" referring to the other referents. An accent negating a non-concurrent "not x" negates a projection of the absence of the referent of "x" among other referents, "not x" referring to the absence of the referent. Thus, informally, and with an assertive type of last accent, a "topic"-accent (concurrent negation) selects x (the referent) from among the things in its environment; this implies that x was already present in that environment (hence the association between "topic" and "old information"). A "comment"-accent (non-concurrent negation) says that x is not absent in its environment, it adds, as it were, x to its environment (hence the association between "comment" and "new information").

A negation of a non-concurrent negation is the basic type; it is reinterpreted as a negation of a concurrent negation if the meaning of word order excludes the basic interpretation. The technical details need not concern us here (see K 1985: 313 ff.); the following example gives the main idea.
The sentence *Priechal prijatel’* (Lit. Arrived friend) has the word with the last accent (*prijatel’*) in final position. The accent here negates a non-concurrent negation, by virtue of the fact that it is the last accent. Further, the meaning of word order ensures that "not prijatel’’ and "prijatel’'' refer to the world of different moments: the accent introduces the friend against the background of the previous absence of the friend:

- "prijatel’’ - "world at moment $t_2$"
- "not prijatel’’ - "world at moment $t_1$"

Next, in *Prijatel’ priechal* (Lit. Friend arrived), the accent, being the last one, also negates a non-concurrent negation. However, the meaning of word order ensures that "not prijatel’’ and "prijatel’'' refer to the world of a single moment: the accent negates the absence of the friend in the world of a given moment, the latter being given independently:

- "prijatel’’ - "prijatel’’ - "world at moment $t_2$"
- "not prijatel’’ - "not prijatel’’ - "world at moment $t_1$"

The difference is, essentially, identical to coinciding vs. non-coinciding projections (see section 1.4 above). However, it does not affect the scope of the accent on *prijatel’’; in both cases, "prijachel’’ may concur with "prijatel’’. (The coincidence/non-coincidence does not concern the level "person" or "group of persons", as it did in 1.4, but the level "world at moment $t$".)

If we now add a second accent: *Prijatel’ priechal* (Lit. Friend arrived), the accent on *prijatel’’ can no longer be interpreted as it is in *Prijatel’ priechal*; the accent on *priechal’* ensures, given the backward link, that "not prijatel’’ and "prijatel’’ refer in the same way as they did in *Priechal prijatel’;*

Thus, given an accent on *priechal’*, the backward link has the same effect on the interpretation of the accent on *prijatel’’ as word order had when *prijatel’’ was the last word (in *Priechal prijatel’*). However, *prijatel’’ is not the last word now, and the meaning of word order says that it must have a negation belonging to the same moment now. In *Prijatel’ priechal*, the "same moment" prescribed by the meaning of word order was the same moment of world-time (world at $t_2$), but in *Prijatel’ priechal* this interpretation becomes impossible. We then give "prijatel’’ a negation in the same moment of projection time, i.e. a concurrent negation:

- "not prijatel’’ - "prijatel’’ - "not priechal’’

In this way, a negation of a non-concurrent negation is reinterpreted as a negation of a concurrent negation if a further accent to the right makes it impossible to comply with the meaning of word order in a different way.

The step from *Prijatel’ priechal* to *Prijatel’ priechal* is very important, inter alia for understanding negative sentences. For example, whereas *Ne prijatel’ priechal* (Lit. Not friend arrived) is a relatively simple sentence, we must take special measures for interpreting *Ne prijatel’ priechal* (Lit. Not friend arrived). In this case we must either combine "ne" with "prijatel’’ into the compound "neprijatel’’ (a not-friend, an enemy), or we must link "ne" to the entire combination of subject and predicate:

This will be discussed in 3.2-3.5.
In addition to this case, which follows directly from K 1985, Chapter Four below introduces the same problem in application to forward links in *adverb ne verb*. Here, if we do not take special measures, "ne verb" and "verb" refer to the world at different moments, which is basically incompatible with the negative character of the sentence: the latter says that the referent of "verb" must be removed; it must obviously be removed from the same time as it was imagined to be present, so we must stop the flow of world-time in order to do the removing.

A parallel link as described in 1.6 is a means of introducing such a time-stop: the projection "p" given in 1.6 is a projection of the world at $t_2$; both levels in a parallel link diagram refer to that world. The parallel link option is not available in *Ne prijáteľ priechal*, but it is available as a solution for the same problem in *adverb ne verb*: in Russian, as far as I know, only sentences with *ne* before the verb (if any) can have a parallel link."

1.8 Concurrent and non-concurrent parts; identical and non-identical parts

Just as projections can belong to the same or to different moments of projection time, referents can be opposed to other referents which exist simultaneously or at different moments. In order to understand the interpretational possibilities of quantifier-like meanings, especially in negative sentences, a distinction must be made between concurrent and non-concurrent parts. Concurrent parts are each other's complement:

"The notion of non-concurrent parts can be understood by imagining a pie which becomes progressively smaller by eating parts of it:"

The pictures just given contain non-identical parts. A pie which is cut up into pieces of equal size illustrates the notion of identical parts:

In addition to these basic distinctions introduced in K 1985 (: 278 ff.), 5.2 below gives one further distinction, for negated quantifiers: it concerns the ways in which a part can be removed if the thing from which a part is removed is, itself, a part. Section 5.4 illustrates how concurrent and non-concurrent parts can be combined. The discussion in the present paper is self-contained.

1.9 Inference

A last notion which is indispensable for understanding negative sentences (as well as positive sentences) is the notion "inference". In the model applied here, an inference is a conclusion about the truth or falsehood of something which results from combining negations in a certain, well-defined way. For example, in *My friend is ill* the accent on *my* negates, and thereby evokes, a (concurrent) projection "not my", e.g. *your*; the accent on *ill* negates, and thereby evokes, a (non-concurrent) projection "not ill". At this point, the strict meaning of the accentuation ends. However, we often go a step further. The sentence uttered says, with an assertive type of last accent, that the combination of
"my friend" and "is ill" is true:

\[
\text{not my} \text{ my friend} \text{ is ill} \quad \text{conveyed to be true}
\]

\[
\text{not my} \text{ my friend} \text{ is not ill} \quad \text{inferred to be true}
\]

A possible inference is that the combination of the two negations involved is also true:

\[
\text{not my} \text{ my friend} \text{ is not ill} \quad \text{inferred to be true}
\]

That is, e.g., "Your friend is not ill" is true. It is not necessary to draw this conclusion, but the sentence spoken allows it; it directly derives from the configuration of projections involved in the sentence. The example given here illustrates the third type of inference as described in K (1985: 293-295). In total, five types of inference have been formulated (K 1985: 287-312); together with the other notions summarized here, they account for interpretations which, in other frameworks, have been described under headings such as "negation transportation".

Section 3.1.3, below, repeats the first type of inference, in order to give (in addition to K 1985: 288-289) the negative counterpart of this inference in 3.2.2. The second type of inference is mentioned in 2.2. Section 5.1 illustrates the difference between the third and the fourth types of inference, in application to Russian sentences containing vs- (all) and ne (not). Finally, 5.2-5.3 elaborates on the fourth and fifth types of inference. In all cases, the discussion in the present paper is self-contained, but the numbering of inferences is taken from K 1985, where the reader can find other examples and details which are irrelevant here.

2.1 No backward link

The application of ne as a separate word is frustrated by the fact that it cannot be linked backwards. For example, it cannot be planned as the last item of a sentence: a string like Ona byla ne (Lit. She was not) unambiguously conveys that a thought has been broken off midway: "ona byla ne ..."

2.2 No second type of inference

In e.g. English, sentences can be spoken with a non-prominence-lending rise in the last syllable. This intonation is used, inter alia, for "associating" a negation with the item which carries the last accent. For example (with pitch contour indicated):

\[
\text{I don't read newspapers on Sundays} \quad \text{(My wife does)}
\]

\[
\text{I don't read newspapers on Sundays} \quad \text{(I buy them)}
\]

\[
\text{I don't read newspapers on Sundays} \quad \text{(I only sleep/I read only books)}
\]

\[
\text{I don't read newspapers on Sundays} \quad \text{(I read them on Mondays)}
\]

The interested reader is referred to K (1985: 290-293) for a description of how this "association" takes place. In Russian, the relevant non-prominence-lending rise in the last syllable does not exist, and I have never met an example of this type of inferential "negation association".
2.3 Moveability

Leaving aside the restrictions summarized in 2.1, ne-placement is flexible. For example (Dahl 1979: 105):

Ne ja čitaju gazety po voskresen’jam
Not I read newspapers on Sundays
Ja ne čitaju gazety po voskresen’jam
I not read newspapers on Sundays
Ja ne čitaju gazety po voskresen’jam
I not read newspapers on Sundays
Ja čitaju ne gazety po voskresen’jam
I read not newspapers on Sundays
Ja čitaju gazety ne po voskresen’jam
I read newspapers not on Sundays

Such lists are sometimes given in order to illustrate the notion "scope of negation". This notion is redundant in my approach. For example, in application to Ne ja čitaju gazety po voskresen’jam many authors would say that the only word in the scope of ne is ja. Instead, I say that the accent on ja includes ne in its scope ("ne" is linked forwards to "ja" here); further, the accent does not include čitaju gazety po voskresen’jam in its scope, because "ne ja" cannot refer to a figure in a figure/ground organization (see 1.5 and Chapter Three). The word ne does not have scope.

Although the list adequately illustrates the flexibility of ne-placement, it tends to suggest that the semantic effect of ne-placement and accent is identical in all sentences of the list. This suggestion is incorrect: some types of message can only be expressed by a sentence having ne before the verb. In Chapter Four I will mainly be concerned with the latter types of message. The semantic effect of ne-placement and accent in a list such as the one given above can be derived along the lines of the model supplied in Chapter Three.

2.4 Forward link vs. no link

The property of ne which causes the spelling problem mentioned in the Introduction (see 0) is its tendency to become incorporated in the next word alongside ne prijatel’ (not a friend) we have the word neprijatel’ (a not-friend, an enemy), alongside ne dejstvitel’nyj (not valid) we have the word nedejstvitel’ny (invalid), etc.; especially with adjectives, many such pairs can be formed.

The step from e.g. ne prijatel’ to neprijatel’ consists in eliminating the forward link from "ne" to "prijatel’":

ne"prijatel’"  "ne prijatel’" (no link direction)

What this amounts to semantically will be explained in Chapter Three.

Words exist which do not occur without ne-; for example: nevzgoda (ill-luck) (vzgoda does not exist), neukljužij (clumsy, unwieldy) (ukljužij does not exist), etc. If the rest of the sentence says that there is a link between "ne" and, e.g., "vzgoda" or "ukljužij", impossible or odd combinations are the result: ?eto nimalo nevzgoda/ne vzgoda (? that is altogether ill-luck / that is not at all luck), ? on vovse neukljužij/ne uklužij (? he is altogether unwieldy / he is by no means wieldy) (Obzor 1965: 364). The non-existence of the word without ne- may be not absolute; in that case, only an insoluble spelling problem arises: nikomu nevedome/ ne vedome ščast’e (cf. ? happiness, unknown to anybody (not known to anybody / unknown to everybody)) (Ivanova 1982: 153). Such conflicts appear at least if a "ne+x" combination with no link between "ne" and "x" combines, in its turn, with the rest of the sentence by means of a parallel link: the parallel link on the higher level implies that "ne" is linked forwards to "x" (see 4.9 below).
2.5 Prosody

It would be nice if the semantic difference between forward link and no link were directly correlated to a different prosodic treatment of *ne* in the two cases. Such a direct correlation does not seem to exist, however, although a thorough study of rhythm as perceived on the basis of pitch accent distribution, pitch movement in pretonic and posttonic syllables, and degree of vowel reduction, could perhaps bring to light a tendency towards differentiation. But e.g. Ivanova’s (1982: 126) suggestion that in *Biletъ niedejestvitel’ny* (The tickets are invalid) “intonational underlining” of *ne* is unnecessary, whereas in *NØ, biletъ net dejestvitel’ny* (NØ, the tickets are not valid) *ne* is necessarily prominent, is certainly too optimistic. On the other hand, the remark made during the 1962-1964 discussion about spelling reforms, viz. that the difference between word boundary and morpheme boundary is neutralized in the case of *ne* (see Obzor 1965: 375), may be too rash on the other extreme. Native speakers contradicting each other, this problem must be left open here.

If a word is accented, the choice of the syllable which gets the accent is not normally semantically motivated. Such a word (lexical accent unit) may include *ne*. For example, we have the paradigm on *ne byl* (He not was), *Ona ne bylå* (She not was), etc., where the combinations *ne byl* and *ne byla* are single accent units (although confusingly written as two graphic words, *byl* (a) being a verb). The difference between *ne byl* and *ne byla* is not semantically motivated; the accent includes (at least) the entire combination in its scope in both cases. This implies that Russian cannot express semantic distinctions like that between *He wasn’t* and *He was not* (see Koenitz 1982: 754 for comparable remarks about Czech).

Lexically determined stress positions may be overruled by semantic considerations, just as in English. For example, although the dictionary gives *impa:sible*, one may say *Impossible* or *im-på:sible* in order to focus attention on the element *im*.

A Russian example (Ivanova 1982: 126): *Itak, vy kelaete lubå*

byt’ némilosédryn, *dem milosédryn* (So you prefer being uncharitable to being charitable).

On the sentential level, any word, including *ne*, can be accented for emphasis. For example, the text analysed by Odé elsewhere in this volume contains a sentence: "Ni-ségå nē polučíloš" (Lit. NØ-thing not was-received), with two accents on the word *ničego*, and accents on *ne* as well as the verb. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that *ne* behaves exactly like, e.g., English *not*, even if it is a separate word by other criteria. For example, consider the following dialogue:

- I thought he was your friend
- Nå, he is not my friend

Here, *not* is accented for semantic reasons, the accent negating a projection of the absence of *not* in the sentence. The corresponding Russian string is: *Net, on ne moj prijatel’* (without a verb). Although an accent on *ne* and no accent on *prijatel’* (friend) would suit the context nicely, such a pronunciation of the string is at least awkward. It is better to put the last accent on *prijatel’* (or, for that matter, on *moj: he is not my friend*). Thus, although *ne* can be separated from *prijatel’* by placing e.g. *moj* between them, and although "ne" is linked forwards to "moj prijatel’" here, it tends not to behave as a separate accent unit (but as a proclitic element).

Needless to say, all this conspires to making the prosodic difference between forward link and no link (if any) subtle indeed.

2.6 *Ne* and parallel links

The feature of Russian negation which is most striking from e.g. the English point of view can best be explained on a rough intuitive level. Consider the sentences *They have eaten* and *They have eaten nothing*. As long as we have not heard the word *nothing*, we do not know whether or not they have eaten; the verbal complex *have eaten* alone does not enable us to decide this issue. In
Russian, a situation as in *They have eaten nothing* does not arise: starting from *éli* (have eaten), the rest of the sentence cannot change the information to such an extent that we must say: "They have not eaten". If the latter should be the outcome we must say *ne elii*. In the example, the result is a so-called "double negation" construction: *Oni nišegó ne elii* (Lit. They nothing not ate).

The converse, however, does not hold true: the combination *ne elii* alone does not exclude the possibility that the rest of the sentence changes the information to such an extent that we may say: "They have eaten". For example, *Oni mnógo ne elii* (Lit. They much not ate), i.e. They didn't eat much (but they did eat).

Technically, this says that Russian sentences with a parallel link have *ne* preceding the verb (if any)." (But not all combinations *ne* plus verb are linked to the rest of the sentence by means of a parallel link.)

This fact ensures that Russian sentences with a parallel link are formally homogeneous (in contrast to, e.g., English and Dutch). But on the other hand, the same fact ensures that the system is at first sight awkward in terms of what is true and what is not true. In e.g. English and Dutch, parallel links have a ubiquitous relation to truth: two levels of a diagram of the type introduced in Chapter One (see 1.6) are both correct. For example, *Nobody arrived* implies that "Everybody did not arrive" is also true (see K 1985: 302-305) (fused negation); *They didn't eat much (to do plus not)* allows the conclusion that "They ate not-much" is also true; and *Váak kwam hij niet op tijd* (Lit. Ōften came he nōt on time) (Other element - Verb - Subject - niet) allows the reading that "Not often did he arrive on time" is correct (K 1985: 296-302). In Russian, however, there are, as far as truth is concerned, two types of parallel link. In e.g. *Niktó ne pričchal* (Lit. Nobody not arrived) (ni plus ne) we cannot draw the conclusion that "Everybody arrived" is correct (in contrast to the English *Nobody didn't arrive*); on the contrary, the Russian sentence says that everybody did not arrive (see K 1985: 309-312). In other sentences with a parallel link (without a *ni*-word) we can draw such a conclusion. For example, *Oni mnógo ne elii* (Lit. They much not ate) allows the conclusion that (Lit.) "They not-much ate" is also true (K 1985: 296-302).

The development of this system can probably be explained on the basis of the meaning of word order (as described in K 1985: 313-358), in combination with the status of the verb to be mentioned in 2.7 below.

As indicated in 1.7, *Pričchal prijátel'* (Lit. Arrived friend) introduces the friend against the background of his previous absence: first it was true that the friend was absent, now it is true that the friend is present. Now, if we take e.g. "nobody" instead of "friend", this meaning must be cancelled, because it leads to the odd idea that a person called nobody was first absent and then present. Russian took the step of inserting *ne* before the verb in order to cancel the meaning of word order (in order to preclude a thought of the absence of the referent of "nikto" - see the following chapters). It has the effect that the two levels of a diagram of my type refer to the same time (parallel link), but it interprets the type *Ne pričchal nikto* (Lit. Not arrived nobody) as belonging to the type of 2.7 below. Later (see Kržková 1968: 23-25), *ne* before the verb became the rule also with Subject - Verb order (presumably by analogy): *Niktó ne pričchal* (Lit. Nobody not arrived). Although the introduction of *ne* in such sentences is a natural step to take, given the rest of the system, it has the awkward consequence that parallel links no longer have a ubiquitous relation to truth.

In (what are now) English and Dutch, there was no basis for introducing *ne*, because the type of 2.7 does not exist in the same way, and the meaning of Verb - Subject order changed, to the effect that (now) English Auxiliary - Subject order and Dutch Verb-first order have a meaning saying that both "Aux-S-V" (English)"/V-first-S" (Dutch) and the negation of these combinations can be true about the world of a single time (see Keijser, forthcoming).

The exact development must, of course, be investigated more thoroughly. As a far offspring of the different development, Dutch needs *V-S* order for a parallel link in sentences like *Váak kwam hij niet op tijd* (Lit. Ōften came he nōt on time); a parallel link
gives the reading "Not often did he arrive on time". If vaak precedes niet but no V-S order is chosen, as in Hij kwam vaak niet op tijd (Lit. He came often not on time), a parallel link is excluded (only: "Often, he did not arrive on time") (the word zo (so) seems to be an exception). In Russian, both Adverb-Subject-ne-Verb and Subject-Adverb-ne-Verb allow (a variant of) the parallel link reading, because here ne before the verb, not word order, is the prerequisite for a parallel link. On the difference between these two Russian arrangements see 4.7 below.

2.7 Absolute absence

We saw in 2.3 that ne can occupy various positions in a sentence, according to the message one wishes to convey. In 2.6 we saw that, if the message involves a parallel link, ne must be placed before the verb. There is yet another type of message which requires ne before the verb; the two classes overlap in the "double negation" construction, which, as far as truth is concerned, belongs here, in 2.7.

Consider the sentence On byl ne na Krasnoj plôžâdi (Lit. He was not on Red Square). This sentence says that he was not on Red Square and implies that he was elsewhere (cf. 4.1 below). It cannot mean that he has never been on Red Square: his not being on Red Square is conveyed about a specific, independently given time, for example: when the bomb exploded, he was not there. If we wish to convey that he has never been there, ne must precede the verb: On ne byl na Krasnoj plôžâdi (Lit. He not was on Red Square).

(Moreover, on must be in the nominative case; In Ego (genitive) ne bylo na Krasnoj plôžâdi, his absence on Red Square also applies to a specific time.)

This status of the verb in messages conveying absolute absence has a parallel in accent placement in interrogative sentences (with the Russian type of "question intonation", i.e., in Odé's classification elsewhere in this volume, a group C accent). If, with the type of accent concerned, the accent is on plôžâdi (and the sentence is interpreted as a question), the result is a question about his whereabouts at a given time: On byl na Krasnoj plôžâdi? asks whether or not he was on Red Square, for example, when the bomb exploded. If we wish to ask whether or not he has ever been on Red Square, the type of accent involved must be placed on the verb: On byl na Krasnoj plôžâdi?

Although ne must be placed before the verb if one wishes to convey absolute absence, it is not the case that, if ne is placed before the verb, the sentence necessarily conveys absolute absence.

The features of the system summarized here make it quite complicated. We will now look into some corners of the system in greater detail.

CHAPTER THREE

NE PLUS SUBJECT NOUN PLUS VERB

3.1 Prijatel' priechal (Lit. Friend arrived)

It follows from Chapter One that this sentence, for the time being without ne, has two interpretations: "prijatel'" may, but need not, coincide with the non-linguistic perception of what it refers to. I shall give these two interpretations separately.

3.1.1 Coinciding projections

In this interpretation, the sentence answers the question: What happened ?, i.e. priechal is included in the scope of the accent on prijatel', "priechnal" concurring with "prijatel'":
As indicated in the diagram, the accent (assuming an assertive type) negates the absence of the friend. The "world" is the ground to which the friend is being added. This ground contains other figures; these constitute the environment of the friend (cf. K 1985: 171 ff.):

We may also represent this procedure by means of a picture. The sentence evokes the thought of a world with a number of entities among which the friend is absent:

This thought is replaced by the thought of a world where the friend is present; simultaneously ("priechal" concurring with "prijatel'"), the friend gets the property of having arrived:

In terms of attention, the accent in this sentence focuses attention on the person who is the friend, and "arrived" projects a property of that person.

3.1.2 Non-coinciding projections

In this interpretation, the sentence answers the question: Who arrived?, i.e. priechal is not included in the scope of the accent on prijatel', "priechal" concurring with the thought of the whole of which "prijatel'" projects a part:

As indicated in 1.4 - 1.5, the whole can be either a group of persons or a single entity. In the former case the (assertive type of) accent negates the absence of the friend among other persons pictured as having arrived; in the latter case it negates the absence of the property /friend/ of the given entity (it identifies the entity). Thus, the size of the whole involved is not specified. The sentence replaces or

In terms of attention, the accent in this sentence adds information about something which already is the focus of attention, and which has the property /arrived/. Thus, whereas in the coinciding case (3.1.1) we directly focus attention on the friend, in the non-coinciding case attention is focused on something else, and the friend is identified with that thing (included in that
thing, mapped onto that thing). This procedure corrects an incorrect idea: it is incorrect to have the idea that the friend belongs to the environment of the thing we are thinking of, because this thing is itself the friend (includes the friend).

Note that in this description the focus of attention is the fixed point: the friend or /friend/ can be included in or mapped onto this fixed point, but the focus of attention remains where it is. This fact is essential, for understanding negative sentences, too.

3.1.3 First type of inference, positive

The two possible sizes of the whole in 3.1.2 can also be stated in terms of truth: if the friend is one among other persons pictured as having arrived, then these other persons may also have arrived. But if only one entity arrived, and this entity is the friend, then it is not somebody else, i.e. other potential identifications of the person are incorrect. (Cf. K 1985: 197-198, 221-222, 269, 288-289.) This incorrectness of other potential identifications can be formally stated as follows:

\[
\text{"prijatel" } \not\text{ inferred to be not true}
\]

\[
\text{"not prijatel'" }_1 \quad \text{"not prijatel'" }_2 \quad \text{"priechal"}
\]

First type of inference, positive sentences (see 3.2.3)

That is, if we map a property other than /friend/ onto the person who arrived, the result is incorrect (the person who arrived is the friend and not somebody else). This is the first type of inference; it is possible with last accents. Note that it is defined 1. on non-coinciding projections, 2. when the whole involved has the size of a single entity. This is relevant here, because we are now going to place \textit{ne} before \textit{prijatel}; in that case, the (negative counterpart of the) first type of inference must be applicable, i.e. the size of the whole involved must be one entity.

3.2 Ne prijatel' priechal (Lit. Not friend arrived)

3.2.1 Basic operation of negation

The addition of \textit{ne} to the subject in our example has the effect of excluding an interpretation with coinciding projections. Further, the whole involved in the resulting non-coinciding case has the size of a single entity. Finally, instead of assigning an identifying property, the sentence now removes one.

These observations tell us that in the example a figure is transformed into a whole by the removal of a part. Representing all relevant projections separately, we arrive at the following diagram:

\[
\text{whole minus part} = \text{"ne" "prijatel"} \quad \text{----- 3}
\]

\[
\text{"figure" = "whole including part" = "prijatel"} \quad \text{----- 2}
\]

\[
\text{"absence of figure" = "not prijatel"} \quad \text{----- 1}
\]

Thus, in the direction of the arrow, the levels are the following. Level 1 is the following picture:

- \[
\text{----- absence of friend}
\]

- \[
\text{other figures}
\]

Then, the addition of the friend would give:

- \[
\text{friend}
\]

- \[
\text{other figures}
\]
However, this does not happen entirely; the latter picture must be construed as (level 2):

```
/other/ figures

friend/
```

This urge is implied in the instruction that the ultimately resulting picture be (level 3):

```
absence of /friend/

/other/ figures
```

In this way, we are left with a projection of an unidentified entity. As always, the property of having arrived is mapped onto the person as such, i.e. "príčal" concurs with level 2 of the diagram.

Now, the procedure as given here must be specified further, because it consists of a number of operations: "ne" is combined with "prijatel'", and the accent on "prijatel'" performs an operation; also, the diagram contains two potential jobs for the accent: does it introduce level 1 and replace level 1 by level 2, as it did in 3.1.1, or does it introduce level 2 and replace level 2 by level 3, i.e. the reverse of what happened in 3.1.2?

From a comparison with other examples, it appears that the order in which the various operations are performed is relevant, and that the following holds true:
- There is, as far as I know, one case where a level 2 projection is present simultaneously with a level 3 projection. In that case the accent does its job before "ne" is added:

```
II

"ne"  "x"  \[ I \]

"not x"

level 2 and level 3

level 1
```

Here, x and ne x are simultaneously referred to, and the accent asserts x, i.e. the accent does what it did in 3.1.1. For this case see 4.8 below.
- Elsewhere, the accent does its job after the addition of "ne" to "x". As long as there is a link between "ne" and "x", the negation of "ne x", i.e. the projection negated by an accent on x, is "x":

```
I

"ne"  "x"  \[ II \]

"x"

level 3

level 2
```

(For this order of operations in positive sentences see K 1985: 241, 313, 331 etc.)

As we will see below (3.3), a combination "ne x" with no link between "ne" and "x" has a different negation.

Thus, by linking "ne" to "x" first, the task of the accent becomes the creation of level 2 and the replacement of this level by level 3, i.e. the operation of 3.1.2 is reversed. This says that the step from level 1 to level 2 in the general diagram given above, is relegated to the past by linking "ne" to "x". (In contrast, the choice between 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 is a matter of interpretation, contextually dependent. In e.g. Ne prijatel' príčal, a reading as the reverse of 3.1.2 is obligatory, independent of context.) In effect, the sentence gives the impression of removing something which was already there. This impression is, of course, an illusion, i.e. "x" need not be there before the sentence is spoken; the sentence itself says that it was.
- Finally, the fact that in our example, only a part of the entity is removed, viz. the identifying property /friend/, is not inherent in the use of ne; nor can it be ascribed to the link between "ne" and "prijatel'" or to the order of the operations. It follows from a general principle (see 4.1). We will come across
cases where the size of the thing removed is different.

- Note that in this description, ne does not remove or add anything; "ne x" is just a projection of something (the last picture given above). (In other words, not ne but the accent has scope.)

Summarizing for Ne prijatel' priechal:

I

whole minus part

"figure" = "whole including part"

"absence of figure"

II (accent)

[prijatel']

[relegated to the past)

In terms of attention, this diagram says that we remove the property /friend/ from the entity which is the focus of attention. Thus, we cancel an identification: it is incorrect to have the idea that the person we are thinking of (the person who arrived) is the friend; in reality, this person is not the friend. Note that, just as in the positive case (3.1.2), the focus of attention in the fixed point; we remove /friend/ from this fixed point, the latter staying where it is.

Note finally that the combination "ne prijatel'" is related to the absence of the friend indirectly, via a projection "prijatel'". This is characteristic of what we experience as a negative thought.5

3.2.2 First type of inference, negative

The operation introduced in 3.2.1 leaves us with a projection of an unidentified entity. We are now going to identify the entity; we have said that it is not the friend (we have removed /friend/), but we have not yet said who it is.

In order to arrive at a positive characterization of the person who is not the friend, we apply the same inference as that given in 3.1.3, but instead of a combination which is inferred to be not true, we now arrive at a combination which is inferred to be true:

Inferred to be true

First type of inference, negative sentences (see 3.2.3)

That is, given the fact that the identification of the person who arrived as the friend is incorrect, another identification must be correct.

3.2.3 Remarks

Three points must perhaps be made explicit.

1. The combination "ne prijatel'" does not refer to the environment of the friend (i.e. it is not identical to "not prijatel'"). Even if we adopt the simplistic view that a given universe divides up into A and not-A, A and not-A comprising everything there is, not-A as a whole is not referred to. An expression referring to not-A would be an expression which, if accented, focuses attention on everything except A; such an expression necessarily becomes positive in the way described in 3.3 below. Elsewhere, as far as I know, we always focus attention on a specific element in a given universe. Next, we may remove /A/ from the thing which is the focus of attention, and then (first type of inference, negative) we may take another element and map it onto the thing which is the focus of attention. I think this is where many analyses of negation go wrong; as a consequence, they do not account, inter alia, for the facts of accent and scope (see also 4.1 and 4.5 below).

2. Although, for my own convenience, the diagram of the first type of inference (positive and negative) puts the entire "not prijatel'" in a box, any given application of the inference makes a choice from "not prijatel'". Indeed, e.g. Ne prijatel' priechal does not lead to the conclusion that the person who arrived is everybody except the friend; instead, the person who arrived has one other identity.
3. The negative variant of the first type of inference (3.2.2) applies only if *ne* precedes the accented element, here *prijatel'*. In e.g. *Prijatel' ne priechal* we may also apply the first type of inference, but only the variant for positive sentences (3.1.3). That is, we may interpret this sentence as: the person who did not arrive is the friend and not somebody else (cf. K 1985: 289); evidently, the accent here has nothing to do with *ne*.

### 3.3 *Neprijatel' priechal* (Lit. Not-friend (enemy) arrived)

As compared with 3.2, we now eliminate the link from "*ne*" to "*prijatel'": "*ne*prijatel'" − "*ne*prijatel'". The result is a (positive) thought of an entity. The idea that "*neprijatel'" is somehow positive, in comparison with "*neprijatel'"”, originates in the fact that in "*neprijatel'" we introduce a thought of the absence of the referent of "*neprijatel'"", in the following way. The procedure described in 3.2 resulted in this picture:

```
--------------- absence of /friend/
other figures
```

In 3.2, this picture was the result of removing /friend/, i.e. it followed this picture:

```
---------------/friend/
other figures
```

Now, the same picture, without /friend/, can also be evaluated as being the result of adding with respect to a preceding phase:

```
--------------- absence of person lacking /friend/
other figures
```

If it is this picture which is followed by the picture of a person lacking /friend/, the latter is felt as positive, and the absence of the property /friend/ is the identifying property of the person. This is what happens in *Neprijatel' priechal*.

Thus, the step from "*ne prijatel'" to "*ne prijatel'" (no link) consists in introducing a projection of the absence of the referent of the complex "*ne prijatel'":

```
"whole minus part" = "*ne prijatel'" (= new figure)
"absence of whole minus part" = "not neprijatel'"
```

In terms of attention, the accent now focuses attention on the referent of "*ne prijatel'", i.e. it negates a projection of the absence of this same referent. What we have done, in comparison with 3.2, is to transfer the focus of attention: in 3.2, we removed a part of the thing which is the focus of attention; now, the referent of "*ne prijatel'" itself is the focus of attention.

*Neprijatel'" is a single word in the sense that the negation of "*neprijatel'", i.e. the projection negated by an accent on *-ja-*, is "*not neprijatel'" referring to the absence of a *not*-friend.

We saw in 3.2 that two steps are needed in order to pass from "*ne prijatel'" to the total absence of the referent: "*ne prijatel'" − "*prijatel'" − "*not prijatel'" (absence of friend); such a two-step chain is characteristic of what we experience as negative. From the referent of "*neprijatel'" to the absence of the referent...
is only one step: "neprijatel'" - "not neprijatel'" (absence of not-friend); this is what we perceive as positive (despite the fact that the entity concerned is characterized in a negative way). (Cf. K 1985: 274-276, 306-308.)

Once we have combined "ne" and "prijatel'" into the single concept "neprijatel'" we can start anew: the interpretations of Neprijatel' priechal are the same as those of Prijatel' priechal (see 3.1, but with "neprijatel'" instead of "prijatel'").

3.4 Nev ne prijatel' priechal

As compared with 3.2, we have now added an accent on priechal. The result is incoherent (unless we take Ne prijatel' and Priechal to be two separate sentences). The cause of the problem is the effect of the backward link described in 1.7: given the backward link from "prijechal" to "ne prijatel'", the referent of the negation of "ne prijatel'" is relegated to the past. This is incompatible with the part-whole organization involved in construing the referent of "ne prijatel'", because a part-whole organization is a means of spreading something belonging to one moment of world-time (here: an entity) over two moments of projection time (here: the entity pictured with and without its identifying property) (see 1.5 and K 1985: 151, 209-210).

The incompatibility can also be formulated in terms of concurrent and non-concurrent negations (see 1.7), which is, possibly, easier here. The effect described in 1.7 results in giving "ne prijatel'" a concurrent negation. This would imply that the accent on prijatel' selects the referent of "ne prijatel'" from among the things in its environment. But this implies that attention can be focused on the referent of "ne prijatel'", and the latter is contradicted by the link between "ne" and "prijatel'".

What saves the day in this type of conflict is a parallel link (see the end of 1.7). In our sentence this is, however, impossible, because in Russian a parallel link requires ne before the verb (see 2.6). Thus, whereas Prijatel' ne priechal has a reading "the person who arrived is not my friend", such an inter-

prestation is impossible for Ne prijatel' priechal, unless we divide the string up into two sentences: ? "somebody who is not my friend (but somebody else). Arrived".

In order to accommodate the given accentuation within one sentence we must, consequently, either eliminate the link between "ne" and "prijatel'" or choose the links in such a way that "prijechal" is not linked backwards to the "ne" plus "prijatel" combination. The former option results in the sentence Neprijatel' priechal, conveying simply that a not-friend arrived, which is not of special interest. The latter will be given in 3.5.

3.5 Ne prijatel' priechal / Ne prijatel' priechal

This type of sentence repeats 3.2, but the referent involved is not an entity now, but a situation (the referent of the subject-predicate combination). Thus, the example says that the situation (state of affairs) meant lacks the property of being an appropriate referent of "my friend arrived". This information, just as in 3.2, does not provide a positive characterization of the referent; if the latter is needed, it must be added separately (first type of inference, negative variant): "(- Why are you so upset ?) (- It is) not (that) my friend arrived (but ...)".

Note that, in order to remove the complex property /prijatel' priechal/ from the state of affairs meant, the elements of the complex must first be put together, i.e. (for the two-accent case):

However, the link from "ne" to the complex relegates these operations to the past; it pretends that "prijatel' priechal" is already available as a single chunk of information, so that the absence of the state of affairs meant is no longer in view, and so
that the last thing conveyed is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{"state of affairs minus id. property"} &= \text{"ne" "prijatel' priechal"} \\
\text{"state of affairs incl. id. property"} &= \text{"prijatel' priechal"}
\end{align*}
\]  
("absence of state of affairs")

For this last step, one accent is sufficient. The choice from \textit{Ne prijatel' priechal}, \textit{Ne prijatel' priechal}, or even \textit{Ne prijatel' priechal}, creates different possibilities for the subsequent inference, as it makes available "not prijatel'" and/or "not priechal". Note that in such complex configurations, it is hardly possible to say whether "ne" is linked up before the accent(s) does/do its/their job (see the levels in 3.2.1). But at least one of them must (also) mark the last step, to the effect that a level containing "ne" follows a level without "ne". Otherwise, the presence of the property would be asserted at the moment when its absence is referred to; this is incoherent, except for the case of 4.8 below.

The type of this section is frequently used in folklore texts (tales, proverbs etc.). For example (Savel'eva 1977: 60):

\textit{Ne kukuška kukuet, a žena gorjuet}
Not cuckoo calls but wife grieves

\textit{Ne on umer, a smert' ego prisla}
Not he died but death his came

\textit{Ne carstvo gorit, a moja žena v korobke edet}
Not Czardom burns but my wife in box. rides

\section*{4.0 Introduction}

Combinations of \textit{ne} plus verb are more heterogeneous than the simple string discussed in Chapter Three. This heterogeneity has three causes:

1. We saw in 3.2 that the presence of a link between "ne" and "prijatel'" in \textit{Ne prijatel' priechal} is accompanied by the interpretation that only the identifying property /friend/ of the entity is removed but not the entity itself, i.e. the sentence leaves us with a projection of an unidentified entity rather than with a projection of the absence of the entity.

In other combinations, among which \textit{ne} plus verb (and \textit{ne} plus \textit{prijatel'}) when used as a predicate), we find both an interpretation where only a part is removed and an interpretation where the corresponding whole is removed. For example, \textit{On ne čitæt} (Lit. He not reads) has an interpretation "the thing he is doing is not reading (but something else)" (removal of identifying property) as well as an interpretation "he is not reading, i.e. his potential reading is absent" (removal of the entire activity).

This difference between sentences like \textit{Ne prijatel' priechal} and \textit{On ne čitæt} is reflected in (at least one of the applications of the terms "constituent vs. sentence negation" or "special vs. nexal negation". I think it has a simple explanation. The point will be discussed in 4.1 below.

2. As I mentioned in 2.7, \textit{ne} plus verb is used for conveying "absolute absence". The difference between \textit{On ne čitæt} in the sense "he is not reading now" and the same sentence in the sense "he never reads" ("absolute absence") will be described here as a second level of removing a part vs. removing a whole (4.3).
3. The third complication is parallel links. It does not pertain to ne plus verb per se but to the way in which this combination, in its turn, combines with the rest of the sentence. I will use strings of the form adverb ne verb for illustrating the difference between parallel and (here) forward links (4.4 ff.).

Points 1-3 listed above all pertain to the case when "ne" is linked forwards to the verb, i.e. the case where our example of Chapter Three had only a single interpretation (removal of a part on the lowest level). Just as in "ne" plus "prijatel'" there is, in addition, the possibility of no link between "ne" and the verb (see 4.2). In order to illustrate the difference with other readings, examples here also have the form adverb ne verb (see 4.4 ff.).

In the course of the discussion, we will meet the same problem as that of 3.4 ("ne prijatel' priechal"), this time in application to forward links. In ne plus verb the problem has a natural solution, because here we have, besides the possibility of eliminating the link, the option of a parallel link. Moreover, the removal-of-part vs. removal-of-whole distinction on the second level (see point 2. above) makes available a solution which neither eliminates the link between "ne" and the verb nor uses a parallel link. It is suggested that this point is relevant to the choice of verbal aspect in the sentences concerned. Aspect itself will not be discussed, but my treatment hopefully explains why problems can be expected there.

This chapter discusses only extremely simple combinations, although some extensions will be mentioned in 4.9. It seems to me that a precise understanding of the mechanisms involved in simple cases is a prerequisite for investigating more complicated sentences. The latter I leave for another occasion.

4.1 Removal of part vs. removal of whole, first level

The fact that "ne prijatel'" in Ne prijatel' priechal cannot refer to the absence of the friend, whereas "ne citaet" in On ne citaet may refer to the absence of his reading, is at first sight very remarkable. On closer inspection, the difference appears to be another way of stating a truth which is so obvious that it sounds odd in explicit form: this fact tells us that the friend is imagined to exist when "ne prijatel'" has a referent, whereas the reading which would be there if he were reading is not there when he is not reading.

Consider again what we did in 3.2. We removed the property /friend/ of the person who arrived, i.e. we cancelled a previous identification. Why was the identification of the person who arrived and the friend incorrect? Because the property /friend/ is carried not by the person who arrived but by a different person, a person in the environment of the person who arrived. If we removed not only the property /friend/ of the person who arrived, but the entire person, i.e. if "ne prijatel'" referred to the absence of the person who arrived, the friend would be absent and present simultaneously, because he also belongs to the environment. Since a single person cannot be absent and present simultaneously, "ne prijatel'" in Ne prijatel' priechal cannot refer to the absence of the friend. (Note that two friends, one absent, the other present, would save us here; this point will be used in 4.3 below.) In ne citaet, however, we may remove the thing he is doing (i.e. reading) entirely: in that case, reading does not belong to the environment where "ne citaet" has a referent (it is there at a different moment only).

Note that ne citaet also allows an interpretation removing only the identifying property of his activity: On ne citaet, a smotrit televizor (He is not reading but watching television) (the but-phrase makes explicit the first type of inference, negative variant - see 3.2.2). We then, indeed, imagine a set of things one can do, which is, in itself, a timeless idea. The sentence then says: "the thing he is doing at this moment is not reading (lacks the property of being an appropriate referent of "citaet"), because reading is a different thing one can do (the property is carried by a different activity)". This leaves us with a projection of an unidentified activity (the thing he is doing at this moment); the first type of inference (negative variant) fills in the correct identification.
In this way, the fact that On ne čítâet has two interpretations where Ne prijâtel’ priechal has only one, is, in my view, not an arbitrary fact; rather, it tells us something about how we perceive different types of referent. The regularity is: "ne x" is a projection of the absence of x only if x does not exist (imagined not to exist) at the moment when "ne x" has a referent; otherwise, "ne x" is a projection of the absence of a part of a given referent (here: the identifying property /x/ of a given entity/activity). There is one exception to this statement (see 5.2).

The rule is not restricted to the type of example given here. To give one other example, consider the difference between On byl ne v kómnate (He was not in the room) and On byl ne v dûche (He was not in the mood, i.e. he was in a bad mood). In the case of the room, we imagine him somewhere outside the room:

Since the room is imagined to exist at the moment when he is not in it (i.e. since "v komnate" has a referent), "ne v komnate" cannot refer to the absence of the place in the room. Instead, the place where he is lacks the property of being an appropriate referent of "in the room" (that property is carried by a different place). Thus, the sentence leaves us with a projection of an unidentified place; if we wish to identify it, we must apply the first type of inference (negative variant).

In the case of the mood, in contrast, we simply remove the mood if we are told that he is not in it:

Since the mood in which he would be if he were in it does not exist if he is not in it, "ne v duche" refers to the absence of the state v duche.

Now, these two examples can, of course, be brought under the same heading: we can say that in both cases, the following picture does not obtain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>room/mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But a further description of the difference between the two sentences must, in my view, take into account the focus of attention. The case of the mood is simple: we remove the mood. But the case of the room is, in my view, different from what one may think at first sight. My formulation says that we do not mentally move him to some place outside the room. Instead, he is somewhere, and we mentally remove the (incorrectly assigned) property /in the room/ from this place; the latter is the focus of attention. The property was assigned to the place where he is incorrectly because the property is in reality carried by a different place (simultaneously existing).

In the same way, in On ne čítâet we remove either his entire activity or only the identifying property of this activity. For the reason given above, Ne prijâtel’ priechal allows only the removal of the identifying property of the person who arrived (the focus of attention).

Next, it is important to keep in mind that we have arrived at a referent for "ne x" via the corresponding positive expression (by removing /x/ or x). Thus, independently of the size of the thing removed, we have the two-step procedure introduced in 3.2.1. In application to ne čítâet:

activity minus identifying property /reading/ = "ne" čítâet
activity including identifying property /reading/ = čítâet
absence of reading (relegated to the past) = "not čítâet"

removal of part, first level
The fact that we arrive at a referent for, here, "ne čitaet" by removing part or all of his activity, is responsible for peculiarities of negative sentences as compared with positive sentences (for some discussion see e.g. Givón 1979: 91-142). Moreover, the two-step procedure distinguishes the cases discussed so far from combinations without a link between "ne" and the verb (see 4.2 below).

Note that the distinction introduced in this section cannot adequately be covered by the terms "non-nexal" vs. "nexal" negation or "constituent" vs. "sentence" negation. For one thing, Ona ne Čitaet allows both interpretations. For another, On byl ne v kôsnate and On byl ne v dôche both have "non-nexal"/"constituent" negation but different interpretations.

The phenomenon that the size of a part-whole combination is not specified by a form itself (although it may be determined by other factors) is a regularly recurring point in the type of thing we are talking about (cf. 1.4, 3.1.2, 3.1.3). It is very convenient because it ensures high flexibility; for logicians, however, it is awkward because of its consequences in terms of truth.

4.2 No link between "ne" and verb

As we saw in 3.3 in application to Neprijatel' priechal, the elimination of the forward link between "ne" and "x" amounts to the introduction of a projection of the absence of the referent of the "ne x" complex:

\[ \text{"not ne x"} = \text{"absence of ne x"} \]

In Neprijatel', the incorporation of "ne" amounts to making the referent of "neprijatel'" an entity, the accent (in the coinciding case) negating a projection of the absence of this entity in an environment of other entities.

The same possibility is available for verbs. The incorporation of "ne" makes the referent of "ne V" an activity (or state, or whatever it is) which is introduced by an accent on V against the background of the absence of this activity; the referent of "V" is a different activity (state, etc.):

\[ \text{"not ne V_1"} \quad \text{\(\rightarrow\)} \quad \text{"not ne V_2"} \]

\[ \text{(other activities,} \quad \text{(absence of ne V)} \]

\[ \text{including V)} \]

The fact that V and ne V are construed as different activities here has given rise to the observation, in logic-oriented linguistics, that V and ne V are contraries rather than contradictories in this case, that is (roughly), both referents can be absent: Mary doesn't like Susan, but she doesn't dislike her either (Tottie 1980: 103).

The difference between "ne prijatel'" and "ne prijatel'" as discussed in Chapter Three, is immediately clear intuitively, because a link between "ne" and "prijatel'" is accompanied by the interpretation removing the property /friend/ only, not the entire entity. With verbs, the difference between "ne V" and "ne V" is more difficult to become aware of, since the presence of a link does not exclude the possibility that the entire V is removed (see 4.1 above). The relevant difference between "ne V", removing V entirely, and "ne V", is that a referent for "ne V" is arrived at via "V" (by removing V), whereas a referent of "ne V" replaces the absence of this same referent.

For example:

(1) Ona spráza ne ponrašilas nam
   immediately not pleased
   (We disliked her immediately)
Here, at the moment indicated by "srazu" an event of disliking starts: before that time, dislike was absent. (The sentence has in principle also a reading involving a parallel link: "we didn't like her immediately"; such readings will be discussed below.)

Compare also:

(2) On дъвд'не ljubili menja
very not loved
(He "disloved" me very much)

vs. (with a link):

(3) Nенавистi к nemu u menja net, no ja ego i ne ljubljU
not love
(I don't hate him, but I don't love him either, i.e. love is absent as well)

A well-known type of opposition, also rendered in spelling, is the opposition between verbs with the so-called prefix nedo- and verbs with the prefix do- preceded by ne: ne do-. For example (Skorobač 1978: 97): Teper' posdno nedogovarivat' (It is now too late to not speak to the end (to withhold information)) versus Govorit' i ne dogovarivat' (To speak and not to speak to the end (to stop speaking before the end is reached)). There are about 70 of such pairs (op.cit.: 96). (Besides, there are also verbs with nedo- which do not exist without ne-.)

Verbs with nedo- differ from combinations like that in (1) (Ne ponsravilas'): they are:

"ne do V" (hence the name "prefix" for nedo-)

The meaning of ne ponsravilas' in (1), in contrast, would more adequately be expressed if the form were ponsenravilas', po- indicating the starting point of the event of disliking:

"po ne V"

However, this order prefix - ne actually occurs only in verbs which do not exist without ne, e.g. voznenavidet' (to hate, perfective aspect). As we will see below (example (18)) there is also a type

"ne do V" (opposed to "ne do V" in e.g. ne dogovarivat').

4.3 Removal of part vs. removal of whole, second level

The removal-of-part vs. removal-of-whole distinction introduced in 4.1 (first level) is well-known and hardly requires further illustration. Roughly, the removal-of-part case on that level is the interpretation which suggests a continuation of the sentence with a but-phrase: not X but .... The corresponding removal-of-whole case is the reading which simply refers to the absence of the potential event in question, e.g.

(4) V ótot moment ja pisal pis'mo i ne zamétil, kto vošel
not noticed
(At that moment I was writing a letter and did not notice who entered)

Now, as is well-known, a sentence like On ne govorit po-kitajski (Lit. He not speaks Chinese) urges us to make a further distinction (also for the corresponding positive sentence). The example says either that he is not speaking Chinese, e.g., at this moment, or that he speaks no Chinese at all. In both cases we remove his entire activity on the first level. (The corresponding removal-of-part case would be, e.g. On ne govorit po-kitajski, a smotrit televizor (He is not speaking Chinese but watching television.) Nevertheless, there is a difference as to the size of the thing which is removed. In order to state the difference in terms of my model, so that we will be able to discuss an issue about adverbs later on, I introduce the notion of "the whole of potential occurrences of an event". In the example, the whole consists of all potential occurrences of the event On govorit po-kitajski:
every individual occurrence is a part of this whole (which consists, then, of identical parts - see 1.8). Correspondingly, we have the time in which all occurrences are placed, say $T$, and the time of every individual occurrence, say $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n$. Of this whole, we may remove a part, say the occurrence at $t_i$; alternatively, we remove the entire whole of potential occurrences from $T$. Thus:

- **whole of potential occurrences** = \( "ne" \ "goverit" \)
- **whole of potential occurrences minus occurrence at \( t_i \)** = \( "goverit" \) (II)
- **whole of potential occurrences including occurrence at \( t_i \)** = \( "not govorit" \)
- **absence of whole (relegated to the past)** = \( "not govorit" \)

**removal of part, second level**

- **absence of whole of potential occurrences** = \( "ne" \ "goverit" \) (II)
- **whole of potential occurrences** = \( "goverit" \)
- **absence of whole (relegated to the past)** = \( "not govorit" \)

**removal of whole, second level**

Note that we have retained a two-step procedure.

We saw in 4.1 that the choice between removing a part and removing a whole amounts to saying whether or not $x$ belongs to the environment where "ne $x$" has a referent. On the second level introduced now, the contrast can also be stated in terms of environment, the environment now being all occurrences of events in $T$. If we remove only a part of the potential $v$-occurrences in $T$, we consider a stretch of time larger than that from which potential $v$-occurrences are removed; in other words, $v$ belongs to the environment where "ne $v$" has a referent, $v$ being the rest of potential $v$-occurrences. Just as before, the case when we remove the whole of potential $v$-occurrences in $T$, is the case where $v$ does not belong to the environment where "ne $v$" has a referent; indeed, we arrive at a referent for "ne $v$" by removing all of $v$.

Yet another way of stating the same difference is one in terms of truth. The case when we remove only a part of the potential occurrences of the event is the case when both the positive and the negative sentence may be correct, namely at different moments. For example, although he is not speaking Chinese at this moment, he may have done so yesterday. The case when we remove the whole of potential occurrences of the event (He speaks no Chinese at all) is the case when only either the positive or the negative sentence is correct; indeed, no potential occurrence is left for a different moment.

(For the first level, correspondingly: e.g. "ne čitaet" and "čitaet" are simultaneously correct projections, namely they apply to different activities (removal of part), vs. at a given moment only either "ne čitaet" or "čitaet" is a correct projection (removal of whole). Needless to say, the whole on the first level is the part on the second level.)

In 2.7 I said that, in order to convey an "absolute absence" idea (removal of whole, second level), $ne$ must be placed before the verb. What is more precise is the observation that a corresponding idea elsewhere is not expressed by means of $ne$. Consider, for example, nikto, nekto (nominative case), and nekogo (other cases) (approximately: "not somebody", see below). Of these three, only nikto can refer to the absence of the whole of people (English 'nobody' basically refers to an empty part of this whole). Nekto, in contrast, says (roughly): "the person referred to is not (just) somebody, i.e. he is a certain person" (removal of part, first level, but lexically incorporated here). Nekogo and other cases of the same word does remove an entire person (removal of whole on the first level), but it leaves the rest of the whole of people in the environment (i.e. removes only a part on the second level, lexically incorporated).

For example: *Mne ne s kem pogovert' to-me (is) not with "somebody" to-talk (I have nobody to talk with)*

Here, we remove persons with whom I can talk but not other people. Thus, with *kto*, the absence of the whole is expressed by *ni-*, not by *ne-*. However, in order to be able to refer to the absence of the whole, *nikto* needs, in addition, *ne* before the verb (if any), *ne* removing the event in question. Otherwise, *nikto* refers to a person
called nobody: given a verb, only ne can preclude a thought of the absence of the referent of "nikto", which thought renders the expression positive (see 3.3 above and K 1985: 302-312). What is remarkable is that ne before the verb needs no help from elsewhere in order to be able to refer to the absence of the whole of potential occurrences of the event in question; the combination is rendered positive by eliminating the link. This is remarkable because the removal of this whole leaves us with no whole other than T to concentrate upon while we do the act of removal.

4.4 Adverb ne verb: the problem and three solutions

We saw in 1.7 that in a positive sentence like Priechal prijatel' (VS) the projections "not prijatel'" and "prijatel'" refer to the world at different moments, i.e. that such a sentence (with the appropriate type of accent) introduces (here) the friend against the background of his previous absence. The same meaning can be found in other combinations, among which adverb - věr (K 1985: 335-336). For example, in Ėtот podchod okončatľno utverdilsja (That approach definitively established itself) the fact of the establishment replaces the previous absence of that fact:

- "not okončatľno" "utverdilsja" - "world at t₂"  
- "not utverdilsja" - "world at t₁"

Now, in negative sentences such a meaning can in principle be expected to raise problems, because with such sentences we basically remove something which is first thought to be present at least potentially. This obviously implies that no world-time should elapse while we are busy removing the thing; just as we cannot lift up an object which is in place A by going to place B where the object is not, we cannot remove an event which is imagined to occur in time A by going to time B and viewing its absence there. The time-stop which we need for the act of removing is introduced by a parallel link:

The "world at t₂" to which both "ne V" and "V" apply is the projection "p" given in 1.6.

As a result of using a parallel link, the meaning we find in okončatľno utverdilsja is cancelled in okončatľno ne utverdilsja; indeed, this combination does not convey the fact of the non-establishment against the background of the previous absence of this fact:

(5) Odnako posledovatel'nyj podchod ... poka čto v slavjanskom jazykoznani okončatľno ne utverdilsja definitively not established-itself  
(However, a consistent approach did not definitively establish itself in Slavic linguistics, i.e. if some approach established itself, then not definitively)

To be sure, a combination adverb ne věr may convey the fact of not-V against the background of the previous absence of this fact, but this idea eliminates the link between "ne" and the verb (see 4.2):

(1) Ona srasu ne ponrâvias' nam immediately not pleased  
(We disliked her immediately)

That is:

- "not adverb" "ne V" - "world at t₂"  
- "not ne V" - "world at t₁"

Compare (parallel link):
As mentioned in 1.6, a parallel link involves two projections of the same state of affairs; here: "srazu ne zamatili" and "not-srazu zamatili". Leaving aside sentences with ni-words, both projections are correct: about the state of affairs referred to ("p") we say both that noticing was absent and that noticing was there; but the former applies only in combination with "srazu" and the latter only in combination with "not-srazu".

These, then, are the obvious possibilities: a parallel link between "adverb" and "ne V" cancels the meaning we find in the corresponding positive sentences; the latter is retained by eliminating the link between "ne" and "V".

However, there is at least one other possibility; it uses the whole of potential occurrences introduced in 4.3.

The diagram is:

```
  "adverb"
    "not adverb" "ne" "V" "not V"
    "V"
```

Here we arrive at a referent for "ne V" via "V" (in contrast to cases without a link between "ne" and "V"); yet, the time-stop introduced by a parallel link is not there. In order to interpret the sentence we need a combination of 1: "ne V" and "V" refer to the same time (in order to remove V from where it is imagined), and 2: "ne V" and "V" refer to different times (as instructed by the forward link between "adverb" and "ne V").

Evidently, we need more than one time-level in order to resolve this contradiction. To this aim we employ the whole of 4.3: we remove a potential occurrence or potential occurrences from, say, t₁ (so that this particular occurrence is removed from where it is imagined); it leaves the rest of potential occurrences for other t's (so that the absence and the presence of the event obtain at different moments). This combination saves the link between "ne" and "V" without recourse to a parallel link between "adverb" and "ne V".

Note that this proposal predicts a problem for the case when we remove the whole of potential V occurrences from T (see 4.6 below).

The next section gives some examples, first of the t/T trick, then of the three types of adverb ne verb combination mentioned here, in pairwise opposition.

4.5 Examples

Consider what happens with On počti spit (He almost sleeps) if we insert ne before the verb. In on počti spit we think of a single occurrence of a sleeping-event: such an occurrence is almost there, but it is as yet absent. If in on počti ne spit (Lit. He almost not sleeps) we keep concentrating on a single occurrence, we necessarily construe an activity of not-sleeping (whatever that may be) which is almost there but which is as yet absent; in other words, we eliminate the link between "ne" and the verb. In order to prevent the creation of an activity of not-sleeping, we must broaden our view to the effect that it embraces more occurrences of a sleeping-event. We then interpret the sentence as saying that most potential occurrences of this event are absent, although there is one from time to time. This iterative effect can also be observed in the following attested example:

(7) Il'ja počti ne žii doma
    almost not lived
    (Il'ja hardly ever lived (slept etc.) at home)

Interestingly, Ivanova (1982: 142) mentions počti among the adverbs which lead to a spelling of ne plus adjective as a single graphic word (no link) e.g.
Note that the adverb is interpreted differently in the two cases: in (7) it has a "temporal" sense, while in (8) it rather indicates a degree. With verbs, the "degree" sense does not necessarily eliminate the link between "ne" and "V"; it rather brings us to the more subtle distinction given in 5.4 below.

Compare further:

(9) Iz-za došče došče teper' počti ne chodjat
    almost not go ("indeterminate" form)
    (Lit. Because of the rain the cars now almost do not go, i.e. there are hardly any cars travelling)

The sentence does not mean that the cars can hardly move because of the rain but that they travel infrequently.

An example without počti:

(10) Samolěť iz-za plochoj pogody ne idut
    not go ("determinate" form)
    (Lit. Because the weather is bad the planes do not go, i.e. they cannot fly)

Here, because there is no počti, we are not urged to adopt a broader view than that of the specific journey of every plane which is cancelled.

In this way, the part-whole idea of potential occurrences makes it understandable, in my view, why on počti pročital knigu
    (Lit. He almost read the book, perfective aspect) is a normal sentence, whereas on počti ne pročital knigu (Lit. He almost not read the book, perfective aspect) is unacceptable, in contrast to on počti ne čital knigu (Lit. He almost not read books, imperfective aspect).

Another illustrative adverb is ešče (yet, still):

(11) Ja ešče ne zavtrakal
    yet not breakfasted
    (stil)
    (I have not had any breakfast yet)

Compare: Kogda on vošel, ja ešče zavtrakal (When he entered I was still eating my breakfast). If time relationships remained the same in the negative (11), (11) would mean that I was still busy with an activity of not-eating; this odd idea eliminates the link between "ne" and the verb. In order to prevent this from happening, we interpret (11) as saying that potential occurrences of breakfasting are removed from the time indicated by "ešče"; this leaves potential occurrences for after that time.

Note that I propose to treat the positive and the negative sentence in a different way. Of course, in ja ešče zavtrakal, the meaning of ešče instructs us to imagine a time when the event of breakfasting will be absent, and in ja ešče ne zavtrakal the event and its absence are seemingly simply interchanged. But we need a trick in order to arrive at this idea. The point is that in ja ešče zavtrakal the event of breakfasting is introduced against the background of its expected absence. If the negative sentence were interpreted in the same way, it would introduce not-breakfasting against the background of its expected absence: the link between "ne" and the verb would be eliminated, "ne zavtrakal" referring to an event instead of to the absence of an event. In order not to evoke the thought of the absence of a (positive) event of not-breakfasting, but only of the absence of an event of breakfasting (without a further negation of this absence), we must imagine the events of breakfasting which could have occurred in the time indicated by "ešče" as a part of a whole of potential occurrences, the rest of this whole being placed after the time indicated.

Note further that I have not moved an event of breakfasting from the time indicated by "ešče" to some later moment. Instead, I have introduced several potential occurrences, and removed some while leaving the others.

This procedure enables us to arrive at a referent of "ne zavtrakal" via "zavtrakal", so that the referent of "ne zavtrakal" is not op-
posed to its own absence. (For the proposal not to move around referents compare On byl ne v kómatě in 4.1.)

I think the procedure described here adequately explains the fact that, in general, ešče combines with a verb in the perfective aspect only if the latter is negated: the potential occurrence(s) which is (are) left for after the time from which potential occurrences are removed may be perfective, because the durative character of ešče applies only to the time from which potential occurrences are removed. In the positive case, however, the referent of the verb is located in the stretch of time indicated by "ešče", so that the aspect of the verb may not contradict the durative character of the adverb.

An exception to the general impossibility of ešče plus perfective aspect (without a negation) is the verb ostat'sja (to remain; see Barentsen 1979: 154), presumably because this verb is inherently negative in the sense explained in K 1985 (: 274-276), i.e. given our normal picture of the world, the interpretation of the lexical meaning of the verb involves the two-step procedure characteristic of negative sentences. This feature is relevant to the scope of accents as well as to the use of aspect here.

I now turn to some examples which put the three types of combination introduced in 4.4 into direct pairwise contrast.

A. \[\] vs. B. \[\]

(12) Oní kategoríčeski ne chotjášt puskat' ee v Moskvú (A)
   (They categorically do not want ("diswant") to let her go to Moscow)

(13) ... formy ... padezej ... morfológičeski ne različájutsja (B)
   (The case forms are not morphologically distinguished (but they may be distinguished in a different way))

Here also belong (1) (srážu ne ponsáválas', A) vs. (6) (srážu ne zamě-tíli, B).

B. \[\] vs. C. \[\]

(14) Ja vas dólgo ne zaderžá (B)
   long not shall-detain
   (I shall not detain you long, i.e. I am detaining you, but it won't last long)

(15) Ja teper' dólgo vas ne uvižu (C)
   long not shall-see
   (I shall not see you now, for a long time)

As described in the foregoing, the difference between the parallel link in (14) and the forward link in (15) pertains to the way in which the adverb is combined with the ne+V complex. In (14), only "dólgo" combines with the not-detaining; the thing which lasts not long is the detaining (not the not-detaining):

\[ "dólgo" "not dolgo" "zaderžu" \]
\[ "not dolgo" "zaderžu" \]
\[ "not zaderžu" \]

In (15), in contrast, dólgo says how long the absence of seeing will last; it will last long, but it could have lasted not long. That is, the "not dolgo" negated by the accent on dolgo, as well as "dólgo" itself, combine with "ne uvižu", "dólgo" replacing "not dolgo":

\[ "dólgo" "not dolgo" "ne" "uvižu" \]
\[ "uvižu" "not uvižu" \]

As we saw in the foregoing, such a combination removes potential seeing-events from the stretch of time indicated by "dólgo"; it leaves the rest of the potential occurrences for after that time.
As is well-known, type (15) does not allow perfective aspect in the preterite. Thus, alongside (15) (perfective aspect), we find e.g. (16):

(16) V poslednej kvartire dolgo ne otkryvali
long not opened (imperfective, preterite)
(For a long time, people in the last apartment did not open the door)

In the intended reading, (16) has it that potential opening-events are removed from the stretch of time indicated by "dolgo"; this leaves potential occurrences for after that time (two forward links). (With no link between "ne" and the verb the sentence would mean (incoherently) that for a long time, people were busy not opening the door. With a parallel link between "dolgo" and "ne+V" it would mean that, if the door was opened, then for a short time only; this idea requires nadolgo rather than dolgo.)

C. vs. A.

(17) Medvež'ich uglóv zdes' bol'še ne suščastvóet (C)
more not exist
(Remote places do not exist here anymore)

(18) Rebenok vsé bol'še i bol'še ne doverjál vzróslym (A)
more and more not trusted
(The child, more and more, distrusted adults)

Examples like (18) must be further specified as "ne do V" in order to keep them apart from "ne do V" (see 4.2 above). Note that the adverb bol'še is interpreted differently in the two cases. In (17) it acquires a "temporal" interpretation; what "grows" here is time: as time proceeds, the existence of remote places is removed. In (18) it is the degree of distrust which grows. With a parallel link, which is in principle the third possibility, I would expect an atemporal sense of bol'še. Possibly, Glovinskaja (1982: 68) alludes to the existence of this type when she observes that in Bol'še ja ne mogú napisat' (More I cannot write - perfective infinitive), bol'še has an "object" sense. In contrast, in Bol'še ja ne mogú pisat' (idem, imperfective infinitive) the "temporal" sense of bol'še is more likely, according to Glovinskaja.

The fact that the interpretation of the adverb changes according to the organization chosen, and the fact that an individual adverb does not necessarily occur with all organizations, makes it necessary to investigate every adverb (or type of adverb) separately. For example, with srazu I found A. and B. but not C. In this case, the gap can possibly be filled by collecting more examples or construing the appropriate context (and choosing the appropriate aspect), but the lexical meaning of an adverb may be too specific to be compatible with the meaning of a certain organization. The same holds true, of course, for the lexical meaning of the verb. Obviously, then, the observations here do not exhaust the subject; hopefully, they sufficiently illustrate that the use of verbal aspect in negative sentences is related to organizations in projection time.

4.6 Removal of whole, second level: a predictable problem

Consider (19):

(19) Struktura suždenija i členenie predloženija očen' často ne
very often not
sovpadájut ...
coincide ...
(The structure of the judgement and the partition of the sentence very often do not coincide)

In the intended reading, "očen' často ne sovpadájut", we remove potential occurrences of the event from the time indicated by "very often"; this leaves the rest of the potential occurrences for the remainder of time. (With a parallel link the sentence would mean that p and q do not very often coincide.) As we saw in the foregoing, the differentiation between T in which all occurrences are placed and the t's of the individual occurrences,
saves the link between "ne" and the verb.

Now, if we wish to remove the whole of potential occurrences, the appropriate adverb to use would seem to be vsegda (always):

\[ p \land q \text{ vsegda ne sovpadajut} \quad \text{(Lit. p and q always not coincide).} \]

However, if such a sentence occurs (I have found no examples with the given word order), it will probably have the last accent on the adverb: \( p \) and \( q \) always (and not, e.g., only sometimes) do not coincide (i.e. first type of inference, variant for positive sentences - see 3.2.3). The reading we are looking for now, however, viz. "it is always the case that \( p \) and \( q \) do not coincide", is not normally expressed by means of vsegda; instead, we shift to the negative quantifier nikogda (never). Why this drastic step?

Because otherwise we would need a further time-distinction in order to save the link between "ne" and the verb: besides \( T \) from which the whole of potential occurrences is removed, we would need a further \( T' \) for the rest of potential occurrences. This is obviously incoherent because there is no rest if the whole is removed and a \( T' \) level does not seem to exist in Russian. The projection \( T' \) is the ultimate time-stop; its referent is not part of a larger whole, and we cannot arrive at a projection of the absence of \( T' \); even if there is no link between "ne" and the verb, "not ne \( V' \)" does not refer to the absence of \( T \) but to the absence of the event concerned in \( T \).

The reasoning in the foregoing makes it understandable, then, that \( p \land q \text{ vsegda ne sovpadajut} \) is not a normal Russian sentence. The alternative, \( p \land q \text{ nikogda ne sovpadajut} \), must have a parallel link in order to preclude a thought of the absence of the referent of "nikogda", which thought would render the referent positive (cf. the end of 4.3). The sentence differs from our earlier examples with a parallel link in its relation to truth: whereas, e.g., \( \text{srazu ne zametili} \) (example (6)) says that both "srazu" - "ne zame­

tili" and "not srazu" - "zametili" are correct projections of the state of affairs referred to, a \( ni \ldots \text{ ne combination} \) does not mean that both "nikogda" - "ne sovpadajut" and "vsegda" - "sova­
pdadajut" are correct; instead, the truth of the former excludes the truth of the latter, and vice versa (see further K 1985: 302-312). In this way, Russian \( ni \ldots \text{ ne combinations} \) group with "absolute absence" cases, where also only either the positive or the negative sentence is correct (4.3); this grouping takes place despite the parallel link. In English and Dutch, in contrast, fused negations (no-) group with other parallel links (despite the fact that the sentences concerned may convey absolute absence). To be sure, the inherent meanings of the words involved differ slightly in the two types of system (absence of whole vs. empty part of that whole); otherwise, one of the two groupings would be illogical.

4.7 A further distinction concerning parallel links

In all examples with adverbs discussed so far, the adverb preceded \( ne \) plus \( V \) immediately. Many other adverb positions are possible, and they must all be examined separately, a task which I shall not undertake here. But one interesting case can be mentioned: when the adverb is in initial position. Strings \( \text{adverb - subject} \ldots \text{ ne - } V \) can have a parallel link:

\[ \text{"adverb subject } \ldots \text{ ne } V" \]

For example:

(20) Říkala jsem, ne byla zavřená a 

\[ \text{These facts did not remain unnoticed, but so far, they have} \]

\[ \text{not been worked out in detail; i.e. they were worked out,} \]

\[ \text{but not in detail) \]}

(21) Ovšem ne byli zavřená a 

\[ \text{But they do not satisfy us completely because of} \]

In this way, Russian \( ni \ldots \text{ ne combinations} \) group with "absolute absence" cases, where also only either the positive or the negative sentence is correct (4.3); this grouping takes place despite the parallel link. In English and Dutch, in contrast, fused negations (no-) group with other parallel links (despite the fact that the sentences concerned may convey absolute absence). To be sure, the inherent meanings of the words involved differ slightly in the two types of system (absence of whole vs. empty part of that whole); otherwise, one of the two groupings would be illogical.

4.7 A further distinction concerning parallel links

In all examples with adverbs discussed so far, the adverb preceded \( ne \) plus \( V \) immediately. Many other adverb positions are possible, and they must all be examined separately, a task which I shall not undertake here. But one interesting case can be mentioned: when the adverb is in initial position. Strings \( \text{adverb - subject} \ldots \text{ ne - } V \) can have a parallel link:

\[ \text{"adverb subject } \ldots \text{ ne } V" \]

For example:

(20) Říkala jsem, ne byla zavřená a 

\[ \text{These facts did not remain unnoticed, but so far, they have} \]

\[ \text{not been worked out in detail; i.e. they were worked out,} \]

\[ \text{but not in detail) \]}

(21) Ovšem ne byli zavřená a 

\[ \text{But they do not satisfy us completely because of} \]

In this way, Russian \( ni \ldots \text{ ne combinations} \) group with "absolute absence" cases, where also only either the positive or the negative sentence is correct (4.3); this grouping takes place despite the parallel link. In English and Dutch, in contrast, fused negations (no-) group with other parallel links (despite the fact that the sentences concerned may convey absolute absence). To be sure, the inherent meanings of the words involved differ slightly in the two types of system (absence of whole vs. empty part of that whole); otherwise, one of the two groupings would be illogical.

4.7 A further distinction concerning parallel links

In all examples with adverbs discussed so far, the adverb preceded \( ne \) plus \( V \) immediately. Many other adverb positions are possible, and they must all be examined separately, a task which I shall not undertake here. But one interesting case can be mentioned: when the adverb is in initial position. Strings \( \text{adverb - subject} \ldots \text{ ne - } V \) can have a parallel link:

\[ \text{"adverb subject } \ldots \text{ ne } V" \]

For example:

(20) Říkala jsem, ne byla zavřená a 

\[ \text{These facts did not remain unnoticed, but so far, they have} \]

\[ \text{not been worked out in detail; i.e. they were worked out,} \]

\[ \text{but not in detail) \]}

(21) Ovšem ne byli zavřená a 

\[ \text{But they do not satisfy us completely because of} \]

In this way, Russian \( ni \ldots \text{ ne combinations} \) group with "absolute absence" cases, where also only either the positive or the negative sentence is correct (4.3); this grouping takes place despite the parallel link. In English and Dutch, in contrast, fused negations (no-) group with other parallel links (despite the fact that the sentences concerned may convey absolute absence). To be sure, the inherent meanings of the words involved differ slightly in the two types of system (absence of whole vs. empty part of that whole); otherwise, one of the two groupings would be illogical.
Examples of type (20)/(21) are far more difficult to find than cases like (22) (adverb immediately preceding ne plus V).

Padučeva (1969: 21-23) suggests a semantic difference between the two adverb positions (with a parallel link in both cases). She paraphrases *On gromko ne rassmejalsja* (Lit. He loudly not laughed) as follows: "To li izvestno, što on rassmejalsja, no ne gromko, to li izvestno tol’ko to, što on ne rassmejalsja gromko" (Either it is known that he laughed, but not loudly, or it is known only that he did not laugh loudly). About *Grómkö on ne rassmejalsja* (Lit. Loudly he not laughed), in contrast, the author remarks: "To li on rassmejalsja, no ne gromko, to li ne rassmejalsja vobbërë* (Either he laughed, but not loudly, or he did not laugh at all). Elsewhere on the same pages Padučeva remarks that *Pricina tdočno ne ustanovlena* (Lit. The cause exactly not was-established) does not presuppose any contrasts, whereas she continues *tôčno pricina ne ustanovlena* (Lit. Exactly the cause not was-established) with: a *ustanovlena li vobberë - neizvestno* (but whether it is established at all is unknown).

In combination with the observations cited in K 1985 (300-301), viz. that *vsegda* (always), *nikogda* (never), *uše* (already), *ežë* (still, yet), *srasu* (immediately), *snova* (again), and also *vsjudo* (everywhere), *vesde* (everywhere), *nigde* (nowhere), do not often occur in sentence-initial position (the list does not differentiate between various link-types and positive/negative, of course), and in combination with my own observations, Padučeva’s remark induces me to suggest the following.

The essence of a parallel link is that the two levels of my type of diagram refer to the same state of affairs, the latter being pictured independently by "p" in 1.6. In comparison with forward and backward links, this is a type of non-coincidence of projections. However, there is a lower level type of non-coincidence, the one introduced in 1.4 (e.g. the level "person"). I think the two adverb positions differ on this lower level, given a parallel link in both cases: if the adverb is immediately before ne plus verb, the projection introduced by the adverb coincides with the projection of the property it refers to; if the adverb is in initial position, the property involved is projected independently, i.e. "not adverb" does not refer to the absence of the property but to the property without its identifying property. Thus, in the following sentence, what is left open is the possibility that the grammatical structure has been studied; if it has been studied, then the study lacks the property "especially".

(23) ... grammatičeskij stroj sovremennogo russkogo jazyka

Notes:

If, however, the adverb is in initial position, "special'no" would be, I think, a projection of the way in which the grammatical structure was studied; "special'no" incorrectly characterizes the way in which the structure was studied, i.e. if we choose "special'no", we must combine it with "ne izucalsja"; this leaves open the possibility that, if we choose a different adverb, the way in which the structure was studied would be characterized correctly.

This suggestion, which must be verified by collecting more examples, especially of adverbs in initial position, accounts for the fact that *nikogda* and *nigde* strongly prefer the preverbal position; they refer to the absence of the whole involved (not to a given number of times/places of which "nikogda"/"nigde" is an incorrect projection). Further, in preverbal position the adverb can be unaccented (if the contrast applies to a preceding word); this does not seem to be possible if the adverb is placed in initial position.
Finally, the distinction being suggested here is supported by a Dutch case to be mentioned in 5.3 below: as we saw in 2.6, Dutch allows a parallel link only if the adverb is in initial position (i.e. with VS order); but this possibility is restricted to the reading expressed in Russian by Adverb - S - ne - V; in a case which would lead to the other reading, Dutch avoids a parallel link (see 5.3).

4.8 Poka ... ne (until; as long as not)

The conjunction pokas has been studied in unprecedented detail by Barentsen (e.g. 1973; 1979). For combinations of pokas and ne he found two main types. The so-called type 4 can be recognized by the fact that it allows the inclusion of ěščě in the sentence; for example:

(24) Studenty uporno zanimajutsja, pokas ich (ěščě) ne raspustili na kanikuly.
(The students work unwaveringly as long as they have not yet been dismissed for the vacation)

This type is covered by the distinctions introduced in the foregoing: "ěščě ne raspustili"

That is, potential occurrences of the event "they dismissed the students" are removed from the stretch of time indicated by "ěščě" (or "poka"), so that the rest of the potential occurrences are left for after that time (see 4.3-4.5).

The second main type of pokas ... ne sentence, called type 1 by Barentsen, is a special type of ne sentence; it has not been treated in this chapter. Consider the following example (for ease of comparison one with an adverb):

(25) Kogda ja perečital dannoe predloženie, ono pokazalos' mne neumestnym, pokas ja nakonec ne pónjal , čto ...
(When I reread the given sentence, it seemed inappropriate to me, until I, at last, understood that ...)
This case constitutes one end-point of the range of possibilities; at the other extreme are combinations without a link between "ne" and "V". In both cases an event replaces its absence in one step, but in the poka-case the event is the referent of "V", whereas in the no-link-case it is the referent of "ne V".

4.9 Combinations

An issue requiring further research is the question as to which types given in the foregoing may be combined in one sentence. From the discussion, only one point follows directly, in my view: a parallel link implies a forward link between "ne" and the verb. This is because a parallel link says:

"x" ---- "ne" "V"

"not x" ---- "V"

("not V")

In order for "not x" to concur with "V", "ne" must be linked forwards to "V"; otherwise (no link), "not x" would concur with "not ne V", which contradicts the time-stop idea of a parallel link. Thus, my analysis predicts, for example, that if we, starting from a sentence without a link between "ne" and the verb, insert a ni-word, which requires a parallel link (assuming that the normal interpretation of the ni-word is to be retained), the interpretation of the sentence changes, because the parallel link replaces "ne V" by "ne V".

For example, starting from (1):

(1) Ona srazu ne ponrâvilas' nam
    immediately not pleased
    (We disliked her immediately)

we replace nam (us) by nikomu (nobody) (or ona (she) by niktò (nobody)):

(26) Nikomâ Ona srazu ne ponrâvâlas’
    Nobody she immediately not pleased

Predictably, this sentence does not mean "Everybody disliked her immediately", nor "Nobody disliked her immediately", but "Nobody liked her immediately" (but some people may have started to like her later). The reasoning is as follows.

In (1) we start with

"srazu ne ponrâvilas'"

Then, the ni-word in (26) requires

"ne ponrâvilas'" instead of "ne ponrâvâlas’"

In principle, this leaves two possibilities for linking up "srazu":

"srazu ne ponrâvilas'" and "srazu ne ponrâvâlas’"

But the former is incoherent, given the meaning of srazu and that of the perfective aspect.

The message "Everybody disliked her immediately" can be expressed by means of vsè: Vsèm ona srazu ne ponrâvâlas’ (Lit. To-all she immediately not pleased). Note that this vs- plus ne combination has quite a different interpretation from the ni plus ne combination in (26) (cf. 4.6 above and 5.1 below). It will be clear that the message "Nobody disliked her immediately" (but some people may have started to dislike her later) cannot be expressed with the given ingredients.

Sentences like (26), with two parallel links, occur regularly. One attested example:

(27) ... oni [prostye sintagmy] ... nîčêm principial'no
    nothing (instr.) principally
    ne otiljcâjutsja ot sintâm dvüčlênných
    not are-distinguished
(They [simple syntagms] in no respect differ fundamentally from two-part syntagms, i.e. (approximately) they may be different in some respects, but such differences are then not fundamental)

What is more interesting is the question of what happens if we combine \[ \text{something} \] with \[ \text{something else} \]. Such combinations do not seem to be excluded:

\[ (28) \ldots \text{no oni [čti sredstva]} \in \text{dostátočný stepen} \text{mezný} \]

ne izúčeny

not are-studied (participle)

(But they [these means] have not yet been studied sufficiently)

Yet, questionable examples can easily be constructed. For example, starting from

\[ (16) \text{V poslednej kvartire dolgo ne otkryvali} \]

long not opened

(For a long time, people in the last apartment did not open the door)

the insertion of niktó (nobody) renders the sentence uninterpretable:

\[ (29) \text{? Niktó dolgo\langle e vremja\rangle ne otkryval} \]

Nobody long time not opened

The sentence can be made acceptable by replacing dolgo by nadolgo; in that case it says: "Nobody opened the door for a long time, but some people may have opened it for a short time", i.e. two parallel links.

Alternatively, we may place the adverbial phrase in initial position; with that arrangement, the parallel chunk can be linked backwards to the adverb, which eliminates the problem:

\[ (30) \text{Dolgoe vremja niktó ne otkryval} \]

Long time nobody not opened

(For a long time, nobody opened the door)

In this way, many messages can be imagined which would drive an informant crazy.

4.10 Spelling

As mentioned in the general introduction (0), a ne plus verb combination is written as two words unless the verb does not occur without ne- (excepting the ne do- vs. nedo- cases mentioned in 4.2). The discussion in this chapter hopefully explains why such an arbitrary rule is a wise solution. Given the fact that only two options are available for spelling (one word or two words), any semantically motivated proposal takes into account one opposition but disregards others. Clearly, a good candidate for one-word spelling is the type \text{Ona srazu ne ponravilas' nam} (We disliked her immediately) or the type \text{Rebenok vsé boliše i boliše ne doverjál vrzolym} (The child more and more distrusted adults). These types more or less parallel the \text{neprijatel'} case of Chapter Three. One disadvantage of this solution would be that, in the imperfective aspect, no distinction is made, in that case, between nenavidet' (to hate), which does not occur without ne-, and nenravit'sja (to displease); in the perfective aspect these would be distinguished by prefix-placement: voznenavidet' vs. neponravit'sja. Further, the present graphic distinction between "ne do\text{v}" and "nedo\text{v}" would be eliminated. But a far more serious disadvantage would be the suggested equivalence between "ne prijatel'" as used in Chapter Three and "ne čitaet". These are equivalent only if with "ne čitaet" we remove a part on the first level (He is not reading but watching television). It has been proposed that this point should be taken as the borderline, i.e. On \text{ne čitaet}, a smotrit televizor (two words) vs. \text{nečitaet} (one word) in all other cases. But then it is suggested that \text{nečitaet} is equivalent
CHAPTER FIVE

NOTES ON SCALES

5.0 Introduction

Quantifiers, especially when combined with a negation, have always interested logicians and linguists, because they seem to exhibit a number of idiosyncrasies. My suggestions in K 1985 (278-312) differ from earlier proposals in many respects. Importantly, they do not recognize the notion "scope of a quantifier". Further, they do not assume any ("deep") structures in which quantifiers and/or negations are placed elsewhere than where they are in surface structure; hence, no "transformations" such as "negation transportation" are postulated. Instead, I have applied the basic distinction between "x and its negation belong to the same moment" and "x and its negation belong to different moments", which recurs in information structure in every conceivable place, to an additional level in the case of quantifiers; this results in a distinction between concurrent and non-concurrent parts (see 1.8).

Together with five types of inference (see 1.9), which are not restricted to quantifiers, this accounts for most relevant readings. One further distinction will be added in this chapter (5.2); it deals with removing a part if the thing from which a part is being removed is, itself, a part. The distinction accounts for the fact that, e.g., Jespersen's (1966: 81) "the hill is not two hundred feet high" is interpreted as conveying that the hill is less than two hundred feet high, unless the numeral is "strongly stressed" (ibid.): "the hill is not 'two hundred feet high, but 'three hundred".

This fact has worried logicians a great deal. It has even led to the idea that, e.g., two means "at least two"; in Gricean pragmatics the reading "exactly two" is then derived as a Gricean implicature (e.g. Horn 1978: 136-137). In contrast to this view, I do not assume any meaning other than "two"; the possibility of two readings has, in my view, a natural explanation.

The same point explains why logicians are inclined to call, e.g., Nén many of us wanted the war the "sentential negation" of Many of us wanted the war (see below).

Before we come to that point, in 5.1 some examples are given of Russian sentences with vs- (all) and ne, in this order; they illustrate the difference between my third and fourth types of inference (K 1985: 293-302). The fourth type, i.e., e.g., vsé ne prièchali (Lit. Everybody not arrived) in the sense "not everybody arrived", may be unfamiliar to the English-speaking reader, as it is of very restricted occurrence in English (All that glitters isn't gold). It must not be confused with the second type, mentioned in 2.2. The second type, which is quite normal in English, has the last accent on the quantifier and a sentence-final intonation rise; as mentioned in 2.2, this type does not occur in Russian. Instead, the fourth type has at least two accents and no sentence-final intonation rise (if such a rise is present in the few English examples it is not essential).

It must perhaps be mentioned that my inferences have little to do with truth in the sense of traditional logic; they, inter alia, group together readings which are treated in quite different places in logic. One potential source of confusion is the following.
As is well-known, Jespersen (1966: 44) regarded a sentence like
Many of us didn't want the war as a case of nexal negation; in
contrast, Not many of us wanted the war is, with Jespersen, a
case of special negation. Logic-oriented linguists who distinguish
between sentential and constituent negation would rather call Not
many of us wanted the war the sentential negation of Many of us
wanted the war, because the truths of these sentences are incom­
patible, whereas the truth of Many of us didn't want the war is
compatible with that of Many of us wanted the war (e.g. Horn 1978:
133-134). In my framework, Many of us didn't want the war would be
described as a third inferential type from Many of us wanted the
war, and vice versa. In the example, the type uses concurrent
parts (complements), "many of us" in one sentence referring to
persons other than the persons referred to by "many of us" in the
other sentence. Thus, the observation that the truths of the two
sentences are compatible is, in my view, just as trivial as the
observation that John, didn't want the war is compatible with
John wanted the war. The semantic phenomenon ensuring that logi­
cians call Not many of us wanted the war the sentential negation
of Many of us wanted the war will be described in 5.2 below; it
is indeed the case that words like many allow an interpretation
which is also characteristic of, e.g., verbs (see 4.1). Hence
Jespersen's and the logician's points of view.

Further, just as "many" and "many" (in the two sentences above)
may refer to concurrent parts, "everybody" and "nobody" may. Thus,
"Everybody didn't want the war" is an inference from Nobody wanted
the war, "everybody" and "nobody" referring to each other's com­
plements here. (Starting from nobody gives the fifth type rather
than the third because of some additional complications there.)
This pair would, in logic, be treated quite differently from the
many-case, because the everybody - nobody pair consists of logi­
cally equivalent sentences. (Everybody wanted the war and Nobody
wanted the war are contraries, etc.) The fact that Nobody wanted
the war is necessarily true if "Everybody didn't want the war" is
true, while Many of us wanted the war is not necessarily true if
"Many of us didn't want the war" is true, has no role to play in
my framework (although it follows from my distinctions, of course).

Thus, the inferences state which conclusions can be drawn by a
hearer on the basis of the given accent distribution and the
inherent meanings of the words, irrespective of whether he must
draw such a conclusion or may not do so according to logicians.

5.1 Third vs. fourth type of inference: vs- examples

In 4.6 we saw that p i q vsegdâ ne sovpâdjut is not a normal
Russian sentence, at least in the reading "it is always the case
that p and q do not coincide". Elsewhere, combinations of vs- and
ne do occur; some attested examples will be given in this section.
The fact that they do occur is more remarkable in Russian than it
is in English because, e.g., "it is always the case that p and q
do not coincide" says (third type of inference) "it is never the
case that p and q coincide"; but, in contrast to English never,
Russian nikogda does not refer to the complement of the vs-word;
instead, it refers to the absence of the whole in question (given
ne before the verb). Although Russian has no word referring to the
complement of the vs-word, the thought of the complement can be
evoked. This thought is the concurrent negation of the vs-word
(using concurrent parts here).

The technical description of the inferences can be found in
K 1985 (: 293-302). In the examples following below the third type
has the following form. There is a subject containing vs-.
The predicate contains ne plus verb. The sentence has a backward link
between predicate and subject. It states the truth of the combi­
nation vs- ... ne V. The inference holds that the combination of
1. the complement of the vs-word, and 2. V, is also true. In
effect, the sentence says All x ... not V, and the interpretation
is nô x ... V.

The fourth type of inference uses non-concurrent parts. (The
third type is also possible with non-concurrent parts, but I have
as yet found no Russian vs- examples of this application.) Again,
the subject contains vs- and the predicate ne plus V. This time,
the two constituents are linked up by means of a parallel link.
The sentence states the truth of the combination vs- ... ne V.
The inference holds that the combination of 1. a non-concurrent part to the vs-word, and 2. \( \forall \), is also true. In effect, the sentence says \( \forall x \ldots \neg \forall y \), and the interpretation is \( \forall x \ldots \neg \forall \) (not all here stands for a non-concurrent part to all, e.g. many - see the picture in 1.8).

Under every example it is indicated which reading was probably meant in the source of the example (taking into account the context).

Examples:

(31) No \( \forall \) vsé éto ne imelo uspëcha 
But all that not had success
(intended reading: nothing had success; third type)

(32) Učebnikov bolgarskogo jazyka suščestvuet neskol'ko. ...
(There are several text-books for the Bulgarian language) 
\( \forall \) oni, odnako, ne rasčitan special'no na studenta-
All they, however, not are-meant especially for student
of-Russian
(intended reading: no text-book is especially meant for ...; third type)

(33) ...\( \forall \)së éti suščestvitel'nye ne dopuskâjet sočetâniya s...
all these nouns not allow combination with...
(intended reading: none of the nouns allow ...; third type)

(34) \( \forall \)së dela / vseh del \( ne \) peredâjâš' 
All things / (genitive) not you-do
(intended reading: one cannot do everything; fourth type)

(35) \( \forall \)së nesobstvenno sintaksîšeskie ... otnošeniya,..., \( ne \)
All improperly syntactic ... relations,..., not
svôdjatsja k aktual'nomu členeniju,... 
reduce to actual division,...
(intended reading: not all ... relations can be reduced to ...; fourth type)

(36) Vsé slučai, kogda ..., \( ne \) polûšâjet dolžnogo ob'jasiâniya 
All cases, when ..., not receive appropriate explanation
v ramkach tradicionnogo ...
in framework of-traditional ...
(intended reading: not all cases ... receive ...; fourth type)

(37) ... \( \forall \) svjazi s čem \( \forall \)së javlenija, svjazannya s ..., 
in connection with which all phenomena, connected with..., 
ne mûgot polûšit' ob'jasiâniya v ramkach tradicionnogo...
not can receive explanation in framework of-traditional ...
(intention unclear: in which connection all phenomena cannot be explained / not all phenomena can be explained)

(38) No \( \forall \)së oni otnjûd' \( ne \) javâjutsja variantami odnogo 
But all they absolutely not are variants of-single
predloženiya 
sentence
(intention unclear: they are all by no means variants of .../ by no means all of them are variants of ...)

Etc.

In speech, accent distribution probably helps to resolve the ambiguity. It can be expected that the possibility of a "not all" reading decreases if, after the negated verb, a long stretch follows, which can hardly be entirely unaccented.

According to Padučeva (1969: 19), Puškin's sentence \( \forall \)së eščë ne propalo (Lit. Everything still/yet not is-lost, i.e. not everything is already lost) is nowadays perceived as a gallicism (in the sense indicated). This seems to be a strange characterization, because sentences like (34)-(38) do occur, despite their lack of clarity. Possibly, Padučeva has in mind a reading according to the second type of inference (she indicates only the accent on \( \forall \)së), which is indeed non-Russian (see 2.2). But probably, it is the embedded forward link between "eščë" and "ne propalo" which makes things worse (cf. 4.9):
Interestingly, in her own generative treatment Padučeva stars out as ungrammatical vs-...ne combinations in the "all...not" reading, replacing them by ni...ne combinations (e.g. op.cit.:18). As illustrated by (31)-(33), things are more complicated than that.

Although some authors incidentally mention examples like (31)-(38), the questions raised by the data remain without an answer. One question is: what difference exists between vs-...ne with the third type of inference and ni-...ne? I would suggest that a close inspection of the contexts in which these alternative expressions occur could clarify this point. Note that the interpretations of the two meanings come close to each other only in some sentences; as we saw in 4.9, circumstances exist where the two convey quite different ideas.

A second question is: what difference exists between vse-...ne with the fourth type of inference and ne vs-? In Dutch, where the same two arrangements occur, the basic difference is the following. 
\[\text{Alle} \, X \ldots \text{niet} \, V \, \text{(all} \, X \ldots \text{not} \, V) \, \text{says: if some} \, X \, V, \text{then not all} \, X \, V; \text{this leaves open the possibility that no} \, X \, V. \text{This possibility is excluded in} \, \text{ni}t \, \text{alle} \, X \ldots \, V \, \text{(not all} \, X \ldots \, V); \text{the latter arrangement says that at least one} \, X \, V. \text{For example, in a context speculating on what would happen if all houses burnt down simultaneously, if all cars were in the same street at the same moment, etc., the following sentence appeared:} \text{Alle huizen branden niet tegelijk af} \, \text{(Lit. All houses burn not simultaneously down).} \]

In the given context this sentence cannot be replaced by \text{niet alle huizen branden tegelijk af} \, (or a different accentuation) \, (Lit. Nöt all houses burn simultaneously down); the latter implies that at least some houses burn down simultaneously, whereas the author intended only to put an end to his phantasy. Probably, the difference in Russian is comparable; this would explain why people sometimes prefer the unclarity of (34)-(38) to the unambiguity of ne vs-: the latter excludes more than they want to.

More complicated questions concern the possibilities of combining various types of link in one sentence (cf. 4.9).

5.2 Removing a part of a part

Recall from 4.1 the following diagram for removing a part on the first level (type: \textit{On ne čitaet, a smotrit televizor}):

| activity minus identifying property /reading/ | "ne čitaet" |
| activity incl. identifying property /reading/ | "čitaet" |
| absence of reading (relegated to the past) | "not čitaet" |

The name "part-whole organization" used here and elsewhere in the foregoing has the sense indicated in 1.5; it abbreviates a certain relationship between organizations in projection time and the things referred to.

In \textit{on ne čitaet, a smotrit televizor} we do not, of course, actually cut off a part of his activity; we only mentally deprive the activity of its identifying property. In the same way, in \textit{ne pri-fjátel' as discussed in Chapter Three, we mentally remove an incorrectly assigned identifying property and not, e.g., a leg of the friend: the person involved cannot lose his identity by losing a leg, so we must apply the part-whole idea on a more abstract conceptual level.

Now, if we are talking about the non-concurrent parts of a pie (see 1.8), we have a case where we can deprive something of its identity in both ways: we either mentally remove the identifying property of a piece of the pie, so that an unidentified thing remains, or we mentally cut off a part of the piece, so that a smaller piece remains. Therefore, the diagram given above has two applications here. First (the "abstract sense"):

| whole (part of the pie) minus part (id. prop.) | "ne""x" |
| whole (part of the pie) incl. part (id. prop.) | "x" |
| absence of x | "not x" |

This is the sense applied in e.g. \textit{The hill is not two hundred feet high, but three hundred}; we remove the identifying property /two/ (hundred feet) of the height of the hill; this leaves us with an unidentified height; the but-phrase makes explicit the first type
of inference (negative variant). This case exactly parallels the procedure for Ne prijatel' priechal (see 3.2). The element from the environment which is used for identifying the height is one of the non-concurrent parts to two: one, three, four, etc. Note that any element from the environment can be used for identification and that non-concurrent parts are imagined in this case as things simultaneously available in the environment (cf. 4.1); the parts of the pie are imagined as being, themselves, indivisible things (cf. the friend whom we cannot deprive of his identity by removing a leg).

Secondly (mentally cutting off a part):

\[
\text{whole (part of the pie) minus part (part of the part) = "ne"x}
\]
\[
\text{whole (part of the pie) incl. part (part of the part) = "x"}
\]
\[
\text{absence of x = "not x"}
\]

This is the idea we use in e.g. The hill is not two hundred feet high in the sense "The hill is less than two hundred feet high". We now remove some of the height of the hill, so that we are left with a hill less high than two hundred feet. This possibility is available because we can deprive a part of the pie of its identity by cutting off a part, the result being a new part.

Now, the last-mentioned case is interesting. What we have applied is the diagram for removing a part, i.e. the reading chosen if X belongs to the environment where "ne x" has a referent (see 4.1). But what we have construed as referents for "x" and "ne x" is non-concurrent parts, i.e. things which do not belong to each other's environment because they exist at different moments. For such referents we expect the application of the diagram for removing a whole (see 4.1), i.e. e.g. On ne čităet in the sense "his potential reading is absent". We have not applied such a diagram: it removes his entire activity, or, here, the entire part of the pie referred to by "x" (not a part of that part). So we have combined one feature characteristic of removal-of-part cases, viz. the fact that only part of the thing involved is being removed, with one feature characteristic of removal-of-whole cases, viz. the fact that "ne x" and "x" do not have a referent simultaneously.

It is the last-mentioned feature which ensures that logicians call Nět many of us wanted the wår "the" (sentential) negation of Mány of us wanted the wår.

5.3 Further discussion

The "less than" reading of 5.2 creates an interesting conflict in Dutch. I will mention it here because it clearly illustrates the exceptional status of the type. Just like the Russian Ne prijatel' priechal (see 3.4), the Dutch translation Niet de vriend kwam is unacceptable because of the conflict between the part-whole organization prescribed by niet in the subject and the backward link between the accented verb and the subject.

Now, if we replace de vriend by a word allowing a "less than" reading, such sentences become acceptable, e.g. Niet iedereen kwam op tijd (Nět everybody arrived on time). Since it is, in general, a parallel link which resolves the conflict concerned, we are inclined to say that words like iedereen allow a parallel link to be chosen here. However, all related facts tell us that this is not what happens.

In the first place, the parallel link proposal does not account for the fact that such sentences become odd if, here, the first accent is on iedereen instead of niet. (Moreover, we cannot choose then between iedereen and iedereen - cf. K 1985: 301-302.)

Secondly, if Niet iedereen kwam op tijd had a parallel link we would expect the same possibility for, e.g., Niet vaak kwam hij op tijd (Lit. Nět often came he on time). But, in contrast to English Nět often did he arrive on time, where Auxiliary - Subject order has in principle no problem with a "less than" reading in the first part of the sentence, the Dutch sentence is odd; more specifically, it tends to be interpreted as English S-V order (backward link) in, e.g., Nět long āfter, he arrived. This is remarkable because, as mentioned in 2.6, Dutch V-S order allows a parallel link in e.g. Vaak kwam hij niet op tijd (Lit. Ōften came
he not on time, i.e. not often did he arrive on time). Clearly, Dutch at least prefers to restrict the use of parallel links here to removal-of-part cases in the "abstract" sense: in 

\[ \text{Vaak kwam hij niet op tijd, "not vaak" (negated by the first accent) projects an unidentified number of times; the correct identification of that number is filled in by means of the fourth type of inference. In } \text{Niet vaak kwam hij op tijd, in contrast, "niet vaak" does not refer to an unidentified number of times but to a number of times smaller than that referred to by "vaak" ("less than").} \]

These and other related facts make it very unlikely that the type 

\[ \text{Niet iedereen kwam op tijd has a parallel link. Yet, the sentence is fully acceptable. It seems to me that in such cases, Dutch systematically, in word order as well as in accent placement, chooses arrangements creating the same organizations of projections as a parallel link would do, but in such a way that the elements can also be linked up in a different way. For example, } \]

\[ \text{Niet iedereen kwam is:} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"niet"} \\
\text{"kwam"} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"not niet"} \\
\text{"iedereen"} \\
\text{"not kwam"} \\
\end{array} \]

This organization can be a parallel link:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"niet"} \\
\text{"kwam"} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"not niet"} \\
\text{"iedereen"} \\
\text{"not kwam"} \\
\end{array} \]

but the same organization corresponds to "overlapping constituents":

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"niet"} \\
\text{"kwam"} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{"not niet"} \\
\text{"iedereen"} \\
\text{"not kwam"} \\
\end{array} \]

Cases where the "overlapping" option is not available because of accent placement and/or word order are odd or unacceptable (\[ \text{Niet iedereen kwam op tijd; Niet vaak kwam hij op tijd). They would not be odd/unacceptable if they allowed a parallel link. It would be strange if the type } \text{Niet iedereen kwam (op tijd) exceptionally allowed a parallel link. Hence it must be the "overlapping" option which applies here.} \]

In Russian, the problem has quite a different solution. Here, the possibility of a parallel link cannot even be considered, because such a link requires ne before the verb, but we are talking about ne preceding a quantitative expression. The solution congruous with the rest of the system is: eliminating the link between "ne" and the quantitative expression. And indeed, we find, e.g., nemnogo (not-much) for the "less than much" reading, vs. ne mnogo (a vsě) (not much but everything) for the other reading.

But is spelling semantically correct here? That is, does nemnogo indeed introduce a thought of the absence of the part arrived at by removing a part of the referent of "mnogo"? And is the further step of eliminating the link indeed not taken in, e.g., ne vsě (not everything), which is written as two words in both readings? With vsě, of course, it is less useful to keep the two apart, because the thing meant is a part smaller than vsě in either case, vsě indicating the extreme point of the scale involved. There are facts showing that spelling is surprisingly consistent here. Thus, for example, one may say v nemných stránách (In some countries), whereas v ne vsch stránách (In not all countries) would rather be replaced by Ne v vsch stránách (Not in all countries); this shows that the connection between "ne" and "mnogie" is more intimate than that between "ne" and "vsé". Also, On nemnogo pospál (Lit. He not-much slept) seems to convey the fact of his sleeping, just as On mnogo spál (Lit. He much slept) does. Compare: On ne vségda spál (Lit. He not always slept), On ne často spál (Lit. He not often slept), which do not parallel the positive On vsegdá spál (He always slept) and On často spál (He often slept). (This issue has not been discussed in Chapter Four; with the last accent on the adverb, i.e. On ne vsegdá/často spál the given strings are, of course, normal.)

Obviously, we have another issue for further research here. For this moment, it suffices to say that the distinction between forward link and no link is not the same as the distinction between the two readings introduced in 5.2, so there is no reason,
in principle, why we could not distinguish between, e.g., "ne mnogo" and "ne mnogo", both for the "less than much" reading. But evidently, the conceptual complexity of such a distinction favours its elimination.

Elsewhere, the word i (in the sense "even") is used for the "less than" reading. For example: On i 5-i knig ne pročital (Lit. He even 5 books not read), i.e. he has read less than 5 books; versus: On pročital ne 5 knig, a ě (Lit. He read not 5 books but ě (or any other number)). Interestingly, the i ... ne construction exceptionally allows perfective aspect in combination with a durative expression like za ves' večer (during the whole evening); e.g. za ves' večer on i dvůch slov ne skazal (Lit. During the whole evening he even two words not said). The same is possible with ní (as a separate word), e.g. (39) Tak on polagal i ní razu za vsjú svojú mnogoletnju prášku ne osibuja

(This was his assumption and not once during his many years of practice did he make a mistake) (Barentsen, p.c.)

According to Rassudova (1982: 39) (she does not mention the za-case) ní ... ne plus imperfective aspect conveys the absence of the event by negating all possible occurrences; with perfective aspect the same is arrived at by negating the (possibility of) one single occurrence. It seems that Russian comes close to the Dutch problem about the parallel link here (see above). As we saw in the foregoing, ní-words require a parallel link (and hence ne before the verb) in order to be able to refer to the absence of the whole in question; when the absence is arrived at by removing the last part of the whole, we have the ultimate case of the "less than" reading.

Hopefully, the few peculiarities mentioned in this section (others can undoubtedly be added) sufficiently illustrate the conceptual complexity of the "less than" reading, normal as it may seem at first sight. I have argued that the complexity consists in the fact that here we remove a part in circumstances in which a whole is removed elsewhere.12

5.4 Gradable ne-compounds

In this section I would like to add two further remarks, one about the direction of a scale, the other about a combination of concurrent and non-concurrent parts.

As Sapir remarked in 1944 (1949: 134), "Logically, as mathematically, b increased from a = b decreased from c. Psychologically however, and therefore also linguistically, the explicit or implicit trend is frequently in a specific direction".

At first sight, my reasoning in the foregoing seems to be incompatible with the fact that, e.g., Russian has words like nemalo (not-few), meaning "quite a lot" (more than few), neplocho (not-bad), meaning "quite good", etc.: it seems as if we here add rather than remove something. I think it is not negation which is responsible for this impression, but the direction in which we proceed along the scale involved. What I do think is that, given a negation, moving along a scale from low to high is more complex than descending it from high to low.

Russian is more flexible in choosing a scale-direction than, e.g. Czech. Grygar-Rechziegel (1980: 384-385) gives examples of antonymic Czech adjectives where only the "higher"/"positively evaluated" member of the pair allows a ne-compound to be formed. For example: nebohatj (not-rich), but not nechudy (not-poor).

This says, in my view, that the language does not allow us to ascend this scale from low to high.

In "less rich than rich" we arrive at a lower point of the scale by removing some of his wealth. If in "less poor than poor" we retained the same scale direction, the negation would induce us to remove a further part of his belongings, so that we fall off the scale. In order to prevent this from happening, we must put the scale upside down, to the effect that adding money diminishes his poverty. This is evidently more complex than the case when both negation and scale-direction induce us to remove (part of) x, so restrictions can be expected here.

Finally, consider the following sentences: Da nét, on sovsém ne aktiven (Lit. No, he is altogether not active) and Byl bádkij mál'čik, a stal sovsém všílum i neaktivnym (Lit. He was a vivá-
The top row represents a scale of activity. It starts at the left with a full degree of activity and ends to the right with the absence of any activity. This rightward end-point of the top row is referred to by "sovsem ne aktiven"; the graded property is here: activity, and the scale runs: fully active - less active - absence of activity.

Simultaneously with the diminishing activity, the degree of inactivity rises; this is indicated in the bottom row (that of the complement). The rightmost point of this scale, i.e. full inactivity, is referred to by "sovsem neaktivnym". This time the graded property is inactivity; the scale runs: absence of inactivity - more inactive - fully inactive.

It will be clear that ne aktiven has a link between "ne" and "aktivnen": we arrive at a zero-degree of activity by removing a degree of activity, and the (gradable) property of activity per se is negated by removing the whole pie of activity (i.e. two steps). The bottom row (the complement) corresponds to the absence of a link between "ne" and "aktivnym": the (gradable) property of inactivity is negated by removing the pie of inactivity (one step).

As Sapir remarked in 1944 (1949: 130), "To the naive, every person is either good or bad; if he cannot be easily placed, he is rather part good and part bad than just humanly normal or neither good nor bad".

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

As a general conclusion I would like to warn against simplifications like that of Dahl (1979), who classifies approximately 240 languages according to whether they use a morphological and/or a syntactic type of sentence negation.

Criteria for classification on the morphological side are, following Dahl: portmanteau realization of the negation, prosodic unity of the negation and the verb, placement of the negation close to the root of the verb, and morphophonemic alternation in the negation morpheme. Features which favour a syntactic analysis are: moveability of the negation, prosodic independence, orthographic separation, and inflectional affixes carried by the negation morpheme.

Dahl correctly mentions (1979: 83) that the spelling criterion leads to an arbitrary classification in the case of Polish and Czech. The same holds true for Russian, which Dahl puts on the syntactic side. But the problem is worse: even the observation that e.g. Russian has both types, and that the semantic borderline cannot be detected by any of Dahl's criteria, is not worthwhile, because calling one case "morphology" and an adjacent case "syntax" contributes nothing to our understanding anyway.
Finally, Verhagen's formulation of the two basic interpretations of an accent means "not not" formulates a property of all speaking rather than the additional effect of accent, because "a speaker is always talking about what he is talking about, and not about something else" (op.cit.: 87). I agree, of course, with Verhagen's statement that "the ideas evoked by the elements of an utterance are all 'made present' (i.e., in some sense, 'not not present') simply through the act of speaking" (ibid.). In my view, this "property of all speaking" is the act of copying a meaning from the permanent stock in projection time. It is always the case that a speaker who copies some meaning, say "a", copies "d" and not "a", "b", "c" etc. For this opposition we need no accent, because it follows from the fact that our permanent stock contains more than one meaning (see K 1985: 112). Therefore, the proposal that an accent means "not not" is sensible only in combination with my differentiation between permanent meanings and temporary projections (K 1985: 173). Given this differentiation, Verhagen's proposal (ibid.), that an accent presents an idea as a relevant alternative, is close to mine. If the copied meaning involved is "d", an accent turns it into "not (not d)"; here, "not d" is that to which "d" is an alternative. By combining the copied meaning "d" with one "not" into "not d", i.e. by forcing the projection to which "d" is to be an alternative, the copied meaning "d" itself is used up. Next, a projection "d" is re-introduced by means of the other "not". This procedure accounts for the ability of an accent to introduce a new moment of projection time, and for the fact that there is, in projection time, a projection other than "d" although only "d" and the meaning of accent have been copied. In other words, I agree that an accent presents "d" as a (relevant) alternative, but I hold the view that we must also account for the fact that there is something to which "d" is an alternative. In my proposal, this something is created in projection time by means of an accent: there is an act of copying "d", there is an act of copying "not not"; together, they give a temporary projection "not d", although no meaning "a", "b", "c" etc. is involved.

Finally, Verhagen's formulation of the two basic interpretations of an accent (op.cit.: 88) (cf. "theme" and "rheme") is closer to my point of view than he thinks it is on p. 263, note 7 (the opinion formulated in this note is not mine). Verhagen says on p. 88: "In the first case [cf. "theme"], the accent is interpreted as presenting an alternative to some other idea(s) in particular: it is selected from a set of given ideas. In the second case [cf. "rheme"], the idea evoked by the accented element is interpreted as an alternative to its own negation, i.e. to its absence". Here we disagree only with respect to the last phrase: "i.e. to its absence". In my view, the "own negation" to which "d" is an alternative, i.e. "not d", is a projection (of the absence of the referent d) and not a projection (K 1985: 195; 366-367 (note 33)). Further, the "some other idea(s)" which figure in the first-mentioned interpretation, is, in my view, also an "own negation" of "d", namely a concurrent negation instead of a non-concurrent negation (see also 1.7 below). Therefore, the formulation that the accent presents "d" as an alternative to its own negation is inaccurate in my view, both interpretations. For the reasons explained above, I maintain that "not not" is correct, but I should have said more explicitly that it is correct only if one accepts the notion of projection time; it cannot be transplanted into some other theory without becoming nonsensical in the way explained by Verhagen.
arrived), or entirely a matter of contextually dependent interpretation (John arrived). The vertical notation (order in projection time) specifies whether we are dealing with broad scope or with narrow scope (whether the unaccented element concurs with the other element or with the negation of the other element), but it does not specify whether or not the cause of the reading is structural; the latter can be seen from the type of link.

3. With Fuchs, excentric integration is an integrative accent on a modifier, and concentric integration is an integrative accent on a head (op.cit. (ms.): 7), independently of word order. Thus, broad scope head - modifier is an excentric integration, and broad scope modifier - head as well as broad scope head - modifier is concentric integration. In my terminology, this opposition is expressed by saying: in head - modifier (excentric integration) the head is linked to the modifier; in modifier - head and head - modifier (concentric integration) the modifier is linked to the head. This corresponds to the order in projection time (vertical notation): this order is different in head - modifier vs. modifier - head (broad scope) vs. modifier (concentric integration) is identical. Thus, the abstraction from word order is made in the vertical notation (order in projection time). The difference between e.g. head - modifier and modifier - head (excentric vs. concentric, head linked to modifier vs. modifier linked to head) is in my framework described in terms of part-whole and figure-ground relationships (cf. nothing real, where "nothing" refers to a part, and a real nothing, where "nothing" refers to a figure).

Since my notation is intended to cover accentuation as well as word order, it also opposes all forward links to all backward links. The types of link enable me to make observations like: "Russian "ne" (in contrast to e.g. English "not") cannot be linked backwards" (see 2.1). Also, in both e.g. predicate - subject and subject - predicate the predicate is linked to the subject, but the forward type is, in Russian, restricted to inherently predicative elements (other elements cannot both function as a predicate and be linked forwards); the backward type has no such restriction.

Thus, in my terminology a statement like "x" is linked to "y", or "y" is linked to "x", is independent of word order, just as Fuchs' types of integration are. A statement like "x" is linked forwards to "y", or "y" is linked backwards to "x", is not independent of word order. I need both types of statement.

4. Since in Fuchs' view, Subject - Predicate combinations cannot be analyzed as being only either modifier - head or head - modifier, the fact that only an accent on the subject can be an integrative (broad scope) accent has two explanations simultaneously (op.cit. (ms.): 17 - this point is not quite clear to me). In my terms, Subject - Predicate combinations (in this order) have a backward link, and the impossibility of a forward link is explained as a consequence of the temporal meaning of a predicate. (In fact, I would argue these constructions as an argument in favour of the view that the head/modifier terminology is useful as a temporary mnemonic device only; my distinctions cover the same area as this terminology does, but divide it up in quite a different way, which amounts to the proposal that the traditional terminology is inadequate and redundant.)

Despite these differences, Fuchs' observation that, e.g., attributive constructions Noun plus Prepositional Phrase can be integrated in an excentric way (x + y) as well as in a concentric way (y + x), is concerned with the same semantic fact as my observation that such constructions can have a forward as well as a backward link. It may well turn out in the future that the present differences are a temporary inconvenience caused by the different paths which led us to a common area.
The indispensable constructed Russian examples were checked by V. Barentsen-Orljanskaja, whom I would like to thank.
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That is, a normal forward linking scheme with an additional level (cf. 3.2). However, in my notation this scheme says that given "V", "not adverb" is replaced by "adverb", i.e. that both "not adverb" and "adverb" link up with "V". This incorrectly describes the relevant meaning. In the meaning which I note down as a parallel scheme it is essential that the replacement of "not adverb" by "adverb" takes place simultaneously with the replacement of "V" by "ne V", i.e. that "adverb" does not combine with "V". It is, of course, not surprising that this meaning is found where a level is added as compared with positive sentences, i.e. that the parallel scheme applies mainly in negative sentences, but it is a semantic step more than just the addition of a level. Therefore, I have a special notation for it. (Elsewhere, the parallel scheme occurs, e.g., in English sentences with Auxiliary - Subject order, where the "time-stop" idea is introduced by the meaning of the order of the words; not surprisingly, words like only which combine with this order are often discussed in the context of negation.)

As we will see below, starting from a parallel scheme projections can be "lowered", so that again a forward linking scheme results:

$$\text{["ne" "V"]}$$

So the addition of a level, and the fact that, if "ne" is linked to "V" first, the negation of "ne V" is "V", does not automatically result in a parallel scheme. Therefore, it is a separate type.

The example is questionable, however, because of the initial position of bol'se, which adds a further complication (see 4.7 below). But Glovinskaja's suggestion as to dependence of accent placement (I have translated her suggestion by placing the last accent on mogu in the perfective case and on the infinitive in the imperfective case) can probably be taken to mean that there is a parallel link in the "object" sense ("I cannot write more although I could write until now (less)").

As we will see in 5.1 below, combinations of vs- and ne are not excluded per se; thus, it is not difficult to find examples of vs- (subject) ... ne vs-. Also, vsed'ya subject ne verb is attested. Because of such observable differences between individual vs-cases, I do not consider it problematic that my framework makes understandable both the fact that ne is inserted before the verb if a ni-word is used (see e.g. 2.6 on word order) and the fact that vs- tends to be replaced by ni- if the verb is preceded by ne (for example the vsed'ya case being discussed in the main text). I indeed hold the view that from various sides, the system conspires to the "double negation" construction, and that it is useful to keep the various sides apart because, after all, ni occurs without ne, and ne occurs with vs-. The two expressions ni ... ne and vs- ... ne are not synonymous, although their interpretations overlap (cf. also 4.9).
Things improve considerably in sentences with "ambient" het (it) and "existential" er (unstressed there); for example (attested): *Niet altijd gaat het om mensen met een voldoende literaire achtergrond* (Lit. Not always goes it about people with a sufficient literary basis).

Further, fused negations do not need word order for a parallel link; thus, e.g., *(Nog) geen drie boeken heeft hij gelezen* (Lit. (Still/yet) not three books has he read) is acceptable ("he has read even less than three books").

This seems to be the end-point of the conceptual level on which accent functions. Beyond this point a drastic change takes place.

On ne citAet, a smotrit televizor *(mentally removing an identifying property)*

On ne ubil ee, a tol'ko tjazelo ranil *(mentally removing the "terminus part" of the event, so that "less" of the event remains)*. In cases like the latter the thing being removed is a part and a whole simultaneously, but in different constellations. It is the "terminus part" of the event, i.e. in the internal structure of a single occurrence of the event, but it is a whole (figure) in the system I have been dealing with so far, i.e. something with an own identity on which attention can be focused.

In this example the entire whole is being removed. In this respect the sentence is not different from, e.g., example (4) (4.3).

In application to entities, the same step brings us to the level mentioned in footnote 2.

Thus, at the point where according to the regularity given in 4.1 (or its counterpart for positive sentences), i.e. the truth-relationships it reflects (cf. 4.3, a part-feature is combined with a whole-feature, the thing involved is a whole as far as the relation with identity and attention mentioned in 1.5 is concerned; it is a part in a different constellation, i.e. there is a second whole (e.g. the machine in footnote 2). The "less" reading dealt with in 5.2-5.3 is a borderline case, because here something with an own identity on which attention can be focused. In this example this entire whole is being removed. In this respect the sentence is not different from, e.g., example (4) (4.3).

In application to entities, the same step brings us to the level mentioned in footnote 2.

REFERENCES

Barentsen, A.A.


Channon, R.

Dahl, Ø.

Fuchs, A.
forthcoming "Pragmatic as against grammatical factors in the determination of accent placement".

Givón, T.

Glovinskaia, M.Ja.

Grygar-Rechziegel, A.

Horn, L.R.

Ivanova, V.F.

Jespersen, O.

Keijsper, C.E.
1985 Information Structure, With examples from Russian, English and Dutch. Amsterdam.

Koenitz, B.

Křížková, H.
1968 "K voprosu o tak nazyvaemoj dvojnoj negacii v slavjanskich jazy­kach", *Slavia* 37, 21-39.

Obzor
1965 "Obzor predloženij po usovershenstvovaniju russkoj orfografii (XVIII-XX vv.)" (ed.: V.V. Vinogradov). Moskva.

Padučeva, E.V.
1963 "Semantičeskij analiz otricatel'nych predloženij v russkom jazyke", *Našin'my pervod i prikladnaja lingvistika* 12, 5-35.

Rassudova, O.P.
1982 Upotreblenie vidov glagola v sovremennom russkom jazyke, izdanie 2-e, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. Moskva.

Sapir, E.

Savel'eva, L.V.

Skorobac, A.N.
1978 "O sitnom i razdelenom napisanii glagolov s pristavkoj "nedo-"", Moskva.

Starosta, S.
Tottie, G.
1980
"Affixal and non-affixal negation in English - Two systems in (almost) complementary distribution", Studia Linguistica 34, 2, 101-123.

Verhagen, A.
1986