Raissa Rozina (Moscow, Russian State Humanities University)

RUSSIAN VERBS WITH EMBEDDED PREDICATES OF MOVEMENT

The present paper is concerned with the analysis of meaning and aspectual peculiarities of a number of derived Russian verbs with the base *pustit'* 'let', namely *dopustit'* 'let to', *podpustit'* 'let closer', *propustit'* 'let through', *vpustit'* 'let in'. These verbs have been described in Glovinskaia 1982 as having one and the same type of a non-standard relationship between the meanings of the Imperfective and Perfective. I argue that the meanings of the Imperfective verbs differ (and so the relationships between related Ipfv and Pf verbs are different), but can be derived on the basis of the Pfv verb meanings by applying one and the same rule of derivation.

First, I consider the basic meanings of the Pf verbs and suggest what their lexicographic definitions might be like, then, taking into consideration the peculiarities of their definitions, I introduce the rule of derivation of the meanings of Ipfv verbs, and finally I look at different meanings of individual Ipfv verbs resulting from the application of this rule.

1. The General Meaning Definition

In their basic meanings all these verbs describe situations with two active participants, one wishing to arrive at a certain point, and another having under his or her control a certain obstacle on the way of the former, e.g.:

(1) Za nim gonjatsja, no za krepostnymi vorotami – druz'ja, i oni uspevajut *vpustit'* ego i zakryt' vorota pered presledovateljami v poslednee rokovoe mgnovenie (Uppsala corpus)
He is pursued, but behind the fortress gates there are his friends and at the very last moment
they manage *to let* him *in* and close the gates in front of the persecutors.

In this example, the final point the moving participant wants to reach is a container (in this particular instance, a fortress), whereas the obstacle removed by the controlling participant is an object closing the entrance to it (in this instance, the gates; it might be a door or a curtain or the like).

An essential feature of these verbs, in contrast to other verbs also describing the situations with two active participants, is that they always assign the role of the Agent, and, consequently, the syntactic function of the Subject to one participant of the situation only, namely to that controlling the obstacle. The second, moving participant, though he/she has the properties of the Counteragent, is assigned the syntactic function of the Object in the sentence and never gets to the more prominent position of the Subject. In the framework of Carttunen 1985 these verbs classify as double implicatives, cf.:

$$X \ \textit{vpustil} \ Y \ \text{в} \ Z \supset Y \ \text{has moved into } Z$$
$$X \ \textit{let} \ Y \ \textit{into} \ Z \supset Y \ \text{has moved into } Z;$$

$$X \ \text{ne} \ \textit{vpustil} \ Y \ \text{в} \ Z \supset Y \ \text{has not moved into } Z$$
$$X \ \text{did not let } Y \ \text{into } Z \supset Y \ \text{has not moved into } Z$$

etc. In the meanings of these verbs, the component describing the action of the second participant is dependent on the first one. This relation between components is very close to causative, though not identical to it. Though the first participant does not cause the action of the second one, he controls the situation. If he does not remove the obstacle, the second participant won't be able to perform his action. This inequality seems to be a plausible explanation for the fact that it is the first participant only who can be assigned the role of the Agent.

The relation of the components in the meanings of these verbs is manifested in their derivational structure: the derivational base describes the action of the Agent, whereas the choice

of the prefix is determined by the movement of the Counteragent. For instance, in *vpustit'* 'let in' the prefix *v-* refers to the movement into smth, i.e to the Counteragent's movement, whereas the removal of the obstacle by the Agent should have been described by the prefix *ot-*, e.g. *otkryt' dver'* 'to open the door', *otodvinut' zanavesku* 'to draw the curtain', *otkatit' kamen'* 'to roll the stone away', etc. The prefix of the verb *propustit'* 'to let through' describes the movement of the Counteragent through the entrance, whereas a corresponding action of the Agent could have been described by verbs with either the prefix *po-* (*postoronit'sia* 'to get to the side') or raz/s- (*razdvinut'sia / rasstupit'sia* 'to make way for').

  Besides, the meaning of verbs under consideration includes the components 'Y wanted to arrive in Z' and 'in t>MS[1] Y arrived at the obstacle', which do not get under the negation and thus constitute the presupposition. So, a generalized definition matching all Perfective verbs in question is as follows:

> Y wanted to arrive in Z <presupposition>
> in t<MS Y was in front of the obstacle in the way to Z <presupposition>
> X controls the obstacle <presupposition>
> in MS X acted: removed the obstacle   <assertion>
>   Y acted: moved into Z <assertion>

2.   Individual Verb Meanings

  Within this group the difference between verbs is determined by the difference in the nature of the point of destination and the obstacle. Besides, there might be some peculiar components in individual verb meanings. In the following explications of each of these verb meanings will be given and analyzed.

2.1. *vpustit'* 'to let in/into'

  The nature of the point of destination and the obstacle in the situation described by the verb *vpustit'* has been already discussed at the beginning of this paper. Now the explication of its meaning can be given:

> *Xozjain vpustil sobaku v dom.*
> The master *let* the dog *into* the house.
> *X let Y into Z*
>
> Y wanted to move into Z <presupposition>
> In t<MS Y was in front of the obstacle <presupposition>
> The obstacle closed the entrance into Z <attribute>[2]
> X controls the obstacle <presupposition>
> In MS X removed the obstacle: moved it away from the entrance into Z <assertion>
> Y moved into Z <assertion>

2.2. *propustit'* 'to let through'

The difference between *propustit'* and *vpustit'* is that the point of destination in the situation described by *propustit* is not specific: one may let someone through into the hall (a comtainer), to the shopwindow (a thing), to the boss (a person and place-owner) or to the exhibition (an activity typical of the place). Besides, the two verbs differ in the

---

[1] MS=moment of speech.
[2] The term introduced by E.V.Paducheva to refer to the dependent components of the definition (Paducheva 1996:243).

nature of the obstacle. It may be constituted by the body (or bodies) of one participant standing in the way of another one; to make the movement of the latter possible, the Agent has to move to the side, as in (4):

(2) Korovjev i Begemot postoronilis', *propustili* kakogo-to pisatelja v serom kostjume, v letnej
bez galstuka beloj rubaške. (Bulgakov)
Korovjev and Begemot moved aside to *let through* some writer in a grey suit and a white
summer shirt without a tie.

On the other hand, in the situation described by *propustit'* the obstacle may be volitional, i.e. a ban imposed by someone, who is not necessarily the Agent, on the movement through the existing passage. This ban can be abolished by someone, usually an authourity of some sort, in responce to the second participant's request to let him move through, i.e. the Agent may decide not to interfere with the Counteragent's movement and let him know about it, as in the following example:

(3) Žhenščina nedoumenno pogliadela na zabintovannuju golovu bufetčika, pokolebalas',
skazala: - Nu čto že… - i *propustila* bufetčika za arku. (Bulgakov)
The bewildered woman looked at the bartender's bandaged head, said hesitantly, 'Well'...
and *let* the bartender *through* the arch.

In this meaning of *propustit'* the role of the Agent and, consequently, the syntactic Subject, is performed by someone having power. Names of people performing this function, i.e. having the right to control the movement through the passage constitute a list, e.g. *bilet*ër 'an attendant', *vaxtër* 'a janitor', *kontrolër* 'a ticket collector', *oxrana* 'guard', *privratnik* 'a door-keeper', etc.
The passage may be blocked, and then, besides the permission to move through it given by the Agent or somebody else, some physical action to remove the obstacle should be performed. At the same time, if the passage is free, but, for some reason, the Agent does not allow the Counteragent to move through it, the Agent may block it. So, the component describing a physical action of the obstacle removal is accounted for in the meaning explication, but at the same time is optional. It is absent, for instance, in the meaning of *propustit'* in (3), because an attendant at the cinema makes a decision whether to let somebody through or not while the door is open, whereas it is present in (4), as in the normal state of affairs the city gates are closed:

(4) …oni mčalis' opromet'ju čerez most. Mat' mogla *propustit'* i četveryx, pjateryx…
(Uppsala Corpus)
They were rushing along the bridge. Mother could *let through* even four, five …

(5) My prijexali k gorodskim vorotam; karaul'nyje nas *propustili*; my vyjexali iz
Orenburga (Pushkin)
We came to the city gates; the guard *let* us *through*; we left Orenburg.

So, two meanings of *propustit'* can be distinguished, namely *propustit'1*, indifferent to the Subject's taxonomic class but implying a physical obstacle on the way through the passage, and *propustit'2*, requiring a more specific taxonomic class of nouns to fill the position of the Subject, but indifferent to whether the passage is free[3]:

propustit'1 'to let through 1'

---

[3] In MAS those two meanings of *propustit'* are presented respectively as meaning 1. Postoronivšis', dat' dorogu komu-nibud' 'having moved aside, to let one go on moving'and the shade of this meaning 'pozvolit' komu-libo vojti ili v''jexat', projti ili projexat' kuda-libo' 'to allow someone to come in or drive in, to go through or to drive through in some direction'.

Tolpa propustila kortež k vorotam kladbišča.
The crowd let the procession through to the cemetery gates.
X let Y through to Z.

Y wanted to move to Z <presupposition>
In t<MS Y was in front of the obstacle <presupposition>
The obstacle was constituted by X <attribute>[4]
In MS X moved away; by this X removed the obstacle on Y's way;
                                                the passage started to exist <assertion>

Y moved into Z <assertion>

propustit'2 'let in'2
Storož propustil nas v usad'bu.
The warden *let* us *through* into the estate.
X let Y through into Z.

Y wanted to get to Z through the passage <pressuposition>
There was a chance that there would appear an obstacle to Y's movement through the passage
                                                <presupposition>
volitional <attribute>
X controls the obstacle <attribute>
in MS Y is in front of the passage <presupposition>
X decided not to interfere with Y's movement through the passage and let Y
                        know about it <assertion>
Y moved along the passage (to Z) <assertion>

So, the assertive part of the definition of *propustit'2* combines a performative component and a physical one.

2.3. *podpustit'* 'to let come'

Podpustit' 'to let come' is different both from *vpustit'* and *propustit'* in that the Counteragent's goal is more distinct. Besides an immediate aim to get to the point of destination, the Counteragent has another, a long-range aim to come into a physical contact with the destination point and, possibly, to damage it. Therefore the indirect Object of this verb combines the semantic role of the Destination point with the role of the Goal, e.g.:

(6) *Mjatežniki, pritajas', podpustili ix k samoj kreposti.* (Pushkin)
    The rebels, lying hidden, let them come *to* the very fortress.

The Destination point can be a thing, as well as the body of the Agent, e.g.:

(7) *Sobaka nikogo k sebe ne podpustila.*
   The dog has not let anyone to come near itself.

Another distinction is provided by the nature of the obstacle on the way of the moving participant of *podpustit'*. It is neither physical, nor volitional, but dynamic, i.e. a possible use of force by the Agent to prevent the Counteragent from getting into the contact with his Goal. The point in space

---

[4] The term introduced by E.V.Paducheva to refer to the dependent components of the definition (Paducheva 1996:243).

where the Agent can interfere with the Counteragent's movement is not fixed. The Agent can use force any moment since the Counteragent's appearance in his field of vision and controls his movement all the time in contrast to the situation described by *propustit'2*, where the volitional obstacle may start to exist only at a certain point, i.e. at the existing passage. The Agent and the Counteragent never come into contact and the Agent can block the Counteragent's movement acting from a distance, e.g. by shooting. The agreement of the Agent to let the Counteragent go on moving is not noticed by the Counteragent, so the performative component in the meaning of *podpustit'* is absent. There is an inner negation in *podpustit'*, as the Agent's action consists in making his mind not to act, i.e. not to apply force to block the Counteragent's movement. It is worth noting here that the Agent's decision holds until the Counteragent has overcome a certain distance from the point at which he appeared in Agent's field of vision until a certain point closer to the Agent, cf. (6).

Podpustit becomes richer in content under negation, as well as many other verbs having an inner (semantic) negation. *Ne podpustil* 'has not let come closer' means 'has resisted by force'. This results in the appearance of the causative component in the verb's meaning, as the Agent's resistance stops the Counteragent's progress on his way.

The meaning of *podpustit'* can be, then, explicated as follows:

Oxotniki podpustili volka na sem' metrov i vystrelili.
The hunters let the wolf come to the distance of seven meters and shot.
X let Y come to the distance D of Z.

Y was moving to Z <presupposition>
X decided not to interfere with Y's movement and did not interfere until the
                distance between X and Y became D <assertion>
Y went on moving until the distance between X and Y became D <assertion>
When the distance has become less than D X will prevent Y from movement by force
                        <inference>
X will stop moving <inference>

2.3. *dopustit'* 'to let come to'

Similar to *podpustit'*, *dopustit'* has a more specialized purpose, than *vpustit'* and *propustit'*, yet whereas a distant purpose of *podpustit'* is a physical contact with the Goal, the purpose of *dopustit'* is a social contact, i.e. communication, and the Goal is someone, to whom the place belongs, e.g.:

(8) K sebe one nikogo ne *dopustila* i voobšče sdelala vid, čto ničego ne proisxodit
    (Uppsala korpus).
  She did not *let anyone get to* herself and, generally, pretended that nothing had been
  going on.

If the Goal is a thing or a person perceived as a physical body, an immediate purpose of the Agent of *dopustit'* is a physical contact with it, whereas a distant purpose is some activity in which the Goal is used as an instrument, as in (9), where a distant purpose is riding, e.g.:

(9) Pervym on *dopustil* k lošadi Onika, preduprediv, chto lošad' možet ego ukusit', no on
    budet krepko deržat' povod'ja (Iskander).
    He *let* Onik *get to* the horse first, having warned him that it might bite, but that he
    would be firmly holding the reins.

As well as *podpustit*, *dopustit'* is a verb with the inner negation. It implies that the Agent may create an obstacle on the Counteragent's way, and the Agent's action consists in non-acting. Yet the obstacle is different in nature from that implied by *podpustit*. It is volitional, not dynamic, i.e. a ban on movement, like the obstacle of *propustit'2*, but in contrast to the latter it does not imply the existence of a passage.

> *dopustit'* 'to let get to'
> *Medsestra nexotja dopustila menja k nemu.*
> The nurse reluctantly *let* me *get* to him.
> *X let Y come to S (into Z).*

> Y wanted to move into Z with the purpose to get into contact with S who is in Z
> <presupposition>
> X controls movement into Z <presupposition>
> volitionally <attribute>
> in MS X decided not to resist Y's movement into Z (and let Y know about it)
> <assertion>
> Y moved into Z <assertion>
> Y got into contact with S <inference>

Of all the verbs under consideration, *dopustit'* is semantically the emptiest. It is used mostly in the negative context, where it acquires a more definite content. The reason is that the permission to get into contact with the Goal is not necessarily expressed, as a silent consent is enough, whereas the ban must be expressed by all means. Therefore in the affirmative context a speech (performative) component in the meaning of *dopustit'* is optional, whereas in the negative one it is obligatory. Besides, under the negation *dopustit'* acquires the inferential component 'X resisted Y by force', e.g.:

> (10) Vorona …za svoix ptencov kost'mi poljažet, a ne *dopustit* k nim, razve tol'ko ub'jëte
> eë (Uppsala korpus).
> The crow will lay down her life but won't *let* you *get to* her little ones unless you
> kill her.

3. The Rule of the Ipfv Verb Meaning Derivation

All verbs under consideration classify as momentary verbs, in the sense that they can't have a corresponding Ipfv verb with the meaning of the Progressive (Paducheva 1998). This can be accounted for by the peculiarity of their meaning. All Pfv verbs under consideration describe the result of actions of two different participants, each having their own goal and performed one after another. Therefore the requirement for the existence of Progressive meaning, namely the possibility to present all the components of the situation as if unfolding in front of the eyes of the synchronous observer, cannot be satisfied. Let us see now which other meanings of the Imperfective are possible for the verbs under consideration.

To describe the situation by the Imperfective verb, the look at the situation from within i.e. when the situation has not been completed yet, is required. For the situations described by the verbs under consideration it is possible at such point only, where the action of the first participant has been already fulfilled, whereas the action of the second one is yet to follow. Then the action of the first participant will acquire the status of the assertion, whereas the action of the second one will have the status of the invited inference. So, the rule of deriving the meaning of the Ipfv verb on the basis of given verbs consists in splitting the assertion of the Pfv verb definition and changing their communicative statuses of the components, as e.g.:

vpuskat' 'to be letting into'

LET INTO Ipfv
Babushka *vpuskaet* Petersa v dom.
Grandmother is letting Peters into the house.
X is letting Y into the house.

Y wanted to move into Z <presupposition>
in t<MS Y was in front of the obstacle <presupposition>
the obstacle was in the way to the entrance <attribute>
in MS X removed the obstacle: moved it away from the entrance to Z <assertion>
X will move into Z <invited inference>

The meaning of *vpuskat'* is stative. It is worth noting here that the use of *vpuskat'* in this meaning is somewhat awkward, which can be accounted for by the peculiar combination of the components in the corresponding Pfv verb assertion. Easily split in time are the combinations of the performative component and some other components of action, which results in the meaning of the expectation, as in the case of exercitives (Paducheva 1996:115), including the verb *naznachit'* 'to appoint' (Paducheva 1998:340) and verbs of possession transfer (Rozina 1998). One can say, for instance, *Ja pokupaju* 'I am buying', because the situations described by the verbs of possession transfer are constructed so that a performative utterance and some activity of a different nature supplementing it may be separated one from another by a period of time of almost any length and still remain the components of one and the same action. However, *vpuskat'* describes the situation, both components of which are physical actions immediately following one another. The action of the first participant results in the state 'the entrance is open', which lasts as long as the action of the Counteragent moving through the entrance, i.e. is almost momentary. Therefore *vpuskat'* is more naturally used in such contexts where this state is, for some reasons, longer, for instance where the Object is multiple:

> (11) V zal uže *vpuskajut* zritelej.
> They are *letting* the audience *into* the hall already.

Another meaning *vpuskat'* can take is the meaning of a failed attempt, cf the example from Glovinskaja 1982:102):

> (12) Ja ego *vpuskal*, no on ne voshel
> I was *letting* him *in*, but he has not.

This meaning is easily acquired by all verbs describing situations implying the responding action of the Counteragent, as there is a chance that this action won't be performed (Rozina 1998a:309-312).
Everything that has been said about *vpuskat'* is true about the meanings of Ipfv verbs derived from *propustit'1* 'to let through 1'. These meanings are a state *propuskat' 1.1* and the meaning of an unsuccessful attempt *propuskat' 1.2*, e.g.:

(13) My ego *propuskali*, no on pochemu-to predpochel nas obojti .
We *were letting* him *through*, but for some unknown reason he preferred to go around.

Propuskat' 1.1. 'to be letting through 1.1'
TO LET THROUGH Ipfv 1.1
Tolpa propuskaet passažirov k xramu.
The crowd *is letting* passengers *through* to the temple.

X is letting Y through to Z.

X wanted to move to/into Z <presupposition>
In t<MO Y was in front of the obstacle <presupposition>
The obstacle was constituted by X's body/bodies <attribute>
In MO X moved away, by this removing the obstacle on Y's way; the passage
                                                                started to exist <assertion>
Y will move along the passage <invited inference>

This meaning, as well as the meaning of *vpuskat'* is more natural when the state 'the passage is free' can be sustained longer, i.e. in the contexts with a multiple Object, an elongated Object or an Object that is moving slowly, e.g.

>   (14) Mašiny *propuskajut* pešexodov.
>   The cars are *letting* the passengers through.
>   (15) Pochemu ty stoiš? - *Propuskaju* velosipedista / starušku.
>   Why are you standing? – I am *letting* a bicyclist / an old woman *through*.

If the basis for the Ipfv verb is *propustit' 2*, the performative component acquires the status of the assertion all the same, but the component describing a physical action becomes an invited inference, e.g.:

>   (16) Zavtra ona *propuskaet* nas v kino.
>   Tomorrow she *lets* us *through* into the cinema hall.

In the past it acquires the meaning of an unsuccessful attempt, e.g.:

>   (17) Bileter *propuskal* nas v teatr, no my ne vošli. (example from Glovinskaia 1982)
>   The attendant was *letting* us *through* into the theatre, but we did not
>   come in.

The rule of deriving the meaning of the Ipfv verb we have been applying so far can't be applied to the meaning definition of the verb *podpustit'*. The reason is that the situation described by this verb does not lend itself to the look from within, as at no point the Agent's and the Counteragent's actions can be separated one from another. The Agent controls the Counteragent's progress all the time since a certain moment and until the Counteragent has been stopped. Besides, this is a verb with a quantitative limit, which alone is enough not to let the corresponding Ipfv verb have any meaning but a trivial (iterative) one (Padučeva 1996:186).

The Ipfv verb derived from *dopustit'* must have the meaning of a perfective state, as its assertion is constituted by the performative component 'X made up his mind not to block Y's movement and let Y know about it', but since its part, namely 'X let Y know about it', is optional, *dopuskat'* is hardly ever used in this meaning. At the same time its use under the negation in this meaning is quite natural, as in contrast to expressing the permission, the expression of the ban is obligatory: *ne dopuskajut* 'do not let get to' means 'has not allowed'.

The same rule of deriving Ipfv verb meanings can be applied to other semantic classes of verbs describing actions with two participants, such as verbs of possession transfer, see Rozina 1998a and Rozina 1998b, verbs of interception, and verbs describing actions with heterogeneous components, as e.g. exercitives (Padučeva 1996).

References

Glovinskaja M.Ja. Semantičeskije tipy vidovyx protivopostavlenij russkogo glagola. M.: Nauka, 1982.

Karttunen L. Logika anglijskix konstrukcij s sentencial'nym dopolnenijem. In: Novoje v zarubežnoj lingvistike. Vyp. 16. Lingvističeskaja pragmatika. M., 1985, p.303-332.

Kustova G.I., Padučeva E.V. Performativnyje glagoly v neperformativnyx upotreblenijax.. In: Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Jazyk rečevyx dejstvij. M., 1994.

Muravenko E.V. O slučajax netrivial'nogo sootvetstvija semantičeskix i sintaksičeskix valentnostej glagola. - Semiotika i informatika. Vyp. 36. M., 1998, p. 71-81.

Padučeva E.V. O semantike sintaksisa. M.: Nauka, 1974.

Padučeva E.V. Semantičeskie issledovanija. M.: Škola “Jazyki russkoj kul'tury”, 1996.

Padučeva E.V. Semantičeskije istočniki momental'nosti russkogo glagola v tipologičeskom rakurse. In: Tipologija vida. Problemy, poiski, rešenija. M., 1998, p. 332-342.

Rozina R.I. DARJU (relevantnyj semantičeskij klass glagolov obladanija). In: Liki jazyka. M., 1998, p..306-314.

Rozina R. Meaning definitions and grammatical properties of predicates: Russian verbs of possession. In: The structure of lexicon in functional grammar. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1998, p.85-98.