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1. Introduction

As has frequently been pointed out in previous literature, the presence of negation skews the distribution of the imperfective and perfective from that observed in positive contexts. At the same time, this skewed distribution is often followed by a shift in the meaning of the aspect usage. (Кумар Й. 1977, Калабухова Т.А. 1980, 1985, 1988, Глосинская М.Я. 1982, Bogusławski 1985, Chaput 1985, Куцера 1985, Rappaport 1985, Храковский В.С.1988). Though such skewing in the distribution (often followed by a change in the aspectual meaning) can be observed to some extent in almost all negative contexts, it may differ significantly in each particular case, depending on the type of construction or context involved.

In this paper we will observe only one of the instances of such interaction of aspect and negation; whereby an apparent shift in the semantic function of aspectual form, from its definition in terms of a so-called ‘telicity’ to one primarily in terms of the situational factor of ‘controllability’ (or ‘volition’), is apparent.

This type of shift in the semantic function of aspectual form has been widely argued in literature, mainly with respect to the negative imperatives. Thus, the phenomenon by itself is well-observed, though its descriptions may differ slightly in their definitions or, occasionally, in their ways of formalizing. (Шмелев Д. Н. 1959, Forsyth 1970, Бондарко А.В. 1983, Булыгина Т.В.}
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1982, Рассудова О.П. 1982, Bogusławski 1985, Луценко Н.А.1986, Храковский В.С. 1988) There are also some other environments, in which the factor of 'volition' becomes crucial under negation, and perhaps the most comprehensive list can be seen in Forsyth (1970). Nevertheless, in most literature, general tendencies are discussed without detailing or specifying the environments for each particular type of construction.

In this paper we will take a closer look at one such construction, namely, we will consider the distribution of aspectual use in the infinitive clauses of verbs used to construct the types of complex sentence, where the Event Time of the main clause precedes the Event Time of the subordinate clause. We will refer to such type of time ordering as [ET mc < ET cc] (where the Event Time of a main_clause PRECEDES the Event Time of a complement clause). Within this construction, we will refer to the complement clause as the 'posterior event (PE) complement clause'. In other words, in this paper we will discuss the aspectual choice of PE (posterior-event)-type nonfinite complement clause verbs.

The reasons for restricting the data to this particular construction are as follows. Firstly, in the selected type of clause, verbs of both aspects can be used, meaning there are no inherent restrictions on the use of one of the aspects. Secondly, this work aims to investigate the distribution of the aspectual forms in negated contexts, thus one would wish the choice of aspectual form for the corresponding affirmative contexts to be relatively easily definable. In fact, the distribution of aspectual forms in the structures under consideration can be generalized in the most straightforward form in terms of the correlation between the 'telicity' of the event and the choice of aspectual form.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the interaction of aspect and negation in this particular type of infinitive, with respect to the aforementioned shift in meaning, and to examine in detail the environments in which such shifts may possibly occur. We will try to provide a list of verbs, classified according to the way in which such shifts in meaning take place. We will see that the determining factors can be defined as follows: a) the type of verb in the main clause, b) the aspectual form of the main clause verb, c) the location of the negative particle (whether it is in the main or subordinate clause).

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, a generalization about the
distribution of aspects in affirmative contexts (based mainly on the results of previous literature) will be presented. This will be referred to as [Generalization 1]. In section 3, the scope of the phenomenon under analysis will be presented and discussed. Affirmative contexts of the constructions under consideration will be contrasted with the corresponding negated contexts. As the facts are discussed, generalization about contexts in which the correlation between the skewing in the distribution of aspects and the shift in their semantic function under consideration will be introduced as [Generalization 2]. The lists of verbs relevant to this proposed generalization and a wide range of examples will be presented. In section 4, a table summarizing the results and certain exceptions will be presented, while in section 5, it will be shown that the proposed generalization [Generalization 2] is, nevertheless, subject to certain constraints, which demand further consideration. Finally, the results are summarized in section 6.

For the purposes of this study, several restrictions will be imposed on the range of data considered. Firstly, only verbs in the infinitival form will be considered, even though the same generalization can be made about verbs in other morphological forms. Secondly, attention will be focused only on the predicate types of subordinate clauses, which express so-called 'telic' situations, and, more particularly, express only a single instance of such a situation (a single event). Since in Russian, the use of aspect for expressing 'atelic' situations (such as durative actions), as well as that for multiple situations, is strictly restricted to the imperfective form (at least until we are talking about infinitival forms) in either affirmative or negated contexts, no skewing of distribution can thus be observed. Thirdly, we will be concerned only with the distribution of the aspect forms in subordinate clauses, hence no explanation will be provided on the choice of aspectual forms in the main clauses. (Though, as we will see later, the aspect form of the verb in the main clause by itself is one of the relevant factors for the proposed generalization.)

2. The correlation between aspectual choice and telicity
- affirmative contexts -

Let us start by making a generalization about the aspectual use in the complement clauses concerned for the affirmative contexts, so that we will be
able to refer to it later.

[Generalization1] — the correlation between aspectual choice and the telicity of the event in the infinitives of ET mc<ET cc type. The aspectual choice of the verb in the infinitive complement clause of the PE (posterior-event)-type (ET mc<ET cc) depends on the telicity of the situation expressed by that complement clause. If the situation is telic, the perfective is used, and if the situation is atelic, the imperfective is used.

For example, consider the following two sentences, with the object-control main verb type (1) and subject-control main verb type (2) respectively. In both these examples, the predicate of the accomplishment type (писать<i>/ написать<p> письмо (write a letter), есть<i>/съесть<p> торт (eat up the cake)) is used in the complement clause, so [Generalization1] predicts, that only the perfective may be used in the complement clause. In fact, the use of the imperfective would be ungrammatical here (regardless of the aspect of the verb in the main clause.)

1. Я просил<i>/попросил<p> тебя *писать<i>/написать<p> мне письмо.
   ‘I asked you to write me a letter.’
2. Она хотела<i>/захотела<p> *есть<i>/съесть<p> весь торт.
   ‘She wished to eat the whole cake.’

As we will see below, the distribution of aspect in negated contexts is not quite the same in object-control and subject-control sentence types respectively, thus we will consider them separately. We will start by considering the object-control type.

3. The shift in the aspectual use in negated contexts.

3.1. Object-control verb sentence in negated contexts.
We will start by listing the verbs of the object-control type, and will then proceed to show that the distribution of aspects in negated complements cannot be predicted by [Generalization1].
< (po)prosit' (ask) > type\textsuperscript{11} : агироровать / съагитировать (agitate, persuade); вербовать / завербовать (agitate); говорить / сказать (tell); подговаривать / подговорить (instigate); предлагать / предложить (offer); призывать / призвать (call, urge); приказывать / приказать (order); присуждать / присудить (sentence); просить / попросить (ask); распоряжаться / распорядиться (order); склонять / склонить (incline, persuade); рекомендовать / порекомендовать (advise, recommend); соблазнять / соблазнить (entice, allure, tempt); советовать / посоветовать (advise); требовать / потребовать (demand); убеждать / убедить (persuade); уговаривать / уговорить (persuade, induce); улещать / улестить (cajole); умолять / умольть (entreat, beg, implore); упрашивать / упросить (entreat, beg);

Consider the following sentences with the negative particle in the complement clause. We can see here, that unlike the affirmative sentence (1) above, the perfective is ungrammatical and the imperfective must hence be used instead. This is a complete contradiction to what is predicted by [Generalization1], because the predicate of the complement clause in both sentences expresses single telic situations (Писать<\textsc{i}> / написать<\textsc{p}> статью (write an article)] — accomplishment [отправлять<\textsc{i}>/отправить<\textsc{p}> письмо (send the letter)] — achievement), hence the perfective is supposed to be used.

3. Я просил<\textsc{i}> / попросил<\textsc{p}> тебя не писать<\textsc{i}> / *написать<\textsc{p}> об этом статью.
   ‘I asked you not to write an article about that.’

4. Я же просил<\textsc{i}>/попросил<\textsc{p}> тебя не отправлять<\textsc{i}>/*отправить<\textsc{p}> это письмо без моего разрешения.
   ‘I asked you not to send this letter without my permission.’

One may think of a possibility to treat the negated telic situation as an atelic one, as the denial of an event automatically implies the denial of its endpoint as well. In this case the occurrence of the imperfective can be explained in terms of [Generalization1], as an atelic situation requires the use of the imperfective. Yet, it is not the case that there is a simple correlation between the presence of negation and the use of the imperfective in Russian. This can
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be easily demonstrated by the distribution of aspects in negated finite clauses (and in infinite ones as well, as we will see below.) Consider the following sentence, where both imperfective and perfective can be used, though there is a difference in the implicatures made in each case:¹²

5. (a) Я не выбрасывала твое письмо. ‘I did not throw away your letter.’
      (the mere denial of the fact of throwing away)
(b) Я не выбросил твое письмо. ‘I have not thrown away your letter.’
      (there is an implicature, that I was supposed to do it, but I did not, and I
      still have the letter)

On the other hand, there are contexts, in which the use of both the perfective and imperfective in the complement clause concerned is perfectly grammatical¹³. For example, consider the following sentence:

6. Он просил / попросил меня не выбрасывать / выбросить это письмо. ‘He asked me not to throw away this letter.’

In this example, the achievement type predicate of the complement clause is telic (we can express it as [+telic], using feature representation), while with respect to ‘intentionality’, ‘controllability’ or ‘volition’¹⁴ the situation may be either [+ controllable] (meaning ‘controllable’ by the actor of it), in which case the imperfective would be chosen, or [- controllable], in which case the perfective is used.¹⁵ So far, we have seen that the ‘telicity’ factor, which was sufficient to define aspectual use for affirmative contexts, becomes insufficient (if not completely useless) in negated contexts. The distinction between two types of situation, expressed by a complement clause (namely, [- controllable] vs. [+ controllable] situation) becomes clearer, when adverbs such as случайно (accidentally, casually), нечаянно (carelessly, by mistake) are used. When using these adverbs, the ‘uncontrollability’ of an action is strengthened, thus the use of the imperfective becomes obviously unnatural, as we can see in the following example:

7. Он просил / попросил меня не выбрасывать / выбросить случайно / нечаянно это письмо.
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'He asked me not to throw out this letter accidentally/ by mistake.'

It is important to note, as do Kučera (1985) and Chaput (1985), that the observed element of 'control' is not the inherent property of a verb (or a verb phrase), despite the fact that there are actions, which are normally considered to be controllable, or vice versa. Rather, the distinction on the basis of controllability should be treated as contextually-dependent, since practically any verb may express either [+ controllable] or [- controllable] situations, when given the proper context. Consider, an example (taken from Chaput (1985)), the following sentences, where the same verb expresses [+ controllable] situation in (a) and [- controllable] situation in (b), depending on the aspect used:

8. (a). Не забывай меня!
   'Don't neglect me!'
   (b). Не забудь меня!
   'Don't forget me!'

3.2. The proposal of [Generalization2]

It should be emphasized that the distinction on the basis of [+ controllability], as discussed above, only works in particular environments, while in others it is of no help at all. Refer to the example (5) above, in which the distinction between imperfective and perfective is independent from the 'controllability' factor.

In this paper we are trying to provide an accurate description of environments, in which such distinction works for the complement clause of the kind under consideration. So far, we have considered the distribution of aspects in the infinitive complements of the object-control verbs and established the feature [± controllable] as a criterion for the aspectual choice in negated contexts. We have also seen that the aspect of the verb in the main clause does not influence the aspectual distribution in negated complement clauses of object-control verbs. Thus we can try to state generalizations about aspectual choice in the complement clauses of the kind under consideration as follows:

[Generalization2 (Tentative)]
In the negated complement clause of the type PE (posterior-event)-type
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(ETmain<ETcomp) of the object-control verbs (regardless of the aspect of the main verb), if the event, expressed by complement clause is considered to be controllable by its agent, the imperfective is used, and if not, the perfective is used.

It is significant that the generalization above is stated only for cases, when the negative particle is located in the complement clause, because for object-control verbs, this generalization does not apply when the main clause is negated. This is demonstrated by the following example, in which both imperfective and perfective can be used, but the distinction in their use has nothing to do with the factor of ‘controllability’ of the action by the actor (who is supposed to be controlling the action in both cases.)

9. Я не просил тебя передать ему этот документ.
   ‘I did not ask you to hand over this document to him.’

To sum up, the distribution of aspectual use in the complement clause of the object-control verbs, in the case of a negated main clause, cannot be explained in terms of the ‘controllability’ factor.

Though the distinction of aspectual choice in the complement clauses of object-control verbs in the case of the main clause negation, is independent from the controllability factor, the same cannot be said about subject-control verbs. In the next section, we will see that there are some types of subject-control verbs, for which the correlation between aspectual choice and the ‘controllability’ factor is indeed relevant, in the cases of main clause negation.

3.3. Subject-control verb sentence in negated contexts.

We would like to start by presenting the proposal of generalization about the coverage of the correlation between the aspectual choice in the complement clauses of the type under consideration (including complements of both object-control and subject-control verbs) and the ‘controllability’ factor. Then we will consider several types of subject-control verbs, citing examples for both main and complement clause negation, and see in what way the proposed
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generalization is applicable to them.

[Generalization2 (Revised)]
For the infinitive complement clauses of the PE (posterior-event)-type (ETmain<ETcomp), in the following cases there is a correlation between aspectual choice and a pragmatic factor of ‘controllability’, that is, if the situation, expressed by the predicate of the infinitive clause, is considered to be uncontrollable by the agent, the perfective is used, otherwise the imperfective is used:

(i) when the complement clause is negated, for the complements of the object-control and subject-control verbs.
(ii) when the main clause is negated and the aspect of the main clause verb is imperfective, for the complements of subject-control verbs.

3.3.1. <собираться<i> (intend)> type

The following subject-control verbs come under this category:
думать (think, plan); замышлять (plan, scheme); намереваться (intend, be about, mean); планировать (plan); предполагать (intend); решать (decide); собираться (intend); умышлять (plan, intend);

(a) Negated main clause:

Let us first look at the examples:

10. Я не собирался<i> покупить<i>/купить<p> машину сегодня.
    ‘I was not going to buy a car today.’
11. Я не собирался<i> ей обижать<i>/обидеть<p>.
    ‘I did not intend to offend her.’

As we can see from the sentences above, when the negative particle is located in the main clause, there is a possibility of using aspects of both types in the complement clause, and the choice of aspectual form is associated with the same semantic contrast observed in the negated complements of object-control verbs. Thus, for examples like that above, the interpretation may be given as follows:
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the verb of the negated complement clause is imperfective: expresses the mere denial of the intention to perform a certain action with regard to some past point in time (following which one may change his intention and perform it, though that was not in his original plan). At a particular moment in the past, one was not going to do something, so there were no arrangements for doing it.

the verb of the negated complement clause is perfective: the action was performed without any intention to do so, which means that if it took place, it occurred on its own, without any will on the part of the agent. (thus its result was also unexpected to the agent himself) Hence, the [-controllable] reading.

Conversely, when a predicate expresses specific situations, which are apparently uncontrollable by the agent (as can be concluded from the context etc., as in example (12) below), the imperfective cannot be used, as is predictable by [Generalization 2] above. Consider the following sentence:

12. Я не предполагал *получать<й>/получить<п> эту должность так скоро. 'I did not plan to receive this post so soon.'

Thus, it can be concluded, that the aspectual choice in this environment depends on the 'controllability' factor, as it was in the case of negated complement clauses of object-control verbs.

There is also an interesting implication in the case of the perfective, namely, the implication that the action in question (expressed by the complement clause) did, in fact, take place. In contrast, the imperfective is independent from any such implication, and can be interpreted anyway. Consider the following example:

13. Я не планировал ничего покупать*<й>/купить<п> на рынке в тот день, поэтому денег у меня с собой не было. 'I did not plan to buy anything at the market that day, so I had no money with me.'

This sentence refers to the particular moment in the past, at which the action,
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expressed by the complement clause predicate, has not yet taken place. (This
can be pragmatically concluded from the latter part of the sentence). So, a
contradiction occurs between the implication concerned and the meaning of
the sentence. Consider another sentence, parallel to (10) above. We can see,
that in a context, where the ‘buying of a car’ did not occur, the perfective
becomes ungrammatical:

14. Жена дала мне деньги на покупку новой машины. Однако я с
самого начала не собирался купить машину. На
полученные деньги я купил мотоцикл.
‘My wife gave me money to buy a new car. But I was not going to buy
a car from the very beginning. I bought a motorbike.’

There is also a possibility of a correlation between this implicature, and the
fact that the perfective cannot be used in cases, when the main verb is used in
non-past tenses.

15. Я не планирую ничего купить на рынке сегодня. ‘I am not going to buy
anything at the market today.’

Such a restriction on the use of perfective for future situations can be considered
attributable to the inherent contradiction lurking in the idea of planning some
action and the absence of a will to perform it.

(b) Negated complement clause:

In the case of the negation of the complement clause predicate, the
imperfective cannot be used in the complement clause, as can be seen from
the example below:

16. Я планировал не передавать ей это письмо.
‘I intended not to hand this letter over to her.’

Though the perfective cannot be used here, this fact should not be interpreted
as a contradiction to the proposed [Generalization 2]. Rather, such restriction
should be considered as a result of the strict (true) application of the latter, for
the verbs coming under the group under consideration do require semantically, that the action, expressed by the predicate of the complement clause, be controllable by the actor (expressed by the subject), hence intrinsically, only the imperfective ought to be natural in the complement clauses of these verbs. Having said this, the possibility of using the perfective in the environments considered above (both for the object-control and subject-control verbs), should be viewed as a deviation from this natural restriction. In other words, the possibility of using the perfective in the complement clauses of the kind under consideration is the result of a weakened original semantic requirement.

To distinguish different cases of semantic requirement strength, we will incorporate two terms, namely, a [strict type] for cases where the semantic requirement for either [+ controllable] or [- controllable] type situations is strong enough to block the occurrence of the other, and an [oppositional type], for those where this requirement is comparatively weak and there is a possibility for both types.

Furthermore, even in the case of the [oppositional type], it is not true that both types of aspects can be used unconditionally, as was apparent for the <собираться (intend)> type, where the possibility of using the perfective depends on both the place of the negative particle and the tense of the main clause verb. Thus, even for the same verb, the semantic requirement under consideration may be strengthened, or conversely, weakened, depending on other factors. So, it is important to take into consideration not only the type of the verb, but also other factors that can influence the aspectual choice.

3.3.2 <хотеть<i>(wish)> type

Only two verbs with essentially the same meaning come under this group: <хотеть<i>(wish)> type: желать(wish, desire); хочет(wish)

(a). Negated main clause

The distribution of aspects for this group is very much like that for the <собираться<i> (intend) type, with the exception of cases, when the main verb is in a non-past tense (examples will be seen later). That is, as can be seen from the following example, the use of the perfective associates with the
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[- controllable] situation and vice versa:

17. (a) Я не хотел причинять тебе боль.
    ‘I was not going to hurt you.’
(b) Я не хотел причинить тебе боль.
    ‘I did not mean to hurt you.’

The reason for distinguishing this group from the <собираться (intend)> type lies in the following differences between these two groups.

(i) Unlike the case of the verbs of the <собираться (intend)> type, where the negative particle can be located both in the complement and main clause, in the case of the <хотеть (wish)> type, the negative particle can be placed only in the main clause.

(ii) Again, in contrast to the <собираться (intend)> type verbs, when the main clause verb is in a non-past tense, the predicate of the complement clause can express a [-controllable] situation (together with the [+controllable] one), as can be seen from the following examples:

18. Я не хочу выбрасывать эту фотографию, она мне слишком дорога.
    ‘I don’t wish to throw away this picture. It is too important to me.’

19. Я не хочу выбросить какой-нибудь важный документ, поэтому лучше не буду убираться в его столе в его отсутствие.
    ‘I don’t wish to throw away some important documents, so I would rather not clean his desk in his absence.’

The subject-control verbs groups considered so far included only imperfective verbs. However, next we will consider two perfective verb groups, which are relevant, either semantically or morphologically, to the imperfective groups above. We will see if there are any differences to be found.

3.3.3. <собраться (p) (intend)> type

The following verbs can be included in this group. (Those underlined
practically never allow negation in the main clause.)

<собраться>(<предмет>) type: надумать (make up one’s mind, decide); замыслять (plan, scheme, conceive); вознамериться (conceive an idea); намериться, (intend); запланировать (plan); собраться (make up one’s mind); решить (decide, determine); решиться (make up one’s mind, determine); придумать (invent, devise, think up); прийти в голову (occur to smb., strike smb., come into smb.’s mind); рассудить (think, consider, decide); умышлить (plan, intend);

(a). Negated main clause

Consider the following examples:

20. Он так и не собрался <предмет> покупать <предмет> / купить <предмет> новую машину. ‘After all, he hasn’t made up his mind to buy a new car.’
21. Она пока еще не надумала <предмет> выходить <предмет> / выйти <предмет> за меня замуж. ‘She has not yet made up her mind to marry me.’

The same distribution can be seen in the non-past form of the main clause verb as well^21.

22. Он не решается <предмет> уволнять <предмет> / уволить <предмет> её. ‘He will never decide to fire her.’

In the above examples, we have seen that there is the possibility to use both aspects in the complement clause. However, no distinction can be said to have been made on the basis of the ‘controllability’ factor. Whatever aspect is used, the situation, as expressed by the complement clause, is considered to be controllable by the agent. (This meets the original semantic requirement for the kinds of verbs under consideration.) On the other hand, it is obvious that the distinction cannot be explained solely in terms of the ‘telicity’ factor either, because the imperfective is used here for expressing telic situations. This behavior can be considered as a case of [coexistence] of two possible distinguishing factors, namely, the ‘telicity’ and ‘controllability’ factors. Thus,
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the choice of imperfective is licensed by the [Generalization 2], as the situation, expressed by the complement clause is [+ controllable], and the choice of perfective is licensed by the [Generalization1], as the situation is telic. Hence, the possibility of using both aspects arises. (the ‘free variational’ use of aspects.)

(b). Negated complement clause

The aspectual distribution in the complement clauses of these verbs is the same with <собираться(intend)> type, more specifically, the negative particle can be located in the complement clause, but only the imperfective, expressing a [+ controllable] situation, can be used. ([- controllable] situations cannot be expressed by the predicate of the complement clause, hence the impossibility of using the perfective, which, at the same time fails to express [controllable] situations also (consider the example below), from what can be concluded, namely, that the aspectual choice in the complement clauses of these verbs is not ‘free variational’, as it was in the case of the negated main clause considered above.

23. Он собрался<p> не звонить<i>+ctl</i>/*позвонить<p>+ctl> ей завтра. 'He decided not to call her tomorrow.'

3.3.4. <захотеть<p>(wish)> type

<захотеть<p>(wish)> type: пожелать (wish, desire); захотеть (like)
As was the case with the corresponding imperfective group <хотеть(wish)>, the negative particle cannot be located in the complement clause of these verbs.

(a). Negated main clause

The aspectual choice is the same as the <собраться> type, considered above, namely, both aspects can be used in the complement clause (both in the case of past and non-past tenses of the main verb) without any obvious semantic shift. Therefore, this is another case of the [coexistence] of two generalizations.

24. Несколько студентов не пожелали<p> возвращаться<i>+ctl/> вернуться<p>+ctl> домой из Китая.
'Several students did not like to return home from China.'
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25. Он не захочет отказываться от своего права на наследство.
    'She would never relinquish her inheritance right.'

We have seen that the occurrence of the possibility for the 'free-variational' aspectual usage depends on the aspectual choice in the main clause (specifically, when the main verb is perfective). This point is not represented clearly enough in previous literature. Consider, for example, the following sentence from Forsyth (1970), which is given as an example of the exceptional use of the perfective, which does not express the [-controllable] situation here:

26. Можно вам задать вопрос? Если вы на него не захотите ответить — не надо, я не обижусь. (Розов: Вечно живые.)
    'May I ask you a question? If you don’t wish to answer it you needn’t, I shan’t be offended.'

However, Forsyth (1970) (like many others) overlooks the fact that this is a regular pattern, as we have pointed out above. As a result, Forsyth gives several pragmatic reasons for such usages of the perfective without paying attention to the aspect of the main clause. (The fact that the [coexistence] of two distinguishing factors, rather than other pragmatic factors, is crucial in this case can be demonstrated by the substitution of the imperfective for the perfective, which is possible without any change of meaning in each case. (It should be emphasized that the possibility of such mutual substitution of the perfective and imperfective can be observed in any case, where the main verb is perfective for this group.)

3.3.5. <надеяться>(hope) type

Thus far, we have considered verbs, which originally require a 'controllable' situation in the complement clause (with the possibility of deviation from this semantic requirement, with the resulting opposition between 'controllable' and 'non-controllable' situations.) However, on the contrary, among verbs of the type ETmain<ETcomp, there are also verbs with the semantic requirement for the 'non-controllable' situation in the complement clause. Such verbs are as follows:
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<nадеяться<i>(hope)> type: мечтать(dream); рассчитывать(mean, expect); надеяться(hope)

We are now in a position to predict, due to the semantic requirement for the ‘non-controllability’ of the complement clause situation, that the aspectual choice in the complement clause will be restricted to the perfective. Regardless of whether the negative particle is in either the main or complement clause (refer to the respective examples below). So, this type can be considered as an example of the [strict] pattern of the application of the distinction, based on the ‘controllability’ factor.

(a). Negated main clause

27. Если честно, то я и не надеялся<i> ничего *понимать<i><-cntl> (понять<p><-cntl>) из его выступления. ‘Frankly speaking, I did not hope to understand anything from his lecture.’
28. Я не рассчитывал<i> *встречать<i><-cntl> (встретить<p><-cntl>) его там. ‘I did not expect to meet him there.’

(b). Negated complement clause

29. Я надеялся<i> не *сталкиваться<i><-cntl>/столкнуться<p><-cntl> с ним там. ‘I hoped not to run into him there.’
30. Я рассчитывал<i> не *пропускать<i><-cntl>/ пропустить<p> <cntl> начало сеанса в следующий раз. ‘I hope not to miss the beginning of the performance next time.’

4. Summary of the previous sections

Thus far we have been discussing the aspectual choice of a PE (posterior-event)-type nonfinite complement clause verb. Let us briefly summarize the main points here:

In chapter 2, we argued that in a non-negated context the aspectual choice of a PE-type nonfinite complement clause verb is determined in accordance with the telicity-based [Generalization 1] (i.e. a telic situation selects a perfective
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form, while an atelic situation selects an imperfective one).

On the other hand, in the preceding section of this paper, we have seen that in a negated context, where a negative particle is located in a main or complement clause, the controllability-based [Generalization 2] regulates the aspectual choice of a PE-type complement clause verb. In other words, a controllable situation selects an imperfective form, while an uncontrollable situation selects a perfective one). [Generalization 2] may function in three ways: i) in a ‘strict’ way, where only one form of an aspectual pair is allowed to occur rigorously, depending on the complement clause’s basic controllability; ii) in a ‘contrastive’ way, where, in addition to an aspectual form required by the basic controllability of a situation expressed by a complement clause, the other aspectual form may also be used to satisfy its contextually derived controllability requirement; or iii) in a ‘coexistent’ way with [Generalization 1], in which case a “free variational” usage of aspects occurs (in other words, both aspectual forms can be used without making much difference.) Here we will put aside a complement clause subcategorized for object-control verbs, where a negative particle is located in a main clause, as well as those subcategorized for part of the subject-control verbs mentioned below Table 1, the aspect selectional behavior of which is irregular.

| Type of main clause verb | Position of negative particle | Aspect of main clause verb | Group of main clause verbs subcategorizing for a PE (posterior event)-type nonfinite complement clause | Functioning type of the [Generalization 2] | Basic 'controllability' of a complement clause subcategorized for this group of main clause verbs | Aspect of complement clause verb |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Subject-control verb    | Complement clause             | i                          | <собираться>-type                              | Strict                                  | Controllable                                   | i                              |
|                         |                               | p                          | <собраться>-type                               |                                        |                                               |                                 |
|                         |                               | i                          | <надеяться>-type                               | Uncontrollable                           |                                               | p                              |
| Main clause             | i                             | <собираться>-type          | Contrastive                                    | Controllable                             |                                               | i/p                            |
|                         | <надеяться>-type              | Strict                      | Uncontrollable                                 |                                        |                                               |                                 |
|                         | p                             | <собраться>-type           | [Generalization 1] coexistent                  | Controllable                             |                                               | i/p                            |
| Object-control verb     | Complement clause             | i,p                        | <попросить>-type                              | Contrastive                              | Controllable                                   | i/p                            |
| Main clause             | i,p                           | <попросить>-type           | —                                               | Controllable                             |                                               |                                 |
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Among those verbs, which take the 'posterior type event' complement clause, there are also some subject-control verbs, which fell outside the scope of consideration. These include such verbs as обещать/пообещать (promise), соглашаться/согласиться (agree), разрешать/разрешить (permit), позволять / позволить (permit), грозить (грозиться) / пригрозить (threaten). [Generalization 2] proposed in this paper is applicable in the case of these verbs, but there are many other factors influencing the aspectual distribution in the complement clauses of these verbs, which must be considered separately.

5. Other relevant factors

So far, the aspectual use in the complement clauses of the kind under consideration has been generalized in terms of the 'controllability' factor and a detailed analysis of the scope of its application has been performed. However, some factors capable of significantly influencing the observed correlation between the 'controllability' of the situation and the aspectual usage in the complement clauses remain.

It can be said that most of those verbs considered in this paper express, in some form or other, the will or volition of the speaker or some other person. Forsyth (1970), for example, like many other authors, treats the constructions with such verbs as "constructions involving volition". The important point about the [Generalization 2], proposed in this paper, is that there is a straightforward correlation between the presence of the 'volition' element and the application of the proposed Generalization. It will be shown in this section, that the presence of the 'volition' element may play a crucial role in interpreting aspectual meaning in terms of 'controllability'.

Firstly, consider the following two examples, where sentences, with the main verbs of the type considered in this paper, (хотеть and желать relevantly) modify a noun within another sentence. (the second one is from Forsyth (1970)):

31. По-настоящему любишь не того, с кем хочешь встретиться, а того, с кем не хочешь рассстаться<р>. (Константин Мелихан) 'A person you really love is not the one, with whom you wish to meet, but the one, with whom you don’t wish to part.'

32. Это кажется военной игрой, а не делом, потому что они та-
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The Russians, as we, only with a trick, with which they themselves do not wish to part, and which we will have to knock out of them by force.’ (Forsyth 1970)

In both sentences, the perfective (underlined) is used in the complement clause of the verbs in question (in bold), but it is obvious that the perfective does not express the ‘non-controllable’ situation here. In other words, [Generalization 2] cannot explain the use of the perfective in these examples. On the other hand, via the distinction on the basis of ‘telicity’, we can explain how the imperfective can also be used (without any change in meaning).

This phenomenon can be viewed as another case of ‘free-variational’ aspectual usage in negative contexts. However, the key thing here is that the potential for such ‘free-variational usage of aspects’ in the complement clauses of the verbs of the kind under consideration does not occur arbitrarily. The environment for such possibility can be roughly defined as the ‘non-root’ sentence predicate status of the verb, normally implying ‘volition’ when it is the predicate of the ‘root’ sentence. In other words, when such verbs are embedded in other clauses, the original ‘volitional force’ can be weakened, which, in turn, leads to the weakening of the motivation for distinguishing the aspectual choice on the basis of the ‘controllability’ factor and the occurrence of the potential for distinction on the basis of the ‘telicity’ factor. In the present paper, we cannot provide any persuasive explanation for this effect, so we will simply point it out as a tendency.

As it happens, Forsyth (1970) gives the following explanation for the usage of the perfective in the sentence above.

‘...[It] presents the action as an accomplished act, the reality of which is inescapable because, whatever the attitude of the subject towards it, it will indubitably be performed.’

The fact that this explanation is unsatisfactory can be demonstrated in two ways. Firstly, we can try to construct a sentence with the implication of the ‘inescapable reality’ in the complement clause and see that, if this sentence is...
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not embedded in another, the use of the perfective for expressing the [+controllable] situation is very problematic.

33. ??Он не хочет<i> вернуть<p> долг, поэтому прийдется заставлять его силой.
'He does not wish to pay off his debts, so we’ll have to force him to do it.'

Secondly, we can extract the relevant sentence, and see that when it is used as an independent simple sentence, the same aspectual distribution in the complement clause is also problematic.

34. ??Они не желают<i> расстаться<p> с этой идеей, поэтому нам прийдется выбивать ее силой. 'They don’t wish to part with this idea, so we’ll have to knock it out of them by force.'

So far, we have considered embedded cases24, but embedding is only one of the possible cases, in which the considered phenomenon can be observed. The same effect can be gained by any other environment or context, which is supposed to lead to the weakening of the 'volition' factor. It may be conditional clauses (35), questions (36), sentences, including поскольку or поэтому clauses (cf. (37)) and many others.

35. Если он не хочет<i> продавать<i> / продать<p> такую старую машину за такие огромные деньги, то это означает, он ничего не понимает в машинах.
'If he does not wish to sell such an old car for this sum of money, it means, that he does not understand anything about cars.'
(Cf.: Он не хочет<i> продавать<i> / продать<p> свою старую машину.
'He doesn’t wish to sell his old car.')

36. Почему она не хочет<i> позвонить<i>/позвонить<p> ему?
'Why doesn’t she wish to call him?'
(Cf.: Она не хочет<i> позвонить<i>/позвонить<p> ему.
'She doesn’t wish to call him.')

37. Поскольку он не хочет<i> объяснять<i>/объяснить<p> причин-
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ну своего поведения, мне прийдется его уволить.
‘As he doesn’t wish to explain his behaviour, I will have to fire him’.
(Cf.: (i). Он не хочет объяснять причину своего поведения. ‘He does not wish to explain his behaviour.’)

Another factor, which should be mentioned in regard to this problem, is a correlation between the ‘person’ of the subject pronoun and the strength of the ‘volition’ factor. While in the case of the second or third person, there is potential for the ‘free variational’ usage of aspects, depending on other factors, in the case of the first person pronoun, the application of the [Generalization 2] (the distinction, made on the basis of ‘controllability’ factor), becomes virtually obligatory. Consider, for example, (38), with the third-person pronoun as a subject. Though the perfective in the complement clause is somewhat problematic here, it is still possible. Compare it with (39), where the subject is in the first person. We can see that the perfective has now become completely ungrammatical.

38. Он почему-то не хочет продавать им эту старую машину.
   ‘For some reason, he doesn’t wish to sell them this old car.’
39. Я не хочу продавать эту машину.
   ‘I don’t wish to sell this car.’

Consider also another example with the third-person subject. Here, the perfective in the complement clause sounds completely natural. (Most likely, due to the choice of the verb here25.) However, when we replace the subject by the first-person subject, again, the perfective becomes ungrammatical.

40. Он не хочет помочь мне в этом деле.
   ‘He does not wish to help me with this business.’
41. Я не хочу ему помочь в этом деле.
   ‘I don’t wish to help him with this business.’

It should be noted, however, that the possibility of using the perfective in the case of a non-first person subject, is very restricted both lexically and
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contextually\(^{26}\) (it surfaces mostly in cases, which may be defined as ‘objective narration’, that is, when the speaker states the existence of a volition of the third person as an objective fact, rather than reporting somebody’s volition, in which case the perfective becomes ungrammatical.)

To sum up, it can be said, that all the contexts considered thus far, have only one thing in common, namely, the lack of the ‘volition’ implicature, which otherwise would be present (originating from the lexical meaning of the verbs under consideration.) Therefore, we can say that the most definite case of application of [Generalization 2] is a ‘root’ declarative sentence with a first-person pronoun as subject.

Based on all that has been said so far, we can postulate that there is a straight correlation between the ‘volition’ factor and the preference for a distinction of aspectual use on the basis of ‘controllability’.

6. Conclusion

In this paper we considered the aspectual distribution in the ‘posterior event complement clause’. It has been argued that the aspectual choice for affirmative contexts can be defined solely in terms of ‘telicity’ in these complements ([Generalization 1]). In contrast, it has been shown that in negative contexts, the distinction of aspectual choice becomes complicated. The generalization for negative contexts was proposed ([Generalization 2]) and it has been argued that depending on (i) the type of the main clause verb, (ii) the aspect of the main clause verb, and (iii) the place of the negative particle,[Generalization 2] can function in three different ways, namely, in a ‘strict’, ‘oppositional’ or ‘coexistent’ way respectively. Still, with regard to the final way of functioning (the ‘coexistent’ one), it should be admitted that merely empirical facts about such ‘coexistence’ of two Generalizations were presented in this paper with little related explanation, thus the nature of the ‘coexistence’ itself would seem to be an appropriate topic for future research.

Notes

1. The key points of this paper were presented in Japanese at the 55th Annual Assembly of Japanese Association of Russian Scholars (JARS: Nihon Roshia Bungakukai) held at Waseda University on October 8th, 2005.
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2. In Modern Russian, the aspect type of a verb is defined for each particular verb lexically, so it is to be considered whether each verb is perfective or imperfective. We will refer sometimes to the imperfective as <i>, and the perfective as <p> below.

3. It is not the case for all types of infinitives in Russian, as there are clauses, in which only the imperfective, or perfective respectively can be used in any possible context.

4. According to Smith (1991:27-33), who proposed three features as the basis for the distinction between the different lexical aspects (i.e. ±static, ±durative and ±telic), telicity has to do with the idea that certain types of situation have a built-in boundary. With regard to the Vendler’s verb classification, while states are static with no dynamics and no built-in final boundary, all the other types are dynamic: activities are durative and possess no built-in final boundary — [-static][+durative][-telic]; accomplishments are durative, but also telic, consisting of an activity phase followed by a final boundary phase — [-static][+durative][+telic]; achievements are conceived as having no duration, as occurring instantaneously and as involving a boundary-crossing — [-static][-durative][+telic]. We accept this way of defining situation types in this paper.

5. It is quite common to consider that the status of an event expressed by a predicate, with respect to its telicity, as being one of the most important factors influencing the aspectual choice. (see Filip (1997), Dickey (2000)) However, it is also obvious, that in most cases, this factor is insufficient to describe the particular choice of an aspect form (both with respect to finite and non-finite predicates) (see Comrie (2001) for further discussion). In contrast, however, the chosen type of clause construction is a rare case, in which the correlation between ‘telicity’ and aspectual choice is quite clear. This cannot be said for other contexts, in which the same phenomenon can be observed. For example, though the distribution of the aspectual forms in negative imperatives can be generalized in the same terms, as in the constructions under consideration, the generalization of the aspectual choice for the corresponding positive contexts would be quite different in this case. As has been well documented in literature, there is a wide range of different factors, which can influence aspectual choice in imperatives in positive contexts. (For further discussion, see Шмелев Д.Н.(1959).)

6. By ‘location of the negative particle’ we mean not the mere presence of the negative particle in the clause, but the predicate negation of whether a main or complement clause. This is what we mean by saying ‘the main/complement clause is negated’. Thus, by referring to the location of the negative particle we mean only cases of predicate negation, in which the negative particle immediately precedes the verb. There are also cases of constituent negation, in which not only the predicate, but also one single constituent, is negated, with a negative particle immediately preceding it. Such cases are irrelevant to the discussion here.

7. In particular, a) tenseless verbs in the ‘чтобы’ clauses of the object-control verbs, b) finite verbs in the future tense in ‘что’ clauses of the subject-control verbs.

8. Complement (typically infinitives)-taking verbs that require the referent of one of their
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arguments (subject/object) to be identified with the subject of the complement clause. They can be classified as subject-control or object-control verbs respectively, in accordance with which, arguments (subject/object) to be a 'controller' (i.e. to be identified with the subject of the complement clause). See Norman (1985) for the classification of various types of complement-taking predicates.

9. For the definition of predicate types see Vendler (1967). See also Падучева Е.В (1989) for discussion on the correspondence between Vendler's classification and Russian aspect types, or Spencer & Zaretskaya (2002) for concrete examples.

10. The lists of verbs, presented in this paper, were produced on the base of “РУССКО-ЯПОНСКИЙ СЛОВАРЬ”, Токио, Кэнкюся, 1988.

11. When the verbs are listed by pairs, separated by a slash mark, they are considered to be aspectual pairs. There are also cases, when verbs with similar morphological forms can be paired by meaning, despite not being aspectual pairs in the strict sense. In these cases, the verbs are listed separately. (For the definition of an aspectual pair, refer to the so called критерий Маслова [Maslov Definition], which is commonly used. (The imperfective can express multiple occasions of the situation, expressed by the perfective. (see Падучева Е.В 1989))

12. For more discussions about the correlation of aspectual use and negation in finite clauses see Chaput (1985), Forsyth (1970), Merrill (1985) and Кумар Й. (1977).

13. We must notice, that some of the object-control verbs can take perfective complements quite easily (просить/попросить (ask), советовать/посоветовать (recommend), while for some of them it would be pragmatically unnatural (приказывать/приказать (order), требовать/потребовать (demand)).

14. 'intentionality', 'controllability' and 'volition' are different concepts (there are also such variations in description, as 'undesirability', 'inadvertent action' among many others), which should be carefully used in their proper sense, and much work must be done to decide, which of these concepts should be used for the description of the phenomenon concerned, but here we will arbitrarily choose one of them, 'controllability', and set up the feature [controllable] for describing the phenomenon with which we are concerned. In other words, we will distinguish the use of aspects in negated contexts on the basis of the 'controllability' of an action (by the actor).

15. See, for example, what Forsyth (1970) says about this distinction: 'The use of the aspects is affected here by an important semantic distinction between types of action which are consciously and intentionally performed, ...and those which may occur inadvertently...In the latter type, perfective infinitives do occur in sentences of the kind under consideration.' (J. Forsyth 1970)

16. As Kučera (1985) notes, there is a correlation between aspectual type of verbs and the normally presupposed 'controllability' of the event. Accomplishments (and activities) normally express events with a voluntary agent ('open the door', 'take the glass', 'tell him', 'cry' and etc.), while 'ivolitional' situations tend to be expressed mostly by
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achievements. ('catch cold', 'fall off the roof', 'drown', 'cut yourself', 'lose that key', 'forget to come back', etc.)

17. For instance, in the example (3) above, the use of the perfective was ungrammatical for pragmatic reasons, as 'writing an article' or 'throwing out the letter after receiving one's permission' could be hardly considered as [-controllable] situations.

Till we should note, that, as it was pointed out by Храковский В.С. (1988), there are some verbs, which can express only [-controllable] situations, thus their use is restricted to the perfective (поскользнуться (slide), щурнуть (whisk)) and, on the other hand, there is a class of perfective verbs, the so-called po-verbs (глаголы делитмативного способа действия – the verbs, implying the limitation of an action (which is otherwise essentially atelic) in time. Do not include aspectual (imperfective) pairs, that cannot be used for expressing [-controllable] situations. (посидеть (sit for a while), полежать (lay for a while))

It is also interesting to add, that, as was pointed out by Шмелев Д. Н. (1959), Boguslawski (1985) (though for imperatives), in Old Russian, the perfective was freely used in situations requiring an imperfective in Modern Russian. For example, Boguslawski (1985) points out that the following example 'covers both intentional and unintentional cases of killing' in Old Church Slavonic:

(i). Не убий! ~ Do not kill!

Besides, Шмелев Д. Н. (1959) points out that in Modern Russian, in the following two cases, the use of the perfective in imperatives does not imply the meaning of [-controllability]:

1. When expressing entreaty (просьба-мольба) or firm prohibition (категорический запрет) in a written style, (despite the very numerous restrictions, both on verbs, which can be used in this sense, and the style of the sentence.)

(ii). Не покайся, господи, дуру старую...(Горький, В людях)

(Шмелев Д. Н. 1959)

2. When the perfective is used in a specific expressive exclamatory style, there is an independent group of verbs, which are primarily used in such senses (Used in this sense, such perfectives express (strong) requests, or apologies (often with a shade of irony): не откажи(-те), не кинь(-те), не покинь(-те), не оставь(-те), не обидь(-те), не погуби(-те), не рассердись(-тесь), не обесцудь(-те), не осуди(-те), не посетуй(-те), не побрезгуй(-те), не прогневайся(-тесь), не взыщи(-те)

18. In fact, there are other factors influencing the aspectual use in this case (in other words, the aspectual choice is not optional).

Firstly, the use of the imperfective in the complement clause is much more expressive in the sense, that along with the denial of the situation, expressed by the main clause predicate, there is often an implicature of a strong negative attitude toward the same, expressed by the complement clause. Besides, there is often an implicature in the case of the imperfective verb complement clause, that the situation, as expressed by the complement clause predicate, already took place, while in the case of the perfective verb complement clause, there is merely a denial of the situation, as expressed by the main clause predicate.
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There are also some differences in the possibility of using some adverbs (for example, ни когда (never), ни разу (not even once) etc.) in the main clause, depending on the aspect of the complement clause verb. In particular, such adverbs can hardly be used in the case of the imperfective verb complement clause. Compare the following example with (9).

(i). Я никогда не просил тебя передать ему этот документ. 'I never asked you to hand over this document to him.'

It should be also added, that there is a connection between the possibility of using NPIs (Negative Polarity Items) in the complement clause and the aspect usage in it. Consider the following sentence:

(ii). Я не просил тебя ничего передать ему. 'I did not ask you to hand over anything to him.'

It must also be noted that all the aforementioned differences only concern cases with the imperfective main clause verb. When the main clause verb is perfective, only a perfective verb may be used in the complement clause.

Therefore, it can be said, that aspect usage in this case is quite complicated and requires further investigation, but the point here is the fact that it has nothing to do with the 'controllability' factor at all. (For further discussion on this problem see Evseeva (2005)).

19. It should be noted that the verb получить (receive) by itself does have the corresponding imperfective (получать), and that opposition between these two forms exists in other negative contexts, in which the 'controllability' factor is irrelevant (though, as in the case of example (5) above, there is a difference in implicatures depending on which aspect is used.)

cf.: (i). Я еще не получил получую зарплату. 'I did not receive my salary yet.'

20. As the need arises, we will use <+cntl><-cntl> to express the 'controllability' of the situation concerned.

21. It must be pointed out, that there is a preference for the perfective in this case.

22. It is not the case, that this group cannot take imperfective complement clauses inherently, as can be seen from the following example, where the imperfective in the complement clause expresses multiple situations.

(i). Я очень надеюсь никогда больше не встречать таких людей, как он. 'I really hope not to meet people, like him after all.'

23. The phenomenon, which will be considered in this section, is not observed in the complements of object-control verbs or negated complements of subject-control verbs, that is, the considerations below mostly concern cases with negation in the main clause of subject-control verbs.

24. Quotative complement clauses should be excluded from this observation, because they transmit the 'volition' element. Compare the following example with (35). Aspect usage here is the same as the root sentence:

(i). Он говорит, что не хочет продать/опродать свою старую машин...
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ny. ‘He says that he does not wish to sell his old car.’

25. It should be pointed out, that some verbs can be used in the perfective in such contexts, more easily than others. That is, for example, such verbs as рассстаться (part), вернуть (return), помочь (help), отказаться (refuse, throw away) and others.

(i). Он не желает отказаться от идеи купить новую машину. ~’He doesn’t wish to throw away the idea of buying a new car.’ Nevertheless, even such verbs become completely ungrammatical in the case of a first-person subject.

(ii). Я не желаю отказаться от идеи купить новую машину.

‘I don’t wish to throw away the idea of buying a new car.’

26. It should also be noted, that the understood subject of quotative complements, as mentioned in the footnote (24), behaves in the same way as the first person subject of the root sentence with respect to the possibility of using the perfective for [+controllable] situations.
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