

И Х ТЕРПИЕТЬ НЕ МОГУ  
Finnish NPI verbs and some Russian counterparts

Hannu TOMMOLA  
Tampere University  
hannu.tommola@tuni.fi

**Abstract**

Negopetal verbs have received much less attention in scholarly discussion, compared to other types of NPI. In Finnish, there is quite a large open class of verbs that tend to cluster in NPI. In a contrastive study I demonstrate some types of Finnish negopetal constructions and their translation equivalents in a parallel corpus of Finnish and Russian. The results allow identifying some frequent patterns in Russian used in contexts where Finnish prefers NPI verbs; however, they provide evidence for only few straightforward equivalents among the Finnish and Russian verbs.

**Keywords:** emotion, necessity, negation, (im)possibility, question

**Introduction**

As pointed out in Falkenberg (2000: 79), negative polarity verbs (and verb clusters) have received much less attention in scholarly discussion, compared to other types of (lexical and grammatical) NPI, such as “negation reinforcers” (e.g. Eng. *at all*, Rus. *вообще*, Fin. *lainkaan*), “polarity sensitive indefinites” (Eng. *ever*, Grm. *jemals*, Fin. *ikinä*) and “scalar particles” (Eng. *even*, Cze. *ani*, Fin. *edes*). Haspelmath (1997: 34) finds the term negative polarity item (NPI) “not particularly felicitous”, because NPIs are not restricted to negative contexts, and proposed instead “scale reversal items”. In this paper, discussing Finnish verbs that tend to cluster in NPI, I make use of the terms “negopetal” and “negopetality” (cf. *centripetal force* in classical mechanics, coined by Newton). Incidentally, we need no new abbreviation, NPI deciphering “negopetal” as easily as “negative polarity” item.<sup>1</sup>

At the outset of the study I had simply the idea to identify Russian verbs corresponding to negopetal Finnish verbs. It soon turned out that translational equivalence is far from guaranteeing evidence of identical lexical content or grammatical similarity. Therefore, while my contrastive analysis supplies some data on Russian NPI, it does not cover the topic of Russian NPI verbs sufficiently. However, the analysis of translations in a parallel corpus from Finnish into Russian (ParFin) and vice versa (ParRus) allows to present a number of patterns in Russian corresponding to Finnish NPI verbs.

---

<sup>1</sup> I have no pretensions to be right in preferring the terms *negopetal* and *negopetality* to the established two-words term *negative polarity*, even though the latter is not easily used attributively (other than abbreviated NPI). Admittedly, *negopetal(ity)* is seldom used, even in Fenno-Ugristics. I assume that the concept and the term came into linguistic discussion in Finland with Kiuru (1977). *Negopetal(ity)* was entered in a quadrilingual manual of linguistic terms (Kristiansson-Seppälä & Kulonen 2003) along with the recommended corresponding terms in Finnish (*kieltohakui-nen/-suus*), Estonian (*negopetaal-ne/-sus*) and German (*Negationsbestreb-end/-ung*). Petrova (2011) uses *negopetality* when referring to Kiuru (1977), elsewhere only *negative polarity*. The current Helsinki Term Bank for the Arts and Sciences (<https://tieteentermipankki.fi/wiki/Kielitiede:kieltohakuisuus>) has *negative polarity* as the English equivalent of Fin. *kieltohakuisuus*.

The most thorough account of Russian NPI verbs is probably (Apresjan 2017), where a preliminary semantic typology of Russian NPI items is suggested. Unfortunately, I was not aware of the paper when preparing this piece of study. I am deeply indebted to the author for informing me of her work, especially because, along with other NPI phrasemes, it also discusses the construction *терпеть не мочь* examined in section 4.

## 1. Negative concord

Whereas negoptal verbs seem to occur in open sets, the types of NPI mentioned above (negation reinforcers, polarity sensitive indefinites, scalar particles) tend to constitute closed classes, though not without variation across languages. They may thus be regarded as virtually functional units, which, in some languages, can acquire a grammatical function. As regards negation reinforcers this is detected in the cases of Jespersen's cycle: cf. the fate of the French *pas* ending up a negation marker. In several languages this kind of NPI – negative concord items – co-occur with the negation (see examples 1a and 2a) and are incompatible in an assertive clause without a negation marker. However, in isolation they alone have a negative reading (Giannakidou 2006), see examples for French (1b) and Russian (2b).

(1) Saint-Exupéry, *Le petit prince*

- a. Je *ne* le répéterai à *personne*, je vous le jure! 'I swear *not* to tell *anyone*!'
- b. *Personne*. Je suis seul au monde. 'No, *none*. Not one in the world.'

(2) Bulgakov, *Мастер и Маргарита*

- a. *Никогда не* разговаривайте с неизвестными. '*Never* [Ø] talk to strangers.'
- b. Поймите, что язык может скрыть истину, а глаза - *никогда*! 'The tongue may hide the truth but the eyes – *never*!'

In WALS (Chapter 115: "Negative Indefinite Pronouns and Predicate Negation") Finnish is entered, along with Russian (and all the Slavic languages included in the corpus), into the largest group of languages, characterized with the parameter value "predicate negation also present" (Haspelmath 2005). However, compared with Russian, we can state that the clausal negation marker (negative verb + connegative) is obligatory in Finnish also in the isolation cases, unlike French and Russian, cf. (1b) and (2b), and the English translations in these examples. Finnish *koskaan* is not inherently negative, i. e. it does not denote 'never', but 'ever'; see (3). The NPI enclitic particle - (*k*)*AAn* cannot alone indicate negative assertion.<sup>2</sup>

(3) Finnish translations of (2)

- |    |                  |                |                     |                         |                 |
|----|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| a. | <i>Äl-kää</i>    | <i>koskaan</i> | <i>keskustel-ko</i> | <i>tuntemattom-i-en</i> | <i>kanssa.</i>  |
|    | NEG-2PL          | ever           | talk-STEM-PL        | stranger-PL-GEN         | with            |
| b. | <i>Kieli voi</i> | <i>sala-ta</i> | <i>totuud-en,</i>   | <i>mutta silmä ei</i>   | <i>koskaan!</i> |
|    | tongue can       | hide-INF       | truth-GEN           | but eye NEG             | ever            |

## 2. NPI verbs in contexts without an overt negation

There are examples of NPI verbs in overtly negated expressions in the following sections (3. and 4.). In addition to clauses negated with a clausal negation marker,

<sup>2</sup> The clitic *-kAAn* has an antonym, positive counterpart *-kin*. Both can be appended to almost any word and add to the sentence a sense of 'also' vs. 'either', thus in a way functioning as (often redundant) agreement elements.

negopetal items (words, inflected word forms and clitic particles, as well as fixed phrases) occur in several types of clauses without an overt negation. Here I confine myself to illustrating just a few context types that license NPI. Typical contexts licensing NPI include interrogative clauses (often rhetorical questions), conditional and comparative constructions, as well as various other not directly assertive utterances.

The Russian verb *деться* ‘disappear, hide’, is apparently one of the quite rare strongly NPI verbs in Russian. It is used with an obligatory local complement, in most cases either interrogative (*куда* ‘whereto’; *где* ‘where’) or negative (*никуда*, *некуда* ‘nowhere-to’). After all, it might be the case that it is more frequent in (rhetorical) questions than in a negated phrase.<sup>3</sup> The question in (4) is one to which the speaker expects an answer. Perhaps more frequently an NPI seems to occur in rhetoric questions (5).

(4) (Ruscorpora < Пелевин, *Желтая стрела*)

Ты когда-нибудь думал, *куда делись* последние пять лет?

‘Have you ever been thinking, where the last five years did go?’

(5) (Ruscorpora < Солженицын, *В круге первом*)

«Вам до какой остановки?» Ну, *куда денешься*, сошли вместе.

“‘Where are you getting off?’” Well, what can you do, we got off together.’

Occurrences with *где* ‘where’ are felt to be outdated or dialectal by speakers of modern Russian; nevertheless, in the Russian National Corpus several examples can be found, whereas the negative *нигде* and *негде* are almost non-existent.<sup>4</sup>

Besides, *деться* is a candidate for a unique element when investigated as to its frequency in authentic Russian texts compared with translated Russian. The logic in such behavior of unique elements is that they do not have any stimulus in the source text, and are therefore easily ignored in translation process (see also below in section 3.2). As a matter of fact, the difference between the frequencies in the two subcorpora is not very big: *деться* is recorded in ParRus corpus 98, and in ParFin corpus 34 times, but if we consider the different size of the subcorpora, the relative frequencies differ just slightly (for ParRus 0,260/10 000 words, ParFin 0,218/10 000).<sup>5</sup> However, evidence for the uniqueness of *деться* can be seen in the variability of the Finnish verbs chosen to translate it. Among the translational “equivalents” of *деться* there is no one absolute favorite, while a group of directional verbs for ‘disappearing’ (*kadota* and *hävitä* ‘disappear’), ‘coming’ (*joutua* ‘come, get, find oneself’, *päästä* ‘come, get, reach, arrive’), and ‘going’ (*mennä* ‘go’, *lähteä* ‘go, leave’) make together 60 % of the occurrences. Actually, *joutua* and *päästä* are good candidates for unique elements in

---

<sup>3</sup> In the parallel corpora there are two times more interrogative sentences with *куда* ‘where(to)’ than overtly negated with *никуда* ‘nowhere(to)’, while in the Russian National Corpus they are evenly distributed.

<sup>4</sup> E.g.: “Никто, что правда, не мог понять, *где делась* в Одессе рыба, кроме хека, ...” ‘Indeed, nobody could understand, where all fishes in Odessa, except hake, had gone’ (Ruscorpora < Соломатина, *Мой одесский язык* 2011), or — “Ты *где делся?* — кричит Дима-маленький.” ‘Where did you disappear? – Little Dima shouts’ (Ruscorpora < Носов, *Избранные произведения* 1983); and: “Бесчестно мне о тебе рук марать, да уж *негде деться*, выходи на прямой бой...” ‘Dishonorable it is to soil my hands with you, yes, but there is nowhere to go, straightaway to open fight...’ (Ruscorpora < Шергин, *Пинежский Пушкин* 1930–1960).

<sup>5</sup> The size of ParRus is 3 213 918 words in the Russian original texts, and 3 763 514 words in the Finnish translations; the Finnish original texts in ParFin amount to 1 556 497 words, and the Russian translations 1 788 675 words. The fact that the subcorpora of translations in both directions are considerably larger than the originals, should not be taken as evidence of the common translatorial strategy of explicitation, because the subcorpora are in this respect biased as ParRus contains a number of Russian classical literature works in several Finnish translations.

Finnish and, correspondingly, from the verbs in the Finnish source texts *joutua* is the one most often prompting *даться* in Russian translations (over 20 % in ParFin). Moreover, both the construction denoting impossibility *никуда не даться*, and the converse necessive construction (*кому-л.*) *прийтись* ‘have to V’ are often rendered in Finnish using one of the necessive NPI constructions presented in section 3. Not surprisingly, examples are found where both Russian constructions are involved, as in (6), where a straightforward necessive construction in the Finnish original additionally prompts in Russian the NPI construction of impossibility.

(6) Linna, *Tuntematon sotilas*

a. Mäkilä-n *ol-i* *ann-etta-va* uude-t saappaa-t.  
 Mäkilä-GEN COP-PST give-PASS-PCPL new-PL boot-PL  
 ‘Mäkilä had to give new boots.’

b. (Russian transl. by VI. Smirnov and I. Martsina

*Никуда не даться: Мякиле пришлось выдать новые сапоги.*

Example (7) from Venedikt Yerofeyev’s story takes us to a train heading towards Petushki and the protagonist’s wishful thinking of reaching the destination; he promises that if he succeeds, he will mix a cocktail that he need not be ashamed about. This ‘shame’ is exactly the implicature canceled in the NPI semantics of the Finnish verb *kehdata*, whereas the modal predicate (*можно*) in optative (*бы*) in the Russian original merely denotes general possibility and does not communicate this meaning. ‘Shame’ (or rather, the lack of it) is expressed in a noun phrase *без стыда* ‘without shame’, and that is what in the Finnish translation licenses the verb *kehdata* ‘dare, not be ashamed’ (included in section 3.2.).<sup>6</sup>

(7) Ерофеев Вен., *Москва – Петушки*

a. Нет, если я сегодня доберусь до Петушков – невредимый – я создам коктейль, который *можно было бы без стыда* пить в присутствии бога и людей.

b. (Finnish transl. by E. Adrian) [Ei, jos tänään pääsen ehjänä perille Petuškiin,]

tee-n cocktail-n, jo<n>ka *kehta-a* *häpeä-ä*  
 make-1SG cocktail-GEN REL<GEN> dare-INF shame-PRTV  
*tunte-ma-tta* juo-da Jumala-n ja ihmist-en  
 feel-3INF-ABESS drink-INF God-GEN and people-GEN  
 läsnäoll-essa, ...  
 be.present-CVB

‘[No, if I today reach Petushki safe] I’ll make a cocktail that one *can* drink *without* feeling shame in the presence of God and people.’

### 3. Finnish NPI verbs as tools in the detection of potential Russian NPIs

This section offers a brief account of the corpus findings, the initial list of 25 Finnish verbs examined, and a short record of the most frequent Russian verbs and constructions, regarded as translation equivalents for the Finnish NPI verbs. The investigation was carried out in both directions, extracting data from a parallel Finnish-Russian subcorpus (ParFin), containing fiction texts in original Finnish and their published Russian

<sup>6</sup> See Paducheva (2014: 226–232) on *внутрисловное отрицание* – lexeme internal negation of the type *без* ‘without’, and on non-veridicality in general also, for example, Giannakidou 1998.

translations, as well as from a Russian-Finnish subcorpus of Russian fiction texts with their Finnish translations (ParRus).

Whereas most of the types of German NPI verbs displayed in (Falkenberg 2000) have cognates in Finnish, preliminary analysis of the findings in the parallel corpus shows that only in rare cases the translational equivalents of the 25 Finnish verbs display a Russian verb with similar NPI behavior. As an example of detected Russian NPI verbs, let us mention *церемониться*, to which in Finnish texts usually corresponds one of the synonymous verbs *häikäillä*, *sumeilla*, *siekailla* ‘have scruples, hesitate, shy away’. Another example is *терпеть* ‘bear, stand etc.’, although it is strictly NPI just in the capability construction ‘can’ +  $V_{INF}$  (see section 4).

3.1. ( $N_{GEN+}$ )*NEG-V+V<sub>INF</sub>* «не стоит; не полагается; не следует, не нужно, не надо»

Characteristic of the verbs in this section is that their NPI quality is restricted to a particular impersonal construction only. This kind of representing the subject as a passive experiencer, rather than an active participant, has been identified as reflecting indifference or incapability to control one’s emotions (claimed as typical of the Russian language, for example in Wierzbicka 1996). Another peculiarity is that outside of this construction these verbs appear with a meaning quite dissimilar to the NPI one involved in this construction (that is why in the list beneath the label *lit.* shall not be understood ‘literally’: it just reminds the reader of the perhaps original or in any case of a different meaning). This applies mostly to the first (upper) half of the verbs listed, while the following three are nearer each other in meaning in both uses. By the way, it might be questionable whether *tarvita* ‘need’ really qualifies as a NPI verb, and this suspicion applies to other languages, too. Here is not the place to go deeper into this question, though.

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. <i>auttaa</i>    | ’be worthwhile’ (lit. ’help’)                           |
| 2. <i>kannattaa</i> | ’be worthwhile’ (lit. ’support’)                        |
| 3. <i>maksaa</i>    | ’be worthwhile’ (lit. ’pay’; ’cost’)                    |
| 4. <i>toimittaa</i> | ’be worthwhile, have sense’ (lit. ’perform, carry out’) |
| 5. <i>parata</i>    | ’be worthwhile, have sense’; ’dare, help’ (lit. ’heal’) |
| 6. <i>tarvita</i>   | ’need’  |
| 7. <i>passata</i>   | ’suit, be suitable/acceptable’                          |
| 8. <i>kärsiä</i>    | ’tolerate, suffer’                                      |

From the five verbs approximately translated as ‘be worthwhile’, *kannattaa* is neutral, while the other four are slightly literary or colloquial, and may have a regional bias. In a contrastive study it is intriguing that one of the Finnish verbs used in this function is *maksaa* with the two full-verb meanings of ‘pay’ and ‘cost’. Thus it is equivalent to Rus. *стоить* both in its ‘cost’ meaning and in the modal function (‘be worthwhile to V’). Unlike the neutral *kannattaa* the other verbs are in this use strongly NPI. *Kannattaa* is used both as negated and without negation, similarly to Russian *стоить*.

(8) Larni, *Neljäs nikama eli Veijari vastoin tahtoaan*

- |    |                            |              |                |                   |
|----|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|
| a. | <i>Ei</i>                  | <i>maksa</i> | <i>vaiva-a</i> | <i>katsel-la.</i> |
|    | NEG-3SG                    | cost-STEM    | bother-PRTV    | watch-INF         |
|    | ’That isn’t worth looking’ |              |                |                   |

b. (Russian transl. by V.N. Bogachev)

Ерунда, *не стоит* смотреть.

(9) Достоевский, *Записки из подполья*

a. [Уж как докажут тебе, например, что от обезьяны произошел,] *так уж и нечего* морщиться, принимай как есть.

b. (Finnish transl. by Esa Adrian)

[Kun esimerkiksi todistetaan, että ihminen on kehittynyt apinasta,]

*ei* *siinä* *enää* *auta* *irvistellä* – *se-n* *kun* *nielais-et*.

NEG there more help-STEM grin-INF it-GEN when swallow-2SG

Corresponding expressions other than *стоит* attested in Russian texts are *незачем, нет расчета, нечего, не полагается, нельзя, нечего, ничего не поделаешь, никуда не денешься, придется, ни к чему*, and, used as equivalent to those Finnish verbs in the sense ‘need not’ or ‘suits not’: *не следует, не нужно, не надо, можно не, не приходится*. The distribution clearly indicates that the first five Finnish verbs entering this construction (in the sense of ‘be worthwhile’) do not stand in opposition to the sixth in the list (‘need’), but rather their quasi-synonymic relation is reflected. One of the Russian findings in the first group is *придется* (necessive ‘to have to’), while in the second group *не приходится* (‘not to have to’) is attested. The documented variation in translation equivalents, the possibility to express the same “in other words”, even using an antonymic shift, as it were, reflects the logic in that the negation of ‘must’ is ‘need not’.

### 3.2. $N_{NOM}+V+V_{INF}$ «не иметь сердца; не догадаться»

Considered from a translational point of view, it is notable that the frequencies of some Finnish verbs differ significantly between the subcorpora (the case with Rus. *даться* is similar, as mentioned above). This can be interpreted as resulting from unique (cross-linguistically idiosyncratic) elements, which tend to be underrepresented in translations. Included in the Finnish data are many (emotionally loaded) verbs, which in other languages tend to lack a direct equivalent. Almost all the verbs occurring in this construction, probably all but the last one (‘want’), belong to this category. Three of these Finnish verbs (*kehdata, viitsiä, malttaa*) had no entries in the translated Finnish corpus (ParRus). However, that is another story, an issue that does not primarily fall in the scope of this study.<sup>7</sup>

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. <i>viitsiä</i>   | ‘care’, ‘bother’, ‘feel like’                             |
| 2. <i>piitata</i>   | ‘care’ (with sympathetic feelings of pity)                |
| 3. <i>iljetä</i>    | ‘dare, venture, bring oneself’                            |
| 4. <i>ra(a)skia</i> | ‘dare’ (because of emotional, sympathetic reasons)        |
| 5. <i>hennoa</i>    | ‘dare’, ‘have the heart’                                  |
| 6. <i>tohtia</i>    | ‘dare’  |
| 7. <i>arvata</i>    | ‘dare’ (lit. < ‘guess’)                                   |
| 8. <i>kehdata</i>   | ‘dare, not be ashamed, be bold enough’                    |
| 9. <i>hirvitä</i>   | ‘dare, have the courage’                                  |
| 10. <i>malttaa</i>  | ‘have the patience’                                       |
| 11. <i>tahtoa</i>   | ‘want’ (in the sense as ‘the door doesn’t want to close’) |

(10) Трифонов, *Дом на набережной*

a. – И как ты *мог*, сучонок, мово брата *обидеть*? Что ли, жизнь надоела?

<sup>7</sup> On unique units see Tirkkonen-Condit (2004).

b. (Finnish transl. by M. Koskinen)

Mites sä nartunpenikka ilke-si-t mu-n velje-ä  
 how you puppy.of.a.bitch dare-PST-2SG I-GEN brother-PRTV  
*louka-ta?*  
 hurt-INF  
 [Eiks elämä enää maistu vai?]  
 'How dared you son-of-a-bitch hurt my brother? [Has life lost its taste?]

3.3.  $N_{NOM}+V(+V_{INF})$  «не церемониться, бесцеремонно; без зазрения совести, не колеблясь, напропалую»

1. *sumeilla* 'have scruples'
2. *siekailla* 'have scruples, hesitate'
3. *häikäillä* 'hesitate, shy away (from doing)'

Apart from the very frequent *не церемониться* 'act with no scruples', Russian texts present translations that involve internal negative lexemes (with *без, бес-*) 'without', and as corresponding to the Finnish verbs quite idiosyncratic utterances, see (11).

(11) Распутин, *Живи и помни*

a. [Поглянулись они мне сильно, я и схватилась, кофту, шаль продала, насбирала, –] врала *напропалую* Настена и бесстрашно смотрела в лицо Иннокентию Ивановичу.

b. (Finnish transl. by E. Adrian) [Minä niin ihastuin tähän, innostuin ja myin nutun ja saalin ja vähän keräsin kokoon,]

Nastena valehtel-i *sumeile-ma-tta* ja katso-i  
 Nastena lie- PST hesitate-3INF-ABESS and look-PST  
 pelottomasti Innokenti Ivanovitši-a silm-i-in.  
 boldly Innokenti Ivanovitš-PRTV eye-PL-ILL

'[I was so fascinated of it, got excited and sold the jacket and the shawl, and collected some] Nastena lied *without scruples* and looked I.I. boldly in the eyes.'

There are a couple of minor structural groups (i.e., comprising less verbs) that exhibit the constructions  $N_{NOM}+V(+V_{INF/ma-INF})$  and  $N_{NOM}+V+N_{ELAT}$ , but they cannot be described here in more detail. To the first one belongs *joutaa* 'have/find time', the latter includes *perustaa* 'care (of smth)', trouble himself (with smth)' and *piitata* 'care (of smth)'

#### 4. The case of *терпеть* 'suffer; bear, stand, endure; have patience'

Our parade example is *терпеть*, illustrated in a modal construction in the title of this paper. The behavior of corresponding Finnish *sietää* 'bear, stand, endure, tolerate, have patience' is roughly identical with its Russian cognate.<sup>8</sup> Whereas both are not absolutely restricted to contexts with overt negation (see ex. 12 through 15), the Russian construction with the modal verb expressing ability – *и X терпеть не V<sub>мочь</sub>* 'can't bear even X' – does not tolerate any violation of the requirement for a NPI context (no counter-examples found in the Russian National Corpus). The same applies to the Finnish *sietää*, and we can note that the lexeme 'bear, stand' behaves similarly also at

<sup>8</sup> *Sietää* was not included in the initial list of verbs to be investigated.

least in German: Falkenberg (2000: 86–87) lists several verbs of “attraction” that become NPI when used in infinitive with the modal auxiliary *können* ‘can’. Among these “predicates of attraction” is *leiden können* ‘can bear, can stand’, and Falkenberg maintains that this is true of the English *can bear*, too.<sup>9</sup> These examples suggest that NPIs tend not only to be emotionally loaded expressions, but also typically occur in fixed phrases and phraseological units. This is maintained also by Apresjan (2017), who in the first class of his strict NPIs counts phrasemes and “highly idiomatized lexemes”.

As was pointed out earlier, Fin. *sietää* and Rus. *терпеть* are strictly NPI primarily when in infinitive and combined with the modal ‘can’. Both *sietää* and *терпеть* are in (12) and (13) – in the modal construction – licensed by different elements: in (12) the finite modal verb is in conditional; additionally, the time adverb ‘still’ suggests that tolerance is nearing its end (cf. the concepts of ‘limit’ and ‘ultimate degree’ in Apresjan 2017). In (13) it is the speaker’s surprise over someone’s endurance what is signaled.

(12) Larni, *Neljäs nikama eli Veijari vastoin tahtoaan*

a. Tämä-n väärennyks-en vo-isi-mme vielä sietä-ä,  
 this-GEN fake- GEN can-COND-1PL still bear-INF  
 [koska siinä ei ole kenellekään mitään uutta.]

‘We could still accept this falsification, [because that’s nothing new to anyone]’

b. (Russian translation by V.N. Bogachev)

Но эту подделку мы могли бы еще терпеть, [так как в ней нет ничего нового.]<sup>10</sup>

(13) (Ruscorpora < Семен Лунгин, “Виденное наяву”)

А ты, оказывается, *терпеть можешь*. Вот уж не думала. Давай вытащу.

‘Oh, it turns out you *have endurance*. I didn’t expect. Let me help you out.’

The plain lexical verb *терпеть* is less strictly NPI. However, collocated with objects denoting unpleasant, not desired entities or situations *терпеть* tends to develop NPI idioms; typical collocations are, for example, *терпеть лжи*, / *издевательство* / *обиду* ‘bear lie /mockery / grievance.’ In (14) and (15), we have to try and find other elements licensing an NPI reading: in (14) *терпел* ‘suffered’ is reduplicated (similarly, in the Finnish translation, repeated in a tautological continuative construction) and the ‘suffering’ indeed leads in the following coordinated clause to the end of tolerance. In (15) the exclamation mark signifies the speaker’s indignation about how such a situation is being tolerated.

(14) Пастернак, *Доктор Живаго*

a. Ливерий *терпел-терпел* и не выдержал.

b. (Finnish translation by J. Konkka)

Liverij *kärsi* *kärsimis-tä-än* ei-kä enää  
 Liverij suffer.PST suffer.CVB-PRTV-POSS3 NEG-and more.NPI

jaksa-nut maltta-a miel-tä-än.

can-PST.PTCP have.patience-INF mind- PRTV-POSS3

‘Liberius suffered, and didn’t at last stand more’

<sup>9</sup> Incidentally, the German *leiden können* without a negation has got an idiomatic meaning: ‘like, be fond of’ (Falkenberg 2000: 89), which is obviously derived from an ironic understatement-based use and cannot any more be simply understood as the sum of its components.

<sup>10</sup> The perfective *стерпеть* appears to be obsolete in the modal construction but is attested from the end of 19<sup>h</sup> century with four occurrences in Russian National Corpus, e.g., “Батюшка, смилуйся! я от тебя этого *стерпеть не могу!*” (Leskov, *Котин долец и Платонида*) ‘Father, have mercy! I cannot bear it from you!’



(15) (Ruscorpora < Юлия Кудрина, «Злой дух витает над Россией...»)

С улицы приходил всякий люд, говорилась там всякая мерзость, и все это *терпелось!*

'From the street came all sorts of crowded folk, they spoke all sorts of filth, and all that was *tolerated!*'

In addition to the 'can't bear' construction, in Russian the reflexive *терпеться* turns out to be strictly negopetal, too. As a matter of fact, in my data the impersonal construction *не терпеться* + V<sub>INF</sub> 'be impatient' illustrates a separate lexeme, which cannot be readily regarded as negation of *терпеть*; compare (16) and (17) with *терпелось* in (15).

(16) A. Tuuri, *Joki virtaa läpi kaupungin*

a. Annikki on sinu-a koko illa-n niin  
 Annikki be.3SG thou-PRTV whole evening-GEN so  
 kehu-nut, että oikein jännitt-i, minkälainen ihmemies  
 praise-PST.PTCP that right excite-PST which wonder.man  
 sieltä on tulossa.  
 thereof be.3SG coming-INESS

'Annikki has glorified you all night, so that I *was really excited* to see what a miraculous man is coming'

b. (Russian translation by G. Muravin & E. Kamenskaja) Анники весь вечер так тебя восхваляла, что мне уже *не терпелось* поглядеть, что это за чудо такое...

(17) Бакланов, *Навеки девятнадцатилетние*

a. - Сами понимаете, как все это время *не терпелось участвовать*, [- сказал он, при этом строго глянул в глаза и с чувством пожал руку.]

b. (Finnish translation by V. Orlov)

- Varmaan ymmärrä-tte, että hädin tuskin malto-i-n  
 to.be.sure understand-2PL that hardly be.patient-PST-1SG  
 ol-la tule-ma-tta mukaan aikaisemmin,  
 be-INF come-3INF-ABESS along earlier

[hän sanoi, katsoi samalla ankarasti silmiin ja puristi kättä tunteikkaasti]

'You will understand that I hardly could wait to come along before'

There is a semantically very close construction in Finnish with *maltaa* 'have patience' (number 10 in section 3.2). Since there still is a subtle difference in the basic meanings between Fin. *maltaa* and Rus. *терпеть* 'bear, stand, endure', they occasionally cause trouble for translators (as «ложные друзья»). Anyway, in (17) the Finnish translator has chosen the right construction where *maltaa* plus the copula in infinitive combines with a privative converb (in Finnish traditional grammar called abessive of 3<sup>rd</sup> infinitive), communicating the meaning of 'have enough patience not to do smth'. It turns out that these constructions are in a way mutually conversive, expressing the negation in different places (Rus. N<sub>DAT</sub> + NEG + *терпеться* + V<sub>INF</sub> = Fin. *maltaa* + be + V<sub>INF.3ABESS=NEG</sub>), and conveying the same function with help of the adverbs 'hardly' and 'earlier' in Finnish.

## Conclusion

The initial aim with this study was to identify Russian verbs corresponding to a group of Finnish verbs, attested as negopetal. It very soon became obvious that there are not many straightforward equivalents among the Finnish and Russian (negopetal) verbs. In

passing it should be noted that the internal structure of the verb lexicon in general differs considerably in these languages; suffice to consider the abundance of lexicalized prefix verbs in Slavic languages, compared to an almost total lack of this derivation strategy in Finnish.

The contrastive analysis presented in this paper revealed certain data on Russian NPI, but its results do not suffice to cover particularly the topic pertaining to Russian verbs. I must admit having only demonstrated some main types of Finnish negoptal verbs and their translation equivalents, documented in translations from Finnish into Russian and from Russian into Finnish.

As a by-product some evidence was gained for the tendency of unique units to be underrepresented in translated language. From Finnish verbs *kehdata* ‘not be ashamed to do’, *maltaa* ‘have patience to do’, *viitsiä* ‘bother to do’, *parata* and *perustaa* (both with negation ‘not be worthwhile’) were found only in authentic Finnish texts (ParFin). Correspondingly, Russian *деться* was not attested at all in the translated corpus (ParFin).

Apart from issues relevant from a translational point of view, the results from the study allow to present a number of patterns in Russian used in contexts where Finnish prefers NPI verbs – either as translational equivalents, or constructions in original texts that in Finnish translations trigger a NPI verb. The problem in taking the Russian translational equivalents of Finnish NPI as manifestations of NPI in Russian is that, to a considerable extent they are negations themselves. It would seem bizarre to qualify as *negoptal* expressions that are negation markers.

## Abbreviations

(not included in this list are the abbreviations presented in the *Leipzig Glossing Rules*)

ABESS abessive (privative) case

INESS inessive case

PRTV partitive case

STEM plain stem = connegative in Finnish clausal negation

## Data sources

ParFin – Russian–Finnish parallel corpus of literary texts, Tampere University, <https://puolukka.uta.fi/texthammer>

ParRus – Finnish–Russian parallel corpus of literary texts, Tampere University, <https://puolukka.uta.fi/texthammer>

Ruscorpora – Russian National Corpus, <https://ruscorpora.ru/old/en/index.html>

## References

APRESJAN 2017 = Апресян, В.Ю., «Отрицательная и положительная поляризация: семантические источники». Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии: по материалам международной конференции «Диалог 2017» (<https://www.dialog-21.ru/media/3896/apresjanvju.pdf>)

FALKENBERG, Gabriel (2000). “Lexical sensitivity in negative polarity verbs,” in Jack Hoeksema, Hotze Rullmann, Víctor Sánchez-Valencia and Ton Van der Wouden eds., *Perspectives on Negation and Polarity Items*. Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 40. 79–97. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- GIANNAKIDOU, Anastasia (1998). *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- GIANNAKIDOU, Anastasia (2006). "N-words and negative concord," in Martin Everaert, Henk Van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans and Bart Hollebrandse eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Volume III, chapter 45, 327–391. Oxford: Blackwell.
- HASPELMATH, Martin (1997). *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1977.
- HASPELMATH, Martin (2005). "Negative Indefinite Pronouns and Predicate Negation," in Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil and Bernard Comrie eds., *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 466–469.
- KIURU, Silva (1977). *Suomen kielen kieltohakuiset verbit: Murreaineistoon perustuva syntaktis-semanttinen tutkimus*. SKST 335. Helsinki: SKS.
- KRISTIANSSON-SEPPÄLÄ, Anna-Liisa & KULONEN, Ulla-Maija eds. (2003). *Kielitieteen asiasanasto suomi – englanti – viro – saksa*. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 128. Helsinki: Kotus.
- PADUCHEVA 2013 = Падучева, Е.В., *Русское отрицательное предложение*. Studia philologica. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
- PETROVA, Oksana (2011). *Of Pearls and Pigs. A conceptual-semantic tiernet approach to formal representation of structure and variation of phraseological units*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- TIRKKONEN-CONDIT, Sonja (2004). "Unique items — over- or under-represented in translated language?" in Anna Mauranen and Pekka Kujamäki eds., *Translation Universals: Do they exist?* Benjamins Translation Library 48. 177–184.
- WIERZBICKA, Anna (1996). *Semantics, Culture and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.