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Abstract. Russian ni-phrase Negative Polarity Items and the Genitive of Negation are not coextensive: the former must be in the scope of negation while the latter is restricted to direct objects, but does not show the scope requirement. These distributional asymmetries can be understood in terms of a functional category NegP analysis of sentential negation, where the negation operator resides in [Spec, NegP] and ne is its head. Several phenomena, including Negative Polarity Items, Relativized Minimality, and partitive genitives, are sensitive to the operator. Genitive of Negation, on the other hand, only requires there to be a NegP and for this reason can even occur in pleonastic contexts. Pleonastic negation, which we analyze as NegP with no negation operator, is canonically selected by certain verbs and adverbials, but is also syntactically forced in Yes/No questions with V-to-C raising.

0. Introduction

In this paper we propose a functional category analysis of sentential negation in Russian in order to accommodate a distributional asymmetry between Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) and the Genitive of Negation (GN). We then develop an account of pleonastic negation in terms of the idea that this involves a Negation Phrase (NegP) which lacks a negation operator, and demonstrate how this account effectively handles various phenomena associated with pleonastic negation.

1. Two Diagnostics for Negation

Russian displays these two familiar diagnostics for clausal negation, but they contrast in some striking ways. We first discuss the GN, which is a language-specific construction generally taken as indicative of sentential negation, and then compare its distribution with that of ni-phrases, which we take to be representative of the more universal category of NPIs.
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1.1. The Genitive of Negation

The study of the GN construction has given rise to a copious body of linguistic research. Interestingly, all of the studies in this rich literature either explicitly claim or implicitly assume that GN can only be assigned to a Noun Phrase (NP) when that NP is in the scope of sentential negation. Thus, the direct object knigi in (1a) is acc, because the sentence exhibits only constituent negation (which is tantamount to being affirmative). On the other hand, knig in (1b) is gen, because ne here expresses true sentential negation.

(1) a. Ja čitaju ne knigi, a gazety.
   I read NEG books ACC but newspapers ACC
   ‘I am not reading books, but newspapers.’

b. Ja ne čitaju knig.
   I NEG read books GEN
   ‘I don’t read books.’

A possible problem for this perspective arises because sentential negation is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the application of the GN rule: the actual marking of gen in examples comparable to (1b) is not obligatory (although elsewhere it often is). This is generally taken to mean that the Russian GN rule is itself in some way optional. It is this optionality, and the search for factors beyond the scope of negation, that has been the focus of virtually all of the work on GN.

Actual mechanisms to formalize the rule assigning GN have typically focused on a distributional problem other than this optionality, namely the curious fact that—even if all relevant factors favoring gen are satisfied—only certain NP arguments are even eligible for GN marking. There are two perhaps related instances where arguments, although credibly within the scope of clausal negation, can never undergo the GN rule. First, external arguments, by which we mean subjects of transitives and unergative (but not unaccusative!) intransitives, cannot appear in the

---

1 See for example the references in Corbett’s (1986) bibliography.
2 Although we eventually employ the licensing mechanism of feature “checking” rather than the derivational metaphor of “assignment,” unless specific reference to checking is required we will use the more traditional assignment terminology.
3 A watershed study of semantic and syntactic factors restricting the GN is Timberlake 1975, which extends Jakobson’s original (1936) insight that GN marks the quantification of (the lack of) participation in an event, and develops an informal theory of hierarchies for parameters restricting the use of GN. Pushing this sort of taxonomic approach to its inevitable extreme, Mustajoki (1985) and Mustajoki and Heino (1991) offer extensive lists of factors influencing the choice between gen and acc for direct objects of transitive verbs.
gen. Contrast object gen (1b) with subject gen (2), and unaccusative (3a) with unergative (3b):

(2) *Studentov ne čitalo Vojnu i mir.
   students\textsubscript{GEN} NEG read War and Peace
   ‘The students didn’t read War and Peace.’

(3) a. Otveta ne prišlo.
    answer\textsubscript{GEN} NEG came
    ‘No answer came’

b. *Studentov ne spital.
   students\textsubscript{GEN} NEG sleep
   ‘Students don’t sleep.’

These sorts of facts, discussed in Chvany 1975 and central to the theory of category selection put forward in Pesetsky 1982, would seem to require that the application of the GN rule be restricted to object NPs (VP-internal NPs), thus apparently relinquishing any generalization about gen as a negative scope marker. Therefore, in Government-Binding (GB) models, such as Pesetsky 1982 and Franks 1995, as well as Relational Grammar models, GN applies to underlying objects, while in Neidle’s (1988) Lexical Functional Grammar analysis gen-marked subjects undergo a “demotion” rule to in effect become objects. Finally, for some linguists, such as Babby (1980a, 1980b), subject genitives do exist and can be characterized inter alia in terms of the scope of negation.

Second, GN never applies to NPs that would otherwise be marked with some oblique case; even among objects, only acc NPs are candidates to receive gen under negation. This restriction is also discussed by the above authors and is perhaps most prominent in the work of Babby, who invokes the dichotomy between configurational and lexical case and imposes the condition that lexical case is inviolate. Babby (1987: 95), for example, cites (4), in which a dat NP cannot be marked gen, even though it is clearly an internal argument in the scope of negation:

(4) Bogatye nikogda ne zavidujut bednym/ *bednyx.
   rich never NEG envy poor\textsubscript{DAT}/ *poor\textsubscript{GEN}
   ‘The rich never envy the poor.’

Although the direct object status of dative _bednym_ may be debatable, there are other clear examples of oblique NPs that satisfy such object tests as passivization, as discussed in Fowler 1994, but nonetheless fail to undergo GN:
On the basis of these facts, we can conclude that GN applies only to direct object NPs that would not be marked for some oblique (or lexical) case. Such NPs are presumably caseless for the purposes of the GN rule.

Provided, then, that there is some kind of tight structural restriction on GN, one might ask how it should be instantiated. While it seems prima facie correct that gen is only assigned to caseless NPs in direct object position, it is not obvious how that position should be defined. One might simply take it to be sister to V, as in traditional GB work. Alternatively, one might posit a special position to serve this purpose, as in Bailyn 1995. Finally, one might make use of the popular idea that structural (if not all) cases are checked in the specifier position of some functional projection, and assume that GN also operates in such a fashion. In this paper, we opt for a version of this latter sort of approach.

In summary, potential assignment of GN requires sentential negation, but actual assignment is optional, being influenced by numerous semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic factors, and the syntactic environment is highly restricted.

1.2. Polarity and the Scope of Negation

In addition to GN, NPIs also serve as a diagnostic for sentential negation. After introducing polarity theory in general and Russian polarity items in particular, we will demonstrate that, although they too require sentential negation, NPIs in Russian do not have the strict distributional requirements that GN does, nor are they optional in the scope of true sentential negation.

Traditional polarity literature, including Ladusaw 1980 and Linebarger 1981, 1987, identifies and analyzes NPIs, based on data from English, as those items which can be licensed only by clausemate negation or some other polarity licenser. The canonical polarity licensors, besides clausemate negation, include superordinate negation, Yes/No questions, conditionals, and adversative predicates. The following examples illus-

4 We cannot simply conclude that Russian GN applies to NPs that would otherwise be acc—as is indeed the appropriate characterization of the Polish situation—since unaccusative and passive objects, which would have no source for acc case assignment, are also affected. Likewise, objects of prepositions that assign acc case are not affected.
trate the behavior of English *any*-NPIs in these polarity environments (6a–e), and in contrast to a non-polarity environment (6f):\(^5\)

\[(6)\]
\begin{itemize}
  \item[a.] Clausemate Negation: Fred doesn’t like *anyone*.
  \item[b.] Superordinate Negation: I didn’t say that Fred likes *anyone*.
  \item[c.] Yes/No Questions: Does Fred like *anyone*?
  \item[d.] Conditionals: If Fred likes *anyone*, I’ll be sad.
  \item[e.] Adversative Predicates: I doubt that Fred likes *anyone*.
  \item[f.] No context: *Fred saw anyone* this morning.
\end{itemize}

Progovac (1988, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1994), analyzing polarity within the Generalized Binding framework of Aoun 1985a, 1986, addresses some of the problems in the more traditional systems of Ladusaw and Linebarger. In her discussion of English and Serbo-Croatian polarity items, Progovac (1994) argues that NPIs are bound either by negation (the exact structure of which is left unspecified) or, for non-negative contexts, by a polarity operator in Comp. Progovac’s most significant contribution to polarity theory is her classification of variation in the behavior and distribution of polarity items. She makes specific claims about the binding options allowed by Universal Grammar (UG), proposing a set of parameters in order to account for this variation.\(^6\)

For the sake of concreteness, we adopt the framework of Progovac, and refer the reader to Brown (in preparation) for a more detailed discussion of negative and positive polarity in Russian, as well as for alternative proposals. In Progovac’s terms, Russian *ni*-pronouns (henceforth *ni*-NPIs) are NPIs subject to Principle A (i.e., they must be bound in some domain) and are licensed only in the scope of clausemate negation. They pattern with Serbo-Croatian *ni*-NPIs and English strict NPIs, such as *until*. Russian

---

\(^5\) English *any*-NPIs are homonymous with English “free-choice” *any*; this irrelevant interpretation should be excluded.

\(^6\) The range of observed variation is summarized in (i).

\[(i)\]
\begin{itemize}
  \item[a.] Some NPIs are licensed in all polarity environments.
  \item[b.] Some NPIs are licensed only by clausemate negation.
  \item[c.] Some NPIs are licensed in all polarity environments except that of clausemate negation.
  \item[d.] For some NPIs, clausemate negation patterns with non-negative environments in licensing NPIs.
  \item[e.] For some NPIs, clausemate negation patterns with superordinate negation in licensing NPIs.
  \item[f.] Some PPIs can occur with negation or another polarity operator outside of its governing clause.
  \item[g.] Some PPIs can never occur in the same sentence as a polarity licensor.
\end{itemize}

For details of this theory, including the binding and raising parameters it includes, see Progovac 1994.
nibud’-pronouns (henceforth nibud’-NPIs) are subject to Principle B (i.e., they must be free in some domain). Like Serbo-Croatian i-NPIs, they are subject to the general requirement that they be bound in the sentence, which means that they are disallowed in the scope of clausemate negation, but are licensed in other polarity environments. The examples in (7) show the behavior of Russian polarity items in the canonical polarity contexts. Note that no choice exists between the ni-NPIs and nibud’-NPIs in (7a–e).

(7) a. **Clausemate Negation:**

Fedja ne ljubit nikogo/ *kogo-nibud´.
Fedja NEG likes no-who/ *who-any
‘Fedja doesn’t like anybody.’

b. **Superordinate Negation:**

Fedja ne skazal, čto on čto-nibud´/ *ničego znaet
Fedja NEG said that he what-any/ *no-what knows
ob ètom.
about that
‘Fedja didn’t say that he knows anything about that.’

Although our focus is primarily on ni-NPIs and nibud’-NPIs, some discussion of Russian to-PPIs might be warranted. While the nibud’-NPIs must be free in a certain domain but bound in the sentence, the to-PPIs must be free everywhere. This leads to the following contrast:

(i) Ja videl kogo-to/ *kogo-nibud´.
I saw who-some/ *who-any
‘I saw someone.’

In (i) there is no polarity operator to license the nibud’-NPI. Note that neither the nibud’-NPI nor the to-PPI is allowed in the scope of clausemate negation, as evidenced in (ii).

(ii) Ja ne videl nikogo/ *kogo-to/ *kogo-nibud´.
I NEG saw no-who/ *who-some/ *who-any
‘I didn’t see anyone.’

There is also some evidence that to-PPIs are actually QPs, since certain types of pragmatic situations will allow them in the scope of clausemate negation. Note example (iii):

(iii) Kogo-to v ètoj komnate ja očen´ davno ne videl.
who-some in this room I very long ago NEG saw
‘Someone in this room I haven’t seen for a long time!’

Here it seems as if the to-PPI/QP can raise to take wide scope over negation. For further discussion, see Brown (in preparation).
c. Yes/No Questions:
   (i) Fedja ljubit kogo-nibud’/ *nikogo?
       Fedja likes who-any/ *no-who
       ‘Does Fedja like anybody?’
   (ii) Ljubit li Fedja kogo-nibud´/ *nikogo?
        Likes Q Fedja who-any/ *no-who
        ‘Does Fedja like anybody?’

d. Conditionals:
   Esli kto-nibud’/ *nikto pozvonit, ja tebe skazu.
   if who-any/ *no-who will call I you will tell
   ‘If anybody calls, I’ll tell you.’

e. Adversative Predicates:
   Ja somnevajus´, čto Fedja čto-nibud´/ *ničego znaet
   I doubt that Fedja what-any/ *no-what knows
   ob Ivane
   about Ivan
   ‘I doubt that Fedja knows anything about Ivan.’

f. No Context:
   Fedja videl kogo-to/ *kogo-nibud´/ *nikogo segodnja
   Fedja saw who-some/ *who-any/ *no-who today
   utrom.
   in the morning
   ‘Fedja saw someone/*anyone this morning.’

Notice that any-NPIs occur throughout in the English equivalents, as in
examples (6a–e) above.

With this understanding of the behavior of Russian polarity items, it
is now easy to demonstrate that NPIs in Russian do not display the same
restriction in distribution as GN. While GN, as we have seen, is limited to
non-oblique direct objects, ni-NPIs occur freely in all positions in the scope
of sentential negation. Thus the familiar GN asymmetry between subjects
and objects, given in (8), is not observed for the ni-NPIs in (9):

(8) a. On ne pišet pisem.
    He NEG writes lettersGEN
    ‘He doesn’t write letters.’
   b. *Studentov ne čitalo Vojnu i mir.
      studentsGEN NEG read War and Peace
      ‘The students didn’t read War and Peace.’

We assume that an element occurs in the scope of sentential negation if it is c-
command-ed by a negation operator at Logical Form.
(9) a. On ne pišet ničego.
   He NEG writes no-what
   ‘He doesn’t write anything.’

b. Nikto ne čital Vojnu i mir.
   no-who NOM NEG read War and Peace
   ‘No one read War and Peace.’

Nor is there any problem with ni occurring as an oblique constituent, whether complement or adjunct, as shown by (10) and (11):

(10) On ne upravljaet nikakoj fabrikoj.
   he NEG manages no-which INST factory INST
   ‘He doesn’t manage any factory.’

(11) On ni s kem ne xodit v kino.
   he no with who NEG goes to movies
   ‘He doesn’t go to the movies with anyone.’

We conclude that sentential negation is necessary for both NPIs and GN, but that GN is more restrictive. The grammaticality of (9–11), with NPIs in subject and oblique positions, reveals that subjects and obliques can be in the scope of negation, yet these positions, as we have shown, do not allow GN.

2. The Structure of NegP

We now turn to the issue of how negation should be incorporated into the phrase structure of Russian. The broad distribution of NPIs reveals that—despite the structural limitation of GN—sentential negation must have scope over all substantive elements of the clause. We will argue that Russian ne heads its own NegP projection. NegP typically has a negation operator (NO) in its specifier, so that this NO will have scope over everything it c-commands. This sort of analysis is far from original with us, but rather stems from such work as Ouhalla 1991 and has been proposed for various languages. For Russian, we tentatively adopt the phrase structure in (12), at the top of the following page, in which both subjects and objects originate within VP but raise by Logical Form to the specifier positions of functional categories to have their case features checked. The use of AspP in this phrase structure is based on recent proposals by among others Borer (1993) and Yadroff (1994), and stemming from Travis (1991), that the accusative case of the direct object is checked in [Spec, AspP], and that in general a more streamlined functional category system can do without the device of AgrP for case checking.
While this move is not vital to our proposals about NegP, it does have some positive repercussions and so we adopt the AspP system here.

2.1. The Negation Operator

An apparent advantage of the structure in (12) is that it seems to account for the fact that NPIs are licensed in all positions. The hallmark of NPIs is that they must occur in the scope of a NO (or some polarity operator). Structure (12) posits this operator in \([\text{Spec, NegP}]\) so that it c-commands everything dominated by or adjoined to VP, i.e., all the substantive elements of the sentence. Assuming subjects to be generated in \([\text{Spec, VP}]\) and sentential adjuncts to be adjoined to VP (or at worst AspP, noting that \([\text{Spec, NegP}]\) also dominates AspP), we then have a ready explanation for why NPIs are licensed in all positions.

Unfortunately, as pointed out to us by Howard Lasnik (pc), there is a serious problem with this line of reasoning: Why doesn’t clausemate negation license English NPIs in subject position? Contrast the following examples with their Russian counterparts:

\[(13)\]
\[\begin{align*}
  & a. \quad \text{He doesn’t write anything.} \\
  & b. \quad \text{He doesn’t go to the movies with anyone.} \quad \text{but:} \\
  & c. \quad *\text{Anyone didn’t read War and Peace.} \\
  & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \ Quad
(14) The teacher doesn’t think that anyone read *War and Peace.*

Clausemate negation in C⁰ has a similar effect:

(15) *Don’t anyone* try anything stupid.
    [cf. *Anyone doesn’t* try anything stupid.]

The problem therefore specifically involves the structural relationship between clausemate negation and sentential subjects: the relative positioning of NO and the subject must somehow be different in the two languages. A solution manipulating NO is untenable: even if one were to make the theoretically unpalatable proposal that NegP is lower in English than in Russian, there would be no place to put it to obtain the desired scope results. Instead, it is clearly the location of the subject NP that must differ in the two languages: NO c-commands the subject in Russian at the relevant level of representation but not in English. We thus conclude that the status of preverbal subjects must be different in Russian and English.

In order to resolve this dilemma we suggest that in Russian subjects raise out of [Spec, VP] by A´-movement rather than by A-movement, as in English. This is in line with proposals by King (1993/1995, 1994c) among others, who argues that subjects appear preverbally in Russian by virtue of focus or topic movement, rather than out of considerations of case, as they do in English. In earlier GB terms one might regard this distinction in terms of some kind of “post-syntactic” Phonetic Form (PF) movement instead of syntactic movement, i.e., movement which takes place by S-structure. Only syntactic movement would be relevant for Logical Form (LF), hence Russian subjects would be expected to exhibit VP-internal scope effects. The insight is that certain movements “reconstruct”—are undone so that they do not count for LF—whereas others do not. In general, only movement to A´-positions reconstructs; A-movement does not. We thus conclude, in keeping with King’s account of Russian phrase structure, that SVO order in Russian is derived through A´-movement of the subject. Consequently, the A-movement of subjects indicated in (12), which was driven by the need to check case features, is presumably like that of objects in not taking place until LF.

2.1.1. Interaction of the Negation Operator with Other Operators

Another compelling reason to posit a NO is that it interacts with other operators in familiar ways. For example, NO counts as a “typical potential” A´-governor for the purposes of Rizzi’s (1990) Relativized Minimality (RM). As such, NO blocks antecedent government in the examples in (16), although the counterpart affirmative questions in (17) are perfectly acceptable with long construal:
(16) a. *Why didn’t you say that John arrived late?
b. *What didn’t you say that John weighs?
c. *What credence didn’t you say that Jill gave to your remarks?

(17) a. Why did you say that John arrived late?
b. What did you say that John weighs?
c. What credence did you say that Jill gave to your remarks?

Consider also the colloquial Russian examples in (18), where the presence of *ne* intervening between Gde and the embedded clause extraction in (18a) site leads to a RM violation:

(18) a. Gde vy skazali, čto on ne potratil svoi den’gi?
   where you said that he NEG lost REFL money
   *’Where did you say that he didn’t lose his money?’
   b. Gde vy skazali, čto on potratil svoi den’gi?
   where you said that he lost REFL money
   ‘Where did you say that he lost his money?’

To be more precise, it is not actually the *ne* itself that interferes with antecedent-government, but rather the NO in [Spec, NegP] position. The relevance of this point will become clear when we examine the properties of pleonastic negation.

2.1.2. NegP and Partitive Expressions

Although there is a rapidly increasing body of literature exploring the ramifications of treating negation as a functional projection with a negation operator in its specifier, the bulk of this literature deals with negation in Romance and, to a far lesser extent, Germanic languages. We would therefore like to draw attention to a new argument for the existence of NegP based on Russian data.

Partitive expressions contain a null quantifier which assigns gen to the following nominal material, as in (19).

(19) QP
   Q
   e
   NP

As a phonologically empty expression, however, Q can only occur in the scope of some other element that licenses the empty Q and, furthermore, identifies it so that it can be appropriately interpreted. In the normal
situation, partitive complements therefore only occur after certain verbs. Following standard assumptions, Franks and Dziwirek (1993) implement this by saying that a verb which allows a partitive complement must have a feature [+Qu] to identify the phonologically null quantifier.

Thus, the verb vytip ‘to drink up’ allows a partitive complement, but s“est ‘to eat up’ does not. Compare (20a) with (20b), cited by Klenin (1978), who based her discussion on observations in Padučeva 1974:

(20) a. On vyipil čaj/čaju.
    he drank tea_{ACC/PART}  
     ‘He drank the tea/some tea.’

b. On s”el sup/*supu.\(^{11}\)
    he ate soup_{ACC/*PART}  
     ‘He ate the soup.’

The forms čaju and supu must be analyzed as partitive, since they bear the special -u ending that distinguishes the Russian partitive from the regular genitive form.\(^{12}\) Since the partitive form čaju is acceptable in (20a) but the partitive form supu is unaccepta ble in (20b), we conclude that vyipil ‘drank’, but not s”el ‘ate’, licenses the null Q of the partitive phrases. In formal terms, vyipit ‘drinks’ bears the feature [+Qu] whereas s”est ‘does not.

As Klenin notes, however, if the imperfective pit ‘to drink’ is used instead of the perfective vyipit’, then the partitive complement is blocked, as shown in (21):

(21) On pil čaj/*čaju.
    he drank tea_{ACC/*PART}  
     ‘He drank the tea.’

---

9 Leonard Babby (pc) suggests that sentences of the type ljudej sobralos ‘constitute a couterexample to this claim, under the assumptions that ljudej is both partitive and a subject. We agree that such “large quantity” nominals are technically partitive and should be ascribed the same structure in (20); cf. Franks 1986, 1995 for discussion. However, following Pesetsky (1982) and others, we claim that the verbs with which they (and other putative subject partitives) occur are unaccusative, so that such partitive phrases are really underlying direct objects.

10 This kind of approach is developed in some detail in Neidle 1988, to which the reader is referred for discussion. See also Pesetsky 1982 and Fowler 1987, where similar claims are made.

11 At least one speaker we consulted found the partitive acceptable with this verb. We are not troubled by this possibility, since the fact that admissibility of the partitive is lexically driven admits variation.

12 The distribution of this ending is highly restricted; Fowler (1987: 416) counts 392 Russian words with a distinct partitive form. In general, the regular genitive form can always be used in partitive contexts, even when an -u partitive exists.
We conclude that even though this particular verb does bear the feature [+Qu], that feature must itself be activated by being in the scope of perfective aspect. To formalize this idea, we again make use of the phrase structure in (12), with the VP embedded in an AspP; a [+Qu] V₀ must then be minimally c-commanded by a [+Pf] Asp₀.

Curiously, as Klenin (1978: 175) goes on to observe, the aspectual effect illustrated in (21) is mitigated by negation, as shown in (22):

(22) On ne pil čaj/čaja/čaju.
    he NEG drank tea_{ACC/GEN/PART}

‘He didn’t drink the tea/any tea.’

We take this to mean that the negation morpheme ne (or more precisely the NO associated with it), just like perfective aspect, is also able to activate the [+Qu] feature on the verb pil. In more general terms, the [+Qu] which identifies the null Q of the partitive phrase must be in the scope of some kind of quantificational operator, and both negation and perfective aspect can serve this purpose.¹³ In further support of our claim that the interaction of negation and partitivity calls for a NO, consider also the fact that the Yes/No interrogative operator (IO) induces the same effect.

(23) Pil li on čaj/čaja/čaju.
    drank Q he tea_{ACC/GEN/PART}

‘Did he drink the tea/any tea?’

In (23) the partitive čaju is once again acceptable, despite the fact that the verb is imperfective. The NO of (22) is thus on a par with the IO required for the Yes/No question in (23).

¹³ In light of these facts, note now that even if (20b) is negated the partitive remains inadmissible, regardless of aspect:

(i) On ne s’el sup/supa/*sopu.
    he NEG ate soup_{ACC/GEN/PART}

‘He didn’t eat the soup.’

Only the regular genitive supa, and not the -u partitive, is possible in (i). This shows that negation does not actually license the empty Q of a partitive itself, although it can activate the [+Qu] feature of a verb in its scope. The reason we suppose why negation cannot license Q is that it is not sufficiently local—there is an intervening VP projection which makes V the minimally higher head. Hence, V, and only V, can license the empty Q of the partitive, presumably by being [+Qu].
2.2. The Status of *ne*

We argue that the NO is in [Spec, NegP] and that *ne* occupies the head position. One reason for this, as we shall see when pleonastic negation is discussed, is that the presence of *ne* does not necessarily imply the presence of NO, so *ne* cannot itself be the operator. A somewhat more mundane reason to regard *ne* as the head of NegP is that it is clearly an X₀ element. In Russian, sentential *ne* always appears immediately before the highest verbal head. We therefore make the natural assumption that this V₀ raises to adjoin to the right of *ne*, which is forced by the fact that *ne* is a bound morpheme and has proclitic status.

Although we are not aware of any controversy over the head status of *ne*, the issue of its locus has been the subject of some recent debate. King (1994b) argues for a structure in which *ne* is base-generated adjoined to I, as in (24), whereas Bailyn (1995) adopts a stance similar to our own.

(24) King’s Negation Structure:

```
    I
   Neg
    I
   Tns
```

King adopts the structure in (24) because negation is inseparable from the finite verb and because, according to her, a NegP structure should allow *ne* to have scope over coordinated finite VPs, but it does not. Some of her data are presented in (25):

(25) a. Ja *ne* budu [pisat’ pis’ma] i [čitat’ knigi/knig].
    I NEG will write<sub>INF</sub> letters and read<sub>INF</sub> books<sub>ACC/GEN</sub>
    ‘I will not write letters and (will not) read books.’

b. Ja *ne* [pisala pis’ma] i [čitala knigi/*knig].
    I NEG wrote letters and read books<sub>ACC/GEN</sub>
    ‘I did not write letters and did (*not) read books.’

Negation only has scope over both conjuncts in (25a). Similarly, GN can occur in the second conjunct of (25a) only.

There are, however, a variety of reasons why we believe King’s argumentation is fallacious, some of which are treated in Bailyn 1995. The problems relate both to the inadequacy of King’s base-generated adjunction structure and to the viability of the NegP approach. For one thing, King’s structure is too restrictive, in that, depending on one’s definition of c-command, negation adjoined to I should not have scope over anything but the verbal element in I. In point of fact, the distribution of NPIs led us
to conclude that *ne has scope not only over \( V^0 \) and its complement, but also over all arguments—crucially including the subject—as well as all adjuncts in the sentence.\(^{14}\)

In explaining how a NegP analysis such as in (12) might accommodate the curious paradigm in (25) we follow Bailyn (1995) in arguing that there are independent problems with getting *ne + \( V^0 \) to have scope over multiple VPs. These problems have to do with the proclitic status of *ne, which is evident from its accentual properties, and this is also what blocks even the coordination of I elements, as in (26), which under King’s analysis is expected to be acceptable:

\begin{equation}
(26) \quad \text{Ja(nikogda) ne [byl i budu] v ètom položenii.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation*}
\text{I never NEG was and will be in this situation}
\end{equation*}

\begin{equation*}
\text{‘I wasn’t (ever) and will (*not) be in this situation.’}
\end{equation*}

Consequently, a more straightforward account of (25b), as Bailyn observes, is simply that it is impossible to derive without violating Ross’s Coordinate Structure Constraint. The proclitic *ne needs to be supported, but the Coordinate Structure Constraint prevents raising just čitala up to Neg\(^0\). We thus concur with Bailyn that the problem here “is not one of scope but rather of support for the clitic *ne”.

### 2.3. The Genitive of Negation

We now turn to the issue of how GN is assigned and the relationship between GN and NegP. Following much recent work, we adopt the idea that cases are checked in the specifier positions of functional categories, and extend this mechanism to GN as well. This version of case checking thus reduces to an instance of Spec-Head agreement. Checking gen in [Spec, NegP] might work, except that we require this to be an A’-position dedicated to the NO. We therefore claim that GN is checked in whichever functional projection of the verb checks object case. Since there is a close selectional relationship between Neg\(^0\) and AspP, and because we assume (following e.g., Borer and Yadroff) acc is checked in [Spec, AspP], we propose that GN also be checked in the Spec of the AspP complement of Neg\(^0\). As indicated in (12), the object raises to [Spec, AspP] and—when AspP is a complement to *ne—this position becomes associated with gen.\(^{15}\)

\(^{14}\) In a footnote, King (1994b: 293, fn 12) essentially admits that the NPI evidence would appear to call for an analysis in which “all of the arguments are within the scope of negation at D-structure and licensed there”, but goes on to maintain that “evidence from the genitive of negation suggests that the subject is not within the scope of negation”.

\(^{15}\) This raising could be in the syntax rather than LF, since either way the object remains within the c-command domain of the NO. Word order facts do not make this easy to resolve, and even suggest the possibility that raising to [Spec, AspP] might be syntactic only for pronouns.
2.3.1. Genitive of Negation at a Distance

Although the precise mechanism whereby GN is assigned is somewhat peripheral to our analysis of negation, a closer examination of some of the complexities involved bears some interesting and provocative results. Consider first of all the fact that the target of GN may be considerably more embedded than the *ne* that induces it. In rough terms, GN can extend into certain infinitival complements, provided there is no intervening complementizer. Some examples of this, drawn from Mustajoki and Heino 1991, are offered in (27):

(27) a. STRUCTURE: Subj **ne** V [TP PRO infin GN]
   (i) Vovka **ne** ljubil čitat’ **knig**.
       Vovka NEG liked to read books
       ‘Vovka didn’t like to read books.’
   (ii) ... a [**takix uslovi**] igry Danilov prinjat’
        and [such conditions] game Danilov to accept
       ‘...and Danilov didn’t wish to accept such conditions on the
        game.’
   (iii) Šura **ne** xočet davat’ **soglasija**.
        Shura NEG wants to give consent
        ‘Shura doesn’t want to give her consent.’

b. STRUCTURE: *Subj **ne** V [CP Comp [TP PRO infin GN]]
   *Ja**ne** pomnju, kak pisat’ **stixov**.
   I NEG remember how to write poems
   ‘I don’t remember how to write poems.’

c. STRUCTURE: *Subj **ne** V [CP Comp [TP finite-subjunctive GN]]
   *Ja**ne** xoču, čtoby ty pisala **stixov**.
   I NEG want that you wrote poems
   ‘I don’t want you to write poems.’

d. STRUCTURE: *Subj **ne** V [CP Comp [TP finite-indicative GN]]
   *Ja**ne** skazal, čto ty pišeš’ **stixov**.
   I NEG said that you write poems
   ‘I didn’t say that you write poems.’

According to Mustajoki and Heino’s data, when there is an intervening (indirect or even direct) object in structure (27a), GN may still be possible, although its acceptability can be greatly diminished by various factors. One reasonably felicitous example is given in (28):
(28) Ja ne xoču zastavljat’ ego [PRO rešat’ takix zadac]  
   I NEG want to force him to solve [such problems]_{GEN}  
‘I don’t want to force him to solve such problems.’

This example is based on one in Mustajoki 1985, although he employed the perfective infinitive rešit’, which our consultants replaced with the imperfective rešat’. Given this phenomenon, we are now faced with a puzzle: how can this apparently non-local GN be reconciled with our idea that GN depends on a selectional relationship between ne and AspP?

In order for this state of affairs to be accommodated, GN must be able to occur at some syntactic distance but still be reducible to a purely local relationship. Under our assumption that GN is checked in [Spec, AspP], one possibility is that the object raises to the [Spec, AspP] complement to ne, and that this raising can take place out of a bare TP but not out of a CP. CP would presumably be a barrier (by inheritance from TP) and so an ECP violation at LF would ensue. An alternative account, which we explore here, is one in which the [Spec, AspP] of the embedded clause is empowered by the matrix negation to check gen. Assuming the embedded clause to be aspectually dependent on the main clause, we propose that its AspP is coindexed with that of the main clause. One of the properties the higher AspP can therefore “transmit” to the lower one is that of checking GN. Whether or not this transmission of GN takes place is highly complex and somewhat idiosyncratic, as the copious statistical data in Mustajoki 1985 and Mustajoki and Heino 1991 amply demonstrate.

Assuming an aspectual chain to be implicated in putatively long-distance GN, it must be determined whether each [Spec, AspP] in the chain has the independent capacity to check GN or only one instance of GN is allowed per Neg^0 element. We have uncovered two types of apparent multiple GN, which at first indicate that one Neg^0 element can license two instances of GN. The first involves an infinitival clause complement to a NP which itself displays GN, as in the two examples in (29) cited by Mustajoki (1985: 65) and Mustajoki and Heino (1991: 27), respectively.

---

16 An anonymous reviewer draws our attention to a third possible monoclausal type, based on the “adjunct genitive” construction discussed in §5.2 below. We will claim, following Franks and Dziwirek 1993, that the adjunct genitive in (i) is in fact a partitive whose empty Q is licensed by the NO, rather than a second instance of GN from a single Neg^0 element.

(i) On ne smotrel televizora ni minuty  
   he NEG watched television_{GEN} not minute_{GEN}  
   ‘He didn’t even watch television for a minute.’
(29) a. Ves’ god ja dopisyvala, razbirala i otbirala, sejčas all year I wrote sorted and took away now vse končeno, a net kuražu novogo načinat’… all finished but NEG is courage\textsubscript{GEN} new\textsubscript{GEN} to begin ‘I spent all year finishing writing, sorting out and taking away; now everything’s finished, but there’s no courage to start something new.’
b. Oni i uznават’ drug o druge ni slovečka ne They even to find out each about other not word\textsubscript{GEN} NEG imeli prava. had right\textsubscript{GEN} ‘They didn’t have the right to find out a word about each other.’

Here it looks as though GN occurs in the embedded clause in addition to the matrix clause. The second type of apparent multiple GN is observable in object control constructions, as in (30), which is a variant of (28) with the matrix direct object ego replaced by an unambiguously gen expression.

(30) Ja ne zastavljuj ni odnoj studentki [PRO rešat’ takix I NEG force not [one student]\textsubscript{GEN} to solve [such zadač] problems]\textsubscript{GEN} ‘I don’t force a single student to solve such problems.’

While it is true that to accommodate this multiple GN phenomenon would technically require the availability of two distinct [Spec, AspP] positions, which would in turn indicate that our exploitation of AspP is on the right track, we believe that the conclusion that one Neg\textsuperscript{0} head can license multiple instances of GN is unwarranted. First, some speakers we consulted found example (29a) archaic and were dubious about any connection between genitive novogo and existential negation, going so far as to ascribe affirmative est’ kuraž novogo načinat’ equal status to (29a). On the other hand, (29b) and (30) do truly exhibit two distinct instances of GN. However, aside from the otherwise problematic fact that ni slovečka is idiomatic, both involve the negative intensifier ni, which might be the conditioning factor for the extra instance of GN.\textsuperscript{17} And indeed, substitution of an alternative phrase without ni was deemed unacceptable:

\textsuperscript{17} Note that in their study of factors influencing the choice of the direct object of a negated verb, Mustajoki and Heino (1991) deem the ni-adjectives and the particle ni ‘strong factors’ demanding the genitive case. These are factors whose influence is so strong that other factors are negligible in their presence. In their corpus, 125 examples of direct objects of negated verbs contain a ni-adjective, and all occur in the gen. For the particle ni, there were 24 examples, and all occurred with gen as well.
The presence of *ni on at least one of the genitive-marked objects is therefore crucial in sanctioning multiple GN; thus, the simple addition of an intensifying *nikakix before *novostej in (31) is enough to make the sentence acceptable.18

We believe that a solution to this puzzle should fall out from a proper understanding of the syntax of *ni. This element is an NPI, which means that it must occur in the scope of negation. We can formalize this relationship by requiring *ni to be c-commanded by a NO in the Spec of some reasonably local dominating NegP, as in our structure (12). Now the question is how does *ni, which we take to in some sense still instantiate its etymological decomposition *ne + *i, give rise to GN? The answer to this problem takes advantage of the mechanism we have already adopted, namely that GN is checked in the Spec of an AspP. The structure is given on the following page in (33), which is the LF representation of (30). We propose that *ni, which is presumably itself a head, raises from the VP which contains it to adjoin to the Asp0 head that takes that VP as its complement. Central to this account of GN is the observation that it is precisely because *ni adjoins to Asp0 that [Spec, AspP]
is able to check for gen rather than acc case. The reason is that by moving \(ni\) to \(\text{Asp}^0\) it literally becomes part of the head of AspP, so that its features can be reflected in the Spec-Head agreement process that is ultimately responsible for checking GN on the direct object.

(33) LF Representation of (30):

2.3.2. Genitive of Negation and the Role of AspP

This account of the role of \(ni\) in inducing GN accommodates the putative multiple GN phenomenon, for which any analysis of GN must be able to account. However, most importantly it leads to new insights about how Neg\(^0\) itself causes [Spec, AspP] to check gen. We have suggested that \(ni\) triggers GN just like \(ne\) does, and argued for a method of realizing this. The question now is how to assimilate regular negation to this paradigm. Optimally, we would like \(ne\) to cause [Spec, AspP] to check gen in exactly the same way as \(ni\) does; the problem is that \(ne\) is higher than \(\text{Asp}^0\) rather than lower than it; recall the structure in (12). What is crucial, however, is that \(\text{Asp}^0\) and \(ne\) in some way amalgamate. For \(ni\) this happens when \(ni\) raises to \(\text{Asp}^0\). For \(ne\), on the other hand, it must happen when \(\text{Asp}^0\) raises to \(ne\). Now why should this raising take place? The answer is simply that

---

19 Whether \(ni\) adjoins to Asp or substitutes for it is not entirely clear, given that \(ni\)-raising applies at LF whereas Asp vacates this position in the syntax, picked up by V on its way up to T. For the purposes of discussion we shall put the derivational metaphor aside and assume \(ni\) incorporates into Asp.
the verb moves up the tree through each head position, picking up elements like Asp\(^0\) and Neg\(^0\) on its way up to T\(^0\) or C\(^0\) in Yes/No li-questions, as will be discussed in §4.2. One necessary consequence of this movement is that Asp\(^0\) incorporates into Neg\(^0\), since Neg\(^0\) is the immediately higher head. By the Government Transparency Corollary (GTC) of Baker (1988), this incorporation means that Neg\(^0\) now governs whatever Asp\(^0\) did. We therefore propose that the GTC provides a mechanism for the trace of Asp\(^0\), having incorporated in Neg\(^0\), to check gen through Spec-Head agreement. The result, we feel, is a particularly elegant system for effecting GN, since it unifies ne and ni into a single mechanism and explains the close selectional relationship between Neg\(^0\) and AspP.

Following Lasnik 1995 and other recent work, we see no reason to limit the Spec-Head agreement mechanism in general to the so-called “structural” cases, but rather to unify contexts of case-licensing if possible. Note that such an unmotivated limitation would exclude GN, which must by Chomsky’s criteria be inherent rather than structural. The reason GN is inherent is that it cannot participate in Exceptional Case Marking (ECM), which in Russian is limited to small clause complements. This is demonstrated by the unacceptability of (34) with gen; cf. Timberlake 1975:

\[(34)\] Ja ne sčitaju [russkij jazyk/ *russkogo jazyka
I NEG consider Russian language\(_{ACC}\)/ *Russian language\(_{GEN}\)
trudnym].
difficult
‘I do not consider the Russian language difficult.’

Our claim is thus that Neg\(^0\) checks gen on the object NP through Spec-Head agreement with [Spec, AspP], mediated by the Asp\(^0\) head which has incorporated into it.

In this section we considered examples with led us to conclude that it is always the immediately superior AspP which checks an object’s GN in its specifier. For sentential negation Baker’s GTC ensures that once the head of AspP has incorporated into the higher head of NegP, the former position is endowed with the features of Neg\(^0\) and thus can check GN in its specifier position. This possibility depends on a selectional relationship between the head of NegP and its complement AspP, and stems from the requirement that V\(^0\) raise at S-structure to pick up Asp\(^0\), Neg\(^0\), and T\(^0\). Further examples demonstrated that the AspP may also transmit the GN property to an AspP which is aspectually dependent on it, although the evidence seems to indicate a limit of one GN-assignment per independent negated AspP. We explained those examples that appear to contain multiple instances of GN by showing how the negative features of the
head of NegP *ne* and the NPI *ni*, both licensed by a single NO, can enter into a Spec-Head relation with the specifier position of AspP in order to check GN.

### 3. Canonical Pleonastic Negation

The term *pleonastic* has been used in the literature to refer to expletive pronouns such as *it* and *there* in (35).

(35) a. **It** surprised Ted that the car had been stolen.  
    b. **There** arose a great commotion in the courtyard.

Haegeman (1994) accordingly defines an expletive as an element in an NP position that is not an argument and to which no theta-role is assigned. More broadly construed, however, a pleonastic element is any element which serves no interpretive purpose (i.e., is vacuous at LF), but is required purely in order to satisfy a particular grammar’s idiosyncratic morphosyntactic requirements. Overt *it* and *there* in (35) are required because principles of UG force subject position and English does not countenance a “little pro” silent counterpart. Other credible examples of English pleonastic elements are the auxiliary *do*, which supports stranded tense and agreement morphology in negated sentences (36a) and interrogatives (36b), the preposition *of*, which case-marks prepositionless NP complements of nouns (36c) and adjectives (36d), and the complementizing preposition *for*, which case-marks otherwise caseless subjects of infinitives (36e).

(36) a. **He does** not like apples.  
    b. **Does** he work at the factory?  
    c. Your description **of** the incident amazed us all.  
    d. The mayor was justly proud **of** her achievements.  
    e. **For** such a person to have the last word would be a travesty.

The term “pleonastic” thus picks out those elements which are syntactically present, but are semantically null. Although use of this term has traditionally been limited to phonologically overt elements, there is no reason why it should not extend to null pleonastics as well. There is in fact a sizable GB literature on phonologically null pleonastics, although this essentially means null expletive subjects.\(^{20}\) What seems to us to conceptually unify all pleonastic elements is that they occur to circumvent some morphosyntactically illegal expression and thereby save a representation that would otherwise be ill-formed.

\(^{20}\) One other enticing possibility is that of null prepositions, as discussed in Fowler and Yadroff (1993: 270–76).
Traditional grammar also characterizes negation that is phonologically overt but lacks negative semantic content or force as “pleonastic”. This phenomenon is particularly familiar from Romance linguistics, but it also exists in the Slavic languages. Instances of pleonastic negation in Russian are most prevalent in fixed lexical expressions, although, as we shall show, they occur in some rather more exotic and obscure syntactic contexts as well. In (37) and (38) we give some examples of this type of “canonical” pleonastic negation in Russian.

(37) On čut’ ne uronil stakan.
    he barely NEG dropped glass
    ‘He almost dropped the glass.’

Mustajoki and Heino (1991: 24) point out that: “… it is… reasonable to treat čut’ ne and its variants as examples of positive meaning in spite of the formal presence of negation. Indeed, it would appear that clauses of this type are not perceived as being properly negative at all: the particle ne evidently ‘loses its independence’ in these constructions, becoming part of a compound particle with a meaning of its own.”

(38) Ja podeždu, pok a ty ne prideš’.
    I will wait while you NEG arrive
    ‘I’ll wait until you arrive.’

Mustajoki and Heino (1991: 36) refer to pok a ne as “another construction which can be said to have positive meaning in spite of its negative form”.

Besides these two lexicalized examples, certain constructions with the modal particle by in Russian regularly exhibit pleonastic negation. These are kak by and its synonym čtoby after verbs of fearing and worrying (bojat’šja ‘to be afraid of’, (o)bespokoit’šja ‘to worry’, opasat’šja ‘to fear’, (is)pugat’šja ‘to be frightened of’, etc.) or in main clauses expressing fear or worry, as in (39) and (40).

(39) Ja bojus’, kak by on ne opozdal!
    I fear how MOD he NEG was late
    ‘I’m afraid he’ll be late!’

(40) Kak by rebenok ne prostudilsja.
    how MOD child NEG catch cold
    ‘What if the child catches a cold!’

3.1. Pleonastic Negation Has No Negation Operator
Structurally, canonical pleonastic negation appears to consist of a NegP with either an empty or vacuous specifier position. The head position is filled with *ne, which is merely the morphosyntactic marker of a NegP, but there is no NO, the bearer of the semantics, to give the sentence negative force. This conclusion is supported by the data in (41–43), which show that pleonastic negation cannot license *ni-NPIs, but does allow *nibud’-NPIs and to-PPIs, which crucially are disallowed in the scope of true clausemate negation.

(41) Ja podoždu, poka kto-nibud’/*nikto ne pridet.
I will wait while who-any/*no-who NEG will arrive
‘I will wait until someone comes.’

(42) —Čto slučilos’? — Ivan čut’ ne uronil kakuju-to/
what happened Ivan barely NEG dropped which-some/
*nikakuju butylku.
no-which bottle
‘“What happened?” “Ivan almost dropped some bottle.”’

(43) Ja bojus’, kak by kto-nibud’/*nikto ne prišel.21
I fear how MOD who-any/*no-who NEG came
‘I’m afraid someone will come.’

This type of lexical pleonastic negation is not limited to Russian, and appears to be a widespread syntactic phenomenon. The same kind of pleonastic reading as in Russian (37) and (38) is found for example in French, where *ne expletif appears without the support of a so-called “negative auxiliary” such as *pas. This absence of *pas in French pleonastic negation comports with the generally accepted claim that *pas is the overt negative operator in [Spec, NegP], while *ne is its head. Recall that we have defined pleonastic negation as a NegP that necessarily lacks a NO, hence only the Neg⁰ head element is expected in order to project the NegP.22 Compare pleonastic (44a) with truly negative (44b):

21 An indicative perfective future čto clause, as in (i) below, must be used to negate the embedded clause:

(i) Ja bojus’, čto nikto ne pridet.
I fear that no-who NEG will come
‘I’m afraid that no one will come.’

22 An alternative analysis based on Ouhalla (1990), who claims that the negative head element in French negates the operator in the [Spec, NegP] position through Spec-Head agreement, would be that pleonastic negation entails a head element that is morphologically negative, but has no semantic negation features to identify the operator
(44) a. Je crains que l’ennemi ne vienne.  
I fear that the enemy **NEG** come\textsubscript{SUBJ} 
‘I fear that the enemy will come.’

(44) b. Je crains que l’allié ne vienne **pas**.  
I fear that the ally **NEG** come\textsubscript{SUBJ} **NO** 
‘I fear that the ally won’t come.’

A survey of the environments for *ne expletif* found in Grevisse 1988 reveals that pleonastic negation occurs, sometimes optionally (unlike Russian *čut’ ne* and *poka ne*), in specific lexical constructions, i.e., after expressions of fear, verbs such as *empêcher que* ‘to hinder’, certain time expressions, coordinate conjunctions taking subjunctive complements, comparatives expressing inequality, etc.\textsuperscript{23} Some examples are given in (45–47).

(45) Tout cela n’empêche pas que je (n’) aie faim...  
All this **NEG** hinder **NO** that I **NEG** have\textsubscript{SUBJ} hunger 
‘All this doesn’t keep me from being hungry.’

(46) Il n’est pas plus grand que vous (n’) êtes.  
he **NEG** is **NO** more **big** than you **NEG** are 
‘He’s not taller than you are.’

(47) Avant que (ne) chante le coq...  
Before that **NEG** sings the crow 
‘Before the cock crows...’

Contrast this situation with that of true negation, which in colloquial French regularly omits the head element *ne* while retaining the *pas* operator. Some typical examples are given in (48) and (49).

(48) C’est **pas** rigolo.  
this is **NO** funny 
‘That isn’t funny.’

(49) J’ai **pas** pu trouver Jean-Paul.

in [Spec, NegP]. Note, however, that Ouhalla’s analysis will not account for the French examples of true negation in (48) and (49).

\textsuperscript{23} Not all contexts listed under *Ne expletif* in Grevisse (1988: 1492–97) equate to true pleonastic negation, i.e., negation not licensed by a **NO**. In some of his examples, *ne expletif* seems to be licensed almost in the same way as an NPI, such as *personne*, ‘no one, anyone’, *aucun* ‘no kind, any kind’, *jamais* ‘never, ever’ would be licensed, i.e., by superordinate negation or Yes/No questions.
I have NO can to find Jean-Paul

'I couldn’t find Jean-Paul.'

This array of facts supports our characterization of pleonastic negation as a NegP which displays the phonological trappings of its Neg\(^0\) head but lacks the semantic content of its expected operator Spec.

3.2. Genitive of Negation is Independent of the Negation Operator

Up to now we have not challenged the traditional assumption that sentential negation is necessary to license both GN and NPIs, despite the distributional differences between them. Recall that the distribution of GN is more restricted than that of NPIs, since sentential negation licenses NPIs in all positions, while licensing of GN by sentential negation is limited to non-oblique verbal complements. Examples (8) and (9), repeated here as (50) and (51), showed the relevant contrast between GN and NPIs.

(50) a. On ne pišet pisem.
    He NEG writes letters\(_{GEN}\)
    'He doesn’t write letters.'

    b. *Studentov ne čitalo Vojnu i mir.
    students\(_{GEN}\) NEG read War and Peace
    'The students didn’t read War and Peace.'

(51) a. On ne pišet ničego.
    He NEG writes no-what
    'He doesn’t write anything.'

    b. Nikto ne čital Vojnu i mir.
    no-who\(_{NOM}\) NEG read War and Peace
    'No one read War and Peace.'

However, examples (41–43) above clearly demonstrate that in pleonastic contexts, i.e., those with morphological negation but no NO in [Spec, NegP], ni-NPIs (which must be licensed by clausemate negation) are disallowed, whereas nibud’-NPIs and to-PPIs (which are disallowed in the scope of true clausemate negation) are perfectly fine. We thus conclude that pleonastic negation cannot license ni-NPIs.

Given these facts, we might expect pleonastic negation not to be able to license GN either. Strikingly, however, examples (52–53) reveal that GN is actually compatible with pleonastic negation, despite the lack of a NO evidenced by the unacceptability of ni-NPIs.

(52)...poka ne poluču vašego/kakogo-nibud’/*/nikakogo otveta...
...until NEG receive your/any-which/no-which\(_{GEN}\) answer
‘...until I receive your/some/*no answer’

(53) Ja bojus’, kak by kto-nibud’/ *nikto ne narušil
I fear how MOD any-who/ *no-who NEG ruin
èksperimenta.
experiment_{GEN}
‘I’m afraid someone might ruin the experiment.’
This fact is quite unsettling, since all previous analyses of GN have linked its optional occurrence to whether or not the object NP occurs in the scope of negation. These data, however, demonstrate that GN occurs even when there is no NO, hence no negative force, and hence no true scope of negation. GN is thus completely divorced from the presence of a NO. GN simply appears to require a dominating NegP, which in Russian always has a filled head position, and universally does so when the negation is pleonastic. NegP is a necessary and ceteris paribus sufficient condition for the checking of GN; whether or not that NegP actually contains a NO, surprisingly enough, turns out to be immaterial.

4. Forced Pleonastic Negation

In this section we comment on a previously unobserved syntactic phenomenon of Russian, which we shall refer to as “forced pleonastic negation”. We propose that certain independently motivated grammatical principles, such as Rizzi’s (1990) Relativized Minimality, conspire to prevent negation from having negative force in specific syntactic environments, namely in Russian Yes/No questions with the interrogative particle li. In addition we will discuss other environments where this type of non-canonical pleonastic negation can occur optionally.

4.1. Types of Russian Yes/No Questions

Before turning to our analysis of the interaction of pleonastic negation and li-interrogatives, we discuss the general semantic classification of Yes/No questions. For each category, we note whether or not the negated variant of that category carries negative implicature and whether or not it allows the interrogative particle li. We will explore the relevance of the connection between negative implicature and the particle li in the next section.

As modified from Restan 1969, Russian Yes/No questions fall into five main categories, which we will treat individually in the next five subsections devoted to the following types of questions: purely informative Yes/No questions; rhetorical questions; dubious questions; presumptive questions; and emotionally-charged questions.

4.1.1. Purely Informative Yes/No Questions (čisto-informativnye voprosy)

These questions are Yes/No questions whose sole purpose is to obtain information. Unlike the remaining categories, no other pragmatic strategies play a role in these types of questions. In these questions the presence of formal negation does not carry negative implicature. Negation is neutralized. The particle li is allowed and rather frequently occurs in these types of questions, as in (54) and (55).
(54) (Ne) uznal li ty čego-nibud’ interesnogo v Peterburge?
‘Did you find anything interesting out in Petersburg, by the way?’

(55) Gde Borja? Ty (ne) videl Borju?
‘Where’s Borja? Have you seen Borja?’

4.1.2. Rhetorical Questions (*ritorichecke voprosy*)

Rhetorical questions do not elicit information, but rather convey an opinion to the listener, or attempt to convince the listener of something. The implication of a rhetorical question is contrary to its literal denotation. In these types of questions the speaker uses negation as a rhetorical conversational strategy. In other words, formal negation in rhetorical questions carries positive implicature, just as the lack of formal negation can carry negative implicature. Like informative Yes/No questions, negated rhetorical questions have no negative force, and the interrogative particle *li* is allowed.

(56) Nu, ne govoril li ja tebe?
‘Well, didn’t I tell you?!’

(57) Ljubil li kto tebja, kak ja?
‘Did anyone love you like I did?!’

(58) Dlja takoj li grjazi vveril ja vam 15-letnego mal’čika?
‘Is it for such filth that I entrusted a 15-year old boy to you?!’

4.1.3. Dubious Questions (*dubitativnye voprosy*)

Like formal negation in informative Yes/No questions and rhetorical questions, formal negation in dubious questions carries positive implicature. The speaker is unsure of the answer to the question being posed, but is assuming that it is the opposite of what is being said. In these questions, the particle *li* occurs frequently.
(59) Ne vzyvaet li tol`ko pobeda kadetov kakix-nibud` 
NEG cause Q only victory cadets which-any
besporjadkov?
disturbances
‘Could it be that the cadet victory is causing some disturbances?’

(60) Poˇcemu tak poluˇciloˇsˇ? Ne dopustil li kto-nibud´ oˇsibki?
why so turned-out NEG allow Q who-any mistake
‘Why did it turn out like that? Did someone make a mistake?’

(61) Ty ne vykinula ´cego-nibud´ bezrassudnogo?
you NEG tossed-out what-any imprudent
‘You didn’t toss out anything without thinking, did you?’

4.1.4. Presumptive Questions (prezumptivnye voprosy)

In these types of questions the speaker is expecting a negative or positive answer. If the speaker is expecting a negative answer, then the question is negated and formal negation does carry negative implicature. In these types of questions the interrogative particle li is disallowed.

(62) Vy verno ne zdeˇsˇnie?
you probably NEG local
‘You’re not from around here, right?’
[explicitly presumptive because of verno]

(63) Da vy, stalo byt´, niˇcego ne zameˇcaete v sebe, ni 
so you it seems no-what NEG notice in self not
malejˇsˇego protivoreˇcija?
smallest contradiction
‘So, it seems, you notice nothing in yourself, not even the smallest contradiction?’
[explicitly presumptive because of stalo byt’]

(64) Gnediˇc ne poluˇcil moego pis´ma?
Gnediˇc NEG received my letter
‘Gnedich didn’t receive my letter?’
[implicitly presumptive]

The word order for presumptive Yes/No questions is typically Subject-ne-Verb and, as noted in Restan 1969, carries a specific intonation.
4.1.5. Questions as Emotionally-Charged Responses (èmocional’no-konstatirujuščij tip)

These questions express an emotional response. In these types of sentences, like the presumptive questions discussed in §4.1.4, formal negation carries negative implicature. The particle li is disallowed.

(65) Kak? Ty ee ne našel?
how you her NEG found
‘What, you didn’t find her?!’

(66) A vy, jurist, ne znaete ètogo?
and you lawyer NEG know this
‘And you, a lawyer, don’t know this?!’

The following table summarizes the classification of Russian Yes/No questions:

(67) Classification of Russian Yes/No Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Yes/No Question</th>
<th>Negative Implicature</th>
<th>Li Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. informative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. rhetorical</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. dubious</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. presumptive</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we shall show in the next section, the interaction of pleonastic negation with Yes/No interrogation is supported by the syntax and semantics of the Yes/No questions just described.

4.2. Li-Interrogatives

A striking, and to the best of our knowledge, previously undescribed property of li questions in Russian is that they display the same curious pattern as canonical pleonastic negation: NPIs are blocked, but GN is still allowed. This is illustrated in (68a), with the approximate structure in (68b); cf. also §4.1.1 and §4.1.3 above.

(68) a. Ne skazal li on *ničego/ čego-nibud’ lišnego?
NEG said Q he *no-what\textsubscript{GEN}/ what-any\textsubscript{GEN} extra\textsubscript{GEN}
‘Had he said too much?’
The negation in (68a) has in effect been rendered pleonastic by the interrogation. Since the pleonastic aspect of the negation is apparently induced by something connected to the Yes/No operator phrase, we refer to this phenomenon as "forced pleonastic negation". We argue that pleonastic negation is forced in (68a) because *ne* cannot be outside the scope of its licensing operator and still retain negative force. We propose that failure to raise NO to c-command *ne* would amount to vacuous quantification. Hence, if there were a NO in [Spec, NegP] in (68b), then this NO would have to raise to a position to c-command *ne*, presumably adjoined to CP. Crucially, however, the presence of the Yes/No OP in [Spec, CP] makes this movement illicit. The reason, we suggest, reduces to RM, in that the Yes/No OP in [Spec, CP] would serve as a closer A'-antecedent for the trace of the NO (again amounting to vacuous quantification). One alternative is thus for there to be no NO in [Spec, NegP], i.e., negation in (68a) is forced to be pleonastic. Another, as suggested by an anonymous reviewer, is that there is an operator in [Spec, NegP], but—because of the requirement that *ne* be in the scope of its licensing operator to retain negative force—it necessarily lacks negative force. Such an element cannot be interpreted, and is therefore logically vacuous. See §5.1 below, as well as Brown (in preparation), for further discussion of this alternative.

Notice now that this result obtains only when the *ne* head of NegP, by virtue of being proclitic on the verb, moves to C⁰ to host *li*. Yes/No questions may otherwise retain negative force (and license *ni*-NPIs), as shown in (69); cf. §4.1.4 and §4.1.5 above for similar examples:

---

24 The same reviewer notes that our analysis also provides an additional argument against raising of the verb to C⁰ in *wh*-questions, since such raising would incorrectly result in pleonastic negation.
(69) Vy ničego ne pisali, (čto li?)  
you no-what NEG wrote what Q  
“You didn’t write anything?”

Pleonastic negation is not imposed in (69), despite the fact that this is a Yes/No question, which is presumably conveyed by intonation; the optional čto li tag is technically irrelevant. Indeed, even the li in (68) may not be crucial, when movement of the [ne + V\(^0\)] complex to C\(^0\) takes place. Compare (70a), where movement has not taken place and the nibud’-pronoun is illicit, with (70c), where there is no interrogative particle li, but movement of the [ne + V\(^0\)] complex to C\(^0\) has taken place and the nibud’-pronoun is acceptable.

(70) a. Nikto/ *kto-nibud´ iz vas ne znaet, kak èto  
no-who/ *who-any of you NEG know how this  
delaetsja?!  
is done  
‘None of you know how this is done?’

b. Ne znaet li *nikto/ kto-nibud´ iz vas, kak èto  
NEG know Q *no-who/ who-any of you how this  
delaetsja?!  
is done  
‘Does any one of you know how this is done?’

c. Ne znaet *nikto/ kto-nibud´ iz vas, kak èto delaetsja? NEG know *no-who/ who-any of you how this is done  
‘Does any one of you know how this is done?’

This can be made to follow on our account as long as it can be maintained that there is a Yes/No operator in [Spec, CP] that induces a RM violation in (70c), despite the lack of an overt interrogative particle li, just as in (68) or (70b), where there is such a particle. Progovac (1994: 68–69) makes a similar observation about the distribution of NPIs in Serbo-Croatian:

(71) a. Zar *i(t)ko/ ni(t)ko od vas ne zna kako se  
Really *any-who/ no-who of you NEG know how REFL  
to radi?  
this does  
‘Can it be that none of you know how this is done?’

b. Da ne zna i(t)ko/ *ni(t)ko od vas kako se  
that NEG know any-who/ *no-who of you how REFL  
to radi?  
this does  
‘Does any one of you know how this is done?’
She explains the data in (71) as a difference in the location of the negation element *ne* vis-à-vis either the anaphoric NPI *nî*(*t*)ko or the anaphoric pronominal NPI *i*(*t*)ko. Our analysis, however, makes a more explicit claim about the interaction of potential operators. It seems to us that the Russian and Serbo-Croatian effects can only obtain if *ne* moves to *C*⁰ and there is another operator in [Spec, CP]; other reordering, such as scrambling, is clearly irrelevant, even if the NPI/GN position should accidentally happen to follow *ne*.²⁵

Of further interest is what happens when constituents other than the verb are questioned and moved into *C*⁰ (or [Spec, CP], depending on one’s analysis). We shall call this type of *li*-question “focal” interrogation. The following examples are drawn from King (1994a: 96–97), to whom the reader is referred for further discussion:

(72) a. [NP *Vodku*] *li* ona kupila?
    vodka<sub>FOC</sub> Q she bought
    ‘Did she buy *vodka*?’

b. [PP *V magazin*] *li* pošel Ivan?
    to store<sub>FOC</sub> Q went Ivan
    ‘Did Ivan go to the *store*?’

c. [AP *Doroguju*] *li* ona kupila knigu?
    expensive<sub>FOC</sub> Q she bought book
    ‘Did she buy an *expensive* book?’

What do we predict? Since only V-raising takes *ne* along to *C*⁰, the *ne* is not raised and we expect no imposition of pleonastic negation. Therefore, NPIs should in principle be felicitous in the context of focal interrogation. Even though examples of negated focal interrogation with NPIs are often very awkward stylistically, given the conflict between the fronted focus and the focusing of the NPI, the examples in (73) nonetheless seem relatively acceptable:

(73) a. V *ètom* *li* klube vy *ni* odnoj *devočki ne* znaete?
    In this Q club you not [one girl]<sub>GEN</sub> NEG know
    ‘Is it in this club that you don’t know a single girl?’

²⁵ For example, (i) is comparable to (71) in polarity properties despite the word-order differences:

(i) Zar *ne* zna *‘i*(*t*)ko/*nî*(*t*)ko od vas kako se to radi?
    really NEG know *any-who/ no-who of you how REFL this does
    ‘Can it be that none of you know how this is done?’
(73) b. V ètom li magazine vy ne našli nikakogo podarka
dlja Vali?
for Valja
‘Is it in this store that you didn’t find a gift for Valja?’
c. Maše li vy ničego ne kupili?
MashaDAT Q you no-what NEG bought?
‘Is it Masha that you didn’t buy anything for?’

Since ne does not raise in these examples, the NO need not adjoin to CP at LF. Since NO is below any interrogative operator no RM effect arises. Consequently, pleonastic negation is not forced in focal interrogation and NPIs are legitimate. If, on the other hand, the [ne + V\(_0\)] complex moves instead, the now familiar RM effect is induced, with the result that NPIs are not viable. The examples in (73) are thus in clear contrast to the pleonastic negation ones in (74); the English versions are similarly ungrammatical (with sentential negation):

(74) a. *Ne znaete li vy v ètom klube ni odnoj devočki
NEG know Q you in this club not [one girl]\(_{GEN}\)
*‘Do you know not a single girl in this club or not?’
b. *Ne našli li vy v ètom magazine nikakogo podarka
dlja Vali?
for Valja
*‘Did you find no gift in this store for Valja or not?’
c. *Ne kupili li vy Maše ničego
NEG bought Q you MashaDAT no-what
*‘Did you buy Masha nothing or not?’

In sum, the syntax of focal interrogation provides compelling confirmation for our account of forced pleonastic negation. If the [ne + V\(_0\)] complex does not raise to C\(_0\) to host the interrogative particle li, but some other constituent does, then no RM violation obtains. Crucially, it is the raising of the NO to a position where the IO intersects the NO’s c-command domain that results in forced pleonastic negation.

---

26 In §5.1 we will claim, for reasons of scope, that all quantificational operators must be in adjoined positions at LF, and that sentential negation must c-command tense. Hence, NO ordinarily adjoins to TP, but can also adjoin to CP when forced to by ne in C. The relevant point for the examples in (73) is that NO remains below the interrogative operator.
4.3. Non-\textit{li} Yes/No Questions

We concluded in the preceding section that RM and the requirement that both \textit{li} and \textit{ne} be phonologically supported by the verb combine to force pleonastic negation in negated Yes/No questions with \textit{li}. We also demonstrated that overt V\textsubscript{0}-movement to C\textsubscript{0} can induce pleonastic negation in negated Yes/No questions even when there is no overt question particle in C\textsubscript{0}. This followed from the uncontroversial assumption that there must also be a Yes/No IO, even if \textit{li} is unexpressed.

In this section we turn to another interesting aspect of pleonastic negation in Russian, i.e., its optionality in certain syntactic contexts, and discuss its significance in light of our analysis. Specifically, we introduce evidence that non-\textit{li} Yes/No questions \textbf{without} fronted verbs also lead to pleonastic negation. Curiously however, unlike with \textit{li}-interrogatives, this pleonastic reading is not forced, but \textbf{optional}. Contrast pleonastic (75) with true negative (76):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{(75)} A \textit{kogo-nibud´ drugogo} iz podpol´ščikov ty \textbf{ne} znaeš? \\
     and who-any other of undergrounders you \textbf{NEG} know \\
     ‘So don’t you know any others from the underground?’
  \item \textbf{(76)} A \textit{nikogo drugogo} iz podpol´ščikov ty \textbf{ne} znaeš? \\
     and no-who other from undergrounders you \textbf{NEG} know \\
     ‘So you don’t know anyone else from the underground?’
\end{itemize}

Both (75) and (76) are interrogatives, which implies the presence of a Yes/No operator. The presence of the operator is also manifested by question intonation, typically IK-3, or certain word-order permutations, depending on focus. However, the fact that (75) allows a \textit{nibud´}-pronoun and (76) a \textit{ni}-pronoun reveals that NO must interact with the Yes/No operator in different ways in these two sentences. This is an unexpected result, since there is always only one option in \textit{li}-questions: as (73) and (74) showed, negation is pleonastic only if it is forced to be. Under focal interrogation (73), negation cannot be pleonastic, while under non-focal interrogation (74), since the \textit{ne} + V\textsubscript{0} complex raises to C\textsubscript{0}, it must be. The conclusion that negation cannot be pleonastic under focal interrogation is further demonstrated by the following sort of example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{(77)} *Ètu \textit{li} knigu ty \textbf{ne} podaril \textbf{komu-nibud’}? \\
     this Q book you \textbf{NEG} gave who-any \\
     ‘Is it this book that you did not give to anyone or not?’
\end{itemize}

Implicit in the analysis is thus that negation is only pleonastic when forced to be; since it is not forced in (73) and (77) it is not a viable option.
To summarize the main points: we have claimed that negation in Yes/No questions with the interrogative particle *li* must be pleonastic, because of RM and morphological requirements on *li* and *ne*, given their status as clitics. In order for the negative particle *ne* to retain negative force once it has raised with the verb to C\(^0\), the licensing NO must also raise to a position which c-commands *ne*, presumably adjoining to CP. However, as shown in (68b), the IO in [Spec, CP] would create a RM violation, blocking antecedent government of the trace of the NO. In Yes/No questions with-out *li* and with no V-fronting, as shown in (75) and (76), we also find in-stances of pleonastic negation, but these are optional rather than required. It seems that the speaker can use negative or positive implicature as a pragmatic strategy in non-*li* Yes/No questions, and the English versions of (75) and (76) support this conclusion. Interestingly, the pleonastic option is unavailable in *li*-questions in which *ne* has not raised to C\(^0\), e.g., (73) and (77). We offer a formal account of this array of facts in §5.1.

As further corroboration that this is indeed the system, recall the discussion of the semantic categories of Yes/No questions from §4.1, where we concluded that negative implicature and the *li* particle are incompatible. This complementary distribution between true negation and *li* was summarized by category in the table in (67). The absence of negative implicature results in an informative, rhetorical, or dubious question, and is manifested not only in the semantics of the question, but also by the potential for *li* and the absence of *ni*-NPIs in negated questions. Likewise, negated presumptive and emotionally-charged questions retain negative implicature, as evidenced by the fact that these questions disallow *li* and license *ni*-NPIs. In other words, the presence or absence of NO and the concomitant positive or negative implicature determine the semantic interpretation of the Yes/No question and restrict its syntactic form.

One final relevant observation is that perhaps the choice of negative or positive implicature in non-*li* interrogatives has arisen to compensate for the ongoing loss in colloquial Russian of *li* in Yes/No questions. Although the particle *li* is disappearing in main clauses in colloquial usage, the choice of negative or positive implicature remains in Yes/No questions and allows for a broader range of semantic expression in interrogation. Note in this regard that *li* is still used in embedded clauses.\(^{27}\) These are contexts where an IO is selected by the matrix verb. Compare matrix (78) and embedded (79). Speakers much prefer not to use *li* in the former. The status of embedded non-*li* questions is however not easy to assess, since the direct speech structure interferes and is not

\(^{27}\) For further discussion of the use of negated *li*-questions in embedded clauses, see Brown (in preparation).
necessarily discriminated by intonation; it is possible that for some speakers *li* and non-*li* may both be available in embedded questions.
(78) a. Pročla li ona ětu knigu?
   read Q she that book
   ‘Did she read that book?’

   b. Ona pročla ětu knigu?
   she read that book
   ‘Did she read that book?’

(79) a. Ivan sprosil, pročla li ona ětu knigu
   Ivan asked read Q she that book
   ‘Ivan asked whether she had read that book.’

   b. *Ivan sprosil, pročla ona/ona pročla ětu knigu
   Ivan asked read she/she read that book
   ‘Ivan asked whether she had read that book.’

A similar and probably stronger effect can be observed for wh-questions: in main clauses the wh-phrase enjoys a much greater freedom of occurrence than in embedded clauses. Compare matrix (80) and embedded (81).

(80) a. Počemu ona pročla ětu knigu?
   why she read that book
   ‘Why did she read that book?’

   b. Ona počemu pročla ětu knigu?
   you why read that book
   ‘Why did she read that book?’

(81) a. Ivan sprosil, počemu ona pročla ětu knigu.
   Ivan asked why she read that book
   ‘Ivan asked why she had read that book.’

   b. *Ivan sprosil, ona počemu pročla ětu knigu.
   Ivan asked she why read that book

When selected, the wh-phrase must appear instead its canonical [Spec, CP] position. A natural explanation of this contrast will emerge from our account of “optional” pleonastic negation in the next section.

5. Epilogue

In this section we offer some further speculations about the nature of pleonastic negation and attempt to tie together various loose strands of the argumentation. Two main issues are treated, one conceptual, the other empirical. The conceptual issue deals with the source of pleonastic negation, which relates to the question of what exactly is in [Spec, NegP]
when negation is pleonastic. These are issues about which we have so far remained noncommittal, being concerned instead with what could not be situated there. The empirical issue deals with adjunct genitives, which appear under negation but, as has been argued in Franks and Dziwirek 1993, should in fact be analyzed as formally distinct from the GN. We show that a consideration of adjunct genitives in pleonastic contexts provides further support for this sort of analysis.

5.1. Where Does Pleonastic Negation Come From?

Crucial for our analysis was the incontrovertible conclusion that, when \textit{ne} is pleonastic, [Spec, NegP] necessarily lacks an operator with negative force. In the canonical case, this option was required by lexical selection properties of elements like \textit{poka}, whereas in the forced case this option was a consequence of \textit{ne} moving to C$^0$.\textsuperscript{28} We also considered a set of circumstances where there seems to be a choice about whether or not negation is interpreted as pleonastic. Our analysis allowed this choice because the presence of the higher Yes/No IO is one of the factors that permits a lower NegP to lack actual negative content, but so far does not explain why this choice is not more generally available.

Our basic claim at this point has thus been that pleonastic negation can be defined as “morphological negation coupled with the lack of a negation operator”. There is a NegP for idiosyncratic selectional reasons, and not because negation plays a role in the sentence’s LF representation. It is in this sense that the negation itself is pleonastic or “expletive”, comparable to expletive subject pronouns, which are required in some languages regardless of considerations of interpretation. While the most straightforward way to capture this lack of negative force is simply to leave [Spec, NegP] empty when the negation is pleonastic, in this section we would like to consider an alternative possibility.

One outstanding question was exactly how the higher OP is able to permit pleonastic negation. In order to solve this problem, imagine that there is indeed an operator in the specifier position of pleonastic NegP. Let us assume that by definition a functional category operator phrase, such as NegP, must always have an OP in its specifier. However, even though [Spec, NegP] is filled with an operator, that OP can in principle be vacuous; by “vacuous” we mean “devoid of LF content”. In other words, pleonastic negation may be characterized by a null OP whose quantificational or negation features cannot be activated. Such an NegP will lack negative force, although it is still technically a NegP. It is this lack of negative force that disallows NPIs and it is this technical NegP status that allows GN.

\textsuperscript{28} Rob Chametzky (pc) suggests to us that it may be the existence in the language of the selected type of pleonastic NegP that allows for its extension to use in forced contexts.
We now speculate about the mechanics of a system that gives rise to the expletive OP and accommodates the phenomena left unexplained in the previous section. Although it will require some elaboration and modification of the details of the analysis presented so far, there is nothing incompatible with our general approach. First of all, notice that we have been using the term “operator” in two overlapping senses. In one sense, an operator is an element in the specifier position of a logico-semantic functional category. In effect, for the extended projection of $V^0$, i.e., the clause, the Specs of all functional categories except the AgrPs are operator positions. Consequently, the very existence of a NegP implies the presence of an OP in its Spec. In order for an operator to have semantic force, however, we claim that it must undergo A’-movement, thereby binding its trace as a variable and establishing its scope. A vacuous operator is thus an element generated in the Spec of an operator phrase but which for some reason fails to raise. This is, we maintain, exactly what happens with pleonastic negation.

Now assume that a sentential NO must c-command tense, which is generated in TP but can also be in CP; cf. for example, Jaeggli and Safir (1989: 33–34). Given these two options, how can we understand the problems raised in §4.3? Clearly, negation is only pleonastic when forced to be so; otherwise not only focal interrogation but even ordinary negated statements could be ambiguous. We have seen that forced pleonastic negation arises when NO needs to raise above $ne$ but cannot because of RM. When the verb, hence also $ne$, does not raise to $C^0$—i.e., under focal interrogation—then the NO is not forced to try to adjoin to CP, crossing the Yes/No IO and violating RM. It makes instead the shortest move that it can, adjoining to the lowest possible functional category, i.e., the one immediately dominating the $ne + V^0$ complex.  

Consider in this light what happens in non-li questions, where it was observed that pleonastic negation is optional. Colloquial Russian is apparently special in not requiring the IO to be in [Spec, CP], presumably at least not until LF. We claim instead that in colloquial Russian the IO can be in [Spec, TP], a position which we now assume to be an operator position rather than a position for nominative case-checking. That is why we find main clauses with the $wh$-phrase following the subject, as in (80b), and why $li$ is optional, as in (78b). The Yes/No operator is in [Spec, TP]. However, when there is a $li$ in $C^0$ or a $wh$-phrase in [Spec, CP], then CP

---

29 Notice that if this is correct we will want to revert to the more standard system, as in Chomsky 1992, of employing [Spec, AgrP] for case-checking, thereby freeing up positions like [Spec, AspP] and [Spec, TP] to host operators. We thus add an Agr$_3$P projection above TP and an Agr$_5$P projection above AspP in (12). The subject then raises to [Spec, Agr$_3$P] and the object to [Spec, Agr$_5$P].

30 The relevant functional category is probably Agr$_3$P, but might be TP, depending on one’s analysis. Either way, this does not put NO above IO.
must be [+Q]. Thus, when a [+Q] complement CP is selected by the matrix verb these are the preferred options.31

Having sketched out this system, let us return to the problem of optional pleonastic negation in the non-li questions of §4.3. Since negation is pleonastic in (75), the NO must be forced to remain in situ. This follows if in (75) the IO is in [Spec, TP], given that NO—in order to be interpreted as sentential negation—must move above tense. In (75), however, there is no phrasal node for it to adjoin to which would not also move it over IO and cause a RM violation. Hence it cannot move, resulting in its logical vacuity. In (76), on the other hand, negation is interpreted, hence the NO must be able to raise. We claim that here the option of IO occurring in [Spec, CP] is exercised, so that NO can adjoin above TP (presumably to AgrsP) without crossing the IO, with the result that is has the expected negative force.

In pleonastic contexts, then, the NO is completely vacuous in content: it is essentially an expletive operator. This is, in fact, precisely what we would expect, given what pleonastic negation is. As an expletive null element, and just like non-theta-marked pro, this expletive OP would need to be licensed but not identified. It is not subject to any identification requirement because it has no LF content, but must, like any phonologically null element, be licensed. We therefore suggest that expletive OP is licensed under antecedent-government by a c-commanding real OP. In this sense it is similar to the null operator of parasitic gap (PG) constructions, the chief difference being that in standard PG constructions the phonologically null OP also needs to be identified as a [+WH] operator, since it binds a variable at LF, as in the standard example (82).

(82) Which article did you file \(e\) [OP [PRO without reading \(e\)]?]

The expletive OP of pleonastic negation, on the other hand, has no logico-semantic properties and is thus completely vacuous at LF. It cannot count as an A´-binder because, unlike the OP of PG constructions, NO is unable to raise from [Spec, NegP] and bind its trace as a variable.

This raises the question of whether the expletive NO has the status of a potential A´-antecedent for the purposes of RM. Given that it is not an A´-binder, we would expect that it does not. Recall the contrast in (18), repeated as (83):

31 Absence of li presumably does not mean [Spec, CP] does not contain OP if (79b) is regarded as acceptable. The OP can instead be in either [Spec, TP] or [Spec, CP]. We take the possibility of V-to-C movement even in the absence of li as further evidence of this latter possibility. The lower \(wh\)-phrase in (81b), on the other hand, does indeed indicate a lower position for OP. Since OP is not in [Spec, CP], the selectional requirements of the matrix verb sprosit ‘‘to ask’’ are not met.
Although the fact that canonical pleonastic negation typically occurs in adjunct clauses makes it difficult to come up with a relevant example, in *cut´ne* and forced pleonastic negation contexts it indeed appears that RM is not invoked. Our consultants find the examples in (84) much better than (83a) and roughly on a par with (83b):32

(84)a. Gde vy skazali, *čto on *cut´ne* potratil vse where you said that he barely NEG lost all den´gi e? money e

‘Where did you say that he almost lost all the money?’

b. Gde vy boites´, *kak by on* ne potratil vse where you fear how MOD he NEG lost all den´gi e? money e

‘Where do you fear that he may have lost all the money?’

When the negation is pleonastic, it apparently does not count for purposes of RM. Thus, whatever is in [Spec, NegP], it does not suffice to block A´-antecedent-government.33

---

32 It has unfortunately proven impossible to construct similar French examples based on (79), since this kind of highly stylized pleonastic negation is not compatible enough with island-violation extraction for the speakers we consulted to provide reliable judgments.

33 One reason to question our expectation that a “pleonastic operator” should be irrelevant for RM is that a pleonastic NP seems to count as an intervening potential A-binder, as Rizzi (1990: 84) observed for the “superraising” construction (i).

(i) *John seems [that it is likely [e to shave himself in public]].

And although expletive *it* appears to be irrelevant (as a potential antecedent?) for binding in (ii), as Lasnik and Uriagereka (1988: 59–60) point out, this is only because the extraposed clause which contains *each other* is coindexed with *it*.

(ii) *They think [that it is likely [that [pictures of *each other* will be on sale]]].

When the reciprocal is outside this clause, as in (iii), the sentence is ungrammatical.

(iii) *They think [that *it* surprised *each other* [that [Bill won]]].

We conclude that expletive NPs do indeed count as potential A-antecedents. The crucial difference between these and the pleonastic NOs we propose is that the latter, since they
Let us pursue some of the conceptual implications of our idea that the operator in the specifier position of pleonastic negation phrases has the status of an expletive element. If so, we are now in a position better to understand the similarity between pleonastic ne and the other, more familiar, kind of pleonastic elements catalogued in (36). Recall that pleonastics such as dummy subjects it and there, case-assigning prepositions for and of, and the tense/agreement bearing auxiliary do are minimal elements inserted to save a structure that would otherwise crash. We should therefore ask what it is about ne that might be necessitated in the pleonastic structures in which it occurs. Here we can only speculate that ne is the minimal head of the unmarked operator phrase. If so, there is a simple way to force this head to have phonological content.

Following recent claims by Speas (1994, 1995), for a phrase to exist it must have either semantic or phonological content. Conceptually, this seems to us to be the minimal desideratum for licensing a representation: all phrases must have some interpretation at either LF or PF in order to be motivated. In Speas’ system substantive categories and functional categories other than AgrP have semantic content, hence can be phonologically null. AgrP, on the other hand, is purely a functional category with no semantic content by definition. In the spirit of Kayne (1994), we regard AgrP as nothing more than the syntactic glue which, by providing an appropriate Spec position, holds the sentence together. Devoid of semantic content, AgrP must therefore have some phonological content. Speas employs this idea to develop an account of null subject phenomena based on empty head Agr (in non-null subject languages) forcing [Spec, AgrP], which is the the locus of the subject, to be overt. It should, we believe, be a fairly straightforward matter to develop an analogous solution to pleonastic NegPs. Under our account, these have a vacuous operator in [Spec, NegP], hence lack semantic content. Since the Spec position hosts a phonologically null element, the head position must be overt. It is this requirement that forces the presence of pleonastic ne. Note that this reasoning explains why in French it is the head ne rather than the operator pas that appears in a pleonastic NegP, which it will be recalled is precisely the opposite of what typically happens in a truly negative NegP.

remain in situ, are not activated as A’-binders and therefore cannot function as potential A’-antecedents for RM.

34Consider in this light the problem posed by other elements that induce GN, such as trudno and edva, as in (i) and (ii) from Mustajoki (1985: 44–45) who takes them from RG 1980 (2: 418):

(i) Edva našla voli v sebe, čtoby sest’ na zerkalo.
‘She barely found the will in herself to sit on the mirror.’
Of course, this argumentation goes through only if there is a (pleonastic) NegP in the first place. Here the factors that lead to the generation of a NegP are not so obvious. In the canonical case, NegP is idiosyncratically postulated by lexical selection of adverbials like poka and cut’, which now must be taken as heads that take NegP complements themselves, rather than as specifiers of NegP, as earlier suggested. Note that this selection is purely stipulative, hence a lexical phenomenon. Still, it is surely no accident that pleonastic negation occurs in similar contexts in different languages, as was revealed by our brief comparison of French with Russian. While we will not resolve this issue here, we believe that in a more fleshed-out treatment of pleonastic negation a solution might be found by exploiting a phrase structure system in which all clauses contain Polarity Phrases (PolP), as in Laka 1990, and that what happens under pleonastic negation is that the negation of PolP is somehow canceled out. The result of this neutralization is interpretively tantamount to an affirmative clause, although the structures are formally distinct. There is thus pressure either to: 1) eliminate the distinction between a pleonastic negative PolP and an affirmative PolP; or 2) endow pleonastic negation with some communicative value. This explains why pleonastic negation generally has a marginal status and, as we saw in the French examples (45–47), may well be optional. Its use, in fact, is typically associated with a

(ii) Vpročem, [odnoznačnogo otveta] na ètot vopros v fil´me
nevertheless [unambiguous answer]GEN to this question in film
najti trudno.
to find difficult
‘Nevertheless, it’s hard to find an unambiguous answer to that question in the film.’

In Ouhalla’s (1990) analysis of negation identification, the negative head element negates the operator in [Spec, NegP] through Spec-Head agreement. Modifying our analysis, under which we have been assuming that the NO identifies the head element, accordingly, one could say that trudno and edva occur as heads of NegP and are ascribed negative features, which could “activate” the negation operator in [Spec, NegP]. Such an analysis modeled on Ouhalla would not, however, account for the fact that trudno and edva are unable to license NPIs, which we take to be possible only in the scope of an “active” negation operator. Since GN obtains but there is no NO, our approach would require there to be a NegP headed by trudno or edva which would have sufficient features of negation to cause Spec, AspP to check gen rather than acc. In this sense edva and trudno behave very similarly to pleonastic ne, and should perhaps be formally treated in a parallel fashion.

³⁵ We suspect that the special interaction between a NO and a Yes/No IO derives from their both being bipolar. Yes/No IOs differ from WH IOs in that they act as truth value switches. WH IOs, on the other hand, presuppose the truth value of the proposition but question a particular constituent, hence are not expected to interact with NOs as Yes/No IOs do. Developing these ideas properly requires a more finely tuned theory of RM than we can offer here.
particular learned style or high register of speech. That pleonastic negation should have this kind of stylistic effect is precisely what we would expect, given that it is vacuous for LF aspects of interpretation.

5.2. Adjunct Genitives and Pleonastic Negation

In this concluding section we examine another type of genitive construction that has traditionally been treated under the GN rubric: adjunct genitives as in (85).

(85) Ivan ne čital ni minuty.
Ivan NEG read not minute$^{\text{GEN}}$

‘Ivan did not read even for a minute.’

A consideration of adjunct genitives suggests additional evidence supporting our central claim that pleonastic negation is a NegP whose NO is not semantically active. The adjunct in (85) is not assigned its semantic role by the verb, but rather bears an intrinsic adjunct role of Time; presumably it does not bear the same structural relation to the verb as a complement would. Although the gen in (85) is typically taken to result from some non-canonical application of the GN rule, Franks and Dziwirek (1993) argue that, despite initial appearances to the contrary, such genitive adverbials should not be regarded as resulting from the GN rule generalized to apply also to adjunct NPs. Instead, they show that these adjuncts are special partitive forms that are only licensed in negative contexts. They argue for this analysis from two distinct perspectives, on the one hand presenting evidence that genitive complements and genitive adjuncts typically exhibit distinct characteristics in any language in which both are present, and on the other demonstrating that adjunct genitives uniformly pattern with partitives rather than GN complements in all Slavic languages. Russian does not discriminate between the three constructions; it displays them all productively. Our analysis of pleonastic negation will however confirm that, even in Russian, adjunct genitives pattern differently from genitive complements, which are unequivocal GN phrases.

In order to see this, first of all recall from §2.1 in connection with items (19–23) that partitives are able to occur in certain imperfective contexts only if there is a higher NO. Also relevant is the fact that GN requires only that there be a NegP, whether pleonastic or not, whereas partitives are sensitive to the true negative force of the NO. We are therefore now in a position to test whether our analysis of pleonastic

---

36 In this sense these adjuncts are very much like strict polarity items; see Brown (in preparation) for discussion.
negation indeed confirms the expectation that adjunct genitives are sanctioned differently from true GN complements.

It is, unfortunately, extremely difficult to test this prediction. Canonical pleonastic negation cannot be used to construct an appropriate example, because it turns out that this always calls for a perfective verb. Perfectivity, however, is generally incompatible with the durative adjunct phrases that display the partitive under negation phenomenon. Nonetheless, to the extent that judgments can be elicited, speakers consulted did at least suggest that the (partitive) gen is completely unacceptable in a pleonastic negation example like (86), although it is marginally possible in a true negation example like (87).

(86) Ja bojalsja, **kak by** kto-nibuď’ ne ostalsja tam
I feared how MOD who-any NEG stayed there
*vsego dnja/* ?ves’ den’/* na ves’ den’.
[all day]_{GEN}/ [all day]_{ACC}/ for all day
‘I was afraid someone might stay there all day.’

(87) Ja skazal, čto Borja ne ostalsja tam ?vsego dnja/
I said that Borja NEG stayed there [all day]_{GEN}/
?ves’ den’/* na ves’ den’.
[all day]_{ACC}/ for all day
‘I said that Borja hadn’t stayed there all day.’

The reason for the marginality is that the correct way to express duration here is with the preposition *na*. Still, we take the contrast between (86) and (87) to indicate that the NO in pleonastic contexts is not syntactically active, which in our terms means does not raise from [Spec, NegP]. Fortunately, unequivocal support for this conclusion can be garnered from a consideration of forced pleonastic negation. Here judgments are clear that (partitive) gen adjunct phrases cannot occur with pleonastic negation, as shown in (88–90).

---

37 While the reasons for this may well have to do with the aspecural semantics of canonical pleonastic negation contexts, the mere fact of this correspondence reinforces the idea of some connection between NegP and AspP.

38 Perfective verbs prefixed by *pro* constitute a marginal exception to this generalization, but this prefix probably converts the adjuncts into complements, as discussed in Fowler and Yadroff 1993.
The "nibud"-pronouns in these examples confirm that negation is pleonastic here; as always, this fact is irrelevant to the possibility of GN, as shown by the two variants in (88). The hypothesized partitive gen of the adjunct phrases, on the other hand, is sensitive to the presence of a syntactically active NO. Since the ne in C₀ requires the NO to raise above it but the Yes/No operator in [Spec, CP] blocks this, the NO is prevented from raising at all and is thus inactive. For this reason, in examples (88–90) the (partitive) gen adjuncts are disallowed.

In sum, the unacceptability of the (partitive) gen adjuncts in (88–90) is exactly as expected given the set of fairly intuitive claims about Russian negation that we have made in this paper: ne projects a NegP; [Spec, NegP] hosts a negation operator; this operator is vacuous in pleonastic contexts. Given these claims, we then examined a range of unusual syntactic properties of both true and pleonastic negation in Russian, and showed how these properties could be made to follow from the relatively straightforward interaction between our claims about the structure of NegP and independently motivated assumptions about the organization of grammar and the workings of Russian.
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