Locality restrictions on intra-clausal negative concord in Russian: A comparison with other long-distance interactions[1]

FYODOR BAYKOV   LOMONOSOV MSU, MOSCOW, RUSSIA

Negative concord (henceforth NC) in different languages has been extensively investigated in both formalist [Laka 1990; Progovac 1994; Haegeman 1995; Zanuttini 1998; Brown 1999; Zeijlstra 2004; Penka 2011, *i.a.*] and typologically-oriented [Haspelmath 1997; Van der Auwera, Van Alsenoy 2016] studies. However, the problem of providing an exhaustive enumeration of positions where negative pronouns and adverbs can occur in NC languages apparently has not received much attention. The works cited above concentrate mostly on the effect the relative position of negative concord items (hereafter NCIs) with respect to the verb has on the obligatoriness of verbal negation, as well as on cross-clausal NCI licensing (e.g. infinitival clauses, in contrast to finite indicative ones, may permit licensing of NCIs by matrix negation). Rare exceptions attempting to deal with intra-clausal NCI licensing are [Przepiórkowski, Kupść 1997] on Polish and [Rozhnova 2009] on Russian and Spanish.

PROBLEM. [Rozhnova 2009] describes constraints on intra-clausal NCI licensing in Russian like the ban (4) on NCIs inside attributive AdjPs (unless the adjective itself is negated) and opacity of converbal phrases (6) and nominal adjuncts (8). However, she does not compare these restrictions with those imposed on other long-distance (henceforth LD) syntactic interactions, such as *wh*-question or relative clause formation, reflexive and reciprocal binding, and licensing of non-local negatives polarity items like *nibud'-* and *libo*-pronouns.

Such a comparison, meanwhile, may help us to elucidate the nature of NCI licensing. The extant literature offers a range of analytic options trying to reduce it to establishing an Agree relationship between an NCI and its licensor (either the negation head Neg^0 or a covert operator higher up in the clause; [Haegeman 1995; Zeijlstra 2004]) or to a (covert) movement of the NCI to its licensor [Brown 1999]. Binding is yet another option of what may underlie NC [Laka 1990; Progovac 1994]. If NC is indeed reducible to some other LD interaction, we expect them to obey roughly the same locality restrictions.

DATA. In my talk, I will compare NC with other non-local syntactic processes in Russian with regard to their locality restrictions. The contexts investigated are quite rare in naturalistic discourse, so the data will mostly come from introspection and informal judgement gathering. All the examples below are mine, unless explicitly indicated otherwise.

wh-movement (witnessed in content questions and relative clauses) is the most similar to NC w.r.t. locality restrictions of all LD processes (constraints on anaphor binding and licensing of *nibud'-* and *libo*-pronouns, not exemplified here due to space limitations, have less points in common with those which NC observes). Both *wh*-movement and NC are possible across predicative AdjP boundaries (1-2) and both are ungrammatical across the boundaries of nominal-modifying AdjPs (3-4), converbal phrases (5-6) and nominal adjuncts (7-8), conforming to movement-based approaches to NC [Brown 1999; Rossyaykin 2021, *i.a.*].

(1) Na kogo$_i$ novaya sosedka   byla udivitel'no   pohozha _____$_i$?
     To whom   new neighbor   was strikingly   similar?
     'Whom did the new female neighbor strikingly resemble?'

(2) Novaya sosedka   ne byla pohozha   ni na kogo   iz aktris.
     New   neighbor   NEG was similar   to no one   of actresses.
     'The new female neighbor did not resemble any of the actresses.'

(3) *Na kogo$_i$ ty vchera vstretil   pohozhuyu _____$_i$ sosedku?
     To whom   you yesterday met   similar   neighbor?
     'Whom$_i$ did you meet yesterday a female neighbor resembling t_i?'

---

(4) *Ya   ne vstretil   pohozuyu   ni na kogo iz aktris   sosedku.
    I   NEG met   similar   to no-one of actresses   neighbor.
    'I did not meet a female neighbor resembling any of the actresses.'

(5) *Kakoe otkrytie$_i$ etot ucheniy proslavilsya,   sovershiv _____$_i$ v sorok let?
    Which discovery   this scientist became.famous, make.CNVB   in 40 years?
    'Which discovery$_i$ did this scientist become famous having made ____$_i$ at the age of 40?'

(6) *Etot ucheniy ne proslavilsya,   sovershiv   nikakoe otrkrytie.
    This scientist NEG became.famous, make.CNVB   no   discovery.
    'No discovery is such that this scientist became famous having made it.'

(7) *V chem$_i$ on pokinul   post radi   uchastiya _____$_i$?
    In what   he left   post for   participation
    'What$_i$ did he leave his post for the sake of participation in t_i?'

(8) *Ya   ne pokinu post radi uchastuiya ni v odnom sobranii. [Rozhnova 2009: 59, (28b)]
    I   NEG leave post for participation in no   meeting.
    I will not leave my post for the sake of participation in any meeting.

The only context I looked at in which *wh*-movement and NC diverge is argumental nominals: whereas NC across their boundaries is acceptable (9), *wh*-extraction out of them seems degraded at best (10), though [Abels 2003: 161]'s consultant accepted similar examples.

(9) Ego   ne dopuskali   k uchastiyu   ni v odnom sobranii. [Rozhnova 2009: 59, (28a)]
    Him   NEG allowed   to participation in no meeting
    'He was not allowed to participate in any meeting.'

(10) ??V chem$_i$ ego ne dopuskali   k uchastiyu _____$_i$?[2]
    In what   him NEG allowed   to participation
    'What$_i$ was he not allowed to participate in t_i?'

ANALYSIS. No pair of LD syntactic interactions investigated obey exactly the same locality restrictions, which is an important explanandum for any approach trying to reduce NC to some other LD process. [Progovac 1994]'s binding-based approach to NC predicts the distribution of NCIs to parallel that of anaphors (though, since binding domains of various anaphors may differ, [Progovac 1994: 7] envisages possible divergence between NCIs and anaphors). Her data, however, do not include examples of NCI licensing in Serbo-Croatian across AdjP or DP/NP boundaries comparable to (1-10), while in Russian anaphor binding into nominal-modifying AdjPs is sometimes possible under poorly understood conditions [Grashchenkova 2006], whereas NCI licensing in this configuration is illicit (4).

A possible formalization may appeal to the notion of a probe's horizon introduced by [Keine 2016, 2021], wherein each probe is lexically specified with a list of categories/features such that it immediately stops probing upon hitting into any of these. NC itself can be analyzed along the lines of [Deal 2022] as an Agree relationship between NCIs and an insatiable Neg^0-probe which is in principle able to interact with all the accessible NCIs and license them all. The list of horizons for Russian Neg^0-probe would contain attributive AdjPs (e.g. by including Mod^0 head, obligatorily present in nominal-modifying AdjPs and obligatorily absent from predicative ones; cf. [Rubin 1994]), converbal phrases (Converb^0) and nominal adjuncts.

CONCLUSIONS & OUTLOOK. Our findings provide an empirical basis for evaluating feasibility of NC reduction to some other syntactic process. As a preliminary step of a cross-linguistic investigation, they show which contexts should be minimally taken into account when comparing locality conditions on different LD processes. NC in contexts like (2), (4), (8) and (9) was not considered by [Progovac 1994] based on Serbo-Croatian and [Haegeman 1995] on West Flemish and Romance, while [Przepiórkowski, Kupść 1997: sec. 3.3] only mention that

---

[2] An anonymous reviewer writes that s/he actually accepts (10). Thus, for speakers sharing this judgement, there appears to be no obstacle at all to a unification of wh-movement and NC – clearly a desirable outcome for all the approaches seeking to assimilate these two LD processes [Haegeman 1995; Brown 1999, *i.a.*].

in Polish, adverbial participles are opaque to NC (as in Russian). [Rozhnova 2009], comparing Russian with Spanish, shows equivalents of (4), (6) and (8) to be acceptable in Spanish.

The results also contribute to research on the discrepancies in locality restrictions obeyed by different processes. These studies mostly concentrated on subtypes of A`-movement [Müller 2011; Abels 2012, *i.a.*] like *wh*-questions, relative clauses and topicalisation, and were supplemented by [Keine 2016, 2021] with data on (long-distance) agreement. As far as I know, they have not previously taken NC into consideration, which our results may compensate for.

REFERENCES

As was specified in the submission guidelines at the conference site, the references **do not** have to be included in the maximum abstract size (two pages; i.e., they may occupy the third page).

Abels 2003 — Abels K. *Successive cyclicity, anti-locality and adposition stranding*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 2003.

Abels 2012 — Abels K. *Phases: An essay on cyclicity in syntax*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.

Brown 1999 — Brown S. *The Syntax of Negation in Russian: A Minimalist Approach.* Stanford (CA): Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1999.

Deal 2022 — Deal A.R. Negative concord as downward Agree. Ms. 2022. Available at https://lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/006344.

Grashchenkova 2006 — Grashchenkova A.E. Refleksivy v gruppe prilagatel'nogo: teoreticheskie problemy i tipologiya [Reflexives in adjective phrases: theoretical problems and typology] // *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*, 2006, 1. P. 76-101.

Haegeman 1995 — Haegeman L. *The Syntax of Negation*. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.

Haspelmath 1997 — Haspelmath M. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Keine 2016 — Keine S. *Probes and their horizons*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, 2016.

Keine 2021 — Keine S. *Probes and Their Horizons*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2021.

Laka 1990 — Laka I. *Negation in syntax: On the nature of functional categories and projections*. Doctoral dissertation. MIT, Cambridge, Mass, 1990.

Müller 2011 — Müller G. *Syntactic buffers: A local-derivational approach to improper movement, remnant movement, and resumptive movement*. Universität Leipzig: Institut für Linguistik, 2014.

Penka 2011 — Penka D. *Negative indefinites.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Progovac 1994 — Progovac L. *Negative and positive polarity: a binding approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Przepiórkowski, Kupść 1997 — Przepiórkowski A., Kupść A. *Negative Concord in Polish*. Ms. Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences, 1997. Available at http://nlp.ipipan.waw.pl/~adamp/Papers/1997-828/.

Rossyaykin 2021 — Rossyaykin P. Russian negative pronouns are licensed above negation // *Rhema*. 2021. No. 4. Pp. 69–118.

Rozhnova 2009 — Rozhnova M. A. Sintaksicheskie svoystva otricatel'nyx mestoimenij v ispanskom i russkom yazykax [Syntactic properties of negative pronouns in Spanish and Russian]. MA thesis, Russian State University of Humanities, 2009.

Rubin 1994 — Rubin E. J. *Modification: A Syntactic Analysis and Its Consequences*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cornell University, 1994.

Van der Auwera, Van Alsenoy 2016 — Johan van der Auwera and Lauren Van Alsenoy. On the typology of negative concord // *Studies in Language* 40 (3), 2016. P. 473–512.

Zanuttini 1997 — Zanuttini R. *Negation and Clausal Structure*. Oxford: OUP, 1997.

Zeijlstra 2004 — Zeijlstra H. *Sentential Negation and Negative Concord*. PhD dissertation. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 2004.