Ora Matushansky, SFL (CNRS/Université Paris-8)/UiL OTS/Utrecht University
email: O.M.Matushansky@uu.nl
homepage: http://www.let.uu.nl/~Ora.Matushansky/personal/

Ни хуя себе! Russian genitive IV

The purpose of this note is to signal the existence of yet another secondary genitive case in Russian: the genitive of emphasis. Its use is illustrated in (1):

(1) a. Ne sdelano   ni čertA/   ni xrenA.
        not done-NSG NEG devil-GEN$_{IV}$ NEG devil-GEN$_{IV}$
        Fuck-all has been done.

    b. Ostalos'   eščë do figA/   do xerA   bananov.
        remained-NSG still until FIG-GEN$_{IV}$ until dick-GEN$_{IV}$ bananas-GEN
        There remained still one hell of a lot of bananas.

    c. Na figA/   na xujA   tebe   èto nužno?
        on   FIG-GEN$_{IV}$ on prick-GEN$_{IV}$ you-DAT this necessary-NSG
        Why the fuck do you need this?

Russian genitive IV is lexically restricted to a small set of nouns, all masculine nouns of the second declension class (2). In that it resembles the Russian partitive, a.k.a. Russian genitive II (Jakobson 1958/1984), and the adnumerative case surfacing on measure nouns in numeral NPs (*sem' rentgen/*rentgenov* 'seven roentgens-ADN/*GEN', see Mel'čuk 1985). Both of these secondary genitives are also restricted to second declension masculine nouns:

(2) *čërt* 'devil', *fig* 'FIG', *xuj* 'prick', *xer* 'dick', *xren* 'radish', *sled* 'trace' (with negation only), *šiš* 'an offensive gesture, where the thumb is inserted between the index and the middle finger' (with negation only)

The lexical meaning of most but not all lexical items in the list in (2) is completely bleached, and one of them, *fig*, has no use except in idiomatic expressions, as in (3). Many of them lack inherent stem accent, as shown by the fact that stress surfaces on the preposition (4) (for a discussion of Stress Retraction with Russian unaccented stems, see Halle 1973, 1997, Idsardi 1992, Ukiah 1998, Blumenfeld 2012):

(3) a. Fig/čërt/*sled/šiš/xuj   s   toboj.
        fig/devil/trace/fig/prick with you-INS
        Do what you want, I don't care!

    b. Fig/*čërt/*sled/šiš tebe.
        fig/devil/trace/fig you-DAT
        You won't get anything.

(4) a. pO xuj   b. nA xuj/fig?   c. nE fig
        up.to prick   on prick/fig   not FIG
         unimportant   *why?*   *for no reason*

Given that the second declension genitive case ending is inherently unaccented (Halle 1997), the lack of an inherent accent on the root in (1) should have led to initial stress on the noun itself (cf. *góroda* 'city-GEN') or to Stress Retraction (cf. *zá gorod* 'in the countryside, *lit.*, beyond the city'. Since this is not what happens, we have to conclude that the case ending in (1) is inherently accented and therefore cannot be the same as the regular second declension genitive.

While in (1a,b) the source of the genitive could be assumed to be negation (as in (5a)) and the preposition (as in (5b)), respectively, in (1c) the preposition *na* 'on' does not normally assign genitive case, as illustrated by (6).

Ora Matushansky
Ни хуя себе! Russian genitive IV, April 1, 2015

2

(5) a. Ne sdelano ni odnoj ošibki.
         not done-NSG NEG one-GEN mistake-GEN
         Not a single mistake has been made.

     b. Kopat' ot zabora i do obeda.
         dig-INF from fence-GEN and until lunch-GEN
         Dig starting with the fence and until lunch.

(6) a. Polozi na stol.
         place-IMP on table-ACC
         Place it on the table.

     b. Polozi na stole.
         place-IMP on table-LOC
         Place it somewhere on the table.

     c. #Na stola?!
         on table-GEN
         #Why the table [has this happened]?!

Segmental identity to Russian genitive I combined with final stress is what also characterizes the Russian paucal: the case that surfaces on a handful of nouns (7) with the cardinals *dva/dve* 'two-M/F, *tri* 'three', *četýre* 'four', *četvert'* 'quarter', *pol-* 'half', and *poltorá/poltorý* 'one and a half-M/F', as well as the quantifier *óba/óbe* 'both-M/F'.

(7) *čas* 'hour', *sled* 'trace', *rjad* 'row', *šag* 'step' and marginally, *šar* 'balloon'

However, the nouns listed in (7) do not, with the sole exception of *sled* 'trace', appear in the environments in (1), and those in (2), with the same exception, do not take the stress-final form with paucal cardinals:

(8) a. Ne sdelano ni šAga/*šagA.
         NEG done-NSG NEG step-GEN/GEN$_{IV}$=PAUC
         Not a single step was made.

     b. dva čërta/*čertA, xrEna/*xrenA
         two devil-GEN/PAUC horseradish-GEN/PAUC
         two devils, two horseradish roots

The three environments in (1) can be tentatively unified semantically as involving some sort of degree emphasis: while (1a) is minimizing, (1b) is maximizing and (1c) expresses a high degree of surprise/unexpectedness (see den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002). Not attempting to provide a formal analysis of this sort of emphasis, we may nonetheless ask ourselves if the near-complementarity of the two lists, in (2) and in (7), is grounds enough for juxtaposing genitive IV to paucal case. Indeed, the lexical items in (7) could be excluded from the three environments in (1) due to their inappropriate lexical semantics, and likewise, most lexical items in (2), being semantically empty, can be argued to be incompatible with cardinals, as it wouldn't be clear what is being counted. Given that the factor of lexical content must already be invoked in order to explain why *sled* 'trace' and *šiš* cannot appear in the environments in (1a,b), it is not impossible that similar factors explain why most nouns from (7) are excluded from the three environments in (1).

We believe that this is nonetheless the wrong road to take. A theoretical objection that can be levied against unifying genitive IV with paucal is that the environment for the latter is clearly semantically distinct from those in (1). Added to this is an empirical objection: the semantics of *šag* 'step' would seem to make it a prime candidate for a minimizer, along with the shared *sled* 'trace', yet *šag* can take the stress-final form only with paucal cardinals. And finally, the infelicity rather than ungrammaticality of (6c) shows that most nouns can take the genitive IV form in the appropriate environment, but the paucal form is restricted to the five nouns in (7).

Ora Matushansky
Ни хуя себе! Russian genitive IV, April 1, 2015

3

Hypothesizing the existence of the special genitive IV case does not go beyond a description; the question arises why, in addition to the regular genitive case, as many as four additional variations on the same theme (partitive, adnumerative, paucal and genitive IV) are attested. To answer this question we further observe that for some speakers the preposition *do* 'until' can also yield the meaning of "high quantity" without the special genitive IV, for a subset of the lexical items in (2). In the general case, stress on the stem is possible with the unbleached meaning only, but for the noun *čërt* 'devil' some speakers allow it with the meaning of high quantity (note the morphologically related expression *do čërtikov* = until devil-DIM-PL, with the same interpretation, as well as a few other nouns that can be used with the same meaning: *do smerti* 'to death', *do upadu* 'to a fall', etc.). For some speakers it is also possible to achieve the "high-quality" interpretation with Stress Retraction (% indicates inter-speaker variation, # is used when only the unbleached meaning is possible):

(9)   a. $^{\%}$dO figa   *də fIga   də figA

       b. $^{\%}$dO čerta   də čËrta $^{\%}$də čertA

       c. $^{\%}$dO xuja $^{\%}$də xUja   də xujA

       d.   *dO xrena   #də xrEna   də xrenA

The availability of stress-retracted variants, along with the fact that no speaker allows stress-retracted variants only, strongly suggests that genitive IV is indeed constructed on the basis of the regular genitive. To account for this, we propose to appeal to the hypothesis (Jakobson 1958/1984, Matushansky 2012) that cases are bundles of features rather than atomic features, in other words, that the different variants of the genitive case in Russian correspond to subtly different bundles of case features, most of which are shared between the variants.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blumenfeld, Lev. 2012. Russian yers and the prosodic structure. In *Proceedings of the 29th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Jaehoon Choi, E. Alan Hogue, Jeffrey Punske, Deniz Tat, Jessamyn Schertz and Alex Trueman, 20-28. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

den Dikken, Marcel, and Anastasia Giannakidou. 2002. From *hell* to polarity: "aggressively non-D-linked" *wh*-phrases as polarity items. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:31-61.

Halle, Morris. 1973. The accentuation of Russian nouns. *Language* 49:312-348.

Halle, Morris. 1997. On stress and accent in Indo-European. *Language* 73:275-313.

Idsardi, William J. 1992. The computation of prosody, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Jakobson, Roman. 1958/1984. Morphological observations on Slavic declension (the structure of Russian case forms). In *Roman Jakobson: Russian and Slavic Grammar, Studies, 1931-1981*, ed. by Linda R. Waugh and Morris Halle, 105-133. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matushansky, Ora. 2012. On the internal structure of case in Finno-Ugric small clauses. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics* 1:3-43.

Mel'čuk, Igor. 1985. *Poverxnostnyj sintaksis russkix čislitel'nyx vyraženij*. Wiener slawistischer Almanach. Sonderband 16. Vienna: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Wien.

Ukiah, Nick. 1998. Stress retraction in phrases of the type *ná день*, *zá сорок*, *né был* in Modern Russian. *Russian linguistics* 22:287-319.