

## ОГРАНИЧЕНИЯ НА РЕСТРИКТОР В КОНСТРУКЦИЯХ С ОТРИЦАТЕЛЬНЫМИ ПЛАВАЮЩИМИ КВАНТОРАМИ В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

*А. Ю. Вознесенская*  
*МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова*

В данной статье рассматриваются отрицательные плавающие кванторы в русском языке с точки зрения того, что может быть рестриктором кванторов в таких конструкциях. Анализируются конструкции с *никто*, *ни один* и *никакой*. Данные предоставляются для разрывных конструкций с отрицательными кванторами в позициях субъекта, прямого объекта и дательного аргумента. Рассматриваются рестрикторы, подвергающиеся передвижению. Исследуемые конструкции делятся на три группы по изученным свойствам.

**Ключевые слова:** плавание кванторов, разрывная топикализация, русский язык.

## RESTRICTOR RESTRICTIONS: WHAT KIND OF RESTRICTORS DO NEGATIVE FLOATING QUANTIFIERS IN RUSSIAN REQUIRE?

*Anastasiia Voznesenskaia*  
*Lomonosov Moscow State University*

This paper deals with negative floating quantifiers in Russian from the perspective of what can be a restrictor of those quantifiers in such constructions. Constructions with *nikto* 'nobody', *ni odin* 'not one' and *nikakoj* 'no' are analyzed. Data is provided for split constructions with negative quantifiers in subject, direct object and dative argument positions. Restrictors undergoing movement are examined. The constructions under study are divided into three groups with respect to the properties examined.

**Keywords:** quantifier float, split scrambling, Russian.

## 1. Introduction

This paper is devoted to the phenomenon of floating quantifiers (hereinafter FQs) in the Russian language, which can be defined as the ability of a quantifier to appear separately from a quantified noun phrase (1).

- (1) *Studenty vse lyubiat prepodavatelya.*  
 students all love.3PL teacher  
 ‘The students all love the teacher.’ [Tiskin 2016: 314]

- (2) *Svoikh družej ya uzhe vsekh znayu...*  
 REFL friends I already all know  
 ‘I already know all my friends.’ [Grashchenkov 2009: 397]

In many works devoted to quantifier float in both Russian and other languages, negative quantifiers are not considered as potential floating quantifiers. However, such elements are also recorded in languages.

- (3) *The deans were none of them fond of jeans.* [Hoeksema 1996: 57]

- (4) *I oni nikto ne znayut, i ne khotyat znat'...*  
 and they nobody NEG know.3PL and NEG want know.INF  
 ‘And they all don’t know, and don’t want to know.’ [L. Tolstoy “The death of Ivan Ilyich”, 1886]

The subject of this work are constructions with negative floating quantifiers in the Russian language, namely with *nikto* ‘nobody’ (5), *ni odin* ‘not one’ (6) and *nikakoj* ‘no’.

- (5) *To est' oni nikto ne smeli ee vslukh vyskazyvat'.*  
 so they nobody NEG dare it.F.ACC aloud express.INF  
 ‘So they all didn’t dare express it aloud.’ [F. Dostoevsky “Crime and punishment”, 1866]

- (6) ...*Vse zakony <...> davajte sejchas chestno skazhem:*  
 all laws let’s now honestly say

*oni ni odin ne rabotaet.*  
 they NEG one NEG work.3SG

‘All the laws....let’s honesty say: none of them work.’

[<https://echo.msk.ru/programs/tochka/2222810-echo/>]

One of the problems in analyzing such constructions with negative FQs is that they are superficially similar to split topicalization (or, more precisely, split “scrambling”).

- (7) [*Einen Wagen*] *hat er sich [keinen \_\_] gekauft.*  
 DET.ACC car have.AUX he REFL no.ACC buy  
 ‘He didn’t buy himself any car.’ [Van Hoof 2006: 416]

Even though there are a large number of works devoted to quantifier float, constructions with negative FQs have not been studied in detail yet. This paper focuses on negative FQs from the perspective of the restrictor of the quantifier. In this paper, I will research what kind of nominals can co-occur with negative FQs.

There are seven logical possibilities of constructions with *nikto*, *ni odin* and *nikakoj* if we consider that the restrictor nominal can be both plural and singular (8). Since (8b) and (8g) don’t seem to be acceptable this paper will study five constructions: *nikto* + PL (8a), *ni odin* + PL (8c), (8d) *ni odin* + SG, (8e) *nikakoj*.PL + PL, (8f) *nikakoj*.SG + SG.

- (8) a. *Student-y segodnya nikto ne prishel.*  
 student-PL today nobody NEG came.3SG  
 ‘The students none of them came today.’ {a = b}
- b. \**Student segodnya nikto ne prishel.*  
 student today nobody NEG came.3SG
- c. *Student-y segodnya ni odin ne prishel.*  
 student-PL today NEG one NEG came.3SG  
 ‘The students none of them came today.’
- d. *Student segodnya ni odin ne prishel.*  
 student today NEG one NEG came.3SG  
 ‘Not one student came today.’
- e. *Student-y segodnya nikakie ne prishli.*  
 student-PL today no.PL NEG came.3PL  
 ‘The students none of them came today.’ {e = g}
- f. *Lekarstvo segodnya nikakoe ne postupilo.*  
 medicine today no.NEUT.SG NEG came.in.3SG  
 ‘No medicine came in today.’
- g. ??*Student-y segodnya nikakoj ne prishli/prishel.*  
 student-PL today no.M.SG NEG came.3PL/came.3SG

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Quantifier float

Quite a long time ago, it was noticed that in some languages sentences with quantified nominals can be reformulated into sentences in which the quantifier is separated from the NP and takes an adverbial position. (9) presents such a pair of sentences of the French language.

(9) a. *Tous les enfants ont vu ce film.*  
 all DET kids have.AUX seen this film  
 ‘All kids saw this movie.’ {a = b} [Sportiche 1988: 426]

b. *Les enfants ont tous vu ce film.*  
 DET kids have.AUX all seen this film

English universal quantifiers *all*, *each* and *both*, French *tou(te)s* ‘all’, *chacun* ‘each’, Russian *vse* ‘all’ appear in such pairs.

There are two main approaches to floating quantifiers. The first is the stranding theory, proposed in [Sportiche 1988], according to which the quantifier and the restrictor NP initially form one constituent, after which the NP moves higher in the structure, and the quantifier is stranded in its original position. According to another, adverbial approach [Baltin 1995, Doetjes 1997], a quantifier word or its projection is considered a VP adjunct, similar to manner adverbs.

In [Grashchenkov 2009] constructions with floating numerals and quantifier words in Russian are considered.

Considering these constructions with numeral and quantifier float, Grashchenkov draws attention to the morphosyntax of these constructions. Based on the morphosyntax of the constructions and the behavior of the scope of the quantifiers/numerals Grashchenkov concludes that initially the quantifiers/numerals in these structures form one constituent with the corresponding NP. The effect of quantifier float in this paper is explained by the possibility of “splitting” the NP at the level of one of three projections: QP (projection of a quantifier word), PartP (the head Part assigns the genitive to the lower part of the nominal component in the context of direct cases) or NumP (projection of the numeral).

In [Madariaga 2007], two types of quantifier NPs are considered: the first type, heterogeneous, consists of quantifiers whose complement NPs are marked genitive (10a); the second type, homogeneous, consists of quantifier phrases with agreement (10b).

- (10) a. [*Mnogo detej*] *opozdal-o*.  
 many kids.GEN was.late-NEUT  
 ‘A lot of kids were late.’
- b. [*Vse deti*] *lyubyat ded-a moroz-a*.  
 all kids love.3PL grandpa-ACC frost-ACC  
 ‘All kids love Santa.’ [Madariaga 2007: 267]

The following structure is assumed for the given quantifier NPs:

- (11) a. [<sub>QP</sub> *Mnogo* [<sub>NP</sub> *detej*]]
- b. [<sub>DP</sub>  $\emptyset$  [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>QP</sub> *vse*] *deti*]] [Madariaga 2007: 268]

Quantifier subjects that project DP can cause agreement on the verb (11b), while those that do not project DP cannot, default agreement is observed in (11a).

Madariaga analyzes the properties of two FQ constructions associated, respectively, with heterogeneous and homogeneous quantifier NPs: constructions with an initial genitive (12a, GenN) and constructions with agreeing FQs (12b, AgrFQ).

- (12) a. *Detej prishl-o [malo detej]*.  
 kids.GEN came-NEUT few  
 ‘A few kids came.’
- b. *Deti prishl-i [vse deti]*.  
 kids came-PL all  
 ‘The kids all came.’ [Madariaga 2007: 271]

Madariaga compares the properties of Russian constructions with FQs with constructions of the Japanese and English type and establishes that constructions with the initial genitive follow the pattern of Japanese floating numerals and constructions with agreeing FQs follow the pattern of standard English FQs. This is manifested in the following properties.

First, in GenN, numeral and general quantifier expressions are possible, and in the construction of the AgrFQ, only the quantifiers *vse* ‘all’ and *oba* ‘both’. Secondly, as in Japanese, subjects in GenN are not licensed if they are subject to movement before stranding (13b) and with transitive verbs (13c), but are possible with unaccusatives and passives (13a).

- (13) a. *Vozmozhnost-ej byl-o predlozheno tol’ko [pyat’ e].*  
 possibility-GEN.PL was-NEUT proposed only five  
 ‘Only five possibilities were proposed.’ {a = b}
- b. \**Vozmozhnost-ej [pyat’ e] byl-o predlozheno e.*  
 possibility-GEN.PL five was-NEUT proposed
- c. \**Student-ov kupil-o etu knig-u [mnogo e].*  
 student-GEN.PL bought-NEUT this book-ACC many  
 Intended: ‘Many students bought this book.’ [Madariaga 2007: 273]

On the contrary, the subjects in AgrFQ, as in English FQ constructions, are not subject to such a restriction.

Also, AgrFQs do not allow the quantifier to strand in case of *wh*-movement. There is no such restriction on GenN.

- (14) a. \**Kak-ie deti (vse) prishl-i vse?*  
 which-PL kids all came-PL all  
 Intended: ‘Which kids all came?’
- b. *Kakikh yabl-ok byl-o malo?*  
 which apple-GEN.PL was-NEUT few  
 ‘Which apples were few?’ [Madariaga 2007: 273–274]

Madariaga analyzes GenN constructions as constructions that include split QPs; the nominal part (genitive NP) is extracted into the A’-position using long-distance extraction. The nominal part attaches to the TP to check the [topic] feature. The movement takes place directly from the starting position to the A’-position without intermediate positions.

AgrFQ constructions consist of agreeing DPs that move to the A-position by cyclic movement, while the corresponding FQ is attached acyclically to the copy of the DP.

[Tiskin 2016] considers constructions with negative floating quantifiers in Russian. Tiskin proposes that negative FQ constructions are a result of extracting the restrictor, as according to stranding theory.

## 2.2. Split topicalization

Split topicalization [see Van Hoof 2006; Ott 2012] is a phenomenon in which the core of a constituent is removed to the left periphery (TOP), leaving the rest (REM) in the clause. A good example is the split topicalization of the NP in German.

- (15) [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TOP</sub> *Bohnen*] [<sub>C</sub> *mag er nur* [<sub>REM</sub> *grüne* \_\_\_ ]]]  
           beans          loves  he  only          green  
           ‘He only likes green beans.’ [Van Hoof 2006: 411–412]

[Pereltsvaig 2008] discusses constructions with split phrases. In this paper, two analyses for split phrases are discussed: the analysis with direct extraction, and the analysis with remnant movement. According to the analysis with direct extraction, TOP is removed from the constituent to the left periphery; according to the analysis with remnant movement, at first REM is moved from the initial constituent, then this component moves to Spec, FocP, becoming TOP.

In her paper Pereltsvaig argues that both analyses don't make the right predictions. She proposes an analysis of these structures, according to which movement occurs, but the entire phrase moves. According to Copy Theory of Movement, this movement creates several copies of the phrase. Pereltsvaig suggests that the split nature of the movement is ensured by partial interpretation of the copies: one part, TOP, is interpreted by PF in the upper copy, and the second, REM in the lower one. Such movement can be *wh*-movement, “focal” movement in *li*-questions and scrambling. Pereltsvaig considers split phrases created using scrambling. The question is what motivates this scrambling. Pereltsvaig does not consider [topic] and [focus] as uninterpretable features that could cause movement. She suggests that this movement is caused by the [contrastive] feature, which distinguishes contrastive topic from topic and contrastive focus from focus.

## 3. Split negative FQ constructions in the subject position

In this section, the properties of such split constructions with negative quantifiers *nikto* ‘nobody’, *ni odin* ‘not one’ and *nikakoj* ‘no’ will be described, in which the left side of the structure is the subject of the clause.

In this case, there rises a question of predicate agreement. Apparently, the negative FQs influence the agreement on the verb (or other predicates). Constructions with *nikto* allow for both singular and plural agreement on the verb, while *ni odin* enforces singular verb agreement. The matter of agreement is an important one in the study of negative FQs, however, it is outside the scope of this paper and will not be discussed any further.

### 3.1. Noncanonical subjects

Apart from regular nominative subjects negative FQs can also refer to a dative subject.

- (16) ...*vo vsem dome anglichanam nikomu spat'*  
 in entire house Englishmen.DAT nobody.DAT sleep.INF  
*nel'zya bylo.*  
 not.allowed was  
 'In the entire house, it was impossible for the Englishmen to sleep.'  
 [RNC<sup>1</sup>: N. Leskov "Lefty", 1881]

The following examples show that all five constructions under investigation allow for a dative subject. In (18), example (18c) shows that *ni odin* + SG also allows for a dative subject despite the ungrammaticality of (18b), which I suggest is because this construction doesn't allow for specific NPs as the restrictor. A detailed study of the referential status of the restrictor NP in split constructions with negative FQs is, however, also outside the scope of the current paper.

- (17) *Moim druž'yam etogo nikomu ne ponyat'.*  
 my.DAT friends.DAT this.GEN nobody.DAT NEG understand.INF  
 'None of my friends can understand that.'
- (18) a. *Moim druž'yam etogo ni odnomu ne ponyat'.*  
 my.DAT friends.DAT this.GEN NEG one.DAT NEG understand.INF  
 'None of my friends can understand that.' {a ≈ b}
- b. \**Moemu drug-u etogo ni odnomu ne ponyat'.*  
 my.DAT friend-DAT this.GEN NEG one.DAT NEG understand.INF
- c. *Rebenk-u etogo ni odnomu ne ponyat'.*  
 child-DAT this.GEN NEG one.DAT NEG understand.INF  
 'No child can understand that.'

<sup>1</sup> RNC refers to Russian National Corpus ([www.ruscorpora.ru](http://www.ruscorpora.ru)).



- (19) a. *Muzhchin-am etogo nikak-im ne ponyat'.*  
 man-DAT.PL this.GEN no-DAT.PL NEG understand.INF  
 'No man can understand that.' {a ≈ b}
- b. *Muzhchin-e etogo nikak-omu ne ponyat'.*  
 man-DAT.SG this.GEN no-DAT.SG NEG understand.INF

In Russian, a subject in a negative sentence can optionally be encoded genitive. In this case, the verb displays default agreement. [Pesetsky 1982] lists the following properties of the genitive under negation. Only the internal argument can bear genitive in the context of sentential negation. Also, the genitive NP is necessarily non-specific.

The constructions under consideration are possible with genitive with the predicate *net* 'no' (20), (21), (22b), (23b, d), (24b, d)). However, in the standard construction with genitive under negation and a lexical verb as predicate, only *nikakoj* (24a, d) and *ni odin* with a singular NP restrictor (24c) can appear.

- (20) *Ikh net nikogo sejchas.*  
 they.GEN NEG.be nobody.GEN now  
 'None of them are here now.' [RNC: Andrey Lazarchuk "The holy month of Rin", 1988]
- (21) *U menya ikh net ni odnogo.*  
 at me.GEN they.GEN NEG.be NEG one.GEN  
 'I don't have any of them.' [RNC: Lazar Lagin "The old genie Hot-tabych", 1955]
- (22) a. \**Uchenik-ov nikogo ne zaboledo.*  
 student-GEN.PL nobody.GEN NEG got.ill  
 Intended: 'None of the students got ill.'
- b. *Uchenik-ov nikogo net na meste.*  
 student-GEN-PL nobody.GEN NEG.be at place  
 'None of the students are at the spot/place.'
- (23) a. \**Uchenik-ov ni odnogo ne zaboledo.*  
 student-GEN.PL NEG one.GEN NEG got.ill  
 Intended: 'None of the students got ill.' {a ≈ c}
- b. *Uchenik-ov ni odnogo net na meste.*  
 student-GEN.PL NEG one.gen NEG.be at place  
 'None of the students are at the spot/place.' {b ≈ d}

- c. *Uchenik-a ni odnogo ne zaboledo.*  
 student-GEN NEG one.GEN NEG got.ill
- d. *Uchenik-a ni odnogo net na meste.*  
 student-GEN NEG one.GEN NEG.be at place

(24) Context: We've been walking in the forest looking for mushrooms for 2 hours and still haven't found anything.

- a. *Zdes' grib-ov nikak-ikh ne rastet.*  
 here mushroom-GEN.PL no-GEN.PL NEG grows.3SG  
 'There grow no mushrooms here.'
- b. *Zdes' grib-ov nikak-ikh net.*  
 here mushroom-GEN.PL no-GEN.PL NEG.be  
 'There are no mushrooms here.'

Context: You promised to show me some beautiful mushroom in the forest but we haven't been able to find it for hours.

- c. *Zdes' grib-a nikak-ogo ne rastet.*  
 here mushroom-GEN no-GEN NEG grows.3SG  
 'There grows no mushroom here.'
- d. *Zdes' grib-a nikak-ogo net.*  
 here mushroom-GEN no-GEN NEG.be  
 'There is no mushroom here.'

Also, negative FQs may refer to the subject of the prohibitive. The construction with *nikakoj* here is not possible, since the subject of the prohibitive is necessarily the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun, and this construction is only possible with 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns.

- (25) *Vy ne khodite bol'she nikto po etoj doroge.*  
 you.PL NEG walk.IMP.PL anymore nobody on this road  
 'Don't any of you walk this road anymore.' {(25) = (26) = (27)}
- (26) a. *Vy ne khodite bol'she ni odin po etoj doroge.*  
 you.PL NEG walk.IMP.PL anymore NEG one on this road
- b. *\*Ty ne khodi bol'she ni odin po etoj doroge.*  
 you.SG NEG walk.IMP anymore NEG one on this road

- (27) a. \**Vy ne khodite bol'she nikak-ie po etoj doroge.*  
 you.PL NEG walk.IMP.PL anymore no-PL on this road
- b. \**Ty ne khodi bol'she nikak-oj po etoj doroge.*  
 you.PL NEG walk.IMP anymore no-SG.M on this road

### 3.2. The restrictor's structure

Constructions with *nikto*, *ni odin* are also possible with a personal plural pronoun in the subject position.

- (28) *Vy zdes' nikto ne govorate...*  
 you.PL here nobody NEG say.3PL  
 'None of you here say.'  
 [RNC: Alexey Slapovsky. "The big book of change" // "Volga", 2010]
- (29) *Pust' oni ni odin ne sposobny prostit' menya...*  
 let.be they NEG one NEG able forgive.INF me.ACC  
 'Let them not be able to forgive me.'  
 [T. Solovjova "What did Benedicto say?", 2017]

In a construction with *ni odin* as the subject, only the plural pronoun is possible. A construction with *nikakoj* is possible if the quantifier and the personal pronoun are in plural, but with no context, it is perceived as odd (for data see [Voznesenskaia 2019: 29]).

A subject with a universal quantifier word, *kazhdyj* 'each', *vsyakij* 'every' or *lyuboj* 'any', cannot be part of a construction with negative FQs. *Nikto* requires a plural subject (denoting a plurality of individuals), while these pronouns require a single individual. *Ni odin* and *nikakoj* cannot refer to a subject with one of these words. If *lyuboj* is in plural, such constructions still turn out to be unacceptable, except for (33a).

- (30) \**Kazhdyj/lyuboj/vsyakij moj drug nikto/ni odin/nikakoj*  
 each/any/any my friend nobody/NEG one/no
- ne kurit.*  
 NEG smoke.3SG  
 Intended: 'Not any one of my friends smoke.'
- (31) \**V etoj situatsii lyubye yurist-y nikto ne pomozhet.*  
 in this situation any.PL lawyer-PL nobody NEG help.3SG  
 Intended: 'No lawyer will help in this situation.'

(32) a. \**Mne lyubye lekarstv-a ni odno ne pomogaet.*  
 me.DAT any.PL medicine-PL NEG one NEG help.3SG  
 Intended: ‘No medicine helps me.’ {a = b}

b. \**Mne lyuboe lekarstvo ni odno ne pomogaet.*  
 me.DAT any.SG medicine NEG one NEG help.3SG

(33) a. ?*Mne lyubye lekarstv-a nikak-ie ne pomogayut.*  
 me.DAT any.PL medicine-PL no-PL NEG help.3PL  
 ‘No medicine helps me.’ {a = b}

b. ??*Mne lyuboe lekarstvo nikakoe ne pomogaet.*  
 me.DAT any.SG medicine no NEG help.3SG

However, for some speakers, sentences like (34) are acceptable, in which *nikto* refers to a subject with a quantifier word *vse* ‘all’. A construction with *ni odin* is also possible for a subject with the pronoun *vse* ‘all’ (35), denoting a concrete, not an abstract set, a construction with *nikakoj* doesn’t seem very natural (36).

(34) *Vse moi druz’ya eshche nikto ne zhenilsya.*  
 all my friends yet nobody NEG got.married  
 ‘None of my friends got married yet.’ {(34) = (35)}

(35) *Vse moi druz’ya eshche ni odin ne zhenilsya.*  
 all my friends yet NEG one NEG got.married

(36) ??*Vse eti lekarstv-a uzhe nikak-ie ne pomogayut.*  
 all these medicine-PL already no-PL NEG help.3PL  
 Intended: ‘None of these medicines help anymore.’

As for indefinite pronouns, the pronoun itself cannot be a subject in constructions with negative FQs. However, the subject may include the pronoun *nekotorye* ‘some’. In (38)–(39), *nekotorye studenty* refer to some natural groups of students, for example, a year or a study group. In (40) *nekotorye tetradi* can also be understood only as notebooks, for example, of students from some study groups or years. So, (41), where *nekotorye* clearly refers to certain groups of individuals, turn out to be acceptable.

- (37) \**Kto-to/kto-nibud'*    ***nikto/ni odin/nikakoj***  
 someone                    nobody/NEG one/no

*ne*    *vypolnil*    *zadanie.*  
 NEG    complete    task

Intended: 'None of someone completed the task.'

- (38) ?*Nekotorye*    *studenty*    ***nikto***    *ne*    *vypolnil*    *zadanie.*  
 some-PL            students    nobody    NEG    complete    task  
 'None of some students completed the task.' {(38) = (39)}

- (39) *Nekotorye*    *studenty*    ***ni odin***    *ne*    *vypolnil*    *zadanie.*  
 some-PL            students    NEG    one            NEG    complete    task

- (40) Context: Students from all years should have handed in their homework in notebooks. When I came to collect the notebooks, I didn't find the notebooks belonging to students from some years.

a. *Nekotorye*    *tetradi*    ***nikak-ie***    *ne*    *nashlis'*.  
 some-PL            notebooks    no-PL            NEG    were.found  
 'None of some notebooks were found.' {a = b}

b. \**Nekotorye*    *tetradi*    ***nikakaya***    *ne*    *nashlas'*.  
 some-PL            notebooks    no                    NEG    was.found

- (41) Context: A lot of students ignore their homework. In particular 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students don't do homework.

a. *Nekotorye*    *kursy*    *prosto*    ***nikto***    *ne*    *sdaet*            *zadani-ya.*  
 some-PL            years    just            nobody    NEG    hand.in.3SG    task-PL  
 'In some years, nobody hands in the tasks.' {a = b}

b. *Nekotorye*    *kursy*    *prosto*    ***ni odin***    *ne*    *sdaet*            *zadani-ya.*  
 some-PL            years    just            NEG    one            NEG    hand.in.3SG    task-PL

In this example, the semantics of such sentences with *nekotorye* can be noticed. The quantifier's restrictor is the collective noun *kursy*. Moreover, *nikto* and *ni odin* quantizes the representatives of the respective collective, and not the collectives themselves. Apparently, the same thing happens in (89)–(90): some groups of students are such that none of the members of this group completed the task.

### 3.3. Null subjects

A null element can also be a subject in a clause with negative FQs. So, the negative FQs can refer to PRO in infinitives with subject (42)–(44) and object control (45)–(47). Here we assume that the negative FQ is part of the infinitive primarily because the negation necessary for licensing the *ni*-elements is only in the infinitive. In this case, at least in the construction with *ni odin*, PRO can only be controlled by a plural NP (43b), (47b).

- (42) *Student-y reshil-i [nikto ne prikhodit' na ekzamen].*  
 student-PL decided-PL nobody NEG some.INF on exam  
 'The students have decided to none of them come to the exam.'  
 {(42) = (43)}

- (43) a. *Student-y reshil-i [ni odin ne prikhodit' na ekzamen].*  
 student-PL decided-PL NEG one NEG some.INF on exam

- b. \**Student reshil [ni odin ne prikhodit' na ekzamen].*  
 student decided NEG one NEG some.INF on exam

(44) Context: Once I got a prank call but I could outwit the callers.

- a. *Pranker-y reshil-i [nikak-ie mne bol'she ne zvonit'].*   
 pranker-PL decided-PL no-PL me.DAT anymore NEG call.INF  
 'The prankers have decided to none of them call me anymore.' {a ≈ b}

- b. ??*Pranker reshil [nikakoj mne bol'she ne zvonit'].*   
 pranker decided no me.DAT more NEG call.INF

- (45) *Uchitel' poprosil detej nikogo / nikomu*  
 teacher asked kids.ACC nobody.ACC / nobody.DAT

*ne obizhat' Vasyu.*  
 NEG insult.INF Vasya.ACC

'The teacher asked the kids that none of them insults Vasya.'

{(45) = (46)}

- (46) a. *Uchitel' poprosil detej ni odnogo / ni odnomu*  
 teacher asked kids.ACC NEG one.ACC / NEG one.DAT

*ne obizhat' Vasyu.*  
 NEG insult.INF Vasya.ACC

- b. \**Uchitel'*    *poprosil*    *uchenik-a*    *ni*    *odnogo* / *ni*    *odnomu*  
 teacher        asked        student-ACC    NEG    one.ACC /    NEG    one.DAT
- ne*    *obizhat'*    *Vasyu.*  
 NEG    insult.INF    Vasya.ACC

(47) Context: Since I looked up realtors on the internet a lot of realtors call me and offer their services.

- a. *Ya poprosil rieltor-ov*    ?*nikak-ikh*/*\*nikak-im*  
 I    asked        realtor-ACC.PL    no-ACC.PL/no-DAT.PL

*bol'she ne zvonit'*.  
 more        NEG    call.INF

'I asked that none of the realtors call again.' {a ≈ b}

- b. *Ya poprosil rieltor-a*    ??*nikak-ogo*/*\*nikak-omu*  
 I    asked        realtor-ACC    no-ACC/no-DAT.PL

*bol'she ne zvonit'*.  
 more        NEG    call.INF

Negative floating quantifiers can also refer to PRO in converbs. In this case, PRO must also be controlled by the plural NP (the details are set out in [Voznesenskaia 2019]).

Also possible are negative FQs referring to the subject of particles in case of *nikto* + PL, *ni odin* + PL and *nikakoj*.PL + PL (see [Voznesenskaia 2019: 32]).

Thus, negative floating quantifiers can refer to a number of different subjects, however, for constructions with some quantifier words there are restrictions on the structure of the restrictor.

#### 4. Split negative quantifier constructions in the direct object position

The considered negative quantifier words may also refer to the direct object. In this case, *nikto*, *ni odin* and *nikakoj* agree with the direct object in case.

In Russian, a direct object in a negative context can be encoded genitive. In the case of the negative FQ *nikto*, the corresponding NP can only be animate, which means that the surface difference between the accusative and the genitive under negation in sentences like (48) will not be noticeable. However, the negative FQs *ni odin* and *nikakoj* allow seeing that genitive direct addition is also possible in these constructions.

- (48) a. *Ya inostrann-ykh knig (poka) ni odnoj ne chitala.*  
 I foreign-GEN.PL book.GEN.PL yet NEG one NEG read.3SG  
 ‘I haven't yet read any foreign books.’ {(48) ≈ (49)}
- b. *Ya inostrann-oj knig-i (poka) ni odnoj ne chitala.*  
 I foreign-GEN book-GEN yet NEG one NEG read.3SG
- (49) a. *Ya inostrann-ykh knig (poka) nikak-ikh ne chitala.*  
 I foreign-GEN.PL book.GEN.PL yet no-GEN.PL NEG read.3SG
- b. *Ya inostrann-oj knig-i (poka) nikak-oj ne chitala.*  
 I foreign-GEN book-GEN yet no-GEN NEG read.3SG

The restrictor, in the case of a direct object, can also be expressed by a plural personal pronoun.

- (50) *Ya ikh nikogo ne znayu.*  
 I they.ACC nobody.ACC NEG know.1SG  
 ‘I don't know any of them.’  
 [RNC: Sergei Mostovshchikov. Rublevka (1997) // «Stolitsa», 1997.04.01]
- (51) *Esli vspomnim pyatiletki —*  
 if remember.2SG five.year.plans
- my ikh, kstati, ni odnu ne vpolnili.*  
 we they.ACC btw NEG one NEG completed.2SG  
 ‘If we remember five-year plans, we completed none of them.’  
 [RNC: Komsomolskaya pravda, 2007.03.29]

*Nikto* and *ni odin* go with both the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> person pronouns. *Nikakoj* goes well enough only with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun. The data can be found in [Voznesenskaia 2019: 34–35].

In the case when the restrictor is a direct object, it cannot be expressed by an NP, which includes universal quantifiers *kazhdyj* ‘each’, *vsyakij* ‘every’, *lyuboj* ‘any’ (singular). However, *lyuboj*, in plural, for some speakers can modify the restrictor object (54)–(55) for *ni odin* and *nikakoj*. These sentences do not receive high ratings on the Likert scale, especially in the case of *ni odin*.



- (52) a. \**Vasya kazhdogo svoego druga nikogo/ni odnogo/nikakogo*  
 Vasya each his friend.ACC nobody.ACC/NEG one.ACC/no.ACC

*ne priglasil na den' rozhdeniya.*  
 NEG invited on day birth.GEN

Intended: 'Vasya didn't invite any of his friends to his birthday.'

- b. \**Vasya lyubogo/vsyakogo politika nikogo/ni odnogo/nikakogo*  
 Vasya any/every politician nobody.ACC/NEG one.ACC/no.ACC

*ne uvazhaet.*  
 NEG respect.3SG

Intended: 'Vasya doesn't respect any politicians.'

- (53) \**Nash nachal'nik lyubykh zhenshchin nikogo ne uvazhaet.*  
 our boss any women.ACC nobody.ACC NEG respect.3SG

Intended: 'Our boss doesn't respect any women.'

- (54) a. ??*Moya babushka lyubye lekarstv-a printsipial'no*  
 my grandma any.PL medicine-ACC.PL in.principle

*ni odno ne prinimaet.*  
 NEG one NEG take.3SG

Intended: 'My grandma basically doesn't take any medicine.' {(54) ≈ (55)}

- b. \**Moya babushka lyuboe lekarstv-o printsipial'no*  
 my grandma any medicine-ACC in.principle

*ni odno ne prinimaet.*  
 NEG one NEG take.3SG

- (55) a. ?*Moya babushka lyubye lekarstv-a printsipial'no*  
 my grandma any.PL medicine-ACC.PL in.principle

*nikak-ie ne prinimaet.*  
 no-PL NEG take.3sg

- b. \**Moya babushka lyuboe lekarstv-o printsipial'no*  
 my grandma any medicine-ACC in.principle

*nikakoe ne prinimaet.*  
 no NEG take.3SG

Nevertheless, as in negative FQ constructions in the subject position, the restrictor NP can be modified with a universal quantifier *vse* ‘all’.

- (56) *Moi roditeli vsekh moikh druzei nikogo*  
 my parents all.ACC my.ACC friends.ACC nobody.ACC  
*ne odobryayut.*  
 NEG approve.3PL  
 ‘My parents don’t approve of all of my friends.’ {(56) = (57)}

- (57) *Moi roditeli vsekh moikh druzei ni odnogo*  
 my parents all.ACC my.ACC friends.ACC NEG one  
*ne odobryayut.*  
 NEG approve.3PL

- (58) Context: I’m a writer but my parents wanted me to be a doctor. They haven’t even read what I write.

*Moi roditeli vse moi knig-i nikak-ie ne chitayut.*  
 my parents all my book-PL no-PL NEG read  
 ‘My parent’s don’t read any of all of my books.’

Indefinite pronouns cannot be a direct object in these constructions (59). It is possible, however, to modify the plural restrictor by the pronoun *nekotorye* ‘some’. Here, also *nekotorye studenty* and *nekotorye tetradi* are interpreted as some groups of students/notebooks.

- (59) \**Ya zdes’ kogo-to/kogo-nibud’ nikogo/ni odnogo/nikakogo*  
 I here someone/anyone nobody.ACC/NEG one.ACC/no.ACC  
*ne znayu.*  
 NEG know  
 Intended: ‘I don’t know anyone here.’

- (60) Context: I only teach 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years and I don’t know anyone from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year. I can say:

- a. *Ya nekotor-ykh student-ov zdes’ nikogo ne znayu.*  
 I some-ACC.PL student-ACC.PL here nobody.ACC NEG know.1SG  
 ‘I don’t know anyone from some groups of the students here.’ {a = b}
- b. *Ya nekotor-ykh student-ov zdes’ ni odnogo ne znayu.*  
 I some-ACC.PL student-ACC.PL here NEG one.ACC NEG know.1SG

(61) Context: Students from all years should have handed in their homeworks in notebooks. When I came to collect the notebooks, I didn't find the notebooks belonging to students from some years.

?*Ya nekotorye tetrad-i tam nikak-ie ne nashla.*  
 I some-PL notebook-PL there no-PL NEG found

'I haven't found some notebooks (of students from some of the groups).'

Thus, the properties of negative FQ structures in the position of the direct object are similar to their properties in the position of the subject, in addition to the possibility of a genitive restrictor NP.

## 5. Split negative quantifier constructions in inherent dative

Let us also consider, not only NPs bearing structural case, but also inherently case-marked NPs. A case is called inherent here, which, unlike the structural one, is associated with a theta-role (but, unlike the lexical one, is attributed to a functional head, see [Woolford 2006]). As such an inherent case, we consider dative in bitransitive verbs.

(62) *Voobshche ya videni-yam nikak-im ne veril...*  
 actually I vision-DAT.PL no-DAT.PL NEG believed

'Actually I didn't believe any visions.'

[RNC: G. Rasputin "Life of an experienced pilgrim", 1907]

As in the case of subject and object negative FQs, a dative restrictor can be expressed by a personal pronoun. Just as before, constructions with no don't go with pronouns of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person (see [Voznesenskaia 2019: 34] for data).

In the case of a dative restrictor, it also cannot be expressed by an NP, which includes universal quantifiers *kazhdyj* 'each', *vsyakij* 'every'. However, an NP can be modified by *lyubye* 'any' (plural): (63)–(65). As in the previous cases, it is permissible to modify the NP with the quantifier word *vse* 'all'. As for indefinites, they cannot be a dative restrictor but it is possible to modify plural dative restrictors with *nekotorye* 'some' (see [Voznesenskaia 2019: 37] for data).

(63) *Ya lyub-ym politik-am teper' nikomu ne veryu.*  
 I any-DAT.PL politician-DAT.PL now nobody.DAT NEG believe.1SG

'I don't believe any kinds of politicians anymore.' {(63) = (65)}

(64) a. *Ya lyub-ym politik-am teper' ni odnomu ne veryu.*  
 I any-DAT.PL politician-DAT.PL now NEG one.DAT NEG believe.1SG

- b. <sup>?</sup>*Ya lyub-omu politik-u teper' ni odnomu ne veryu.*  
 I any-DAT politician-DAT now NEG one.DAT NEG believe.1SG
- (65) \**Ya kazhd-omu/vsyak-omu politik-u teper'*  
 I each/every-DAT politician-DAT now
- nikomu/ni odnomu/nikak-omu ne veryu.*  
 nobody.DAT/NEG one.DAT/no-DAT NEG believe.1SG
- (66) a. *Ya lyub-ym gazet-am teper' nikak-im ne veryu.*  
 I any-DAT.PL newspaper-DAT.PL now no-DAT NEG believe.1SG  
 'I don't believe any kind of newspapers anymore.' {a ≈ b}
- b. <sup>??</sup>*Ya lyub-oj gazet-e teper' nikakoj ne veryu.*  
 I any-DAT newspaper-DAT now no.DAT NEG believe.1SG

So, when split negative quantifier constructions are in the position of an inherently marked dative argument, various types of restrictors are also possible (here, the unacceptability of modification using *lyuboj* 'any' that appears earlier in subject and object constructions disappears).

## 6. Movement

In this section, we will consider the behavior of negative FQs if the restrictor NP undergoes movement.

### 6.1. A-movement

Here we will consider the behavior of negative FQs if the restrictor NP undergoes A-movement, e.g. raising. In Russian, raising-to-subject occurs in argument small clauses. According to [Bailyn 2011], if a semi-auxiliary verb takes CP as a complement, (67a) is obtained, and if PredP acts as a complement, the small clause subject moves to the position of the main clause subject (67b).

- (67) a. *Kazhetsya, [<sub>CP</sub> chto Sasha genial'nyj muzykant].*  
 seems COMP Sasha brilliant musician  
 'It seems that Sasha is a brilliant musician.'
- b. *Sasha kazhetsya [<sub>PREDP</sub> \_\_ [genial'n-ym muzykant-om]].*  
 Sasha seems brilliant-INS musician-INS  
 'Sasha seems to be a brilliant musician.' [Bailyn 2011: 110]

Let us consider how negative FQs will behave if the restrictor NP undergoes raising-to-subject (68)–(70) in the described context of a small clause. Here, strictly speaking, we cannot say where the negative FQ is located, however, given that it is to the right of the dative argument of the verb, it seems that it is inside a small clause. Constructions with *nikto* and *ni odin* in such a context are possible; constructions with *nikakoj* are rated low.

(68) *Moi druž'ya ne kazhutsya mne nikto egoist-ami.*  
 my friends NEG seem.3PL me.DAT nobody egoist-INS.PL  
 'My friends seem to me to be egoists.' {(68) ≈ (69)}

(69) a. *ʔMoi druž'ya ne kazhutsya mne ni odin egoist-om.*  
 my friends NEG seem.3PL me.DAT NEG one egoist-INS

b. *ʔʔMoj drug ne kazhetsya mne ni odin egoist-om.*  
 my friend NEG seem.3SG me.DAT NEG one egoist-INS

(70) a. *ʔʔKnig-i ne kazhutsya mne nikak-ie skuchn-ymi.*  
 book-pl NEG seem.3PL me.DAT no-PL boring-INS  
 Intended: 'No books seem boring to me.' {a ≈ b}

b. *\*Kniga ne kazhetsya mne nikakaya skuchn-oi.*  
 book NEG seem.3SG me.DAT no boring-INS

## 6.2. A'-movement

### 6.2.1. Wh-movement

*Nikto*, *ni odin* and *nikakoj* cannot refer to a constituent that has undergone *wh*-movement.

(71) *\*Kto k tebe nikto/ni odin/nikakoj ne podkhodil?*  
 who to you.SG.DAT nobody/NEG one/no NEG came.by  
 Intended: 'None of who came to you?'

(72) *\*Ch'i druž'ya k tebe nikto ne podkhodil?*  
 whose friends to you.SG.DAT nobody NEG came.by  
 Intended: 'None of whose friends came to you?' {(72) ≈ (73) ≈ (74)}

(73) a. *\*Ch'i druž'ya k tebe ni odin ne podkhodil?*  
 whose friends to you.SG.DAT NEG one NEG came.by

b. *\*Chej drug k tebe ni odin ne podkhodil?*  
 whose friend to you.SG.DAT NEG one NEG came.by

- (74) a. \**Ch'i druž'ya k tebe nikak-ie ne podkhodili?*  
 whose friends to you.SG.DAT no-PL NEG came.by.PL
- b. \**Chej drug k tebe nikakoj ne podkhodil?*  
 whose friend to you.SG.DAT no NEG came.by

However, if the *wh*-element is D-linked, such a construction becomes possible for *nikto* + PL and *ni odin* + PL. In this case, it seems difficult to verify the acceptability of the constructions with *nikakoj* exactly in the same context, since in combination with *kakoj* 'which' such sentences would sound odd.

- (75) *Kakie student-y nikto ne sdelal zadanie?*  
 which.PL student-PL nobody NEG did task  
 'None of which students did the task?' {(75) = (76)}

- (76) a. *Kakie student-y ni odin ne sdelal zadanie?*  
 which.PL student-PL NEG one NEG did task
- b. *Kakoj student ni odin ne sdelal zadanie?*  
 which student NEG one NEG did task

### 6.2.2. Relative clauses

Consider now negative FQs in relative clauses. Since such constructions turn out to be rather complicated for perception, this part of the work is restricted to constructions with *nikto* + PL, *ni odin* + PL and *nikakoj*.PL + PL, since these structures turn out to be easier to process. So, in the sentence (77), the relative clause is interpreted as nonrestrictive.

- (77) *Ya pomog prokhozh-im, kotor-ye nikto ne znali dorogu.*  
 I helped passerby-DAT.PL REL-PL nobody NEG knew way  
 'I helped passersby, none of who knew the way.'

In case of a restrictive reading enforced by context and the demonstrative pronoun *tot* 'that', most speakers rate such sentences as unacceptable.

- (78) Context: At the conference, I talked to different linguists: syntacticians, phoneticians, phonologists. Everyone except for the syntacticians knew little about syntax.

- a. \**Mne ne-interesno bylo slushat' tekh lingvist-ov,*  
 me.DAT NEG-interesting was listen.INF that.PL.ACC linguist-ACC.PL

*kotor-ye nikto ne razbirayutsya v sintaksis-e.*  
REL-PL nobody NEG understand in syntax-LOC

Intended: 'It wasn't interesting for me to listen to those groups of linguists none of which understand syntax.' {a = b}

b. \**Mne ne-interesno bylo slushat' tekh lingvist-ov,*  
me.DAT NEG-interesting was listen.INF that.PL.ACC linguist-ACC.PL

*kotor-ye ni odin ne razbirayutsya v sintaksis-e.*  
rel-PL NEG one NEG understand in syntax-LOC

At the same time, if the context suggests a nonrestrictive reading, such sentences are acceptable.

(79) Context: All my sisters were supposed to apply for a visa, but they haven't done it before and didn't know how it's done.

a. *Ya pomog svoim sestr-am, kotor-ye nikto ne znali,*  
I helped REFL.ACC sisters-ACC REL-PL nobody NEG knew

*kak oformit' dokumenty.*  
how draw.up.INF documents

'I helped my sisters, none of who knew how to draw up the documents.' {a = b}

b. *Ya pomog svoim sestr-am, kotor-ye ni odna ne znali,*  
I helped REFL.ACC sisters-ACC REL-PL NEG one NEG knew

*kak oformit' dokumenty.*  
how draw.up.INF documents

The split construction with *nikakoj* is also impossible in a relative restrictive clause with subject relativization. However, unlike *nikto* and *ni odin*, the same construction in a nonrestrictive clause is rated as sounding rather odd (81).

(80) Context: There are a lot of dishonest politicians on TV, but they don't let the honest ones there.

\**V efir puskayut tekh politik-ov,*  
in air let.3PL that.ACC.PL politician-ACC.PL

*kotor-ye nikak-ie ne govoryat pravd-y.*  
REL-PL no-PL NEG say.3PL truth-GEN

Intended: 'They only let those politicians on air none of who tell the truth.'

(81) Context: When I was young I liked politics.

<sup>?</sup>*Ya postoyanno slushal (razn-ykh) politik-ov,*  
I constantly listened different-ACC.PL politician-ACC.PL

*kotor-ye nikak-ie ne govori-i pravd-y.*  
REL-PL no-PL NEG say-PL truth-GEN

‘I constantly listened to (different) politicians, none of who were telling the truth.’

So, a relative pronoun can be a restrictor for negative FQs in nonrestrictive relative clauses. Such construction in restrictive relatives is rated as unacceptable. It is also worth noting that *nikakoj* does not follow this distribution pattern completely, namely, it is perceived as noticeably worse in restrictives.

Unlike with *wh*- and relative movement, for all five constructions the restrictor can be topicalized and moved to the left periphery (see [Voznesenskaia 2019: 40] for data).

## 7. Conclusion

In this section I summarize the data and consider some conclusions. As mentioned above, split constructions with negative quantifiers are superficially similar to quantifier float on the one hand, and split scrambling on the other. Consider the properties of the five structures studied in this work: *nikto* + PL, *ni odin* + PL, *ni odin* + SG, *nikakoj*.PL + PL, *nikakoj*.SG + SG.

As shown in this paper, negative FQs generally fit into the distribution pattern described in Madariaga (2007) for constructions with agreeing FQs (which, in turn, follows the English FQ distribution pattern).

Summarizing the results of the restrictor requirements study it can be seen in Table 1 that the constructions in question follow three patterns: the one of *nikto* + PL and *ni odin* + PL, the one of *ni odin* + SG and *nikakoj*.SG + SG, and the one of *nikakoj*.PL + PL.

The paper discusses cases in which a negative FQ is within an infinitival phrase. In this case, it can be said that the negative FQ refers to PRO, also due to the fact that in object control constructions the negative FQ can take “second” dative (that is not true for *nikakoj* though). A negative FQ can also refer to PRO in converbs. This information is of interest, since assuming that all split constructions with negative quantifiers are the result of split scrambling, it doesn't make any sense for PRO to be the dislocated part. On the other hand, floating quantifiers can refer to PRO in languages. Thus, we expect that split



scrambling and quantifier float will behave differently in this configuration. Indeed, constructions with *nikto* + PL, *ni odin* + PL and *nikakoj*.PL + PL are possible in such a configuration, while *ni odin* + SG and *nikakoj*.SG + SG are not.

Also, the stranding theory predicts that FQs will be acceptable within Russian small clauses, since they are analyzed as raising structures, and, consequently, A-movement. As can be seen from section 6.1, constructions with *nikto* + PL and *ni odin* + PL are allowed in this context. Constructions with *ni odin* + SG, *nikakoj*.PL + PL and *nikakoj*.SG + SG — are not.

Table 1. Restrictors in negative FQ constructions

	<i>nikto</i> + PL	<i>ni odin</i> + PL	<i>ni odin</i> + SG	<i>nikakoj</i> .PL + PL	<i>nikakoj</i> .SG + SG
3 <sup>rd</sup> person pronouns	✓	✓	*	✓	*
1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> person pronouns	✓	✓	*	*	*
<i>kazhdyj</i> ‘each’	*	*	*	*	*
<i>vsyakij</i> ‘every’	*	*	*	*	*
<i>lyuboj</i> ‘any’	IO —✓, DO, SUBJ — *	IO —✓, DO, SUBJ — *	IO —?, DO, SUBJ — *	DO, IO —✓, SUBJ — *	IO — ?, DO, SUBJ — *
<i>vse</i> ‘all’	✓	✓	—	✓	—
<i>nekotorye</i> ‘some’	✓	✓	—	✓	—
genitive under negation	SUBJ — *	DO — ✓, SUBJ — *	DO — ✓, SUBJ — ✓	DO — ✓, SUBJ — ✓	DO — ✓, SUBJ — ✓
dative subject	SUBJ — ✓	SUBJ — ✓	SUBJ — ✓	SUBJ — ✓	SUBJ — ✓
PRO	SUBJ — ✓	SUBJ — ✓	SUBJ — *	SUBJ — ✓	SUBJ — *

Turning to A'-movement, from the fact that negative FQs are allowed with topicalized restrictors, in participles and in nonrestrictive relative clauses, but aren't allowed with *wh*-phrases and restrictive relative clauses, it can be concluded that the studied structures don't combine with operator movement. This contrast is best seen in the difference between the ratings for restrictive and nonrestrictive relatives. Such an attitude to the movement of the operator is characteristic of quantifier float, but not of split topicalization. However, D-linked *wh*-phrases can nevertheless be restrictors of negative FQs (but only in plural). I therefore assume that this restriction is semantic in nature.

Thus, by a number of properties, constructions with *nikto* + PL and *ni odin* + PL pattern together with floating quantifiers. Also, by the same properties, constructions with *ni odin* + SG and *nikakoj*.SG + SG pattern together with split scrambling. The construction with *nikakoj*.PL + PL, being one of the most common, exhibits the properties of both groups.

In conclusion, the constructions under study were divided into three groups, the first (*nikto* + PL and *ni odin* + PL) was proposed to be analyzed as a case of quantifier float, the second (*ni odin* + SG and *nikakoj*.SG + SG) — as a case of split scrambling. For the third group (*nikakoj*.PL + PL), the data turned out to be controversial.

## Abbreviations

ACC — accusative; COMP — complementizer; DAT — dative; F — feminine; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; NEG — negation; NEUT — neutral; PL — plural; REL — relative pronoun; SG — singular.

## References

- Baylin 2011 — Bailyn J. The Syntax of Russian (Cambridge Syntax Guides). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Baltin 1995 — Baltin M.R. Floating quantifiers, PRO, and predication. *Linguistic inquiry*. 1995. P. 199–248.
- Doetjes 1997 — Doetjes J.S. Quantifiers and selection. On the distribution of quantifying expressions in French, Dutch and English. HAG, 1997.
- Grashchenkov 2009 — Grashchenkov P.V. Dreif kvantora kak svidetel'stvo sushchestvovaniya partitivnoi proektsii v imennoi gruppe. [Quantifier float as evidence for a partitive projection in NP]. Kiseleva K.L., Plungian V.A., Rakhilina E.V., Tatevosov S.G. (eds.). *Korpusnye issledovaniya po russkoi grammatike* [Corpus research in Russian grammar]. Moscow: Probel. P. 397–425.
- Hoeksema 1996 — Hoeksema J. Floating quantifiers, partitives and distributivity. Partitives: studies on the syntax and semantics of partitive and related constructions. 1996. No. 14. P. 57–106.
- Madariaga 2007 — Madariaga N. Russian patterns of floating quantification: (Non-) Agreeing Quantifiers. *Linguistic investigations into formal of Slavic languages* (postdam linguistic investigations). Frankfurt Am Main, 2007. P. 267–281.
- Ott 2012 — Ott D. Local instability: Split topicalization and quantifier float in German. Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Pereltsvaig 2008 — Pereltsvaig A. Split phrases in colloquial Russian. *Studia Linguistica*. 2008. No. 62(1). P. 5–38.
- Pesetsky 1982 — Pesetsky D.M. Paths and categories. Ph.D. dis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1982.
- Shlonsky 1992 — Shlonsky U. Resumptive pronouns as a last resort. *Linguistic inquiry*. 1992. No. 23(3). P. 443–468.

- Sportiche 1988 — Sportiche D. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. *Linguistic inquiry*. 1988. No. 19(3). P. 425–449.
- Tiskin 2016 — Tiskin D. Negative floating quantifiers: underestimated evidence for the stranding analysis? // *Proceedings of the international conference “Typology of morphosyntactic parameters 2016”*. Iss. 3. Konoshenko M.B., Lyutikova E.A., Zimmerling A.V. (eds.). Moscow: Moscow State University of Education, 2016. P. 313–325.
- Van Hoof 2006 — Van Hoof H. Split topicalization. *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. 2006. P. 410–465.
- Voznesenskaia 2019 — Voznesenskaia A. Sintaksis otritsatel’nykh plavayushchikh kvantorov (na materiale russkogo yazyka) [The syntax of negative floating quantifiers (based on Russian data)]. BA thesis. Moscow: Lomonosov Moscow State University, 2019.
- Woolford 2006 — Woolford E. Lexical case, inherent case, and argument structure. *Linguistic inquiry*. 2006. No. 37(1), P. 111–130.

Статья поступила в редакцию 16.11.2019

The article was received on 16.11.2019

**Анастасия Юрьевна Вознесенская**

студент 1 курса магистратуры, МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова

**Anastasiia Yu. Voznesenskaia**

1<sup>st</sup> year M.A. student, Lomonosov Moscow State University

[anastvozn@gmail.com](mailto:anastvozn@gmail.com)