

## -NIBUD'-PRONOUNS IN IRREALIS INFINITIVES: STRUCTURE AND LICENSING

Natalia Fitzgibbons

Concordia University, Montreal, Canada

This paper provides evidence from Russian that irrealis infinitives can be generated as either TPs or CPs. The evidence comes from facts about licensing of two series of indefinite pronouns: the *ni*-series and the *-nibud'*-series. Members of the *ni*-series are negative concord items licensed by sentential negation (the head of NegP, which dominates TP); they cannot be licensed across a CP phase boundary (Brown (1999), Fitzgibbons (2010), among others). *-Nibud'*-items, on the other hand, are licensed by certain items that have been argued in the literature to be in the CP domain, such as the question operators ((Cheng (1991), Chomsky (1995), Rizzi (1997), (1999), Sportiche (1995))) and imperative operators ((Han (2001), (Belletti (1999), Schwager (2005), Zanuttini (2008))). *-Nibud'*-items are also licensed by quantificational NPs as observed, for example, in Yanovich (2005); I refine Yanovich's conclusion by showing that only inherently presuppositional quantificational NPs are licensors. I argue that QNP licensors of *-nibud'* are in the CP domain as well, based on the syntactic position of *-nibud'* and the range of available interpretations for weak and strong quantifiers in the presence of *-nibud'*.

Suppose that irrealis infinitives contain an irrealis operator  $C_{IRR}$  in CP along the lines of Stowell (1982). I make the following prediction then: if irrealis infinitives are CPs, *ni*- will not be licensed in them by superordinate negation, but *-nibud'* will be fine; if irrealis infinitives are smaller than CP, *ni*- will be licensed by superordinate negation, but *-nibud'* will not be licensed (unless there is a licenser in the matrix clause). This prediction is confirmed: *ni*- and *-nibud'* cannot co-occur in an irrealis infinitive (1a), although they can occur there separately (1b,c).

I argue that the reason for the contrast between (1a) and (1b,c) lies in the different locality requirements on licensing of *ni*- and *-nibud'*-items. Namely, for *-nibud'*- to be licensed in an infinitival complement, the infinitival complement has to be a CP. Conversely, the *ni*-item will be separated from negation by the CP boundary and as a consequence will not be licensed because it needs to be in the same CP phase with the licensing Neg head.

I propose that a Russian irrealis infinitive can be a CP or a smaller structure; when *-nibud'* is licensed, the infinitive is a CP; when *ni*- is licensed, the infinitive is smaller than CP. This analysis explains why, if the *ni*-item moves into the matrix clause in (1a), the sentence becomes grammatical (2). To be licensed, *ni*- needs to be in the same CP phase with negation. In (1a), this condition is violated, but in (2) it is satisfied.

This analysis extends to *-nibud'*-licensing in infinitival complements to licensing by modals (3). With respect to the examples in (3a,b) on the epistemic meaning, the question arises whether it is the modal that licenses *-nibud'* (4a), or  $C_{IRR}$  (4b). I argue for the analysis where the  $C_{IRR}$  and not the modal is the licenser. The reason is that modal verbs undergo head movement (Stowell (2004), Lechner (2006), (2007), Roberts (2010)), which means that we cannot rule out the root meaning for (3a) – there will be a point in the derivation where the root modal c-commands *-nibud'* (5a). On the theory where  $C_{IRR}$  is the licenser, the epistemic reading for (3a) is correctly ruled out (5b). In (5b), *-nibud'* is not in the scope of its licenser,  $C_{IRR}$ , at any point in the derivation.

1. a. Ja ne xoču \*komu-nibud' ničego/ (??)\*ničego komu-nibud' davat'.  
I not want who-*nibud'* n-what/ n-what who-*nibud'* give  
'I do not want to give anything to someone or other.'
- b. Ja ne xoču ničego emu davat'.  
I not want n-what him give  
'I do not want to give him anything.'
- c. Ja ne xoču komu-nibud' davat' den'gi.  
I not want who-*nibud'* give money  
'I do not want to give money to someone or other.'

- (2) Ja ničego ne xoču komu-nibud' davat'.  
 I n-what NEG want who-*nibud'* give  
 'I do not want to give anything to someone or other.'  
 [Ja [<sub>NEGP</sub> ničego<sub>i</sub> ne xoču [<sub>CP</sub> komu-nibud' ~~ničego<sub>i</sub>~~ davat']]
- (3) a. Kto-nibud' mozet stat' millionerom.  
 Who-*nibud'* can become millionaire  
 Epistemic: it is probable that someone or other will become a millionaire.  
 \*Root: someone or other has the ability to become a millionaire.  
 b. Oxotnik mozet podstrelit' kakogo-nibud' zverja.  
 Hunter may shoot which-*nibud'* animal  
 Epistemic: it is possible that the hunter will shoot some animal or other.  
 Root: the hunter is allowed to shoot some animal or other.
- (4) a. [Kto-nibud' **mozet** [~~kto-nibud'~~ stat' millionerom].  
 b. [Kto-nibud' mozet [<sub>CP</sub> C<sub>IRR</sub> [~~kto-nibud'~~ stat' millionerom].
- (5) a. [Kto-nibud' **mozet<sub>tj</sub>** ~~kto-nibud'~~ <sub>tj</sub>[PRO stat' millionerom].  
 b. [Kto-nibud' mozet<sub>tj</sub> ~~kto-nibud'~~ <sub>tj</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C<sub>IRR</sub> <sub>tj</sub>[PRO stat' millionerom].

#### References:

- Brown, Sue. 1999. *The Syntax of Russian Negation. A Minimalist Approach*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Cheng, L. L.-S. 1991. *On the Typology of Wh-questions*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Fitzgibbons, Natalia. 2010. *Licensers and Meanings: Structural Properties of Dependent Indefinites*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCONN.
- Han, Chung-hye. 1999. The Contribution of Mood and Force in the Interpretation of Imperatives. *NELS* 29, pp. 97-111.
- Lechner, W. 2007. Interpretive Effects of Head Movement. (<http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000178>)
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Haegeman, L. (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1999. On the Position "Int(errogative)" in the Left Periphery of the Clause.
- Roberts, I. 2010. *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press
- Schwager, Johanna Magdalena. 2005. *Interpreting imperatives*. Ph.D. dissertation, Frankfurt am Main, Goethe Universität.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1995. Sketch of a reductionist approach to syntactic variation and dependencies. In Hector Campos and Paula Kempchinsky, eds., *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory*, Georgetown University Press, 356-398.
- Stowell, T. 1982. The Tense of Infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 561 – 570.
- Stowell, T. 2004. Tense and Modals. In Guéron, J., and J.Lecarme (eds.) *The Syntax of Time*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 626-635
- Yanovich, Igor. 2005. Choice-functional Series of Indefinites and Hamblin Semantics. Paper presented at SALT 15
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2008. "Encoding the Addressee in the syntax: Evidence from English Imperative Subjects", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26/1: 185-218.