Licensing negative polarity items in Russian event nominalizations[1]

Anastasia Gerasimova

This paper addresses the issue of licensing negative polarity items in Russian nominalizations. Negation in nominalizations provides negative concord which licenses negative pronouns. Crucially, non-specific indefinite *-nibud'* pronouns, which are usually prohibited in negative concord environments, are available in negated nominalizations, too. In this paper I determine the position of NegP within Russian nominalizations and examine licensing conditions of polarity sensitive items in nominalizations. My analysis suggests that *-nibud'* pronouns are licensed in the scope of the nonveridical operator that is introduced above NegP.

1. Introduction

This paper deals with Russian negated nominalizations, which exhibit a set of features of low frequency phenomena. While nominalizations in general are low frequent in Russian and receive relatively low scores (Pereltsvaig et al. 2018), negated nominalizations are even less used. However, investigation of non-finite structures such as nominalizations contributes to solving the Problem of indirect access (Zucchi 1999), which is that inflected verbs might differ from the uninflected verb forms that are in fact fed into the semantic interpretation component. In particular, nominalizations contain less functional structure than their finite counterparts (e.g. finite clause), and, therefore, can provide evidence for what are the properties of verbs and immediate verbal projections at early stages of syntactic derivation (Lyutikova & Tatevosov 2016). In this paper, using primarily corpus data I study the position and licensing conditions of negation within nominalizations. I hypothesize that negation in nominalizations appears high in the structure and contra clausal negation allows for the presence of polarity elements which are licensed by non-veridical operators from the matrix clause.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I overview generalizations from the previous literature on negated nominalizations in Russian. Section 3 presents the results of a corpus study on the properties of negation and characteristics of polarity sensitive items licensing in negated nominalizations. In section 4, I examine the position of negation with respect to nominalizer. The observations on distribution of pronouns lead me to propose an analysis for licensing conditions in nominalizations in section 5. Section 6 concludes with some

notes on methodological issues that have arisen when studying low frequent language phenomena.

2. Negated process nominalizations in Russian

Russian process nominalizations are derived with the productive suffixes *-nij-/-tij-* from verbal stems (Shvedova 1980). Process nominalizations have an argument structure which is associated with *v*P functional layer, which correlates with several syntactic properties, viz.: availability for adverbial modification (e.g. agent-oriented modifiers), causative-inchoative alternation, and the ability of the external argument to control phonologically null pronominal phrase (PRO) in purpose clauses (Alexiadou 2001, Pazel'skaya & Tatevosov 2008). According to Pazel'skaya & Tatevosov (2008), the highest available projection which can appear in Russian process nominalizations is Aspect Phrase (AspP).

Russian process nominalizations can be negated. In Russian there are two ways of expressing negation: syntactic negation which is expressed by the particle *ne* or, less frequently, particle *ni*, and negation expressed by derivational affixes, the most frequent of which is the affix *ne-*. Syntactic negation is common for verbs, while derivational negation is mostly used with other parts of speech: adjectives, adverbs and nouns (Pazel'skaya 2006). The difference between the two types of negation is dictated by the fact that syntactic negation can be separated by other words from the predicate (Paducheva 2011). Negated nominalizations are derived by the productive derivational affix *ne-* and do not contain syntactic negation: in (2b) *ne* cannot be separated from nominalization by an adjective (if the sense of (2a) is intended); the only possible interpretation is when *ne* is attributed to the nearest adjective *vcherashnee* 'yesterday's'.

(1)   *Ne [vetry veyut buinye],   Ne [mat'-zemlya kolyshetsya]*
        NEG winds blow   vigorous NEG mother-earth trembels
        Shumit, poet,   rugaetsya ... u prazdnika narod
        roars   sings   swears   at the feast   people
        'It is not the rushing of furious whirlwinds, not Mother Earth shaking, this is people's shouting, singing, swearing at the feast'

(2)   a. *ego vcherashnee nevmeshatel'stvo   v konflikt*
           his   yesterday's   nonintervention   in conflict
        'his yesterday not intervening in a conflict'
        b.*ego   ne   vcherashnee vmeshatel'stvo   v konflikt*
           his   NEG yesterday's intervention   in conflict
        int. 'his yesterday not intervening in a conflict'
        but grammatical if : int. 'his not-yesterday intervening in a conflict'

Pazel'skaya (2006) distinguishes three semantic types of negated nominalizations. First, there are nominalizations that denote negated events with the meaning that the expected event was not realized: *nepopadanie* 'not-stricking', *neprisoedinenie* 'not-attaching', *nesovpadenie* 'mismatching'. These nominalizations are compatible with modifiers that mean repeated action like *mnogokratnyi* 'multiple', *regulyarnyi* 'regular', they denote telic events and can be pluralized.

Second, there are nominalizations that denote statives and atelic events and cannot be pluralized. This second semantic type is the so-called *existential negation*: there is no time interval in which the event denoted by the verbal stem was realized: *nenapadenie* ' nonaggression', *nevmeshatel'stvo* 'nonintervention', *nerasprostranenie* 'non-proliferation'. These negated nominalizations are compatible with adjectives denoting time periods: e.g. *trekhletnii* 'three-year long', *dvukhchasovoi* 'two-hour long'. Finally, there are nominalizations that denote negated states, situation such that during a certain period of time the situation denoted by the verbal stem is not realized: *nenakhozhdenie* 'not -finding', *nesootvetstvie* 'discrepancy', *neznanie* 'ignorance'. These nominalizations are compatible with adjectives denoting duration: e.g. *mnogoletnii* 'long-standing'.

According to Pazel'skaya (2006), process nominalizations cannot contain negation due to semantic reasons. Specifically, it is claimed that the timeline in which no process is realized cannot be presented as another process. In particular, Pazel'skaya provides the list of possible candidates, which are unacceptable, according to her judgments: *nekormlenie* 'NEG-feeding', *nepodmetanie* 'NEG-brooming', *nepodderzhanie* 'NEG-supporting', *neraskachivanie* 'NEG-swinging', *nekhrapenie* 'NEG-snoring'.

In this paper I argue that the statement made by Pazel'skaya is not consistent with the data from colloquial speech. In particular, I show that negated process nominalizations do not only exist but demonstrate behavior similar to that of syntactic negation, in particular, licensing of negative polarity items.

3. The Internet-Corpus Study

In order to assess Pazel'skaya's claim about negated process nominalizations, I conducted a study in The General Internet-Corpus of Russian (GICR) (Belikov et al. 2013). The GICR is a corpus of Russian internet texts that contains materials from the largest Russian Internet resources: social network VKontakte, blogging websites LiveJournal and Mail.ru, an archive of Russian literary magazines "Magazine Hall" and several news sites. The contents of the corpus present both colloquial and standardized speech in different genres and registers.

3.1. Do negated nominalizations exist?

The GICR reveals more than 30 000 results with more than 1000 instances of negated nominalizations. Curiously, the generalization about process nominalizations by Pazel'skaya is inconsistent with the data from colloquial speech. All the mentioned instances of negated process nominalizations (the "unacceptable" process nominalizations such as *nekormlenie* 'NEG-feeding' from Pazel'skaya (2006), listed in Section 2) were found in corpus (e.g. (3), (4)) together with other stems, e.g.: *nenapisanie* 'NEG-writing', *nesledovanie* 'NEG-following', *nevladenie* 'NEG-mastering', *neuspevanie* 'NEG-keeping up', (5).

(3)   a *tochnee   nepodmetanie   na moei ulitse   periodicheski musora …*
        to be precise NEG-sweeping   in my street   occasionally   rubbish
        'And to be precise the occasional not sweeping the rubbish in my street'

(4)   *Yavlyaetsya   li   nepodderzhanie blagotvoritel'noi initsiativy   grekhom*
        is   whether   NEG-supporting   charity   initiative   sin
        'Whether not supporting a charity initiative is a sin'

(5)　*argumentiruet on　　svoe nerabotanie　tem, chto　zhizn'　korotka*
　　　argues　　　　he　　his　　NEG-working　by that　　life　　　short
　　　'He reasons his not working by saying that life is short'

Grimshaw (1990) distinguished two types of nominalizations, namely result and process (event) nominals. Both types have an argument structure which is associated with the functional projection VP. The evidence for the distinction is based upon a set of diagnostics, viz.: nominals with a process interpretation obligatorily take internal arguments, pass the telicity test, take aspectual and agent-oriented modifiers. Importantly, negated process nominals as affirmative event nominalizations obligatorily take internal arguments (3), (4), and may take aspectual modifiers (6).

(6)　a. *postoyannoe　nevyderzhivanie　avtorskikh　　dlitel'nosteǐ*
　　　　　constant　　　NEG-keeping　　　original　　　(note) values
　　　　　'the constant not keeping the original note values'
　　　b. *Ezhednevnoe　　neumolkanie*
　　　　　everyday　　　　NEG-going silent
　　　　　'the everyday not going silent'

3.2. Licensing of negative polarity items

The corpus study has also shown that negation in nominalizations licenses polarity sensitive items (PSIs) – elements that have distribution restricted to a set of contexts that may be characterized differently in terms of truth-conditions. Paducheva (1985) and Haspelmath (1997) distinguish the following four main classes of polarity sensitive items in Russian: negative *ni-* pronouns, non-specific indefinite *-nibud'* pronouns, negatively polarized *-libo* pronouns and free-choice NPIs *lyuboi* and *ugodno*.

　　Ni- pronouns belong to strict negative polarity items (Giannakidou 2011), or n-words (Laka 1990), which are licensed only under negative concord. Russian *ni-* pronouns are licensed in the context of clausemate sentential negation (7). Contrary to the claims made by Pereltsvaig (2004) the licensing of *ni-* pronouns in the scope of superordinate negation is subject to structural restrictions. According to Gerasimova (2015), the amount of functional structure dominating VP in the infinitival clause affects the licit positions of negative pronouns: they are licensed if the infinitive is not bigger than TP (8). However, *ni-* pronouns cannot appear in the scope of constituent negation (9), nor are they licensed in any other weak negative or non-veridical types of contexts.

(7)　*Vanya　nichego　　　　　ne　sdelal*
　　　Vanya　nothing (N-WORD)　NEG　did
　　　'Vanya did nothing'

(8)　a. *Ya　ne　pytayus'　[*VP *nichego　　　　istolkovyvat'　v ego puti]*.
　　　　　I　　NEG　try　　　　nothing (N-WORD)　interpret　　　in his journey
　　　　　'I don't try to interpret anything (*int.* any of his decisions) in his journey'

　　　b. ? *On　ne　skazal　[*TP *nichego　　　　smotret'　po televizoru]*.
　　　　　He　NEG　said　　　nothing (N-WORD)　watch　　　on TV

     int. 'He didn't say to watch something on TV'

    c. * *Emu   ne   nravitsya*   [CP *nikogo*   *priuchat' k poryadku*].
       He   NEG likes   nobody (N-WORD)   teach regular habits
       int. 'He doesn't like to teach anyone regular habits'

(9)   * *Vanya   podgotovil   ne   nikakoi   podarok*
      Vanya   prepared   NEG no (N-WORD) gift
      int. 'Vanya didn't prepare any gift'

Non-specific indefinite *-nibud'* pronouns (NSI) are licensed in non-veridical contexts which are introduced by operators that do not ensure truth (Giannakidou 2011). In Russian such contexts include clauses with habitual meaning (e.g. with aspectual modifiers *chasto* 'often', *obychno* 'usually', etc.) (10), conditionals (11), interrogatives (12), clausemate nominal with a universal quantifier (13), irrealis non-specific contexts, such as futures (14), modals (15) and verbs of propositional attitude (16) (Paducheva 2015). Remarkably, *-nibud'* pronouns are not licensed by clausemate sentential negation and have to be substituted by n-words in negative concord contexts (17).

(10) *Vasya   chasto   chitaet kakie-nibud'   zhurnaly*
      Vasya   often   reads   some(NSI)   magazines
      'Vasya often reads some magazines'

(11) *Esli   budut   kakie-nibud'* / *kakie-libo voprosy,   zvoni*
      If   be   some(NSI) / any(NP)   questions call
      'If you have any questions, call me'

(12) *Vy   udivleny   kakimi-nibud'* / *kakimi-libo   voprosami?*
      You be surprised   some(NSI)   / any(NP)   questions
      'Are you surprised with any questions?'

(13) *Vse   studenty   khoteli chto-nibud'* / *chto-libo   skazat'*
      all   students   wanted some(NSI) /   any(NP)   say
      'All students wanted to say something'

(14) *Vasya   kupit   kakoi-nibud' podarok*
      Vasya   will buy   some(NSI)   present
      'Vasya will buy some present'

(15) *on   mozhet chto-nibud'   rasskazat' na uroke*
      he   can   something(NSI) tell   at the lesson
      'He can tell something at the lesson'

(16) *Ya   nadeyus', chto ob etom   kto-nibud'   znal   zaranee*
      I   hope   that about this someone(NSI)   knew   in advance
      'I hope that someone knew in advance about this'

(17) *Vanya   ne   priglasil*[ok] *nikogo   / * kogo-nibud'   na festival'*
Vanya   NEG   invited   nobody (N-WORD)   / anyone (NSI)   to the festival
'Vanya didn't invite anyone to the festival'

Negatively polarized *-libo* pronouns (NP) are not licensed in positive contexts and in irrealis non-specific contexts such as imperatives, futures, modals, verbs of propositional attitude (Pereltsvaig 2004, Paducheva 2014). *Contra* Pereltsvaig (2004) *ni-* and *-libo* pronouns do not appear in complementary distribution because *-libo* pronouns are allowed in negative concord created by both clausemate and distant negation (18).

(18) a. *Vasya   ne   vstretil tam kakikh-libo   prodavtsov*
Vasya   NEG   met   there any(NP)   salesmen
'Vasya haven't met any salesmen there'

b. *Vasya   ne   dumal   chto-libo   pisat'   v otzyve*
Vasya   NEG   thought anything(NP)   write   in review
'Vasya didn't think about writing anything in the review'

As *-nibud'* pronouns *-libo* elements are licensed in the context of conditionals (11), interrogatives (12), clausemate nominal with a universal quantifier (13). Interestingly, unlike *-nibud'* pronouns *-libo* items are not licensed in clauses with habitual meaning but are allowed in the context of aspectual modifier *redko* 'rarely' (19). Free-choice items are not restricted across any of the mentioned contexts and will not be considered in this paper.

(19) *Vasya   * chasto /*[ok] *redko   chitaet kakie-libo zhurnaly*
Vasya   often   / rarely   reads   any(NP)   magazines
'Vasya often reads some magazines'

Pazel'skaya (2006) states that negation in nominalization creates the same context as clausal negation, therefore, NPIs are licensed in the context of the three semantic types of negated nominalizations. The corpus study has shown that negation in nominalizations indeed licenses both types of negative polarity items, *ni-* pronouns (20) and *-libo* items (21). Surprisingly, non-specific indefinite *-nibud'* pronouns, which are usually prohibited in negative concord environments, are available in negated nominalizations, too (22).

(20) *Prichinoi avarii   stalo   [ne-srabatyvanie   ni odnoi   sistemy zashchity]*
cause for breakdown   became NEG-operating   no(N-WORD)   safety system
lit. 'The failure to operate of any safety system caused the breakdown'

(21) *neispol'zovanie chego-libo,   privodit k atrofirovaniyu etogo   chego-libo*
NEG-using   anything(NP) leads to atrophy   of this anything(NP)
lit. 'Not using of anything leads to the atrophy of this same thing'

(22) *kolossal'noe [ne-vladenie   kakim-nibud' tekstovym redaktorom]*
colossal   NEG-posessing   some(NSI)   text   editor
lit. 'Colossal not possessing the skills in any text editor'

Matrix clause	Stem	Position	*ni-*	*-nibud'*	*-libo* series
Neutral	Transitive	internal argument	+	+	+
		external argument	–	–	+
	Transitive with lexical government	internal argument	+	–	+
	Unaccusative	internal argument	+	+	+
		adjunct	+	–	–
	Unergative	external argument	+	–	–
		adjunct	+	–	–
Interrogative	Transitive	internal argument	–	+	+
Modal	Unaccusative	internal argument	–	–	+

Table 1. *The GICR Data. Negated nominalizations and NPIs in the leftmost context.*

As Table 1 shows, all the examined polarity sensitive items are found in the position of internal argument. There were also examples of -*ni* and -*libo* items licensed in external argument and -*ni* items licensed in adjunct positions. This means that all three types of items may appear under negation in at least one same syntactic position with the same interpretation. This observation contradicts previous generalizations about syntactic behavior of Russian polarity sensitive items. Therefore, the research question for this paper is what are the licensing conditions for the three types of pronouns. The following section examines how NSIs interact with the scope of negation and what the position of NegP is that allows for such variation.

4. The structural position of NegP in nominalization

In order to establish licensing conditions, it is essential to determine the position of NegP within nominalizations. Theoretically there are three structural options for negation projection NegP. First, NegP can be introduced as one of the clausal projections after the verbal structure is nominalized (23a). Second, the nominalizer may be attached after the negation has already merged (23b). Finally, NegP can have a structural position of an adjunct to the nominalized structure (23c).

(23)   a. [$_{NegP}$ [… [$_{NMN}$ [… [$_{AspP}$ [… [$_{vP}$ …]]]]]]]
         b. [$_{NMN}$ [… [$_{NegP}$ [… [$_{AspP}$ [… [$_{vP}$ …]]]]]]]
         c. [$_{NMN}$ N\textsc{egp} [$_{NMN}$ [… [$_{AspP}$ [… [$_{vP}$ …]]]]]]]

The diagnostic that could set the options apart is the following. Consider the fact that n-words are licensed in nominalization. In case of analyses within which negation is located higher than nominalizer NegP the possibility of n-word licensing would mean that negation acts as a matrix-clause operator for n-words. Therefore, one would expect that negation in matrix clause can license n-words in nominalization.

To examine whether distant negation creates negative concord in nominalization I conducted a pilot study with 10 participants. Respondents had to give a binary response on acceptability of 10 sentences constructed similarly to (24). The pilot study has shown that *ni-* pronouns licensing is marginally acceptable when nominalization is in the subject position in the matrix clause. Remarkably, there was disagreement in judgments: 4 out of 10 respondents interpreted such constructions as if nominalization was negated, (24ii) instead of (24i).

(24) $^{\%}$*ego   vmeshatel'stvo   ni v kakie dela   ne   smoglo udivit' menya*
         his   intervention   in no(N-WORD) business   NEG   could   surprise me
      'his intervening in any business could not surprise me'
      (i) 'I am not surprised that he interferes in affairs'
      (ii) 'I am not surprised that he does not interfere in any affairs'

In case nominalization in the object position, *ni-* pronouns licensing becomes fully acceptable (*ok* for all 10 respondents).

(25) *Ya   ne   dobilsya   ego   vmeshatel'stva   ni v kakie dela*
      I   NEG   achieved   his   intervention   in no(N-WORD)
      'I have not achieved his intervening in any business'

This diagnostic shows that the syntactic position of nominalization affects judgments on whether distant negation can license negative pronouns. I suggest that the marginality of NPI licensing in subject position results from the fact that negation no longer c-commands the nominal phrase. Consequently, the data from nominalizations in object positions allows us to draw a conclusion that n-words in nominalization can be licensed distantly from the matrix clause. As a result, the nominalizer does not serve as a barrier for the strict NPI licensing, which means that negation can be located above the nominalizer.

I propose that all arguments of a nominalization are generated before the [NEG]-feature is introduced and fall under the negative scope. The evidence for that can be provided by the diagnostic in spirit of Borschev et al. 2006. If one of the arguments is quantificational, both wide and narrow scope are allowed for the negation.

(26) *ne-vladenie   kazhdym instrumentom   mozhet byt'   prichinoi dlya uvol'neniya*
      NEG -posessing   every instrument   can be   a cause for dismissal
      'not possessing the skills to use every instrument can be a cause for dismissal'
      $\forall$ > NEG: employee can't use any of the instruments
      NEG > $\forall$: employee can use some instruments but not all

To sum up, the diagnostics show that negation appears high in the syntactic structure, at least above all arguments and possibly even above the nominalizer. However, the current data does not show what is the relative position of negation and nominalizer. In the next section I propose an analysis for the licensing conditions of the polarity sensitive items in nominalizations.

5. Prospect analysis for PSI licensing in nominalizations

The corpus data has shown that negated nominalization involves the context which licenses the two types of pronouns that are otherwise in complementary distribution. Herewith, the interpretation of the sentence remains the same. The phenomenon of NSIs being incompatible with negation and consequently being substituted by *ni-* pronouns is usually attributed to as the Bagel problem[2] (Pereltsvaig 2004). In case of nominalizations we observe an exception to this problem. However, these are not the only examples in Russian. Paducheva (2015) documents two contexts in Russian in which both NSIs and *ni-* pronouns are acceptable under negative scope with equivalent interpretation: subjunctive sentences (27) and embedded purpose *čtoby-*clauses (28). As in case of nominalizations, the interpretation is the same with NSIs and *ni-*pronouns.

(27) *Ne   naiti sem'i*
      NEG   find   family
      [*v kotoroi* ***by*** ^{ok}*nikto*   / ^{ok}*kto-nibud'*   *ne*   *postradal*]
      in which   **SUBJ** no one (N-WORD) / someone (NSI)   NEG   be hurt
      'It's almost impossible to find a family, in which no one was hurt'

(28) *My shli ostorozhno*
      we were going cautiously
      a. [***chtoby*** ^{ok}*nigde*   *ne*   *upast'*]
         COMP   nowhere (N-WORD) NEG   fall down
      b. [***chtoby*** ^{ok}*gde-nibud'*   *ne*   *upast'*]
         COMP   anywhere (NSI)   NEG   fall down
      'We were going slowly to avoid falling from anywhere'

Paducheva argues that NSIs in such contexts are licensed by non-veridical subjunctive operator. In this way, nonveridicality outweighs negative concord and licenses NSIs. I propose that licensing conditions in nominalization function similarly. I hypothesize that *-nibud'* pronouns are licensed by nonveridical context introduced above NegP.

   An interesting question is where the position of nonveridical operators is with respect to nominalizer. When there is no NegP in nominalization, the position may vary. On the one hand, nonveridical operator may be introduced within nominalization. In (29a) the DP that contains nominalization is specific, which means that no non-veridical operator from the main clause can influence its contents. That is, there is no sentential nonveridical operator and nonveridicality is introduced by the overt operator *postoyannoe* 'constant' in the nominalization itself. This overt nonveridical operator in nominalization licenses *-nibud'* pronouns.

   Another possibility is that nonveridicality is introduced later with sentential aspectual operators such as habitual, generic and iterative: e.g. *vsegda* 'always' in (29b).

(29) a. *ego   postoyannoe podrazhanie kakomu-nibud'   masteru*
         his   constant   copying   some(NSI)   master

---

[2] Clausemate negation creates an anti-morphic context. Anti-morphic contexts constitute a subset of non-veridical contexts. NSIs are licensed by non-veridical contexts, therefore, one would expect that NSIs are licensed by negation. However, this is not true: the anti-morphic context figuratively speaking creates "a bagel hole" with respect to NSIs as they are not licensed.

> *ubilo v nem   individual'nost'*
> killed in him   individuality
> 'his$_i$ constant copying after some master killed individuality in him$_i$'

  b. *podrazhanie kakomu-nibud'   masteru vsegda   ubivaet individual'nost'*
   copying   some(NSI)   master always   kills   individuality
   'copying after some master always kills individuality'

It is important to note that *-libo* pronouns are prohibited in the presence of aspectual operators. It was previously suggested by Paducheva (2014) that *-libo* series are also licensed in non-veridical contexts. However, that would mean that nonveridicality from the main clause could license *-libo* pronouns in nominalization, which is not the case (30a). I propose that *-libo* pronouns in nominalization are licensed by negation. This idea is supported by the fact that in specific nominalizations without any aspectual modifiers *-libo* pronouns are absolutely acceptable (30b).

(30) a. * *podrazhanie kakomu-libo' masteru vsegda   ubivaet individual'nost'*
    copying   any(NP)   master always   kills   individuality
    'copying after some master always kills individuality'

  b. *ego   neispytyvanie   kakikh-libo' chuvstv*
   his   NEG -experiencing any(NP)   feelings
   proizvelo na menya vpechatlenie
   impressed me
   'his not feeling anything impressed me'

An interesting observation is that when nominalization contains both negation and nonveridical operator (29c), NSIs become less acceptable than n-words.

(31) $^?$ *ego postoyannoe neispytyvanie   kakikh-nibud' chuvstv*
    his constant   NEG -experiencing some(NSI)   feelings
    proizvelo na menya vpechatlenie
    impressed me
    'his constant not feeling anything impressed me'

Although a secure conclusion must be based on a formal collection of judgements, this piece of evidence speaks to the fact that the nonveridical operator is indeed located above nominalizer. Then the nominalizer restricts the scope of the negative operator and does not affect the scope of the nonveridical operator.

6. Conclusion

To sum up, in this paper I have examined Russian negated nominalizations. I conducted a corpus study that has provided evidence for the existence of negated process nominalizations. It was shown that negation in nominalizations provides negative concord which licenses negative pronouns. A remarkable result was that all three types of Russian polarity sensitive

items are licensed in negated nominalizations. In order to capture contradictory observations, I determined the position of NegP within Russian nominalizations. I hypothesize that *-nibud'* pronouns are licensed in the scope of the nonveridical operator that is introduced above NegP, while *-libo* and *ni-* pronouns are licensed by negative concord. The results of the paper are in concord with crosslinguistic generalization from (Giannakidou 2006): n-words obey syntactic locality restrictions and are licensed by a clausemate antiveridical expression, while nonveridical operators exhibit long distance licensing.

The obtained result highlights a methodological issue connected to the usage of low frequent construction when developing language theory. As nominalizations are not frequent constructions, in general they receive low acceptability scores. Negated nominalizations are even less frequent, and therefore are judged less acceptable. However, the analysis revealed that different combinations of semantic operators can improve acceptability of negated nominalizations. This finding confirms that exploration of rare constructions helps to develop linguistic theory for acceptable cases.

Anastasia Gerasimova
Lomonosov Moscow State University (MSU)
Pushkin State Russian Language Institute
anastasiagerasimova432@gmail.com

References

Alexiadou, A. (2001). *Functional Structure in Nominals: Nominalization and Ergativity.* Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Publishing.

Belikov, V., N. Kopylov, A. Piperski, V. Selegey & S. Sharoff. (2013). Corpus as language: from scalability to register variation. *Komp'juternaja Lingvistika i Intellektual'nye Tehnologii* 12, pp. 83-95.

Borschev, V., E.V. Paducheva, B.H. Partee, Y.G. Testelets & I. Yanovich. (2006). Sentential and constituent negation in Russian BE-sentences revisited. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Princeton Meeting 2005 (FASL 14)*, pp. 50-65.

Gerasimova, A. (2015). Licensing negative pronouns in Russian infinitives. Lyutikova, E.A., Zimmerling, A.V. & M.B. Konoshenko (eds.), *Tipologija Morfosintaksicheskih Parametrov. Materialy mezhdunarodnoj konferencii "TMP-2015"* [*Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters 2014. Proceedings of The International Conference "TMP-2015"*] 2, MSPU, Moscow, pp. 47-61.

Giannakidou, A. (2006). Only, emotive factive verbs, and the dual nature of polarity dependency. *Language 82*, pp. 575-603.

Giannakidou A. (2011). Positive polarity items and negative polarity items: variation, licensing, and compositionality. Maienborn, C., von Heusinger, K. & P. Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning,* De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 1660-1712.

Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument Structure.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Haspelmath, M. (1997). *From space to time.* Lincom.

Laka, I. (1990). *Negation in Syntax: on the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Lyutikova, E., & S. Tatevosov. (2016). Nominalization and the problem of indirect access: Evidence from Ossetian. *The Linguistic Review* 33:3, pp. 321-363.

Paducheva, E. V. (1985). *Vyskazyvanie i ego sootnesennost' deistvitel'nost'yu (referentsial'nye aspekty semantiki mestoimeniy)* [*The statement and its correlation with reality (referential aspects of the semantics of pronouns)*]. Nauka, Moscow.

Paducheva, E. V. (2011). Otritsanie [Negation]. *Materials for the Russian corpus-based grammar description project* (http://rusgram.ru). Moscow.

Paducheva, E.V. (2014). Suspended assertion and nonveridicality. *Komp'juternaja Lingvistika i Intellektual'nye Tehnologii* 13, pp. 489–505.

Paducheva, E. V. (2015). Nereferentnye mestoimeniya na -nibud' [Non-specific -nibud' pronouns]. *Materials for the Russian corpus-based grammar description project* (http://rusgram.ru). Moscow.

Pazel'skaya A. (2006). *Inheritance of verbal categories by deverbal nouns in Russian*. PhD dissertation, Moscow State University.

Pazel'skaya, A. & S. Tatevosov. (2008). Deverbal nouns and the structure of Russian verb. Plungyan, V.A. & S.G. Tatevosov (eds.), *Studies on verbal derivation*, Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, Moscow, pp. 348-80.

Pereltsvaig, A. (2004). Negative polarity items in Russian and the 'Bagel Problem'. Brown, S. & A. Przepiorkowski (eds.), *Negation in Slavic,* Bloomington: Slavica Publishers, pp. 153-178.

Pereltsvaig A., E. Lyutikova & A. Gerasimova. (2018). Case marking in Russian eventive nominalizations: inherent vs. dependent case theory. *Russian Linguistics* 37:2, pp. 1-16.

Shvedova N. (1980). *Russkaja Grammatika* [*Russian Grammar*]. AN SSSR Publ., Moscow.

Zucchi, S. (1999). Incomplete events, intensionality and imperfective aspect. *Natural Language Semantics* 7:2, pp. 179-215.