

## Lecture 9: Genitive of Negation 2 Scope and ‘Referential Status’<sup>1</sup>

1. Introduction and Background .....	1
1.1. The Genitive of Negation construction .....	1
1.2. More than 100 years of research and still .....	2
2. Theme-Rheme analysis vs. Perspectival Structure .....	2
2.1. Babby’s (1980) Theme-Rheme-based analysis .....	2
2.2. Against Theme-Rheme structure and for Perspectival Structure .....	3
2.3. Genitive Themes .....	4
3. Perspectival Structure and Diathesis Shifts .....	6
3.1. The camera metaphor and diathesis shifts .....	6
3.2. Why only under negation? .....	6
4. In Search of the Q-factor: the property-type analysis .....	7
4.1. The Jakobsonian ideal .....	7
4.2. Genitive of intensionality .....	7
4.3. A possible type-shifting approach to a ‘demotion diathesis pattern’ .....	7
4.4. Are Gen Neg NPs property-denoting? .....	8
4.5. Potential problems for the property-type hypothesis .....	11
References .....	13

**Note:** This handout is built from a handout for a talk at the first meeting of the SlavicLinguistics Society (Bloomington, Indiana, September 2006). It is easier for me to leave in some introductory material that repeats things from Lecture 7; we’ll just skip that in class. I am most interested in your reactions to new things in Section 4 and appendix, which represent work in progress (for FASL 16 in May).

### 1. Introduction and Background

The Russian Genitive of Negation construction (Gen Neg) involves alternation between Genitive and two structural cases, Nominative and Accusative. The construction and the factors governing the alternation have been intensively studied going back at least to Thomson (1911). Many insights have been gained, and the construction has figured in theoretical discussions and in studies of language acquisition, language loss, typology, and historical change.

#### 1.1. The Genitive of Negation construction

The Russian Gen Neg construction involves substituting Genitive case for Accusative or Nominative, usually optionally, with many verbs when the whole sentence is negated (Borschev and Partee 2002a, Partee and Borschev 2002, 2004a). Most researchers have held that a Gen-marked NP under negation, as in (1b) and (2b) below, may have narrow scope with respect to negation, while a Nom- or Acc-marked NP must be interpreted outside the scope of negation.

- (1) a. *Ovet iz polka ne prišel.*  
Answer-NOM.M.SG from regiment NEG arrived-M.SG  
‘The answer from the regiment has not arrived.’  
b. *Orveta iz polka ne prišlo.*  
Answer-GEN.M.SG from regiment NEG arrived-N.SG  
‘There was no answer from the regiment.’

<sup>1</sup> This lecture is based in part on the handout Borschev and Partee (2006b) and in part on work in progress joint with Vladimir Borschev, Elena Paducheva, Yakov Testelefs, Ekaterina Rakhilina, and Igor Yanovich. We are grateful for valuable discussion of these topics over a number of years to both our co-authors and Leonard Babby, Petr Sgall and Eva Hajičová, Wayles Browne, Catherine Chvany, Nomi Erteschik-Shir, Hana Filip, David Perlmutter, Tanya Yanko, and too many others to name; see acknowledgements in our earlier papers as well. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0418311, “The Russian Genitive of Negation: Integration of Lexical and Compositional Semantics.”

- (2) a. *On ne polučil pis'mo.*  
he NEG received letter-ACC.N.SG  
‘He didn’t receive the (or ‘a specific’) letter.’  
b. *On ne polučil pis'ma.*  
he NEG received letter-GEN.N.SG  
‘He didn’t receive any letter.’

A Nom- or Acc-marked NP is more likely to be interpreted as definite or specific, while a Gen Neg NP often has ‘decreased referentiality’ and tends to be ‘(existentially) quantificational’ (Jakobson 1971/1936, Timberlake 1975, Babby 1980, Pesetsky 1982, Neidle 1988, Bailyn 2004) if the NP permits it; but even pronouns and proper names sometimes alternate.

- (3) a. *Maša ne vidna.*  
Masha-NOM.F.SG NEG seen-F.SG  
‘Masha isn’t visible.’ [suggesting that she is present but hidden]  
b. *Maši ne vidno.*  
Masha-GEN.F.SG NEG seen-N.SG  
‘Masha isn’t to be seen.’ [suggesting that she is not present]

Many factors contribute to the choice of Gen, including decreased ‘individuation’ of NP, decreased transitivity of verb (Timberlake 1975, Mustajoki and Heino 1991, Ueda 1993). An important fact is that with Subject Gen Neg, as with many quantificational ‘subjects’ the sentence becomes “impersonal” and the verb is invariantly Neuter singular, as in (1b), (3b).

#### 1.2. More than 100 years of research and still ...

Many, starting with Jakobson (1971/1936), have aimed to relate Gen Neg to other uses of the genitive. The goal is controversial; there is a contrast between the Moscow school tradition of trying to describe each separate use of the genitive, with skepticism about any common denominator, and the Western desire to explain why the genitive is used in all these places.

We focus here on two aspects of the Gen Neg problem. One is the family of issues surrounding the idea that a Gen Neg NP is syntactically ‘demoted’ or ‘lower’ than a corresponding Nom- or Acc-marked NP, and that it is correspondingly ‘less referential’ or ‘less individuated’. Such a claim is found in several frameworks, but some kinds of NPs present major stumbling blocks, including proper nouns and pronouns. The other is the relation of Gen Neg to ‘quantificational’ and ‘partitive’ Genitives and to Genitives in intensional contexts: can any formal capture the similarities without predicting even more similarity than is actually found? Both problem areas illustrate the difficulty posed by “interacting factors”; we will try to illuminate them but we will not solve them.

### 2. Theme-Rheme analysis vs. Perspectival Structure

#### 2.1. Babby’s (1980) Theme-Rheme-based analysis

##### Babby (1980):

- Subject Gen Neg sentences are almost always existential.
- Gen vs. Nom marking indicates that the NP is inside vs. outside the scope of negation.
- This in turn follows from whether the NP is part of the Rheme or is the Theme. Compare (1a-b) above with affirmative (4a-4b).

- (4) a. *Ovet iz polka prišel.*  
Answer-NOM.M.SG from regiment arrived-M.SG  
‘The answer from the regiment has arrived.’

- b. *Prišel otvet iz polka.*  
Arrived-M.SG answer-NOM.M.SG from regiment  
'There was an answer from the regiment.'

As (4a-4b) show, Russian affirmative existential sentences appear to differ from predicative sentences only in word order, which Babby (1980) took to indicate a difference primarily in Theme-Rheme structure.

## 2.2 Against Theme-Rheme structure and for Perspectival Structure

We have argued against ascribing the Gen-Nom and Gen-Acc distinctions to the postulated difference in Theme-Rheme structure.

- Our main argument: the existence of Gen Neg examples in which the NP in the genitive can be argued to be the Theme, or part of the Theme, rather than the Rheme.

- (5) *Sobaki u menja net.* (Arutjunova 1976)  
dog-GEN.F.SG at I-GEN not.is

'I don't have a dog.' [Context: talking about dogs, perhaps about whether I have one.]

- (6) [*Ja iskal kefir.* ] *Kefira v magazine ne bylo.*  
[I looked-for kefir-ACC.M.SG Kefir-GEN.M.SG in store NEG was-N.SG  
'[I was looking for kefir.] There wasn't any kefir in the store.' (Borshev & Partee 2002a)

- A second, indirect, argument concerns Babby's theses that the main determinant of Gen Neg is scope of negation, and that Theme is outside the scope of negation, Rheme inside. But there are examples of Nom/Gen alternation in NPs with the NPI *ni odin* 'not a single', which occurs only under clausemate negation.

- Context for (7) and (8): *My nadejalis', čto na seminare budut studenty.* 'We hoped that (some of the) students would be at the seminar'.

- (7) *No ni odin student tam ne byl.*  
But NI one-NOM.M.SG student-NOM.M.SG there NEG was-M.SG  
'But not a single one of the students was there.'

- (8) *No ni odnogo studenta tam ne bylo.*  
But NI one-GEN.M.SG student-GEN.M.SG there NEG was-N.SG  
But there was not a single student [or: not a single one of the students] there.'

- Difference in interpretation: (7) presupposes a specific group of students to be quantified over, whereas (8) does not. Both are clearly under the scope of negation.
- So either Theme/Rheme does not determine Nom/Gen, or it does not correlate with outside/inside scope of negation.
- Our alternative analysis (Borshev and Partee 2002a, 2002b) invokes what we call **Perspectival Structure**, building in part on insights concerning an implicit Observer role in the work of Apresjan (1980, 1986) and especially Padučeva (1992, 1994, 1997).
- Common starting point: V(THING, LOC); two different diatheses, often with a difference in referential status of "THING" argument. Cf (1a-b), (3a-b), (7-8), but also (9-10) below.
- In a predicative sentence (1a, 3a, 7, 9), THING is the Perspectival Center.
- In an existential sentence (1b, 3b, 8, 10), LOC is the Perspectival Center.
- We give the analogy of "what the camera is tracking": the protagonist when THING is Perspectival Center, the 'scene' when LOC is perspectival center.

Note:

- Existence in an "existential sentence" is relative to Perspectival Center LOCation
- Hence Russian existential sentences can have proper names or pronouns as 'subj'

- (9) [*Ja iskal Petju.* ] *On ne byl na lekcii.*  
[I looked.for Petja. ] He-NOM.M.SG NEG was-M.SG at lecture  
[I looked for Petja. ] He wasn't at the lecture.
- (10) [*Ja iskal Petju.* ] *Ego ne bylo na lekcii.*  
[I looked.for Petja. ] He-GEN.M.SG NEG was-N.SG at lecture  
[I looked for Petja. ] He wasn't at the lecture.

- In (9) and (10), the sentence-initial Theme is the same (*on/ego* 'he-nom/he-gen').
- In (9), the THING Petja is chosen as the Perspectival Center: we consider Petja, and where he was, and we give the partial information that he was not at the lecture.
- In (10) the LOCation is the Perspectival Center; this suggests that either in or before my search for Petja, I went to the lecture expecting to find him, but Petja was not among those at the lecture.

### BUT:

Our analysis is still close to Babby's, and Perspectival Structure has much in common with information structure. Perspectival Structure does not correspond exactly to any established linguistic distinction, as far as we know, so we do not consider the debate to be settled.

### Possible lines of defense for a position closer to Babby's:

- **kefira in (6) is Rhematic but Given:** Babby's account of (1b), (5), (6): since Gen Neg marks NP as Rhematic, word order can be used to mark something else, in this case Given vs. New; so the Gen Neg NPs we have called Theme, he would call Rhematic but Given.
- Similarly, Erteschik-Shir (1997 and p.c.) would propose that in any existential sentence the real Topic is an implicit "Stage-topic" (including a possible overt LOC), and within the Focus there may be subordinate information structure, with *kefira* in (6) a "subordinate Topic".
- **Presuppositionality:**
  - Babby's analysis provided a source for the greater presuppositionality of NPs marked Nom or Acc, since Themes are generally taken to be more presuppositional than Rhemes (Hajičová 1973, and many other authors).
  - We make a similar claim for Perspectival Center with a similar basis: in order to structure a sentence from the perspective of some participant of a situation, that participant must be presupposed to exist.
  - We believe that it is easier to extend our analysis to the kind of presupposition found in examples (7-8), where it is the domain of quantification that must be presupposed to exist and be familiar, than to accept such a negatively quantified expression as *ni odin student* 'not a single student' as a Topic or Theme.

## 2.3. Genitive Themes.

A construction brought to our attention by Maria Polinsky and discussed in Franks (1995) under the name of "Genitive Initial Sentences" further reinforces the possibility that Gen NPs may be themes, and at the same time raises questions about the relation between Gen Neg and quantificational genitives. We had independently noticed the existence of examples similar to our *kefira* example with and without negation and with and without agreement conflicts between the initial (presumably topical) Genitive and its putative source position in the sentence. Our examples below use the genitive plural *deneg* 'money' and the mass genitive singular *vodka* 'vodka'.

- (11) a. *Deneg u nego bylo mnogo/malo.* (Also OK: *U nego mnogo/malo deneg.*)  
money-GEN.PL at him-GEN was-N.SG much / little  
'He had a lot of/ little money.' or 'Of money, he had a lot/little.'
- b. *Deneg u nego sovsem ne bylo<sup>2</sup>.*  
money-GEN.PL at him-GEN altogether NEG was-N.SG  
'He didn't have any money at all.' or 'Of money, he didn't have any at all.'
- c. *Deneg u nego do čërta.* (Also OK: *U nego do čërta deneg.*)  
money-GEN.PL at him-GEN to devil  
'He has a hell of a lot of money.' or 'Of money, he has a hell of a lot.'
- d. *Vodki bylo zalejsja. (??Bylo zalejsja vodki.)*  
vodka-GEN.F.SG was-N.SG pour-your-fill-IMP.SG  
'Of vodka there was 'pour-your-fill'.'
- e. *Vodki bylo kot naplakal. (\*Bylo kot naplakal vodki.)*  
vodka-GEN.F.SG was-N.SG cat wept  
'Of vodka there was [so little that] the cat wept.'

Examples (11a-e) all seem to involve predications of amounts – how much money he had, how much vodka there was. The amount 'predicates' include both common quantifiers *mnogo, malo* 'much, little', which routinely take Gen-marked noun complements, and idiomatic quantity expressions (a PP in (11c), an imperative verb in (11d), and a clause in (11e)) which vary in the degree to which they can be used as derived quantifiers from easily to not at all.

In Franks' (1995) work on this topic, where he cites earlier work of his own and others (Crockett 1976, 318-335, Franks and House 1982, House 1982, Pesetsky 1982, 233-236), he refers to the construction as the "Genitive Initial Sentence (GIS)". He includes under this rubric both examples like (12), which have no "disagreement" properties, and examples like (13), which provide evidence against a movement analysis.

- (12) a. *Mal'čikov ostalos'/\*ostalis' sem'.* (Both verb forms possible in 'plain' word order.)  
boys-GEN.M.PL remained(-N.SG/-PL) seven  
'The number of boys that remained was seven.' (Franks 1995, p.186, ex. 145a)
- b. *Interesnyx knig ja pročital pjat'.*  
interesting-GEN.F.PL books-GEN.F.PL I read five  
'The number of interesting books I read was five.' (Franks 1995, p.186, ex. 145b)
- (13) a. *Knig ja pročital tol'ko odnu.* (\**odnu knig*; OK: *odnu knigu*(AccSg))  
books-GEN.F.PL I read only one-ACC.F.SG  
'The number of books I read was only one.' (Franks 1995, p.187, ex. 146a)
- b. *Publiki na ploščadi bylo jabloku negde upast'.*  
public-GEN.F.SG on square was-N.SG apple-DAT.F.SG nowhere to-fall  
'The public in the square was wall-to-wall' (Franks 1995, p.187, ex. 148a)

Like *kot naplakal* 'the cat wept' in (11e), the idiomatic phrase *jabloku negde upast'* 'there was nowhere for an apple to fall' in (13b) does not accept a genitive complement at all.

What relation, if any, is there between Gen Neg and the GIS construction? Example (14) below is of particular interest, since it apparently exemplifies *both* the Gen Neg construction (because of *ni odnogo*) and the "Genitive Initial Sentence" construction (introduced just below), which provides the 'non-agreeing' initial genitive *studentov*.

- (14) *No studentov tam ne bylo ni odnogo. (\*ni odnogo studentov)*  
But student-GEN.M.PL there NEG was-N.SG NI one-GEN.M.SG  
'But there was not a single one of (the) students there.'

<sup>2</sup> We are no longer sure that (11b) belongs in this group, and even less sure if *sovsem* 'altogether, at all' is removed. See discussion in (Partee and Borschev 2006a).

But what about our *kefira* example (6), and what about (11b)? Those are less clear: they seem to lack a final focused quantifier. To count them as GIS sentences would require allowing the focused negation to be equivalent to focusing a 'none at all' kind of quantifier. This is an open issue we plan to work on in the future.

An apparent difference between GIS's and Gen Neg concerns the distribution of "null copula" versus the existential *est* 'there is/are' in present tense sentences: affirmative counterparts to Gen Neg existential sentences have *est*, whereas predicative sentences  $\emptyset$ . And the present tense versions of (11d-e) and (13b) have  $\emptyset$ , not *est*. We believe that our *kefira* sentences and these GIS's are two different instances of thematic genitives (which can co-occur), and that they help contribute to the broader understanding of (a) when a "weak NP" can be thematic and (b) the ways in which Genitive is used in Russian to mark "non-canonical" subjects and objects, expressing the "weakening" and/or "demotion" of a subject or object NP.

### 3. Perspectival Structure and Diathesis Shifts.

#### 3.1. The camera metaphor and diathesis shifts.

We noted above that Perspectival Structure is metaphorically similar to making a choice of what to track with a video camera: to follow some THING, or to stay fixed on a LOCATION. So where in the grammar might such a notion belong? Diathesis shifts (see Lecture 7).

But the fact that this alternation occurs only in negative sentences makes it different from many familiar diathetic shifts.

#### 3.2. Why only under negation?

One central puzzle concerning Gen Neg is why the Nom/Gen and Acc/Gen alternations occur only in negative sentences. This problem takes different forms for different approaches, and accounts for part of the great wealth of literature on the syntax of the construction. For a diathesis-based account, it raises the question of how the verb and the negation are related.

- Babby's 1980 account was explicit but stipulative, treating it as a construction, much as we have made it sound like in our account so far.
- Pesetsky (1982) made progress toward an explanatory connection with negation when he posited that the Gen Neg NPs were all headed by a null NPI quantifier, which itself received the expected Nom or Acc case of its subject or object position, but assigned Gen to its complement, as many Russian quantificational heads do. Such an account offered insight into the semantic property of 'decreased referentiality' often ascribed to Gen Neg NPs, and into why the corresponding NPs in affirmative sentences, lacking such an NPI quantificational head, show Nom or Acc and are interpreted more referentially.
- But Pesetsky's account has problems with the fact that Gen Neg NPs are not always bare indefinites; they may have explicit quantifiers of their own (which then show up with Genitive case, not Nom or Acc), as in (23b) below, and they may be headed by demonstratives, or be proper names, as in (3b) and (22b).
- It would be tempting to posit a 'negated verb' with its own diathesis shift. There are attested examples of languages with separate negated verbs, especially negations of 'be' or 'have', with their own argument structure, and in many Slavic languages, sentential negation is marked with a preverbal clitic or even a prefix. But as Bailyn (2004) describes, a number of accounts have foundered on the fact that the same negation that licenses Gen Neg only on the direct object of transitive verbs or the subject of some intransitive verbs also licenses NPIs (including negative concord *n*-words) in higher positions such as subject of a transitive or unergative verb.

- Bailyn (2004) himself proposes that sentential Neg, in a relatively high position itself, licenses or checks a Q feature on the verb, and that Q-marked verb may select for a genitive internal argument. That account has some features in common with Pesetsky's original idea, and also with the idea of (Jakobson 1971/1936), modernized in Neidle (1982, 1988), that genitive NPs are in some sense more quantificational than referential.

We believe that something along such lines could be semantically interpreted in a compositional way that could do justice to the interplay of compositional and lexical semantics and contextual factors. This is part of the task we are pursuing in our current research. But it is difficult, because the semantics is only part of the story, and semantic effects are not always found consistently. We turn to the semantics of the "Q feature" in the next section.

#### 4. In Search of the Q-factor: the property-type analysis

##### 4.1. The Jakobsonian ideal

Citing Franks (1995, p.41): "Jakobson's work constitutes the single most important contribution to classic case theory. His articles on case features have inspired more research and debate in the field of Slavic linguistics than any other set of ideas." In Jakobson's (1971/1936) well-known decomposition of Russian cases into bundles of features (see Neidle 1988, see Franks 1995), the feature "quantificational" is assigned to Genitive case (as well as to Locative, which we ignore here), indicating the semantic content of "focusing on the extent to which the entity takes part in the message." As Franks points out, there are many obstacles to Jakobson's ideal of finding a true semantic invariant for this or the other "case features" proposed by Jakobson. But the feature "+Q" invoked by Neidle, Pesetsky, and Bailyn in their analyses of Genitive of Negation is designed to capture, in various ways, what seems right about this part of Jakobson's proposal.

##### 4.2. Genitive of intensionality

It was pointed out by Neidle (1988) that Genitive case is also used to mark opaque objects of certain intensional verbs (although not all, and there is variability in whether it is optional or obligatory.)

- (15) a. *On ždet podругu.* (Neidle 1988, p.31)  
He waits girlfriend-Acc  
'He's waiting for his girlfriend.' (transparent, NP *de re*)
- b. *On ždet otveta na vopros.*  
He waits answer-Gen to question  
'He's waiting for an answer to the question.' (opaque, NP *de dicto*)

The puzzle is: why is the same construction used to mark both? Negation is not intensional, and neither is obviously quantificational, so why should negation and intensionality pattern together?

##### 4.3. A possible type-shifting approach to a 'demotion diathesis pattern'.

One hypothesis related to the work of Neidle (1982, 1988) has been raised in our recent work (Partee and Borschev 2004b, 2004a) and in Kagan (2005):

**The Property-Type Demotion Diathesis Hypothesis:** Wherever there is Nom/Gen or Acc/Gen alternation (both under negation and under intensional verbs), Nom or Acc represents an ordinary e-type argument position ('referential'<sup>3</sup>), whereas a Gen NP is interpreted as property-type: <e,t>, or <s,<e,t>>.

<sup>3</sup> Quantified NPs may also end up in e-type positions by any of the commonly posited mechanisms of quantification (different mechanisms in different theoretical frameworks).

This hypothesis is particularly appealing for constructions involving direct objects of transitive verbs (and non-agentive subjects of some intransitive verbs), where one is most likely to find special markings analogous to the Russian genitive of negation. ("Object incorporation" in Greenlandic Eskimo, with obligatory narrow-scope interpretation (Bittner 1987, Van Geenhoven 1998), Accusative-Partitive alternation in Finnish (Kiparsky 1998), and related phenomena in Turkish (Enç 1991) and other languages .

The idea that such differences may reflect type differences corresponds to the work of Ede Zimmermann (1993b), who argued for an alternative to Montague's treatment of intensional verbs. Montague treated verbs like *ždat* ' as taking type <s<<e,t>,t>> arguments, i.e. intensions of generalized quantifiers. Zimmermann argued in favor of treating definite and indefinite arguments of intensional verbs, (but not generalized quantifiers) as *properties*, type <s,<e,t>>.

In the case of the potentially intensional verb *ždat* ' in (15a-b), we see that its intensional genitive-taking variant in (15b) has all the properties of English *seek*. Its extensional accusative-taking variant, (15a), allows referential NPs and quantificational NPs. We predict that genitive should be disallowed with essentially quantificational NPs such as those formed with *každyj* 'each': the status of this prediction is not clear<sup>4</sup>.

- (16) ? *On ždet každygo otveta na vopros.*  
He waits each-GEN.M.SG answer-GEN.M.SG to question  
'He's waiting for each answer to the question.'

There has been recent interest in the idea of 'weak NPs' as property-denoting in certain contexts (Kamp and Bende-Farkas 2001, Farkas and de Swart 2003, Landman 2003, Van Geenhoven and McNally 2005), and in the future we can expect to find new kinds of arguments for and against treating particular examples in this way. Whether this idea is appropriate for Gen Neg is not clear.

Kagan (2005) and Partee & Borschev (2004a) propose to treat Russian alternating Genitive NPs as "property type" ((the intensional variant) of type <e,t>, "predicative denotative status" in Padučeva (1985)), the type attributed to opaque objects of intensional verbs in Zimmermann (1993a) and Van Geenhoven and McNally (2005), to 'subjects' of existential sentences by McNally (1992), Landman (2004), and Padučeva (1985:99), to incorporated nominals in Van Geenhoven (1998), and to 'small nominals' in Pereltsvaig (2006). In all those cases, the authors argue that such NPs lack e-type reference and bear no referential index. Arguments for and against this hypothesis for Gen Neg NPs have been given in Partee and Borschev (In press). In (Borschev et al. in progress) we argue in favor and try to answer most of the arguments against.

##### 4.4. Are Gen Neg NPs property-denoting?

###### 4.4.0. The analysis in very brief form

We sketch our analysis.

- Proper names and other definite NPs are basically "referential", type e, but can shift to type <e,t> by a number of routes (Partee 1986, Grønn 2006, Von Stechow and Wespel 2006), with the choice often influenced by pragmatics. Indefinite NPs are basically of type <e,t> (Landman 2004); when they occur in e-type argument positions, Heimian mechanisms provide them with existential or other quantificational force (Heim 1982).

<sup>4</sup> V.B. finds this sentence odd but not impossible; some of our informants have rejected it altogether.

- Generalized quantifiers are of type  $\langle\langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ , but most kinds of quantified NPs can also occur as type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  (Partee 1986, Zimmermann 1993a, Brisson 1997, McNally 1998).
- Verbs specify the types of arguments, and variants of a given verb may differ in meaning and in argument types, e.g. extensional and intensional *ždat'* 'wait for, expect'. Subjects and objects are typically type  $e$  but may be  $\langle e, t \rangle$  or propositional type. For Neidle (1988) and Bailyn (2004), negation licenses a +Q feature on the verb licensing Gen Neg; we translate that into a shift of the verb's  $e$  argument to  $\langle e, t \rangle$  (optionally for Objects), simultaneously adding modality (Gen Int) and/or existential quantification (Gen Neg) to the verb's meaning (cf. Dayal 2003, Van Geenhoven and McNally 2005).
- (Tentative: this is one area where we are still unclear.) We conjecture that Object Gen Neg is partly syntacticized, hence less semantically conditioned.

#### 4.4.1. Evidence in favor: parallels to *ždat'*.

The initial evidence in favor of the hypothesis comes from parallels to the behavior of Gen Neg with the intensional verb *ždat'*, 'expect, wait for', as observed by Neidle (1982, 1988). Compare the two possible negations of the affirmative extensional sentence (17a) and their parallels to the corresponding use of Acc and Gen with *ždat'* in (15a-b).

- (17) a. *Petja našel otvet.*  
Petja found answer-ACC.M.SG  
'Petja found the/an answer.'
- b. *Petja ne našel otvet.*  
Petja NEG found answer-ACC.M.SG  
'Petja didn't find the answer.'
- c. *Petja ne našel otveta.*  
Petja NEG found answer-GEN.M.SG  
'Petja didn't find an answer.'

The accusative variant (17b) implies actual-world existence of an answer (and says that Petja didn't find it), while the genitive variant (17c) does not.

If one accepts the arguments of Zimmermann (1993) and Van Geenhoven and McNally (2005) that opaque objects of intensional verbs are property-type, then the assumption that Russian alternating Genitives are property type provides a unified account of Gen Neg and Gen Int. (Needs to be supported by more about Gen Int – in progress.)

#### 4.4.2. More evidence: Parallels between Gen Neg and Subjunctive.

**Thesis:** We suggest that both Subjunctive and the Russian Gen often signal the *absence of a presupposition or entailment*: of truth, and of existence, respectively.

Dahl (1971) observed that the same contexts often license Genitive and Subjunctive in Russian, so that the semantic contrast between Gen and Acc may be similar to that between Subjunctive and Indicative. The parallels are clearest in a paradigm due to Kagan (2005) (our examples):

- (18) a. Ja **ne zametil**, čto jubilej GAI prazdnovali voditeli.  
I NEG noticed that anniversary GAI celebrated drivers-NOM  
'I didn't notice that drivers were celebrating the anniversary of the road police.' (factive)
- b. Ja **ne zametil**, čtoby jubilej GAI prazdnovali voditeli.  
I NEG noticed that-SUBJUNC anniversary GAI celebrated drivers-NOM  
'I didn't notice that any drivers were celebrating the anniversary of the road police.' (non-factive)

- c. Ja ne zametil **vodku** na stole.  
I NEG noticed vodka-ACC on table  
'I didn't notice the vodka on the table.' (presuppositional: vodka was there)
- d. Ja ne zametil **vodki** na stole.  
I NEG noticed vodka-GEN on table  
'I didn't notice any vodka on the table.' (non-presuppositional: I may suspect there was none)

Similar parallels are found with intensional verbs like *ždat'* 'expect, wait for'; correlations between Genitive of Negation (Gen Neg) and Genitive of Intensionality (Gen Int) were described by Dahl, Neidle (1988), Kagan. The similarity between non-veridicality in the sentential domain and non-specificity in the nominal domain has been explored by Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970), Dahl, Farkas (1985), and others. We suggest that both Subjunctive and the Russian Gen often signal the *absence of a presupposition or entailment*: of truth, and of existence, respectively. Their licensing conditions are similar but not identical. A caveat (to be discussed): we do not believe that our proposed semantic generalizations apply to all cases of Object Gen Neg; there is competition from processes of syntacticization, from frozen and semi-frozen phraseologisms, and possibly other sources.

Kagan (2005) offers some evidence in favor of the Property-Type Demotion Diathesis Hypothesis based on claimed parallels between Gen Neg and Subjunctive in complements. Variants of her examples below are given in (19): According to Kagan, one can use the negated verb *ne počuvstvovat'* 'not to feel' with either a indicative (19a) or subjunctive (19b) complement, the former carrying the presupposition that it was cold and the latter making no such commitment, parallel to the way in which the same negated verb can take an accusative or genitive NP object (19c-d) with accusative presupposing the existence and the genitive strongly suggesting non-existence.

- (19) a. *Ivan ne počuvstvoval, čto stalo lučše* [variant of Kagan 2005 example (25)]  
Ivan NEG felt that became better  
'Ivan didn't feel that it had become better [which it had].'
- b. *Ivan ne počuvstvoval, čtoby stalo lučše*  
Ivan NEG felt that-SUBJUNC became better  
'Ivan didn't feel that it had become better.' i.e., as far as he could tell, it hadn't.
- c. *Ivan ne počuvstvoval xolod.* [Kagan 2005 example (26)]  
Ivan NEG felt cold-ACC.M.SG  
'Ivan didn't feel the cold.'
- d. *Ivan ne počuvstvoval xoloda.*  
Ivan NEG felt cold-GEN.M.SG  
'Ivan didn't feel any cold.' i.e., as far as he could feel, it wasn't cold.

Another verb which works as Kagan has predicted is *zametit'* 'to notice'.

- (20) a. Ja ne zametil, čto jubiley GAI prazdnovali voditeli.  
I NEG noticed that anniversary GAI celebrated drivers-NOM  
'I did not notice that drivers were celebrating the anniversary of the road police.' (factive)
- b. Ja ne zametil, čtoby jubiley GAI prazdnovali voditeli.  
I NEG noticed that-SUBJUNC anniversary GAI celebrated drivers-NOM  
'I did not notice that any drivers were celebrating the anniversary of the road police.' (non-factive) [a headline from svobodanews.org]
- c. Ja ne zametil vodku na stole.  
I NEG noticed vodka-ACC on table  
'I didn't notice the vodka on the table.' (presuppositional)

- d. *Ja ne zametil vodki na stole.*  
I NEG noticed vodka-GEN on table  
'I didn't notice any vodka on the table.' (non-presuppositional)

#### 4.4.3 The licensing of subjunctive in relative clauses

As noted, subjunctive occurs only in non-veridical contexts, i.e. where truth is neither entailed nor presupposed (Giannakidou 1998). Negation can license both Gen Neg and sometimes (perhaps by licensing an implicitly modal meaning) Subjunctive; Kagan has observed that relative clauses in some Gen Neg NPs can be Subjunctive. In (21) we give relevant variants of examples from Padučeva (1997).

- (21) a. *Ženščiny, kotorye zasluživajut (\*zasluživali by) uvaženija, dlja nego ne suščestvujut.*  
women-NOM who deserve-INDIC (\*SUBJUNC) respect for him NEG exist-PL  
b. *Ženščin, kotoryje {zasluživajut / zasluživali by} uvaženija, dlja nego ne suščestvujet.*  
women-GEN who deserve-INDIC / SUBJUNC respect for him NEG exist-SG

#### 4.4.4 Decreased referentiality

Property-type NPs are non-referential, giving a semantic basis for the generalization (with potential exceptions to be addressed) that Gen NPs are “indefinite”, or have “decreased individuation” (Timberlake). Cf. Van Geenhoven & McNally's (2005) similar claim for opaque objects of intensional verbs.

#### 4.4.5 Narrow scope

All existing proposals for property-type NPs automatically give property-type NPs “narrowest scope”, giving a semantic basis for the narrow scope behavior of Russian Gen Neg and Gen Int (Neidle).

In fact, the situation with Gen Neg is more complex than the literature would suggest. The normal claims about obligatory narrow scope of Gen Neg expressions are not entirely correct, given the usual assumptions about what “narrow scope” means. We will discuss this more in the “problems” section. \*\*\*This would be a very nice area for student projects, looking more closely at the behavior of words like *mnogo*, *mnogie*, *neskol'ko*, *nekotorye*, *pjat'*, *pjatero*, *každyj*, *vse*, and others, when they occur in subject NPs or object NPs with verbs where we find Gen/Nom or Gen/Acc variation.\*\*\* We will have preliminary discussion in (Borschev et al. in progress), but this subproblem needs more study.

#### 4.5. Potential problems for the property-type hypothesis

We have three arguments against the property analysis for Gen Neg NPs; none of them are unshakeable, but they seem to cast doubt on the analysis and remove some of its initial attractiveness. We are continuing to work on this problem.

##### 4.5.1. proper names

The first argument comes from the fact that proper names, demonstratives, and a number of other prototypically referential NPs participate in Nom-Gen and Acc-Gen alternations under negation. Consider the following pair with negated *videt'* ‘see’. As discussed by Chvany (1975) for the Nom-Gen alternation in analogous intransitive sentences, the Accusative choice in (22a) tends to suggest that it was a volitional choice: I didn't get around to seeing Masha (but it can also be neutral with respect to such an implication). The Genitive choice in (22b) often suggests the opposite: I expected to see Masha but she wasn't there (though it can also be neutral).

- (22) a. *Ja ne videla Mašu.*  
I NEG see Masha-ACC.F.SG  
'I didn't see Masha.'  
b. *Ja ne videla Maši.*  
I NEG see Masha-GEN.F.SG  
'I didn't see Masha.'

Examples like (22b) cause problems for all “quantificational” approaches to the Genitive of Negation, unless one can defend imputing to the NP in this case a meaning like “any trace of Masha”<sup>5</sup>. But we have some proposals for relevant shifts of proper names to <e,t> type; see Appendix.

And although proper names can occur in some Gen Neg contexts, they do not occur in Gen Int. We argue that that is often associated with the presence of a Locative or Situation argument, where Gen Neg signals absence not of presupposition of existence, but of ‘(observable) existence within Situation’. The <e,t> variant of a name *Petja* in *Ja ne videl Peti* ‘I didn't see Petja-GEN’ may denote something like ‘instantiation of Petja in the situation’.

#### 4.5.2 quantifiers

Further difficulties for the Property-Type Demotion Diathesis Hypothesis come from some of the same kinds of quantificational examples that cause problems for Pesetsky's analysis, examples of the sort illustrated in (23), discussed in Padučeva (1974), Klenin (1978), Neidle (1988), Harves (2002), and Borschev et al (2006).

- (23) a. *Vanja ne rešil vse zadači.*  
Vanja NEG solved all-ACC problems-ACC.F.PL  
Vanja didn't solve all-the-problems, i.e. solved none.  
b. *Vanja ne rešil vsex zadač.*  
Vanja NEG solved all-GEN.PL problems-GEN.F.PL  
Vanja didn't solve all the problems (less than all).

Examples (23a-b) may differ in scope, as in traditional analyses, or perhaps even by having a ‘referential (collective) reading’ in (a), but they do not differ in intensionality. A plausible property-interpretation for (23b) is not obvious, but such quantifier phrases do also occur in Gen Int. We are working on this problem and expect to be able to argue for a difference between a purely extensional universal quantifier and a more intensional one, analogous to the distinction between referential and attributive definite NPs argued for by Donnellan (Donnellan 1966).

We have also uncovered many interesting examples involving *mnogo* vs. *mnogie*, *neskol'ko* vs. *nekotorye*, and others. Some quantifiers appear to be “narrow scope only”, and this seems to correlate with “weakness”; some quantifiers appear to be “wide scope only”, and those seem to be presuppositional and strong. I hope we can return to this in a later lecture when we have more of the data sorted out and clearer generalizations and explanations; in the meantime, if anyone wants to work on such problems, I'll be glad to share with you the data we have collected so far.

#### 4.5.3 Differences between Subjunctive and Gen Neg

Subjunctive and Gen Neg do not have identical distribution. We propose that they have overlapping but not identical licensing conditions, with Subjunctive more sensitive to truth ‘in a

<sup>5</sup> Such a suggestion may not be entirely implausible. Compare the English expression, “I looked all around, but no Masha.” The ability of a quantifier like *no* to co-occur with a proper noun is as much in need of explanation as the ability of Russian proper nouns to occur with Gen Neg.

world' and Gen Neg to existence 'in a situation'. Intensional contexts are contexts in which we are quantifying over alternative possible worlds or possible situations, which may or may not include the actual world or actual situation. Negation denies that a given sort of situation is actual; whether that has any implications of non-existence (relative to a location or situation), non-observability, or the like, depends on both the structure of the sentence and the presuppositions, entailments, and implicatures carried by the verb and by the NPs in question. In both kinds of constructions, the choice of Acc or Nom may indicate the presence of a presupposition of existence that gives an effect similar to the effect of "wide scope".

#### 4.5.4 The problem of variability, optionality, instability of data

Like all Slavists, we face the fact that the distribution of Russian Gen Neg involves "tendencies", "optionality", speaker variation. We appeal in part to two factors: (a) competition between semantically conditioned rules and syntacticization, with gradual loss of Genitive; (b) subjectivity of some of the semantic conditions, often allowing the same situation to be described 'either way' (I didn't see the individual Petja or I didn't see 'any trace of Petja'.)

#### References

- Apresjan, Jurij D. 1980. *Tipy informacii dlja poverxnostno-semantičeskogo komponenta modeli "Smysl ⇔ Tekst"* [Types of Information for the Surface-Semantic Component of the Model "Meaning ⇔ Text"]. Vienna/Moscow: Wiener Slavistische Almanach/Škola "Jazyki Ruskoj Kultury".
- Apresjan, Jurij D. 1986. Deiksis v grammatike i leksike i naivnaja model' mira [Deixis in grammar and lexicon and the naïve model of the world]. *Semiotika i Informatika* 28:5-33.
- Arutjunova, Nina D. 1976. *Predloženie i ego smysl* [The Sentence and its Meaning]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Babby, Leonard H. 1980. *Existential Sentences and Negation in Russian*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Karoma Publishers.
- Bailyn, John Frederick. 2004. The Case of Q. In *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Languages: The Ottawa Meeting 2003 (FASL 12)*, eds. Olga Arnaudova et al., 1-35. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Bitner, Maria. 1987. On the semantics of Greenlandic antipassive and related constructions. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 53:194-231.
- Borschev, Vladimir, and Barbara H. Partee. 2002a. The Russian genitive of negation in existential sentences: the role of Theme-Rheme structure reconsidered. In *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague (nouvelle série), v.4*, eds. Eva Hajičová et al., 185-250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co. <http://people.umass.edu/partee/docs/GenNegTravaux.pdf>
- Borschev, Vladimir, and Barbara H. Partee. 2002b. The Russian genitive of negation: Theme-rheme structure or perspective structure? *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10:105-144. <http://people.umass.edu/partee/docs/BorschevParteeJSL2002.pdf>
- Borschev, Vladimir et al. 2006. Sentential and constituent negation in Russian BE-sentences revisited. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Princeton Meeting 2005 (FASL 14)*, eds. James Lavine et al., 50-65. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. <http://people.umass.edu/partee/docs/FASL14.pdf>
- Borschev, Vladimir et al. in progress. Russian genitives, non-referentiality, and the property-type hypothesis. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Stony Brook Meeting 2007 (FASL 16)*, eds. John F. Bailyn et al. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publishers.
- Brisson, Christine. 1997. On definite plural noun phrases and the meaning of 'all'. In *SALT VII: Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Semantics and Linguistic Theory 1997*, ed. Aaron Lawson, 55-72. Ithaca, N.Y.: CLC Publications, Department of Linguistics, Cornell University.
- Chvany, Catherine V. 1975. *On the Syntax of BE-Sentences in Russian*. Cambridge, MA: Slavica.
- Crockett, Dina. 1976. *Agreement in Contemporary Standard Russian*. Cambridge, MA: Slavica.
- Dahl, Östen. 1971. The Genitive and the Subjunctive in Russian. *Scando-Slavica* 17:135-137.

- Dayal, Veneeta. 2003. A semantics for pseudo incorporation. Ms. Rutgers University. <http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~dayal/pseudo-incorporation.pdf>.
- Donnellan, Keith. 1966. Reference and definite descriptions. *Philosophical Review* 75:281-304.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:1-25.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*: Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 84. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Farkas, Donka F. 1985. *Intensional Descriptions and the Romance Subjunctive Mood*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Farkas, Donka F., and Henriëtte de Swart. 2003. *The Semantics of Incorporation: From Argument Structure to Discourse Transparency*: Stanford Monographs in Linguistics. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://people.ucsc.edu/~farkas/papers/seminc-0711.pdf>
- Franks, Steven, and Richard House. 1982. Genitive themes in Russian. In *CLS 18: Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 156-168. Chicago.
- Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)Veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gronn, Atle. 2006. Norwegian Bare Singulars: A Note on Types and Sorts. In *A Festschrift for Kjell Johan Sæbo: — in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the celebration of his 50th birthday*, eds. Torgrim Solstad et al. Oslo: <http://folk.uio.no/torgriiso/fs/files/gronn.pdf>.
- Hajičová, Eva. 1973. Negation and Topic vs. Comment. *Philologia Pragensia* 16:81-93.
- Harves, Stephanie A. 2002. Unaccusative Syntax in Russian, Princeton University: Ph.D. dissertation.
- Heim, Irene. 1982. The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases, University of Massachusetts: Ph.D. dissertation; published 1989, New York: Garland. <http://newstar.rinet.ru/~goga/biblio/heim> (djuv) or <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/Tk0ZmYyY/> (very large PDF file)
- House, Richard. 1982. The Use of Genitive Initial Sentences for the Specification of Quantity in Russian, Cornell University: Ph.D. dissertation.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1971/1936. Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russische Kasus. In *Selected Writings II*, 23-71. The Hague: Mouton (originally published in 1936).
- Kagan, Olga. 2005. Genitive case: A modal account. Ms. Jerusalem. Paper presented at IATL Conference, Haifa, June 22-23 2005. PDF: <http://atar.mscc.huji.ac.il/~english/IATL/21/Kagan.pdf> <http://atar.mscc.huji.ac.il/~english/IATL/21/Kagan.pdf>
- Kamp, Hans, and Agnes Bende-Farkas. 2001. Indefinites and binding: From specificity to incorporation. Lecture notes from the 13th ESSLLI summer school in Helsinki. Ms. Stuttgart.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In *Progress in Linguistics*, eds. Manfred Bierwisch and K. Heidolph, 143-173. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. Partitive case and aspect. In *The projection of arguments: Lexical and compositional factors*, eds. Miriam Butt and Wilhelm Geuder, 265-307. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Klenin, Emily. 1978. Quantification, partitivity, and the genitive of negation in Russian. In *Classification of Grammatical Categories*, ed. B. Comrie, 163-182. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.
- Landman, Fred. 2003. *Indefinites and the Type of Sets*: Explorations in Semantics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Landman, Fred. 2004. *Indefinites and the Type of Sets*: Explorations in Semantics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- McNally, Louise. 1992. An interpretation for the English Existential Construction, University of California at Santa Cruz: Ph.D. dissertation.
- McNally, Louise. 1998. Existential sentences without existential quantification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21:353-392.
- Mustajoki, Arto, and Hannes Heino. 1991. *Case selection for the direct object in Russian negative clauses. Part II: Report on a Statistical Analysis*: Slavica Helsingiensia 9. Helsinki: Department of Slavonic Languages, University of Helsinki.
- Neidle, Carol. 1982. The Role of Case in Russian Syntax, Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT: Ph.D. dissertation.
- Neidle, Carol. 1988. *The Role of Case in Russian Syntax*: Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 10. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Padučeva, E.V. 1974. *O semantike sintaksisa: materialy k transformacionnoj grammatike russkogo jazyka* [On the Semantics of Syntax: Materials toward the Transformational Grammar of Russian]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Padučeva, E.V. 1985. *Vyskazyvanie i ego sootnesenost' s dejstvitel'nost'ju* (The Utterance and its Correspondence with Reality). Moscow: Nauka.
- Padučeva, E.V. 1992. O semantičeskom podkode k sintaksisu i genitivnom sub'ekte glagola BYT' [On the semantic approach to syntax and the genitive subject of the verb BYT' 'BE']. *Russian Linguistics* 16:53-63.
- Padučeva, E.V. 1994. From Puškin to Nabokov: narrator in the position of observer. *Russian Literature* 36.
- Padučeva, E.V. 1997. Roditel'nyj sub'ekta v otricateľ'nom predložeenii: sintaksis ili semantika? [Genitive subject in a negative sentence: syntax or semantics?]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2:101-116.
- Partee, Barbara H. 1986. Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. In *Studies in Discourse Representation Theory and the Theory of Generalized Quantifiers*, eds. J. Groenendijk et al., 115-143. Dordrecht: Foris. [Reprinted in Partner and Partee, eds., 2002, 357-381. Reprinted in Partee, Barbara H. 2004. *Compositionality in Formal Semantics: Selected Papers by Barbara H. Partee*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 203-230]. <http://newstar.rinet.ru/~goga/biblio/essential-readings/15-Partee-Noun-Phrase-Interpretation-and-Type-shifting-Principles.djvu>
- Partee, Barbara H., and Vladimir Borschev. 2002. Genitive of negation and scope of negation in Russian existential sentences. In *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the Second Ann Arbor Meeting 2001 (FASL 10)*, ed. Jindrich Toman, 181-200. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. <http://people.umass.edu/partee/docs/ParteeBorschevFASL10.pdf>
- Partee, Barbara H., and Vladimir Borschev. 2004a. The semantics of Russian Genitive of Negation: The nature and role of Perspectival Structure. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 14*, eds. Kazuha Watanabe and Robert B. Young, 212-234. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications. <http://people.umass.edu/partee/docs/SALT14ParteeBorschev.pdf>
- Partee, Barbara H., and Vladimir Borschev. 2004b. The Russian genitive of negation and diathesis alternation: interaction of lexical and compositional semantics. Handout for TAG+7: 7th International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammars and Related Formalisms, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, May 20-22, 2004. Ms.
- Partee, Barbara H., and Vladimir Borschev. 2006a. Information structure, Perspectival Structure, diathesis alternation, and the Russian Genitive of Negation. In *Proceedings of Ninth Symposium on Logic and Language (LoLa 9), Besenyőtelek, Hungary, August 24–26, 2006*, eds. Beáta Gyuris et al., 120-129. Budapest: Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Theoretical Linguistics Programme, Eötvös Loránd University. <http://www.nytud.hu/lola9/proceedings.html>
- Partee, Barbara H., and Vladimir Borschev. 2006b. The genitive of negation in Russian: Multiple perspectives on a multi-faceted problem. Ms. Indiana University, Bloomington. [http://people.umass.edu/partee/docs/SLS06\\_handout.pdf](http://people.umass.edu/partee/docs/SLS06_handout.pdf)
- Partee, Barbara H., and Vladimir Borschev. In press. Pros and cons of a type-shifting approach to Russian Genitive of Negation. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Tbilisi Symposium on Language, Logic and Computation (Batumi 2005)*, eds. Balder ten Cate and Henk Zeevat. Berlin: Springer. <https://drive.oit.umass.edu/partee/ProsConsTypeshift.pdf>
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2006. Small nominals. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 24:433–500.
- Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and Categories. MIT: Ph.D. dissertation.
- Thompson, A. 1911. Zur Genetivreaktion des Verbuns im Baltischslavischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 29:249-259.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1975. Hierarchies in the Genitive of Negation. *Slavic and East European Journal* 19:123-138.
- Ueda, Masako. 1993. Set-membership interpretations and the genitive of negation. *Russian Linguistics* 17:237-261.
- Van Geenhoven, Veerle. 1998. *Semantic Incorporation and Indefinite Descriptions: Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Noun Incorporation in West Greenlandic*: Dissertations in linguistics. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.

- Van Geenhoven, Veerle, and Louise McNally. 2005. On the property analysis of opaque complements. *Lingua* 115:885-914.
- Von Heusinger, Klaus, and Johannes Wespel. 2006. Indefinite proper names and quantification over manifestations. Ms. Stuttgart. Abstract for Sinn und Bedeutung, Barcelona, Sept 21-23, 2006. Link: [http://www.upf.edu/dtf/sub11/abstracts/vonheusinger\\_wespel.pdf](http://www.upf.edu/dtf/sub11/abstracts/vonheusinger_wespel.pdf).
- Zimmermann, Ede. 1993a. On the proper treatment of opacity in certain verbs. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:149-179.
- Zimmermann, Thomas Ede. 1993b. On the proper treatment of opacity in certain verbs. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:148-171.