Elements requiring some notion of “licensing by clausal negation” in Russian:

- NEG-words — part of the strict concord system
- Genitive of negation (GoN) — patients may be marked genitive if they co-occur with clausemate negation (to be refined)

As in many other negative concord (NEG-concord) languages (Zanuttini, 1997; Giannakidou, 1998; Watanabe, 2004), Russian negative fragments are licensed even in contexts where there is no overt expression of negation.

(1) Kto prišel na konferenciju? Nikto.
   'Who came to the conference? No one.'

A prominent way of understanding the availability of such negative fragments in the absence of an overt expression of negation involves three interrelated commitments:

1. two polarity-related positions: [Pol [ T [ Neg ...]]]; the low position hosts the morphosyntactic expression of negation, while the higher is semantically potent (but often null) (Brown and Franks, 1995; Brown, 1999; Gribanova, 2017) (§1)
2. fronting of the NEG-word to the clausal periphery, plus clausal (TP) ellipsis (Giannakidou, 1998; Merchant, 2004) (§2)
3. licensing of the NEG-word by a TP-external, null, instance of semantically contentful negative polarity (Laka, 1994; Zeijlstra, 2008) (§2)

A puzzle: even when high, null negation apparently licenses NEG-words, it apparently is not the licensor of GoN. (In general, GoN on patients alternates with other structural cases — ACC/NOM.)

(2) Accusative patient in a positive antecedent; ✓ACC, *GoN
   a. Kakuju iz etix knig ty čitala?
      'Which of these books did you read?'
      NEG.which.ACC / *NEG.which.GEN
      'I didn’t read any of these books.'

(3) Accusative patient in an antecedent with clausal negation; ✓ACC, *GoN
   a. Ja pervyj tom tak i ne čitala.
      1sg first.ACC volume.ACC so and NEG read.PST.F
      'I didn’t even read the first volume.'
   b. I vtoroj / *vtorogo tože.
      and second.ACC / *second.GEN also
      'And I didn’t read the second one either.'

(4) Genitive patient in an antecedent with clausal negation; ✓GoN, *ACC
   a. Ja pervogo toma tak i ne čitala.
      1sg first.GEN volume.GEN so and NEG read.PST.F
      'I didn’t even read the first volume.'
   b. I *vtoroj / vtorogo tože.
      and *second.ACC / second.GEN also
      'And I didn’t read the second one either.'

Commitments 1, 2, and 3 alone will not give rise to an understanding of the patterns in (2)–(4) in the absence of a worked out theory of (the syntactic part of) GoN licensing. The analytical commitment I develop and defend (in §3) is:
4. All of the NEG-words that participate in the Russian NEG-concord system — including the (lower) expression of sentential negation (Zeijlstra, 2008) — can also themselves assign genitive case.

What this buys us:

- A unified understanding of all of the environments in which GoN is found:
  - the historically canonical ones (patients w/clausemate negation)
  - and the difficult-to-incorporate ones — external arguments of transitives, unergative arguments, certain temporal adverbials, all w/clausemate negation; and long-distance GoN licensing.

- an understanding of the patterns in (2)–(4) that arises from the interaction of commitments 1–4, and conditions on ellipsis licensing.

This unified picture will meet with a new set of challenges in §4, where I demonstrate that under a narrow set of circumstances, ellipsis seems to license case mismatches on phrasal remnants, in a way that seems to contradict prominent ideas about the identity relation in ellipsis licensing (Chung, 2013; Merchant, 2013b).

1 The loci of polarity in the Russian clausal spine

svo is the discourse-neutral word order in Russian and in traditional accounts (Bailyn, 1995b,a; Fowler, 1994) is derived by the interaction of:

- movement of the subject to [spec, TP];
- verb movement to an intermediate position above its base position and below T.

Expressing negation in Russian svo: polarity is connected to two positions — Pol and Neg (Laka, 1990; Zanuttini, 1997; Brown, 1999; Brown and Franks, 1995; Gribanova, 2017, *inter alios*).

- Neg is responsible for the morphosyntactic expression of proclitic sentential negation.
- Pol hosts an interpretable polarity feature (*i*-neg); Neg hosts an uninterpretable polarity feature (*u*-neg);\(^1\) and Pol are connected by AGREE.
- The verb movement involved in deriving svo takes place to Neg, right below T.
- In non-negative environments, I will assume that Pol and Neg are projected but do not bear NEG-features.
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Evidence that Pol is the locus of semantically contentful polarity features in Russian (Gribanova, 2017):

1. TP ellipsis strands polarity particles → there is a high Pol head.
2. TP ellipsis permits mismatches in polarity → *i*-neg in Pol.
3. [Expletive negation (Brown and Franks, 1995; Brown, 1999); but see Abels 2005.]
4. [Negative polarity licenses subjects in [spec, TP] & subjects don’t reconstruct → the Pol head is the one with *i*-neg.]

\(^1\)As far as I can tell, the proposal I pursue here is also consistent with the use of valued and unvalued polarity features instead of *u*-neg and *i*-neg; note that this would require the use of upward AGREE, since the probe would be structurally lower than the goal.
Argument 1

(6) Mašu ona vstretila, a Pašu — net (*ona).
Masha.ACC she.NOM met.PST.SG.F but Pasha.ACC — not (*she.NOM)
‘Masha she met, but Pasha (she) didn’t (meet).’

• Kazenin 2006; Gribanova 2017: this is TP ellipsis; nothing can come after the stranded polarity particle, and the phrasal remnant preceding the polarity particle shows case connectivity effects.
• → there is a contentful polarity head above TP which, in (6), hosts net.
• This position is distinct from the position of negation, which in SVO clauses is always immediately pre-verbal and below the subject.

Argument 2

(7) a. Evgenija otpravila posylku v Moskvu?
    Evgenija send.PST.3SG.F package.ACC to Moscow.LOC
    ‘Did Eugenia send the package to Moscow?’

b. V to Moskvu — net.
    to Moscow — no
    ‘To Moscow, no.’

• If Neg were the host of iNEG, there would be a Neg head bearing no features in the antecedent and one bearing iNEG in the elided constituent.
• This would constitute a violation: the interpretable features on a head inside the ellipsis site much match the features on the corresponding head in the antecedent (Merchant, 2013b).
• If, rather, the head hosting iNEG is Pol, it will be outside the ellipsis domain (TP) and this difficulty will not arise; the uNEG feature on the lower Neg head would be irrelevant for the purposes of calculating the identity relation between the antecedent and elided constituent (Merchant, 2013a).

2 The concord system & licensing neg-word fragments

2.1 A syntax for strict negative concord

I will assume here a system for Russian strict negative concord like the one proposed in Zeijlstra 2004, 2008.

• The Pol head, which bears iNEG, licenses all instances of uNEG via multiple agree.
• Sentential negation (the Neg head) and all neg-words bear uNEG.

(8) Nikto ne udivel nikogo.
    NEG.who.NOM NEG see.PST.3M NEG.who.ACC
    ‘No one saw anyone.’

• An expectation: if Neg and NEG-words share uNEG features in common, we might expect that they will share some other syntactic properties. More on this in §3.
2.2 Negative concord meets ellipsis

   who.ACC Vanja saw.3SG NEG.one.ACC V NEG saw.3SG
   ‘Who did Vanja see? No one.’

To derive (10):
  • the NEG-word fronts to the clausal periphery;
  • there is TP ellipsis.

2.2.1 NEG-words undergo (multiple) fronting

The canonical position for NEG-words is just before sentential negation (Brown, 1999). But NEG-words are also part of a class of quantifier-looking words that front to the left periphery of the clause — others include wh-phrases, every, all, specific indefinites, and so on.

(11) NEG-word fronting
   a. Ničego Mar’sergeevna ne поняла, no...
      NEG.what.ACC M. NEG understand.pst.3SG.F but
      ‘Maria Sergeevna understood nothing, but.’
      Olga Nekrasova. Platit poslednij. 2000. (rnc)
   b. Ničego nikogda ty ne понимаешь.
      NEG.what.ACC NEG.when you.NOM NEG understand.2SG
      ‘You never understand anything.’

(12) WH-fronting
   a. Kto kakoj gorod zaxvatil?
      who.NOM which.ACC city.ACC conquered.3SG
      ‘Who conquered which city?’
   b. About a dictionary:
      ...i rasskazyvaetsja, что každoye slovo značit.
      ...and tell.2IMPF.3SG.REFL what each word mean.3SG
      ‘...and it tells you what every word means.’

(13) quantifier fronting: every, all
   a. About expatriate dissident circles in Paris during the Soviet era:
      Predstavljajem, každyj každago podozrevaet v stukačestve...
      imagine.2SG everyone.NOM everyone.ACC suspect.3SG in snitching.DAT
      ‘Imagine, everyone suspects everyone of being a snitch...’
   b. ...i vse govorjat, i nikto nikogo ne slušaet, zato vse vsex ljubjat.
      and all talk.3PL and NEG.who.NOM NEG.who.ACC NEG listen.3SG but all.NOM all.ACC love.3PL
      ‘And everyone is talking, and no one listens to anyone, but all the while everyone loves everyone.’

(14) fronting specific indefinites
   a. ‘In that difficult time it was very important...’
      što kto-to kogo-to v opredelënom meste ždet, ili...
      that who.NOM-one who.ACC-one in specific.PREP place.PREP wait.3SG or
      ‘that someone was waiting for someone in a specific place, or...’
      Evgenij Vodolazkin. Lavr. 2012. (rnc)
   b. Počemu-to kakoj-to gorod zaxvatili.
      for.what-one which-one city.ACC conquered.3PL
      ‘For some reason they conquered some city.’

It is possible to make sense of these patterns if we take WH-fronting to be a sub-part of a generalized mechanism that targets a broader range of elements for movement to the clause edge.

---

2 Some examples in this handout are the result of searches in the Russian National Corpus (rnc), and are so noted.
2.2.2 Generalized TPE

The existence of TPE in Russian is well-defended elsewhere:

- sluicing (Grebenyova, 2006)
- contrastive polarity ellipsis (Kazenin, 2006; Gribanova, 2017).

(15) Každyj priglasil kogo-to na tanec, no ja ne pomnju, kto kogo.
Everyone.NOM invited who.ACC-one to dance but I NEG remember who.NOM who.ACC
‘Everyone invited someone to a dance but I don’t remember who (invited) whom.’

(16) Mašu ona vstrelila, a Paša — net.
Masha.ACC she.NOM met.PST.SG.F but Pasha.ACC — no
‘Masha she met, but Pasha (she) didn’t (meet).’

2.3 Deriving fragment NEG-word answers

who.ACC they see.PST.3PL NEG who.ACC
‘Who did they see? No one.’

- For the purposes of the identity calculation in ellipsis licensing, unvalued or uninterpretable features in the ellipsis site (TP, in gray) are not relevant (Merchant, 2013a).
- Result: NEG-words are licensed as fragment answers — by iNEG in the Pol head, external to the ellipsis site — even when the antecedent of the ellipsis contains no expression of negation.

3 GoN & its relation to the negative concord system

We have now established reasons for committing to 1, 2 and 3:

1. two polarity-related positions: Pol hosts iNEG and Neg hosts uNEG.
2. fronting of the NEG-word to the clausal periphery, plus clausal (TP) ellipsis
3. licensing of the NEG-word by a TP-external, null, negation (iNEG in Pol)

The logic set out in §2.3, plus commitments 1–3, might lead us to believe that:

- elements in search of licensing by negation can systematically get that licensing via AGREE with iNEG in Pol,
- and in fact that Neg is nothing but a placeholder for the expression of negation, in need of licensing itself.
- As we saw in §2.3, the presence or absence of uNEG — in the ellipsis site or antecedent to the ellipsis — seems to play no role for the calculation of the identity relation in ellipsis licensing either.

But this clearly cannot be the case, as patterns from the GoN show. Even though genitive case is licensed with clausemate negation in Russian, its licensing conditions are different from those of NEG-words: GoN is not licensed on (negative) fragments unless GoN is also in the antecedent.

(19) Accusative patient in a positive antecedent; *GoN
Kakuju iz četix knig ty čitala? Nikakuju / *Nikakoj.
which.ACC of these books 2SG.NOM read.PST.F NEG which.ACC / *NEG which.GEN
‘Which of these books did you read? I didn’t read any of these books.’
(20) Accusative patient in an antecedent with clausal negation; *GoN
Ja pervyj tom tak i ne čitala. I vtoroj / *vtoroj tože.
1SG first.ACC volume.ACC so and NEG read.PST.F and second.ACC / *second.GEN also
*I didn’t even read the first volume. And I didn’t read the second one either.’

(21) Genitive patient in an antecedent with clausal negation; ✅ GoN
Ja pervogo toma tak i ne čitala. I *vtoroj / vtorogo tože.
1SG first.GEN volume.GEN so and NEG read.PST.F and *second.ACC / *second.GEN also
*I didn’t even read the first volume. And I didn’t read the second one either.’

So iNEG cannot be the relevant licensor for GoN. I will try to argue here for a unified analysis of the syntactic licensing of GoN, which comes down to the so-called 4th commitment:

4. All of the NEG-words that participate in the Russian NEG-concord system — including the (lower) expression of sentential negation (Zeijlstra, 2008) — can also themselves assign genitive case.

The result is an interconnected web of licensing relations in which NEG-words must be licensed by iNEG, but can themselves assign a special kind of structural case (genitive).3

3.1 GoN: building toward a unified understanding

The literature on GoN has historically focussed on a ‘core’ set of environments in which GoN is licensed, and analyses of the GoN correspondingly focus primarily on these environments. I’ll present the ‘core’ cases first and then move to attempting a fuller description of the facts.

All of what I report here has been documented elsewhere; the goal here is to come to a descriptive and analytical understanding of the facts, at least from the syntax side of things,4 that presents a unified understanding of the phenomenon.

3.1.1 ‘Core’ cases

The canonical generalization is that non-oblique internal arguments may be case-marked accusative (ACC) or nominative (NOM); or they may be case-marked genitive (GEN) under negation. This includes surface objects of transitives (22b), subject surfaces of unaccusatives (23b), and subject surfaces of passives (24b), but not subjects of transitives or unergatives (Peškovskij, 1956; Pesetsky, 1982).5

(22) a. Ja ne videl èti fil’my.
   I NEG saw.3SG.M these.ACC films.ACC
   ‘I didn’t see these movies.’
   b. Ja ne videl ètix fil’mov.
   I NEG saw.3SG.M these.GEN movies.GEN
   ‘I didn’t see these movies.’

(23) a. Otvet ne prišel.
   answer.NOM NEG came.3SG.M
   ‘The answer didn’t come.’
   b. Otveta ne prišlo.
   answer.GEN NEG came.3SG.N
   ‘An answer didn’t come.’

(24) a. Gazety ne byli polučeny.
   newspapers.NOM NEG were.PL received.PL
   ‘The newspapers were not received.’

3The idea that the lower expression of negation is responsible for coN licensing is also supported by the fact that coN is licensed by expletive negation — cases in which the morphosyntactically expressed lower negation is somehow not associated with actual negative force (Brown and Franks, 1995). This argument rests on a particular understanding of expletive negation as lacking the higher, semantically contentful polarity features; see Abels 2005 for counter-arguments to this understanding. The idea that NEG-words might have some licensing power when it comes to coN (at least in a limited subset of cases) is raised in Brown and Franks 1995 and Abels 2005, but never systematically pursued.

4In what follows I will set aside the many and important components of the coN which are about its semantics, both in terms of its compositional contribution and in terms of conditions on its licensing (Kagan, 2005, 2007; Borschev and Partee, 2002; Borschev et al., 2012; Paducheva, 1992, 1997, 2006).

5Babby (2001) documents a limited set of examples in which unergatives are also able to take the genitive of negation; we will discuss those in due course.
b. Gazet ne bylo polučeno.
   newspapers GEN NEG was 3SG N received SG N
   ‘The newspapers were not received.’

In the general case, GON is considered ungrammatical on transitive or unergative subjects.

(25)  
   a. Gazeta ne pečataet takuju erundu.
       newspaper NOM NEG print 3SG such ACC nonsense ACC
       ‘The newspaper doesn’t print such nonsense.’
   b. * Gazety ne pečataet takuju erundu.
       newspaper GEN NEG print 3SG such ACC nonsense ACC

(26)  
   a. Deti ne tancujut.
       kids NOM NEG dance 3PL
       ‘The kids are not dancing.’
   b. * Detej ne tancuet.
       kids GEN NEG dance 3SG N

This much can be accommodated in various ways: most approaches reference the presence of morphosyntactic negation, either directly as a case assigner or as the element that licenses some other GEN-case assigning head.

3.1.2 The complement of the ‘core’ cases

At the same time as the focus has been primarily on providing an analysis of the ‘core’ cases, the literature is full of cases of GON licensing in environments that diverge from the initial characterization.

(27) Subjects of unergative predicates (Babby, 2001, 51-55)
   
   a. Na zabrošennom zavode upal i razbilsja Saša. (Ja tam byl.)
      ‘Sasha fell and was badly hurt at the abandoned factory. (I was there.)’
      Tam (bol’še) ne igraet nikakix detej.
      there (more) NEG play 3SG N no which GEN children GEN
      ‘There are no longer any children (seen) playing there.’
   b. S tex por kak na etom zavode sokratili zarplatu, tam ne rabotaet ni odnogo inženera.
      Since on this factory cut 3PL wages ACC there NEG work 3SG not one GEN engineer GEN
      ‘Since the wages were cut at the factory, there hasn’t been a single engineer working there.’

(28) Subjects of transitives (Ljutikova and Testelets, 2013)
   
   a. Ni odnogo zvuča ne narušalo zimnego gornogo pokoja.
      not one GEN sound GEN NEG disturb 3SG N winter GEN mountainous GEN peace GEN
      ‘Not a single sound disturbed the wintery mountain peace.’
   b. Udивител’no — ni odnogo strаžnika ne oxonjalo gorodskie vorota.
      amazing — not one GEN guard GEN NEG protect 3SG N city ACC gates ACC
      ‘Amazing — not a single guard was protecting the city gates.’ (Yandex)
   c. Ni odnogo čeloveka ne videlo ètu udивител’nuju scenu.
      Not one GEN person GEN NEG see 3SG N this ACC amazing ACC scene ACC
      ‘Not a single person saw this amazing scene.’ (Yandex)

(29) Certain temporal adverbials (Pesetsky, 1982; Babby, 2001; Brown and Franks, 1995)
   
   a. On ne smotreli televizor ni odnoj minuty.
      ne NOM NEG watch PST 3SG M television not one GEN minute GEN
      ‘He didn’t watch television for a single minute.’
   b. Ja ni odnoj minuty ne spal.
      I NOM NEG one GEN minute GEN NEG sleep PST 3SG M
      ‘I didn’t sleep a single minute.’

---

The literature on the syntax of GON is rich with approaches to the problem. For a variety of syntactic perspectives, see Pesetsky 1982, Harves 2002, Pereltsvaig 1999, Abels 2005, and Bailyn 1997; a useful summary can be found in Harves 2013.
(30) Long-distance licensing (Brown and Franks, 1995; Abels, 2005)\(^7\)

Oni ne imeli prava uznat’ drug o druge nikakix novostej.

‘They did not have the right to discover any news about each other.’

The paradox:

- There is something really true about the fact that the default (best?) environment for GoN is the one in which it is associated with an internal argument.
- At the same time, we have all these additional cases in the literature which clearly do not fit this description — too many to ignore.
- The status of these latter cases has not been clear: while individual examples seem acceptable, subject to various pragmatic and semantic factors, in the default case it is true that agents cannot, for example, bear GoN.

An important observation:

- Almost all of the examples in which GoN appears on something other than an internal argument, it co-occurs with a NEG-word: ni odin, nikakoj, etc.
- 5/6 of Babby’s unergative GoN examples feature a NEG-word next to the GEN-marked argument.
- 11/11 of Testelets and Lyutikova’s transitive agents with GoN also appear next to a NEG-word.
- The same for temporal adverbial expressions and the long-distance example.
- Further: for all of the examples in (27)–(30), eliminating the NEG-word would result in ungrammaticality or serious degradation.

“Note that in their study of factors influencing the choice of the direct object of a negated verb, Mustajoki and Heino (1991) deem the ni-adjectives and the particle ni ‘strong factors’ demanding the genitive case. These are factors whose influence is so strong that other factors are negligible in their presence. In their corpus, 125 examples of direct objects of negated verbs contain a ni-adjective, and all occur in the GEN. For the particle ni, there were 24 examples, and all occurred with GEN as well.” (Franks and Brown 1995, footnote 17)

3.1.3 An attempt at unification

The entire set of elements participating in the Russian strict NEG-concord system that bear uNEG — including the negative part of NEG-words (ni) and the expression of sentential negation (ne) — is the same set that can assign GEN case.

Two options for the assignment of GoN in the ‘core’ cases:

1. Neg bears GEN case features, which it assigns directly by AGREE (Harves, 2002).
2. Neg licenses a v head in its scope which is the GEN case assigner (Abels, 2005).

\(^7\)Ask me about how the ideas developed here might make sense of this pattern.
(31) Neg as goN case assigner
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(32) uNEG-bearing Neg licenses \(v_{\text{GEN}}\)
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This much will capture the ‘core’ cases, in which goN appears on patients under sentential negation. What about the cases in which it looks like the presence of the NEG-word is itself licensing GEN? An initial hypothesis:

- Ni, which is the negative component of NEG-words, can itself bear a GEN case feature.
- This GEN case feature, if it is present, can be assigned via a very local instance of agree to the constituent associated with ni.
- If ni happens not to bear a GEN feature, the usual case licensing (associated with structural position — e.g. NOM, etc.) will take place.

(33) uNEG-bearing ni assigns case

\[
\begin{array}{c}
i \\
\text{not} \\
\text{odnoj} \\
\text{minute} \\
\text{[\text{NEG}]} \\
\text{[\text{GEN}]} \\
\text{[CASE:GEN]} \\
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\end{array}
\]

- Captures the potentially desirable parallel between sentential negation and NEG-words: both bear \(u\text{NEG}\) and GEN.
- The alternation between goN and ACC is captured through a complex interaction between ACC vs. goN case assigners and the referentiality of the argument.
- Fails to directly capture the observation that external arguments cannot generally be assigned goN in the co-presence of sentential negation.
- Harves 2002, 2006 links the asymmetry between internal and external arguments to agreement: external argument projection requires the kind of T that wants to agree. The data in (28) seem to be inconsistent with this.

- Breaks the potentially desirable parallel between sentential negation and NEG-words, since now the goN is not assigned in exactly the same way.
- Captures the important observation that in the general case, external arguments are not assigned goN in the co-presence of sentential negation (because they are not in the scope of \(v_{\text{GEN}}\)).
- Captures directly the complementarity between goN and ACC case on patients under negation (different vs).
- What is \(f\)?

\[\text{As has been noted as early as Pesetsky 1982, if a direct object of a transitive contains a NEG-word, it can only be assigned goN, not ACC. With Harves (2006), I take this to be a semantic, rather than a strictly syntactic, restriction.}\]
3.2 Back to preventing case mismatch in fragment answers

These approaches have an important characteristic in common: all of the case assignment action associated with GoN happens inside TP. Ellipsis targeting TP will therefore impose an identity requirement on the case features associated with Neg, v, and so on. This is in line with Chung’s (2013) observations and proposal about the identity conditions imposed on sluicing.

\[ \text{(34) Limited syntactic identity in sluicing (Chung, 2013, page 30)} \]

a. Argument structure condition: If the interrogative phrase [for us, any phrase extracted from the TPE site –vg] is the argument of a predicate in the ellipsis site, that predicate must have an argument structure identical to that of the corresponding predicate in the antecedent clause.

b. Case condition: If the interrogative phrase [for us, any phrase extracted from the TPE site –vg] is a DP, it must be Case-licensed in the ellipsis site by a head identical to the corresponding head in the antecedent clause.

Result: fragment answers must match their antecedent in case because of the way ellipsis licensing interacts with GoN assignment → this is a case connectivity effect.

4 da and net, and GoN

We have so far considered configurations with the following antecedent-ellipsis relations:

- positive polarity antecedent, negative polarity ellipsis
- negative polarity antecedent, negative polarity ellipsis

…but we have not yet considered cases in which antecedent is negative — permitting GoN— and the elliptical response changes to positive polarity — making GoN impossible.

\[ \text{(35) The configuration of interest, assuming Abels-type GoN assignment (in (32)):\n} \]

a. newspapers.gen, Pol\[\text{Neg}\] Peter.nom Neg \[\text{Neg}\] v \[\text{F}\] \[\text{F}\] \[\text{GEN}\] reads \{newspapers.gen\}

b. reports.acc, yesP, Peter.nom Neg \[\text{acc}\] \[\text{ACC}\] reads \{reports.acc\}

Given everything we have established thus far, configurations like (35) should not be licensed: the case features associated with v and/or Neg would not identical in the antecedent and the elided constituent. As we will see, this prediction is not (or not completely) borne out.

4.1 The featural composition of da

In terms of the typology of features for polarity particles introduced by Farkas and Bruce (2010); Farkas and Roelofsen (2015): Russian da by itself generally means [AGREE, +] but not [REVERSE].

\[ \text{(36) Crocodile Gena receives a visit at home from a silent monkey, who can only nod “yes” or “no” in response to questions. The monkey is mute because she puts small objects in her mouth for safekeeping.} \]

a. Gena:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vy, navernoe, ne } & \text{ umeet } \text{ razgovorivat’}\? \\
\text{you probably } & \text{ NEG } \text{ able.2PL talk.INF} \\
'& \text{You probably don’t know how to speak?’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

b. Narrator: However the monkey answered now, the result would be the same. If, for example, she nodded “yes”, it would mean “yes, I don’t know how to speak.” If, though, she shook her head “no”, it would still mean “no, I don’t know how to speak.” So she had to open her mouth and extract from it all the small trinkets that were preventing her from speaking.


4.2 da in polarity ellipsis

For some speakers (me included), examples with a negative antecedent but a positive polarity particle preceding the ellipsis are ungrammatical. These are presumably speakers for whom da retains its AGREE meaning, even in contrastive configurations.

\[ \text{(37) Petja ne pridet, a Saša — da.} \]

Peter NEG come.3SG but Saša — yes

‘Peter won’t come, but Sasha will.’

(ungrammatical for ‘conservative’ speakers)
There are speakers who accept examples like (37) though — and corpus examples abound (see the appendix).

(38) From a story dialogue between an adult and a child (Veniamin Kaverin, Legkie šagi. 1962):
   a. Uncle: Interesting — maybe that’s just Sneguročka. Let’s wait till spring.
   b. Child: Why until spring?
   c. Uncle: Because in spring, Sneguročkas melt.
   d. Child: Well, uncle, still . . . doesn’t there exist eternal ice?
   e. On, ved’, ne taet?
      it PART NEG melt.3SG
   ‘It doesn’t melt, does it?’
   f. Uncle:
      ice — no but S. — yes
   ‘Ice doesn’t, but Sneguročkas do.’

A subset of speakers who accept (37) also accept the following:

(39) Petja gazet ne čitaet, a otčety — da.
    Peter newspapers.GEN NEG read.3SG but reports.ACC — yes
    ‘Peter doesn’t read newspapers, but reports, he does.’

Evidence from the RNC: it is common to find analogues of (39) with accusative patients, in both the antecedent and stranded as remnants outside the TPE site. This is the expected pattern.

(40) Eë trudnosti žizni ne slomili. Menja — da.
    3SG.F.ACC difficulties.NOM life.GEN NEG break.PL 1SG.ACC — yes
    ‘The difficulties of life didn’t break her. As for me, they did.’
    Valerij Popov. Užas pobedy. 2000. (RNC)

. . . but it is also possible to find exactly the same configuration as in (39), with a gon-marked patient in the antecedent and an acc-marked patient as the phrasal remnant outside TPE.

(41) No vot ja ležu na narax doma Vas’ kova i ne ispytyvaju užasa. Omerzenie
    But here 1SG.NOM lie.1SG on plank.bed house.GEN Vas’kov.GEN and NEG experience.1SG horror.GEN disgust.ACC — da.
    — yes
    ‘But now I’m in prison9 and not experiencing any horror. As for disgust, I am.’

It is an open question why such a case feature mismatch might be permitted in cases like (41) but not in the cases of (2)–(4).

(42) Illegal case mismatch, fragment answer (4):
   a. ANTECEDENT: Pol’NEG T Neg_uneq v V DP[case:GEN]

(43) Legal case mismatch, contrastive polarity ellipsis (41):
   a. ANTECEDENT: Pol’NEG T Neg_uneq v V DP[case:GEN]

• The schemas in (42) and (43) deliberately underspecify how gon is assigned.
• There is no polarity contrast in (42), as it represents a fragment answer. There is polarity contrast in (43); compare the features of the Pol and Neg heads.
• However gon is assigned — whether by Neg (Harves, 2002) or by v (Abels, 2005) — the latter pattern (43) is a violation of Chung’s (2013) Case condition, at least in letter (but maybe not in spirit).

‘These observations suggest that the function of syntactic identity in sluicing is not, as the early accounts assumed, to ensure that the sluice has the meaning of a constituent question. Rather, it is to ensure that the interrogative phrase is syntactically (and semantically) integrated into the ellipsis and that this integration is recoverable.” (Chung, 2013, page 29)

9Ležat’ na naraz is an idiom which means, roughly, ‘to be in prison’. Vas’kov’s house is a specific prison in Magadan, named after the man who built it.
A full-blown proposal is premature here, but the correct understanding of this phenomenon will depend quite radically on the question of how similar or different the structures are that we associate with ACC vs. GEN patients under negation.

5 Some conclusions & speculations

5.1 Conclusions

An understanding of the case patterns associated with phrasal remnants of ellipsis (under negation):

- NEG-word and GoN look to different parts of the polarity system for their licensing needs;
- The distribution of polarity heads in the clausal spine gives us a way of understanding why NEG-word can be licensed in the absence of negation in the antecedent, whereas GoN generally cannot (case connectivity);
- Associating GoN assignment with the set of elements that require licensing within the concord system:
  - Provides evidence for Zeijlstra’s approach to strict concord systems, unifying sentential negation and NEG-words under one umbrella;
  - Gives rise to a new understanding of GoN assignment that connects the traditional and non-traditional environments in which it is found.

5.2 Speculations

An initial attempt to reconcile the possibility of (43) and the impossibility of (42):

- Adopt the theory of GoN-assignment from Harves 2002, in which Neg assigns GoN directly to the object.
- This hooks the (un)availability of GoN to the identity of the Neg head (inside the ellipsis domain), which in turn is in a licensing relation with the Pol head (outside the ellipsis domain).
- If Pol is $\neg$NEG in both the antecedent and outside the elided constituent, as in (42), then it can (must?) AGREE with $\neg$NEG on the Neg in both the antecedent and in the ellipsis domain.
- If, as in (43), the identity of Pol is different in the antecedent and outside the ellipsis site, then the identity of Neg can be different in the antecedent and within the ellipsis domain.
- This will give rise to the potential for different Neg heads, and begins to make room for different case assignment possibilities inside the elided constituent as compared to its antecedent.

Lessons:

1. TP cannot be what is evaluated for identity under ellipsis, as the Neg heads in (43) can be featurally non-identical. This is consistent with recent work by Rudin (2019); Anand et al. (2020), in which it is proposed that what is under evaluation for the identity relation in sluicing is the ‘eventive core’ (e.g. vP).
2. For speakers who accept (39,41), the structure of a GoN-marked DP and an ACC-marked DP cannot be substantively different, for the purposes of ellipsis identity evaluation.
   - This rules out, for example, ‘quantificational’ accounts of GoN, in which there is a null quantifier associated with the GoN DP (Pesetsky, 1982; Pereltsvaig, 1999) but not an ACC DP.
   - In general the collapsing of structural differences between DPs marked with GoN and those marked with ACC seems to be consistent with recent experimental findings regarding the changing status of the GoN (Vaikšnoraitė, To appear):
     - No statistically significant effect of definiteness or existential commitment on the acceptability of GoN vs. ACC;
     - Younger participants tend to disfavor the use of GoN.
     - A great degree of variability in the acceptability of GoN, by verb and by speaker.
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Appendix: case connectivity with polarity mismatch, from the Russian National Corpus

ACC-ACC: case connectivity

(44) Eë trudnosti žizni ne slomili. Menja — da.
3SG.F.ACC difficulties.NOM life:GEN NEG break:PL 1SG.ACC — yes

guilt.ACC NEG feel:1SG pain.ACC bitterness.ACC — yes.
‘I don’t feel any guilt. As for pain and bitterness, I do.’

(46) Početnomu avtomatičeski perenesti čujuj opyt my ne možem. Strategičeskie
For-this-reason automatically transfer.INF stranger’s.ACC experience.ACC we NEG can:1PL strategic.ACC
podxody — da.
approaches.ACC — yes
‘For this reason we cannot automatically transfer someone else’s experience. As for strategic approaches, we can.’

(47) On esčë ne vospriminaet smert’. Pečal’ — da.
3SG.NOM yet NEG understand.3SG death.ACC grief.ACC — yes
‘He doesn’t yet understand death. As for grief, he does.’

(48) Ja nikogda ne čuvstvoval ix v poëzii Axmatovoj. Ljubov’ — da.
1SG.NOM never NEG felt:3SG 3PL.ACC in poetry:PREP Axmatova:GEN love:ACC — yes

GON-ACC/NOM: case mismatch

(49) Do soroka let u nego ne bylo deneg, a potom uže ne bylo ni vkusa,
Until forty years at him:GEN NEG was:3SG.N money:PL:GEN and then already NEG was:3SG.N neither taste:GEN
ni opyta. A knigi — da.
nor experience:GEN but books:NOM — yes
‘Until forty he didn’t have any money, and later he had neither taste nor experience. But as for books, he did.’
Boris Ljubimov. Tri glavnye temy v žizni — cerkov’, literatura i teatr. 2015.

(50) No vot ja ležu na narax doma Vas’ kova i ne ispytyvaju užasa. Omerzenie
But here 1SG.NOM lie:1SG on plank:bed house:GEN Vas’kova:GEN and NEG experience:1SG horror:GEN
disgust:ACC — da.
— yes
‘But now I’m in prison and not experiencing any horror. As for disgust, I am.’
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