

Russian *nibud'*-Series as Markers of Co-variation

Asya Pereltsvaig
Stanford University

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the Russian *-nibud'* indefinite series listed in (1) below.

(1)	<i>kto-nibud'</i>	x-person	<i>čto-nibud'</i>	x-thing
	<i>kogda-nibud'</i>	x-time	<i>gde-nibud'</i>	x-place
	<i>kuda-nibud'</i>	x-direction	<i>otkuda-nibud'</i>	x-whence
	<i>čej-nibud'</i>	x-possession	<i>kakoj-nibud'</i>	x-attribute
	<i>kak-nibud'</i>	x-manner	<i>skol'ko-nibud'</i>	x-amount
	<i>naskolko-nibud'</i>	x-degree	<i>počemu-nibud'</i>	x-reason
	<i>otčego-nibud'</i>	x-reason	<i>začem-nibud'</i>	x-goal

As has been shown by Yanovich (2005), these indefinites not only prefer to take narrow scope with respect to some other operator/quantifier, but in fact require a presence of an operator/quantifier with respect to which they can take narrow scope; in the absence of such an operator/quantifier, *-nibud'* indefinite is not licensed, as shown in (2).

- (2) a. * Ego o **čëm-nibud'** sprosili.
him about *what-nibud'* asked.PL
'They asked him about something.'
- b. **Každogo** o **čëm-nibud'** sprosili.
everybody.ACC about *what-nibud'* asked.PL
'They asked everybody about something.' [$\forall\exists$, $*\exists\forall$]

In other words, Russian *-nibud'* indefinites can be considered dependent indefinites, or markers of co-variation: they must introduce a dependent variable, that is a variable the values assigned to which co-vary with those assigned to another variable, the so-called "domain variable" (cf. Farkas' 1997, 2002).¹ In this way, Russian *-nibud'* indefinites resemble reduplicated indefinites in Hungarian (as in (3)) and *cîte* indefinites in Romanian (see (4), also discussed in Farkas 1997, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c), as well as Basque distributive numerals (as in (5)).²

* My many thanks to Adrian Brasoveanu, Cleo Condovardi, Ricardo Etxepare, Donka Farkas, Anastasia Giannakidou, Olga Kagan, Elena Paducheva and Igor Yanovich, as well as the audiences at Stanford SemFest and WCCFL XXVII for discussions, suggestions, criticisms and the data.

¹ This notion of dependent indefinite is very different from the one proposed by Giannakidou (1998, 2008): she proposes that a dependent indefinite "does not introduce a discourse referent in the main context", while according to the view adopted here, a dependent indefinite introduces a non-singleton set of possible value assignments and establishes a co-variation dependency between that set and some other set of value assignments.

² Unfortunately, space limitations do not allow me to discuss the similarities and differences between these various types of dependent indefinites. These issues are left for future research.

- (3) a. Minden diák olvasott **egy-egy** verset. *Hungarian*
 every student read.PAST a-a poem
 ‘Every student read a poem.’ [∇E, *E∇]
- b. * Mari meglátogatott tegnap délután **egy-egy** ismeröst.
 Mary visited yesterday afternoon an-an acquaintance
 ‘Yesterday afternoon Mary visited an acquaintance.’
- (4) a. Fiecare student a vorbit cu **cîte un profesor.** *Romanian*
 every student has talked with cite a professor.
 Every student talked to a professor.
- b. * Un student a vorbit cu **cîte un profesor.**
 a student has talked with cite a professor.
 Every student talked to a professor.
- (5) a. Hiru ikasle-k **liburu ba-na** irakurri dute. *Basque*
 three students-ERG book one-DISTR read have.SG
 ‘Three students read a book each.’ [3E, *E3]
- b. * Martin-ek **liburu ba-na** irakurri dute.
 Martin-ERG book one-DISTR read have.SG
 intended: ‘Martin read a book.’

In this paper, I consider more closely the following issue: what types of domain variables can the dependent variable introduced by Russian *-nibud'* indefinites co-vary with. More specifically, I show that the domain variables for Russian *-nibud'* indefinites need not be individual variables, but can be event variables, world variables or even spatial location variables. These types of domain variables are considered in sections 2 through 5 respectively. In section 6, I examine another construction in Russian that marks co-variation (or distributivity), that is the distributive-*po* construction, and show that the two co-variation constructions in Russian have different restrictions and therefore are not in functional competition.

2. Co-variation with individual variables

As noted above, the variable introduced by the Russian *-nibud'* indefinite may co-vary with an individual variable. For example, the sentence (2b) above receives the distributive interpretation (i.e., every person in the relevant domain was asked about some thing or another, not the same thing for different people). Note that *-nibud'* indefinites can never receive a wide scope interpretation (such that there is one thing that everybody was asked about).

In addition to the distributive universal quantifier *každyj* ‘every’, Russian also has a non-distributive universal *vse* ‘all’, which under certain circumstances can receive a distributive interpretation (as noted in Tatevosov 2002: 65). When *vse* ‘all’ receives a distributive interpretation, it is heavily stressed, as shown in (7).

- (6) a. Vse arbuzy prodajutsja za sto rubej.
 all watermelons sell for 100 rubles
 ‘All watermelons sell for 100 rubles.’ (e.g., all 3 watermelons sell for 100 rubles).
- b. Každjyj arbutz prodačtsja za 100 rubej.
 every watermelon sells for 100 rubles
 ‘Every watermelon sells for 100 rubles.’ (e.g., 3 watermelons sell for 3x100=300 rubles).

- (7) Q: A možet ètot malen'kij podeševle otdadite?
'Perhaps this small one you'll give for a cheaper price?'
- A: Mužčina, zdes' **VSE** arbuzy prodajutsja za sto rublej!
man here all watermelons sell for 100 rubles
'You chap! All watermelons here (i.e., each watermelon) sell for 100 rubles.'

As is expected from the co-variation analysis of Russian *-nibud'* indefinites, *každyj* 'every' freely licenses *-nibud'* indefinites, while *vse* 'all' licenses them only if it has a distributive interpretation (and is stressed, as discussed above). Note that the sentences (8a) and (8c) must have a distributive interpretation, namely each boy carried his own load.³

- (8) a. **Každyj** mal'čik nēs **kakuju-nibud'** tjažest'.
every boy carried *which-nibud'* load
'Every boy carried some load.'
- b. * **Vse** mal'čiki nesli **kakuju-nibud'** tjažest'.
all boys carried.DET *which-nibud'* load
'All boys carried some heavy burden.'
- c. **VSE** mal'čiki (uže) nosili **kakuju-nibud'** tjažest', teper' čered devoček.
all boys (already) carried.INDET *which-nibud'* load now turn girls.GEN
'**All** boys have already carried some load, now it's the girls' turn.'

Furthermore, other (non-universal) quantifiers that introduce a plurality of individuals can license *-nibud'* indefinites too; in these examples too, the only interpretation involves co-variation between the dependent variable introduced by the *-nibud'* indefinite and the domain variable introduced by another quantifier, such as *nemnogie* 'few' in (9a) or *bolšinstvo* 'most, majority' in (9b).

- (9) a. Dumaju, očen' **nemnogie** nositeli "deržavnogo" jazyka vzjali na sebja trud vyučit'
I-think very few speakers imperial language took on self work to-learn
kakoj-nibud' iz nacional'nyx jazykov.
which-nibud' from national languages
'I think that very few speakers of the "imperial" language (i.e., Russian) undertook the task of learning some national language.' (<http://www.speakrus.ru/09/f934.htm>)
- b. **Bol'šinstvo** rastitel'nojadnyx nasekomyx voditsja isključitel'no
most vegetarian insects are-found exclusively
na **kakom-nibud'** odnom rastenii ili gruppe rastenij.
on *which-nibud'* one plant or group plants
'Most vegetarian insects are found exclusively on one plant or a group of plants.'
(<http://charles-darwin.narod.ru/chapter2.html>)

So far, I have shown that the variable introduced by *-nibud'* indefinites can co-vary with an individual variable; in the following sections, I show that other types of variables can serve as the domain variable for *-nibud'* indefinites.

3. Co-variation with event variables

In addition to individual variables, the dependent variable introduced by *-nibud'* indefinites can co-vary with an event variable. For this to happen, there must be a plurality of events, which can be

³ Note the use of the indeterminate verb of motion: *nosili* vs. *nesli*. The interaction of *-nibud'* indefinites with verbal aspect is discussed in more detail below.

encoded in a variety of ways.⁴ One way to encode a plurality of events is by using the special habitual forms:

- (10) Čto-to ja somnevajus', što v naše vremena **kto-nibud'** xažival.
what-to I doubt that in our time who-nibud' walked.HAB
 'I am somewhat in doubt that in our times somebody walked repeatedly [there].'
 (<http://forum.cimlyansk.ru/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=1049&view=next&sid=860a0e78bb1fa66f9220d5223124f7bf>)

However, these habitual forms are not productive. Another way to encode a plurality of events is by using the imperfective form of semelfactive verbs (the base perfective forms of these verbs denote a single event of short duration):

- (11) a. V komnate stojala tišina, tol'ko inogda **kto-nibud'** pokašlival ili šarkal nogoj.
 in room stood silence only sometimes *who-nibud'* cough.IMPRF2 or shuffle foot
 'The room was silent, only sometimes somebody coughed or shuffled feet.'
 (<http://www.e-lib.info/book.php?id=1121021164&p=8>)
- b. Živogo penija malo, tak, dergajutsja na scene izredka, pokrikivaja **kakie-nibud'**
 live singing little PRT they-twitch on stage seldom, shouting.IMPRF2 *which-nibud'*
 slovečki.
 little-words
 'There is little live singing, only rarely they twitch on the stage, shouting some words.'
 (<http://www.proza.ru/texts/2002/08/22-47.html>)

More generally, imperfective aspect in Russian can denote either a progressive or an iterative interpretation, and the latter can be singled out by using certain temporal adverbials, such as *každyj raz/den* 'every time/day', *inogda* 'sometimes', *izredka* 'seldom', *postojanno* 'constantly', *po utram/večeram* 'in mornings/evenings', *vremja ot vremeni* 'from time to time', *obyčno* 'typically', *často* 'often', *vsegda* 'always'. In the presence of these adverbials, *-nibud'* indefinites are very frequent. Note that these sentences too necessarily receive a distributive interpretation, where the variable introduced by the *-nibud'* indefinite co-varies with an event variable; in other words, on different occasions different things broke or different people called or a different horse stuck out.⁵

- (12) a. I mel'nica polučilas' tak sebe — **postojanno** **čto-nibud'** lomalos'.
 and mill came-out so to-self constantly *what-nibud'* broke.IMPF
 '... and the windmill came out so-so: something constantly broke.'
- b. **Po utram**, kogda eščë spim, objazatel'no **kto-nibud'** nomerom
 in mornings when still we-sleep necessarily *who-nibud'* number
 ošibaetsja.
 make-mistake.IMPF
 'In the mornings, when we are still asleep, someone always dials a wrong number.'
- c. **Každyj raz** vysovyvalas' **č'ja-nibud'** lošad'...
 every time stuck-out.IMPF *whose-nibud'* horse
 'Every time somebody's horse would stick out...'

The need for a plurality of events is further emphasized by the way temporal universal quantification occurs with *-nibud'* indefinites: in order to license a *-nibud'* indefinite, a temporal

⁴ Cf. Tatevosov (2002: 74-75) on the interaction of verbal aspect and distributivity in Russian.

⁵ Example (12a) is from Fontaine (1978: 101) and examples (12c), (13) and (14) are from Seliverstova (1988: 76-77).

adverbial must quantify over a set of discrete instants, rather than over a whole temporal interval. The adverbial *vsě vremja* ‘all time’ in (13a) implies a set of (plural) discrete events of conversing with someone and hence the sentence establishes a dependency between plural addressees and plural conversations that took place throughout the day. In contrast, the adverbial *celyj den* ‘whole day’ in (13b) does not imply that distinct (plural) events of conversing with somebody took place and is compatible with there being one long conversation; therefore, it is not compatible with a *-nibud’* indefinite.

- (13) a. Ja včera vsě vremja s **kem-nibud’** govorila.
 I yesterday all time with *who-nibud’* talked.**IMPF**
 ‘Yesterday, I spoke to someone all the time.’
- b. ?* Ja včera celyj den’ s **kem-nibud’** govorila.
 I yesterday whole day with *who-nibud’* talked.**IMPF**
 ‘Yesterday, I spoke to someone the whole day.’

In addition to habitual and iterative temporal adverbials discussed above, universal temporal quantification can also be expressed (under certain circumstances) by a bare *kogda* ‘when(ever)’, as in the following example. Again, regardless of the adverbial used, if the sentence receives an iterative interpretation (i.e., denotes multiple events), *-nibud’* indefinites are made possible.

- (14) **Kogda** ona igrala **čto-nibud’** prekrasnoe, kak ljubil ja eë.
 when she played.**IMPF** *what-nibud’* beautiful how loved I her
 ‘When she played something beautiful, how I loved her!’

Furthermore, since the imperfective aspect by itself is compatible with an iterative interpretation, *-nibud’* indefinites are possible in the presence of an imperfective verbal form even if there is no adverbial that emphasizes the iterative interpretation. For instance, the sentence in (15a) is understood to encode a dependency between a set of greeting events and a set of Swedes (note that the plurality of Swedes is introduced by the *-nibud’* indefinite which is morphologically singular); in other words, different Swedes are greeted at different occasions. Note that in the absence of a *-nibud’* indefinite, as in (15b), the imperfective aspect is compatible with both the abovementioned distributive/iterative interpretation and an “ongoing single-event-single-individual” interpretation (i.e., we are in the process of shaking the hand of a Swede).

- (15) a. A to my švedu **kakomu-nibud’** ... ručku trjasëm ...
 but we Swede.DAT *which-nibud’*.DAT hand shake.**IMPF**
 ‘But we shake the hand of some Swede...’
- b. A to my švedu ručku trjasëm ...
 but we Swede.DAT hand shake.**IMPF**
 ‘But we {shake / are shaking} the hand of a Swede...’

Finally, let us consider verbs of motion. In addition to the perfective/imperfective distinction, such verbs have an additional contrast between determinate and indeterminate aspect. As discussed by Kagan (2008), the determinate aspect denotes a single event of motion in a single direction, while the indeterminate aspect can denote (i) a single event of motion in multiple directions, (ii) multiple events of motion (iterative or habitual), or (iii) naming the type of motion in general (generic). While the first interpretation, that of a single event of motion in multiple directions, cannot be reduced to multiple events (for arguments, see Kagan 2008), the latter two interpretations of the indeterminate aspect involve multiple events. Therefore, under either of these two interpretations the indeterminate aspect can license *-nibud’* indefinites, while the determinate aspect does not license them. Example (16) shows that *-nibud’* indefinites are licensed with the iterative interpretation of the indeterminate aspect.

- (16) Narodu bylo mnogo, i poèetomu postojanno, daže noč’ju,
 people was much and thus constantly even during-night
kto-nibud’ xodil po vagonu...
who-nibud’ walked.IMPF.INDET along train-car
 ‘There were a lot of people and therefore all the time, even at night, somebody walked along the train-car.’

Example (17a) demonstrates that determinate aspect does not license *-nibud’* indefinites, while (17b) shows that determinate aspect is not incompatible with adverbials such as *postojanno* ‘constantly’.

- (17) a. * ...postojanno **kto-nibud’** šel po vagonu...
 constantly *who-nibud’* walked.IMPRF.DET along train-car
- b. On postojanno šel po moemu sledu...
 he constantly walked.IMPRF.DET along my footprint
 ‘He constantly followed my footprints...’

Finally, example (18) illustrates the use of *-nibud’* indefinites under the “naming of type of motion” interpretation of the indeterminate aspect.

- (18) Lena vodit mašinu **gde-nibud’** nedaleko ot doma.
 Lena drives.IMPRF.INDET car *where-nibud’* not-far from home
 ‘Lena drives a car somewhere close to home.’

4. Co-variation with world variables

Yet another type of variable that the dependent variable introduced by *-nibud’* indefinites can co-vary with is a world variable. This type of domain variable may also be introduced by a variety of lexical means. For instance, as discussed in Klinedinst (2007), modals denote a plurality of possible worlds. Hence, both necessity and possibility modals may license *-nibud’* indefinites.

- (19) a. A ej **nado** bylo poexat’ **kuda-nibud’**, gde est’ pečka...
 and she need was to-go *to-where-nibud’* where there-is stove
 ‘She needed to go somewhere where there was heating.’
- b. Èti besy v kabakax zdes’... **mogut** sypanut’ **kakoj-nibud’** gadosti...
 these devils in taverns here can sprinkle *which-nibud’* poison
 ‘These devils in taverns here can give one some sort of poison.’

In addition to modals, a plurality of possible worlds can be encoded by intensional predicates and (in Russian) by future perfective verbs expressing potentiality (this use of perfective aspect in Russian is discussed by Forsyth 1970: 175). In both cases, *-nibud’* indefinites are licensed:

- (20) On byl ubežděn, što Štirlica sxvatjat **gde-nibud’** v drugom meste.
 he was convinced that Stirlitz.ACC will-catch *where-nibud’* in other place
 ‘He was convinced that Stirlitz will be arrested somewhere else.’
- (21) Nadejus’, moj opyt vyručit **kogo-nibud’**.
 I-hope my experience will-help-out.PERF *who-nibud’*
 ‘I hope my experience might help someone out.’
 (<http://gorodok.newlist.ru/map/9299.shtml>)

5. Co-variation with spatial location

The fourth and final type of variable with which the dependent variable introduced by *-nibud'* indefinites can co-vary is a spatial location variable. As noted by Tatevosov (2002: 72), distributivity in Russian can be induced by special verbal prefixes together with the reflexive *-sja*. These verbal forms are incompatible with a single spatial location, as shown in (22).

- (22) Sobravšiesja razo-šli-s' {po domam / *ko mne domoj}.
 assembled *raz*-went-REFL {DISTR homes / *to me home}
 'Those present went home [i.e., each one to his/her home] / *to my house.'

Since these verbal forms introduce a plurality of spatial locations, *-nibud'* indefinites are possible with them. In examples such as (23a), a dependency is established between the set of spatial locations introduced by the prefix *raz-* (in combination with the reflexive *-sja*) and the set of directions introduced by the *-nibud'* indefinite. Note that the *-nibud'* indefinite is not possible in the absence of this distributive verbal form even if the subject is morphologically plural (but not quantified), as shown in (23b).

- (23) a. ... raspugajte ètix ljudej, čtoby oni raz-bežali-s'
 scare these people that they *raz*-ran.DET-REFL
kuda-nibud' podal'se.
where-nibud' farther
 'Scare these people so that they ran off [in various directions] far away.'
 (<http://bigstonedragon.livejournal.com/94216.html>)
- b. * Oni bežali **kuda-nibud'**.
 they ran *where-nibud'*

6. Russian *-nibud'* and the distributive *po* construction

So far, I have examined the Russian *-nibud'* indefinites as markers of co-variation, and have shown that they can be dependent on a variety of domain variable type. In this section, I make a brief comparison between *-nibud'* indefinites and another construction in Russian that denotes co-variation, namely the distributive *po* construction, illustrated in (24).

- (24) S každogo dereva upalo **po gruše**.
 from every tree fell *po* pear.DAT
 'A pear fell from each tree.' (Chvany 1975: 26)

As shown convincingly in Borovikoff (2001), a distinction must be drawn between two subtypes of the distributive *po* construction: the *po-NP* construction and the *po-QP* construction. The former consists of the preposition *po* followed by a bare noun phrase, as in (24) above, while the latter includes a numeral, as in (25).

- (25) S každogo dereva upalo **po pjat' gruš**.
 from every tree fell *po* five pear.GEN
 'A pear fell from each tree.'

The first contrast between the two subtypes of the distributive *po* construction involves unaccusativity diagnostics: while the *po-QP* construction is not sensitive to the thematic role of the argument, the *po-NP* construction is.

- (26) a. **Po desjat' studentov** v každoj gruppe pročitali roman «Lolita».
po ten students in every group read.PL novel Lolita
 'In each group ten students read the novel "Lolita".'
- b. * **Po studentu** v každoj gruppe pročitalo /pročitali roman «Lolita».
po student in every group read.SG.N / PL novel Lolita
 'In each group one student read the novel "Lolita".'

The second contrast involves case marking on the complement of the distributive *po*: in the *po-QP* construction the complement of *po* is marked nominative/accusative, while in the *po-NP* construction the complement of *po* is marked dative:

- (27) a. U Vani **po desjat' romanov** v každom portu.
 to Vanya *po* ten.NOM/ACC love-interests.GEN in every port
 'Vanya has ten love interests in every port.'
- b. U Vani **po romanu** v každom portu.
 to Vanya *po* love-interest.DAT in every port
 'Vanya has a love interest in every port.'

However, the *po-QP* construction is not a functional competitor for the *-nibud'* indefinites because the latter are incompatible with numerals (a more detailed discussion of this curious fact cannot be included due to space limitations). Thus, the only true functional competitor for the *-nibud'* indefinites is the *po-NP* construction. Yet, the latter construction is limited in various ways: it cannot be used as an external or oblique argument (see (26b) and (28)).

- (28) * Každij mal'čik vlublěn v **po devochke**.
 every boy is-in-love into *po* girl
 intended: 'Every boy is in love with some girl or another.'

Moreover, the *po-NP* construction cannot express location, time, manner, reason etc. As far as possible licensors are concerned, the *po-NP* construction can establish a dependency with either individual variables (as in the examples above) or with event variables, as in (29).

- (29) **Každyj den'** **po kaple** napolnjaetsja čaša žizni.
 every day *po* drop fills-away chalice life.GEN
 'Every day the chalice of life fills up by a drop.' (<http://www.prokopov.hotbox.ru/>)

In contrast to *-nibud'* indefinites (see section 4 above), the *po-NP* construction cannot be licensed by world variables.

- (30) a. * On možet s'jest' **po gruše**.
 he can eat *po* pear
 'He can eat a pear.'
- b. * Èti besy v kabakax zdes'... mogut sypanut' **po gadosti**...
 these devils in taverns here can sprinkle *po* poison
 'These devils in taverns here can give one some sort of poison.' (cf. (19b))

Finally, there are some stylistic differences between *-nibud'* indefinites and the *po-NP* construction: the latter are more formal than the former (hence there exists a colloquial form of *-nibud'* pronounced as *-nit'*).

Given these differences between *-nibud'* indefinites and the *po-NP* construction is not surprising that both of these constructions have their own use in Russian. In fact, an examination of 993 instances

of *-nibud'* indefinites found in the National Corpus of Russian (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru/index.html>) shows that all of these instances involve *-nibud'* in a position that the *po-NP* construction cannot occur in.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, I have analyzed Russian *-nibud'* indefinites as dependent indefinites in the sense of Farkas (1997) and Yanovich (2005) and have shown that the variable introduced by *-nibud'* indefinites can co-vary with a wide range of variable types, including individual, event and world variables. In this, *-nibud'* indefinites differ from Russian *po* indefinites, which allow co-variation only with individual or event variables. Thus, it appears that the type of domain variable constitutes one parameter with respect to which dependent indefinites may vary within a given language (and presumably across languages as well).

References

- Borovikoff, Natalia (2001) *Unaccusativity and movement in Russian: integrating formal syntax and discourse functions*. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University Bloomington.
- Chvany, Catherine (1975) *On the Syntax of BE-sentences in Russian*. Cambridge, MA: Slavica.
- Farkas, Donka (1997) Dependent Indefinites. In F. Corblin, et al. (eds.) *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics*. Peter Lang Publishers. Pp. 243-268.
- Farkas, Donka (2002a) Extreme non-specificity in Romanian. In C. Beyssade et al. (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 127-151.
- Farkas, Donka (2002b) Varieties of Definites. In *Proceedings of SALT 12*.
- Farkas, Donka (2002c) Specificity Distinctions. *Journal of Semantics* 19: 1-31.
- Fontaine, Jacqueline (1978) Sur les rapports syntaxiques de l'aspect verbal et des pronoms indefinis. *Revue des études slaves* 51(1-2): 97-105.
- Forsyth, James (1970) *A Grammar of Aspect. Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb*. Cambridge University Press.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia (1998) *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)Veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia (2008) Negative and positive polarity items: Variation, licensing and compositionality. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Stechow and Paul Portner (eds.) *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kagan, Olga (2008b) *Aspects of Motion: On the Semantics and Pragmatics of Indeterminate Aspect*. Ms., Hebrew University.
- Klinedinst, Nathan Winter (2007) *Plurality and Possibility*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.
- Seliverstova, Olga Nikolaevna (1988) *Mestoimenija v jazyke i rechi* [Pronouns in language and speech]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tatevosov, Sergei (2002) *Semantika sostavljajuschix imennoj grupy: kvantornye slova*. Moscow: IMLI RAN.
- Yanovich, Igor (2005) *Choice-functional series of indefinites and Hamblin semantics*. Presented at SALT 15, UCLA.

Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Natasha Abner
and Jason Bishop

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2008

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2008 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-428-7 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2008. Russian *nibud'*-Series as Markers of Co-variation. In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Natasha Abner and Jason Bishop, 370-378. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2008. Russian *nibud'*-Series as Markers of Co-variation. In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Natasha Abner and Jason Bishop, 370-378. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1852.