Russian –nibud’-series of indefinite pronouns consists of a wh-stem and a –nibud’-marker (1). Its distribution resembles the distribution of weak NPIs and free choice items, but closer examination reveals that it cannot be described in these terms. In this paper, I concentrate on the exact mechanism of licensing of –nibud’-items in various constructions.

I argue for an analysis that captures a much wider range of data than the previous analyses of the distribution of –nibud’. The paper also provides evidence for Pereltsvaig’s (2000) insight that –nibud’-items are not NPIs. The evidence consists in data that show that licensors of –nibud’ do not form a natural class with respect to either downward monotonicity or (non)-veridicality (2a,b). In (2a), vse ‘all’ creates a downward entailing environment, but nekotorye ‘some.of’ does not; both of them license –nibud’. In (2b), all the adverbs but vsedga ‘always’ create a non-veridical environment (Giannakidou 1998), so vsedga would be expected not to license –nibud’, contrary to fact.

My data involving various quantifiers in Russian also provides support for Ferreira’s (2005) conclusion that quantificational determiners and adverbs form a natural class in that both groups undergo QR. I present a novel empirical generalization that –nibud’-items are licensed by operators in the CP-domain, such as quantifiers that undergo quantifier raising (2a,b), interrogative (3a,a’) and imperative (3b,b’) operators, etc. I also argue that modal words do not license –nibud’-items; instead, the licenser in sentences like (4) Stowell’s (1982) irrealis C. This, in turn, shows that Russian irrealis infinitives can be CP.

My approach makes the surprising prediction that quantifiers that license –nibud’-items must take wide scope. I predict that in a sentence that allows scope ambiguity, this ambiguity will disappear if one of the quantifiers licenses –nibud’.

To show this, we need to compare a minimal pair of two sentences which differ only in whether –nibud’ is present. Moreover, each sentence needs to contain two quantifiers, one that licenses –nibud’ and one that does not. My approach predicts that in a sentence where –nibud’ is present, its licenser has to take wide scope; wide scope for the non-licenser will then be unavailable. Moreover, this scope contrast must survive in a word order where the non-licenser precedes the licenser.

This prediction is borne out. In (5), there are two quantifiers, vse ‘all’ and čto-to ‘something’. Only vse licenses –nibud’, čto-to does not. My informants agree that only (5a) is scopally ambiguous. Significantly, the –to-item cannot take wide scope in (5b). This indicates that the licenser of –nibud’ necessarily QRs to a position above the one occupied by the –to-item. (6a,b) show that this scope asymmetry survives in a word order where the non-licensing quantifier precedes the quantifier that licenses –nibud’.

This discussion provides an argument for covert QR in Russian, a language that is usually considered scope-rigid (7). The data in question also provides evidence supporting Wurmbrand’s (2008) conclusion that there is no [+/- QR] parameter, that is, no language is scope-rigid as a whole.

In conclusion, I provide evidence that Russian –nibud’-items are not NPIs. Rather, they are sensitive to quantifiers in a particular domain – CP. I concentrated on sentences where –nibud’-items are licensed by quantifiers that undergo QR and show examples where the quantifier licensing –nibud’ necessarily takes wide scope. This is in striking contrast to the same sentences without –nibud’, where two scope construals are possible.
(1)  a. kto-nibud’ someone or other (SMN)   
    čto-nibud’ something or other (SMTH)  
    c. kakoj-nibud’, etc. some or other (STH) 

(2)  a. Vse/Nekotoryje mal’čiki (čto-nibud’) pročitali (kakju-nibud’ knigu). All/Some boys SMTH read STH book  
  ‘All/Some of the boys read some book or other/ something or other.’ 

(3)  a. *Kto-nibud’ možet mne pomoč’.  
    SMN can me help  
    ‘Someone or other can help me.’ 

(4)  Mne možno [cp nenadolgo kuda-nibud’ ujti]. 
    Me allowed.ADV not.for.long where-nibud’ leave.INF  
    ‘I am permitted to go somewhere for a short time.’ 

(5)  a. Vse čto-to sprjatali ot roditelej. čto-to (ŋ) > vse(∀), vse(∀) > čto-to (ŋ)  
    All something hid from parents  
    ‘Everyone hid something from their parents.’ 

(6)  a. Čto-to ot roditelej spjatali vse.  
    ŋ > ∀, ∀ > ŋ  
    something from parents hid all  
    ‘Everyone hid something from their parents.’ 

(7)  Kto-to ljubit vse.  
    ŋ > ∀, *∀ > ŋ  
    Someone loves everyone  
    ‘Someone loves everyone.’ 
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