Problem: This paper is concerned with *-nibud'* indefinites in Russian, which so far received little attention in the literature, most of which is concerned with NPIs such as the Russian *ni-* and *-libo* items (cf. Giannakidou 1998, Pereltsvaig 2000, 2004; Progovac 1994, Błaszczak 2003, 2005, Jabłonska 2003 on other Slavic languages). Previous treatments of *-nibud'* indefinites are mostly informal descriptions of their distribution and interpretation in terms of scope (Dahl 1970), assertiveness (Fontaine 1978), specificity (Haspelmath 1997), speaker knowledge (Pitkevich 2001, Timberlake 2004), or referential possibilities (Tatevosov 2002: 128). In this paper, we argue that these analyses are all inadequate and develop a novel formal analysis of *-nibud'* indefinites as dependent indefinites. This proposal opens the door to analyzing other types of indefinites in Russian in terms of valuation constraints rather than in terms of specificity or polarity sensitivity.

What *-nibud'* indefinites are not. Russian *-nibud'* indefinites are typically treated as non-specific (i.e., narrow scope) indefinites, in contrast to *-to* indefinites, which are analyzed as specific (i.e., wide scope) indefinites (cf. references mentioned above). However, a closer examination of *-nibud'* indefinites challenges this approach because:

- in some contexts, *-nibud'* and *-to* indefinites are interchangeable and synonymous, as in (1), while in other contexts they are not, as in (2);

- *-nibud'* indefinites are not licensed in simple affirmative contexts (cf. the 2nd conjunct in (2)).

The latter fact suggests an analysis of *-nibud'* indefinites as (weak) NPIs, i.e., a stylistic variant of *-libo* items (as suggested in Gvozdev 1955, Haspelmath 1997). Moreover, the etymological derivation from *ni budi* '(whichever) it may be' (Haspelmath 1997: 135) suggests treating *-nibud'* indefinites as *wh*-NPIs, in the terminology of Rullmann (1996). However, despite its initial plausibility, the NPI analysis of *-nibud'* indefinites is jeopardized by the following observations:

- The distribution of *-nibud'* and *-libo* items is not the same; specifically, unlike *-libo* items (which are weak NPIs, cf. Pereltsvaig 2000, 2004), *-nibud'* indefinites can appear in irrealis contexts, such as imperatives, future, and modals, as in (3);

- Although *-nibud'* items are in complementary distribution with *ni-* items (*ni*-items are and *-nibud'* items are <u>not</u> licensed by clausemate sentential negation, as in the 1st conjunct in (2)) and *ni-* and *-libo* items are in complementary distribution as well, *-nibud'* items are <u>not</u> in complementary distribution with *-libo* items. In other words, *-nibud'* items do not fit into a three-way partition of NPIs into strong-weak-weakest (cf. van der Wouden 1997).

- Most importantly, sometimes *-nibud'* items <u>are</u> licensed in simple affirmative contexts, as in (4a-c).

Proposal: *-nibud'* indefinites are **dependent indefinites** in the sense of Farkas (1997): they must introduce a **dependent variable**, i.e., a variable the values assigned to which co-vary with those assigned to another variable. In other words, *-nibud'* indefinites are licensed by a distributive quantificational element, whether the quantification involved is over individuals, times/events or possible worlds. This quantification may be encoded by a lexical quantifier (4a), a non-lexicalized universal quantifier (4b), iterative aspect (4c), or an intensional predicate (4d). This analysis allows us to explain why:

- *-nibud'* indefinites are not licensed by negation, cf. (2): negation does not introduce the right kind of variable that the variable introduced by *-nibud'* can be dependent on.

- *-nibud'* indefinites require a distributive universal quantifier *každyj* 'every' rather than the non-distributive universal *vse* 'all', cf. (5). Note that *vse* 'all' can receive a distributive interpretation in certain contexts if stressed Tatevosov (2002: 65), in which case *-nibud'* items are licensed.

Overall, *-nibud'* indefinites appear to be similar to reduplicated indefinites in Hungarian (Farkas 1997); yet, the range of possible licensors for Russian dependent indefinites appears to be wider than for their Hungarian counterparts. Moreover, Russian *-nibud'* indefinites cannot introduce a variable on which another variable is dependent, i.e., in multiple quantifier contexts, *-nibud'* indefinites must take the narrowest scope (rather than intermediate scope; cf. (6)).

(1) On the ∀∃ reading both are ok:

    On vsegda   nosit s soboj   {**kakie-to** /   **kakie-nibud'**} knigi.
    he always   carries with self   *which-to*   *which-nibud'* books
    'He always carries with him some books (not necessarily the same ones).'

(2)   {**Kto-to**   **/* Kto-nibud'**} ne prišël, { **kto-to** / * **kto-nibud'**}   opozdal.
    who-to /**who-nibud'*   not came *who-to* /* *who-nibud'*   came-late
    'Some people didn't come, and some people came late.'

(3) a.   Pridumajte   **čto-nibud'**   sami...
          invent.IMPER *what-nibud'*   by-self
          'Come up with something on your own.'

    b.   Ja togda uspeju **čto-nibud'**   kriknut'…
          I then will-manage   *what-nibud'*   to-yell
          'Then I will manage to yell something.'

    c.   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.'

Quantificational licensors for *-nibud'* indefinites are underlined:

(4) a.   <u>Každyj</u>   ved' v **kogo-nibud'**   vljublën.
          everybody EMPH into *who-nibud'*   in-love
          'Everybody is in love with somebody.' ∀∃, *∃∀

    b.   <u>Kogda</u> oni igrajut   **čto-nibud'**   gromkoe i   bystroe…
          when they play   *what-nibud'*   loud   and fast
          'When(ever) they play something loud and fast...'

    c.   <u>Snova zatevaete</u> **kakoe-nibud'**   očerednoe kovarstvo?
          again you-plan   *which-nibud'*   next   devilry
          'Are you again planning something devilish?'

    d.   On <u>xočet</u> spokojno dožit'   svoi gody   **gde-nibud'**   na malen'koj ferme...
          he wants quietly   to-live-out self's years   *where-nibud'*   on small   farm
          'He wants to quietly live the rest of his years somewhere on a small farm...'

(5)   {Každyj mal'čik nës / *vse mal'čiki nesli }   **kakuju-nibud'** tjažest'.
    every   boy carried / *all boys   carried   *which-nibud'* heavy-burden
    'Every boy carried some heavy burden.' (*vse* is ok on distributive interpretation, if stressed)

(6)   only narrowest scope for *kto-nibud'* (¬ ∃_{time} THINK ∃**x**):

    <u>Nikogda <u>ne dumal</u></u>, čto   **kto-nibud'**   smožet   prevzojti Gaidara po stepeni
    never   not thought that   *who-nibud'*   will-be-able to-surpass Gaidar   on degree

    narodnoj neljubvi.
    popular un-love
    'Never have I thought that anybody will ever be able to surpass (Egor) Gaidar in the degree of unpopularity among the people.' (http://viperson.ru/wind.php?ID=218947&soch=1)