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The phenomenon. In Russian colloquial speech and informal web communication one finds syntactic configurations which resemble floating quantifiers (FQs) but do not exactly fit into the FQ pattern. (A somewhat wider distribution of FQs in colloquial—as compared to standard—Russian, has been noticed by Testelets (2001, p. 296).) Like in the case of FQs, they consist of an NP, which I will call the restrictor due to its function, and an expression with quantificational force; however, they have no in situ equivalents, which makes a stranding analysis (Sportiche 1988) for them hard to motivate (although not impossible: e.g. Sportiche and others treat the preposition in “partitive” restrictors such as some of them as spell-out of Case).

The group of quantificational elements that give rise to cases in question includes (at least) negative (1) and proportional (2) quantifiers, koje- (3) and nibud’-items (4).

(1) a. Oni nikto ne mogut zastavit’ jego rabotat’ v svoix setjax... they no.one NEG can.PL force him work in self.ADJ networks
   ‘No one of them can force it to work in their networks’
   b. . . . mne oni ni odna ne nravijatja. me.DAT they none.of.them.F.SG NEG like.PL
   ‘I do not like any of them’

(2) a. Ox, im mnogim ne nado bylo ugodit’. oh they.DAT many.DAT NEG should SUBJ PST leave
   ‘Oh, many of them shouldn’t have left’
   b. Oni tam čerez odnogo vyskočki... they there every.second.one parvenus
   ‘Half of them are parvenus there’

(3) U nix koje u kogo ostalis’ famili ot klicek. PREP they.GEN KOJE PREP who.GEN remained surnames from nicknames.GEN
   ‘Some of them have retained their nicknames as last names’

(4) U nix u kogo-nibud’ jest kompy, inet? PREP they.GEN PREP who.NIBUD’.GEN are computers Internet
   ‘Does anyone of them have a computer and Internet connexion?’

Despite the trouble cases like (1) and (2) may create for a syntactician (e.g. explaining case assignment and agreement, either of the quantifier or of the verb, which would be SG in the absence of oni in (1)), their semantics can be captured along the lines of Hoeksema (1996), who treats floating quantifiers as adverbials that take a predicate denotation and ensure that the predicate holds or does not hold of the group denoted by the pertinent argument:

(5) [nikto] = λP.λX.∀x ⊆ X : ¬P(X) X ranges over pluralities (Link 1983)

As for (3)—(4), Hoeksema’s insight will have to be combined with an account for the known properties of koje- and nibud’-indefinites.

Analysis. As for the semantics of indefinites, the proposed analysis follows Yanovich (2005) for nibud’ and Malamud (2010) for koje (see also Eremina 2012, pp. 118, 122). However, those proposals cannot handle external restrictors. I will assume, therefore, that koje-kto and kto-nibud’ have an additional slot for a plural individual-type argument, which may be independently needed to account for combinations like kto-nibud’ [prep iz mal’čikov] ‘who-nibud’ among
the boys’. In the absence of an overt restrictor the slot may be filled in by the context—a mechanism familiar from the cases of quantifier domain restriction (von Fintel 1994, i.a.). In addition, the denotations are equipped with an argument slot for a predicate in order to account for their adverb-like behaviour.

(6) a. \[\text{kkoje-kto} = \lambda Y.\lambda P. \{\text{f\_speaker}(\{y \mid y \subseteq Y \land \text{human}(y)\})\}\]

b. \[\text{kto-nibud’} = \lambda Y.\lambda P. \{\lambda x.f(x, \{y \mid y \subseteq Y \land \text{human}(y)\})\}\]

The slot for \(Y\) is intended to be filled with a silent variable bound by the c-commanding restrictor, e.g. \(\text{u nix}\) in (3)–(4). Cf. (7), where the c-command requirement is violated; see Fanselow (1988) for a similar proposal as regards additional variables in split NPs.

(7) * Koje u kogo u nix ostalis’ familii ot kliček. cf. (3)

(8) a. \([u_nix_2] \lambda_1[\text{koje_u_kogo} X_1] \text{VP}\]

b. \([\text{koje_u_kogo}\lambda_1[\text{koje_u_kogo} X_1]\text{VP}]^g(\lambda X.\text{koje_u_kogo} X)^{g[1\rightarrow X]} =\]

\(iZ.Z = [\text{oni_2}]^{g[1\rightarrow X]}: [\text{VP}]^{g[1\rightarrow X]}(\text{f\_speaker}(\{y \mid y \subseteq Z \land \text{human}(y)\})) =\]

\([\text{VP}]^{g[1\rightarrow X]}(\text{f\_speaker}(\{y \mid y \subseteq g[1\rightarrow X](2) \land \text{human}(y)\}))\]

The additional variable \(x\) in (6b) reflects the fact, noted by Yanovich, that \(nibud’\) is licensed only in the scope of another quantifier, on which it is therefore dependent.

**Outlook.** Preliminary observations suggest that the NPs which restrict the range of adverbial indefinites (as well as negative and proportional adverbials) in (1)–(4) are overwhelmingly pronouns. It is evident that they are topics and that the adverbial specifies which part of the already specified plurality is involved (cf. cases of Split NP Topicalisation in German, which involve first-order and numerical quantifiers, in Bobaljik 2003; Nakanishi 2007), but the exact connexion between the givenness or the lexical content of the restrictor and the licensing of the adverbial needs further study.