

Negation in Russian polar questions

Syntactic and semantic/pragmatic aspects

Maria Onoeva & Radek Šimík

onoevam@ff.cuni.cz, radek.simik@ff.cuni.cz



CHARLES
UNIVERSITY

September 21-23, 2023
SinFon|Ja 16 MUNI Brno

Overview

- 1. Intro**
- 2. Background**
- 3. Experiment**
- 4. Results and discussion**
- 5. Conclusion**

Russian PQs

Restan (1972); King (1994); Šatunovskij (2005); Esipova & Romero (2023)

- (1) a. Kupil li Maks v magazine xleb? V1 *li*
bought LI Max in shop bread
'Did Max buy bread in the shop?'
- b. Maks kupil_{L+H*} v magazine xleb? intonation = V2
Max bought in shop bread
'Did Max buy bread in the shop?'

Russian PQs

Restan (1972); King (1994); Šatunovskij (2005); Esipova & Romero (2023)

- (1) a. Kupil **li** Maks v magazine xleb? V1 *li*
bought LI Max in shop bread
'Did Max buy bread in the shop?'
- b. Maks **kupil**_{L+H*} v magazine xleb? intonation = V2
Max bought in shop bread
'Did Max buy bread in the shop?'

Russian PQs

Restan (1972); King (1994); Šatunovskij (2005); Esipova & Romero (2023)

- (1) a. Kupil **li** Maks v magazine xleb? V1 *li*
bought LI Max in shop bread
'Did Max buy bread in the shop?'
- b. Maks **kupil**_{L+H*} v magazine xleb? intonation = V2
Max bought in shop bread
'Did Max buy bread in the shop?'
- (2) a. **Ne kupil li** Maks v magazine xleb? HIGHNPQs
not bought LI Max in shop bread
'Didn't Max buy bread in the shop?'
- b. Maks **ne kupil** v magazine xleb? LOWNPQs
Max not bought in shop bread
'Did Max not buy bread in the shop?'

Research questions

- ① What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- V1 *li*: HIGH negation corresponds OUTER negation (no NCIs)
- V2: LOW negation corresponds to both OUTER and INNER negation

Research questions

- ① What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- V1 *li*: HIGH negation corresponds OUTER negation (no NCIs)
- V2: LOW negation corresponds to both OUTER and INNER negation

- ② How does negation interact with evidential bias?

Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Roelofsen et al. (2013); AnderBois (2019); a.o.

- LOW negation is linked to negative evidence
- HIGH negation is not felicitous with positive evidence

Research questions

- ① What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- V1 *li*: HIGH negation corresponds OUTER negation (no NCIs)
- V2: LOW negation corresponds to both OUTER and INNER negation

- ② How does negation interact with evidential bias?

Büiring & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Roelofsen et al. (2013); AnderBois (2019); a.o.

- LOW negation is linked to negative evidence
- HIGH negation is not felicitous with positive evidence

- ③ How does the particle *razve* correlate with evidential bias?

Repp & Geist (to appear); Korotkova (to appear)

- evidence for the prejacent and epistemic bias against it

Research questions

- ① What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- V1 *li*: **HIGH** negation corresponds **OUTER** negation (no NCIs)
- V2: **LOW** negation corresponds to both **OUTER** and **INNER** negation
→ confirmed

- ② How does negation interact with evidential bias?

Büiring & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Roelofsen et al. (2013); AnderBois (2019); a.o.

- **LOW** negation is linked to negative evidence
- **HIGH** negation is not felicitous with positive evidence

- ③ How does the particle *razve* correlate with evidential bias?

Repp & Geist (to appear); Korotkova (to appear)

- evidence for the prejacent and epistemic bias against it

Research questions

- ① What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- V1 *li*: **HIGH** negation corresponds **OUTER** negation (no NCIs)
- V2: **LOW** negation corresponds to both **OUTER** and **INNER** negation
→ confirmed

- ② How does negation interact with evidential bias?

Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Roelofsen et al. (2013); AnderBois (2019); a.o.

- **LOW** negation is linked to negative evidence
- **HIGH** negation is not felicitous with positive evidence
→ Russian NPQs are never more natural in negative contexts

- ③ How does the particle *razve* correlate with evidential bias?

Repp & Geist (to appear); Korotkova (to appear)

- evidence for the prejacent and epistemic bias against it

Research questions

- ① What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- V1 *li*: **HIGH** negation corresponds **OUTER** negation (no NCIs)
 - V2: **LOW** negation corresponds to both **OUTER** and **INNER** negation
- confirmed

- ② How does negation interact with evidential bias?

Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Roelofsen et al. (2013); AnderBois (2019); a.o.

- **LOW** negation is linked to negative evidence
 - **HIGH** negation is not felicitous with positive evidence
- Russian NPQs are never more natural in negative contexts

- ③ How does the particle *razve* correlate with evidential bias?

Repp & Geist (to appear); Korotkova (to appear)

- evidence for the prejacent and epistemic bias against it
- confirmed: evidential bias affects naturalness

Negation in PQs

HIGH × LOW: syntactic distinction

- (3) a. Didn't Sasha come to the party?
- b. Did Sasha not come to the party?

Negation in PQs

HIGH × **LOW**: syntactic distinction

- (3) a. **Didn't** Sasha come to the party?
b. Did Sasha **not** come to the party?

OUTER × **INNER**: semantic distinction

Ladd (1981); Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Romero & Han (2004)

- (4) Ad: We need a person with a spouse for the experiment.
Sp: Isn't Natasha married? **OUTER = checking p**

Negation in PQs

HIGH × **LOW**: syntactic distinction

- (3) a. **Didn't** Sasha come to the party?
b. Did Sasha **not** come to the party?

OUTER × **INNER**: semantic distinction

Ladd (1981); Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Romero & Han (2004)

- (4) Ad: We need a person with a spouse for the experiment.
Sp: Isn't Natasha married? **OUTER = checking p**
- (5) Ad: Natasha is going out for a date tonight with a new partner.
Sp: Is Natasha not married? **INNER = checking $\neg p$**

Negation in PQs

HIGH × **LOW**: syntactic distinction

- (3) a. **Didn't** Sasha come to the party?
b. Did Sasha **not** come to the party?

OUTER × **INNER**: semantic distinction

Ladd (1981); Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Romero & Han (2004)

- (4) Ad: We need a person with a spouse for the experiment.
Sp: **Isn't** Natasha married? **OUTER** = checking p
- (5) Ad: Natasha is going out for a date tonight with a new partner.
Sp: Is Natasha **not** married? **INNER** = checking $\neg p$

Negation in PQs

polarity items *too* and *either* to disambiguate readings in (American) English

- HIGH → OUTER or INNER
- LOW → INNER

e.g. Romero & Han (2004)

- (6)
- Isn't Jane coming too?
 - Isn't Jane coming either?
 - *Is Jane not coming too?
 - Is Jane not coming either?

- HIGH → OUTER
- LOW → INNER

AnderBois (2019); Goodhue (2022)

- (7)
- Isn't Jane coming too?
 - *Isn't Jane coming either?
 - *Is Jane not coming too?
 - Is Jane not coming either?

Negation in PQs: bias

BIAS: the questioner's inclination towards one answer

Büning & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Gärtner & Gyuris (2017)

- **EPISTEMIC:** private questioner beliefs, knowledge, hopes, etc.
- **EVIDENTIAL:** contextual cues available to all interlocutors

Negation in PQs: bias

BIAS: the questioner's inclination towards one answer

Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Gärtner & Gyuris (2017)

- EPISTEMIC: private questioner beliefs, knowledge, hopes, etc.
- EVIDENTIAL: contextual cues available to all interlocutors
 - positive (for p) , negative (for $\neg p$), neutral
 - non-truth-conditional aspect of PQs meaning

Negation in PQs: bias

BIAS: the questioner's inclination towards one answer

Büring & Gunlogson (2000); Sudo (2013); Gärtner & Gyuris (2017)

- EPISTEMIC: private questioner beliefs, knowledge, hopes, etc.
- EVIDENTIAL: contextual cues available to all interlocutors
 - positive (for p), negative (for $\neg p$), neutral
 - non-truth-conditional aspect of PQs meaning

- (8) a. Isn't Natasha married? HIGHNPQs
- (i) evidential: negative or neutral
 - (ii) epistemic: she is married – positive
- b. Is Natasha **not** married? LOWNPQs
- (i) evidential: she is not married – negative
 - (ii) epistemic: positive

Bias in Russian PQs: *razve*

Repp & Geist (to appear); Korotkova (to appear)

- (9) a. Razve Egor uexal v Venu?
RAZVE Egor left in Vienna
'Did Egor go to Vienna? (I believe he didn't.)'
(i) evidential: he is in Vienna – positive
(ii) epistemic: he is not in Vienna – negative

Bias in Russian PQs: *razve*

Repp & Geist (to appear); Korotkova (to appear)

- (9) a. Razve Egor uexal v Venu?
RAZVE Egor left in Vienna
'Did Egor go to Vienna? (I believe he didn't.)'
(i) evidential: he is in Vienna – positive
(ii) epistemic: he is not in Vienna – negative
- b. Razve Egor ne uexal v Venu?
RAZVE Egor not left in Vienna
'Didn't Egor go to Vienna?'
(i) evidential: he is not in Vienna – negative
(ii) epistemic: he is in Vienna – positive

Negation and indefinites in Russian

Brown (1999); Haspelmath (2001); Geist (2008); Martí & Ionin (2019); Kuhn (2021)

- strict negative concord language
 - negative concord items (NCIs): e.g. *nikakoj* ‘no-which’
 - narrow scope non-specific indefinites – *wh-nibud’*
 - appears in the scope of some operators
- (10) a. Nastja pročitala {**kakuju-nibud’* / **nikakuju*} knigu.
Nastja read which.NIBUD’ which.NCI book
‘Nastja read a book.’
- b. Nastja ne pročitala {**kakuju-nibud’* / *nikakuju*} knigu.
Nastja not read which.NIBUD’ which.NCI book
‘Nastja didn’t read a book.’

Negation and indefinites in Russian

Brown (1999); Haspelmath (2001); Geist (2008); Martí & Ionin (2019); Kuhn (2021)

- strict negative concord language
 - negative concord items (NCIs): e.g. *nikakoj* ‘no-which’
 - narrow scope non-specific indefinites – *wh-nibud’*
 - appears in the scope of some operators
- (10) a. Nastja pročitala {**kakuju-nibud’* / **nikakuju*} knigu.
Nastja read which.NIBUD’ which.NCI book
‘Nastja read a book.’
- b. Nastja ne pročitala {**kakuju-nibud’* / *nikakuju*} knigu.
Nastja not read which.NIBUD’ which.NCI book
‘Nastja didn’t read a book.’
- (11) Nastja xočet pročitat’ *kakuju-nibud’* knigu.
Nastja wants to-read which.NIBUD’ book
‘Nastja wants to read any book.’

Negation and indefinites in Russian PQs

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- (12) a. Nastja pročitala {kakuju-nibud' / *nikakuju} knigu? V2
Nastja read which.NIBUD' which.NCI book
'Did Nastja read any book?'
- b. Nastja **ne pročitala** {kakuju-nibud' / nikakuju} knigu? LOW
Nastja not read which.NIBUD' which.NCI book
'Did Nastja not read any book?'

Negation and indefinites in Russian PQs

Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005); Zanon (2023)

- (12) a. Nastja pročitala {kakuju-nibud' / *nikakuju} knigu? V2
Nastja read which.NIBUD' which.NCI book
'Did Nastja read any book?'
- b. Nastja **ne pročitala** {kakuju-nibud' / nikakuju} knigu? LOW
Nastja not read which.NIBUD' which.NCI book
'Did Nastja not read any book?'
- (13) a. Pročitala li Nastja {kakuju-nibud' / *nikakuju} knigu? V1 *li*
read LI Nastja which.NIBUD' which.NCI book
'Did Nastja read any book?'
- b. **Ne pročitala li** Nastja {kakuju-nibud' / *nikakuju} knigu? HIGH
not read LI Nastja which.NIBUD' which.NCI book
'Did Nastja read any book?'

Negation in Russian PQs: predictions

HIGHNPQs

- Brown & Franks (1995); Abels (2005): negation is too high for NCIs licensing → **OUTER**
 - Zanon (2023): polarity items *eščě* ‘still, yet’ and *uže* ‘already’ are available → **OUTER** and **INNER**
- evidential bias:
 - **OUTER**: checking p → neutral or positive

LOWNPQs

- **OUTER** and **INNER**
- evidential bias:
 - **OUTER**: checking p → neutral or positive
 - **INNER**: checking $\neg p$ → negative

Participants and method

naturalness judgment task (replication of Staňková 2023)

- rate PQs in context
- Likert scale from 1 ‘completely unnatural’ to 7 ‘completely natural’
- run on L-Rex (Starschenko & Wierzba 2023)
- 68 participants found online, not paid

Design and materials

82 items in total

- 32 items – NPQs experiment (main)
- 50 items – secondary filler experiments
 - PPQs vs NPQs – 8 items
 - *razve*-PQs – 8 items
- within-items and within-subjects manipulation
- written stimuli distributed on lists (Latin square)

NPQs main	$2 \times 2 \times 2$	CONTEXT, STRATEGY, INDEFINITE
PPQs vs NPQs	$2 \times 2 \times 2$	CONTEXT, STRATEGY, POLARITY
<i>razve</i> -PQs	3×2	CONTEXT, POLARITY

Table: Experiments to report

Design and materials

CONTEXT: evidential bias manipulation

- neutral (A): no implication of p or $\neg p$
- negative (A'): context implies $\neg p$

(14) **Neutral**

A: U Kiry na dače est' teplica, **kotoruju ej sobrali v prošlom godu.**
at Kira on dacha is greenhouse which her built in last year
'Kira has a greenhouse at her dacha **which was built last year.**'

Negative

A': U Kiry na dače est' teplica, **v kotoroj ona vyraščivaet cvety.**
at Kira on dacha is greenhouse in which she grows flowers
'Kira has a greenhouse in her dacha **where she grows flowers.**'

Question: to be rated from 1 to 7

B: Doesn't Kira grow some vegetables there?

Design and materials

CONTEXT: evidential bias manipulation

- neutral (A): no implication of p or $\neg p$
- negative (A'): context implies $\neg p$

(14) **Neutral**

A: U Kiry na dače est' teplica, **kotoruju ej sobrali v prošlom godu.**
at Kira on dacha is greenhouse which her built in last year
'Kira has a greenhouse at her dacha **which was built last year.**'

Negative

A': U Kiry na dače est' teplica, **v kotoroj ona vyraščivaet cvety.**
at Kira on dacha is greenhouse in which she grows flowers
'Kira has a greenhouse in her dacha **where she grows flowers.**'

Question: to be rated from 1 to 7

B: Doesn't Kira grow some vegetables there?

- additionally for the secondary experiments – positive (context implies p)

Design and materials

STRATEGY: HIGHNPQs and LOWNPQs manipulation

INDEFINITE: NCIs \approx INNER and *wh-nibud'* \approx OUTER manipulation

- (15) B: Ne posadila li tuda Kira {nikakie / kakije-nibud'} ovošči?
not planted LI there Kira which.NCI which.NIBUD' vegetables
'Didn't Kira plant there any/some vegetables?'
- B': Kira ne posadila tuda {nikakie / kakije-nibud'} ovošči?
Kira not planted there which.NCI which.NIBUD' vegetables
'Did Kira not plant there any/some vegetables?'

Design and materials

STRATEGY: HIGHNPQs and LOWNPQs manipulation

INDEFINITE: NCIs \approx INNER and *wh-nibud'* \approx OUTER manipulation

- (15) B: Ne posadila li tuda Kira {nikakie / kakije-nibud'} ovošči?
not planted LI there Kira which.NCI which.NIBUD' vegetables
'Didn't Kira plant there any/some vegetables?'
- B': Kira ne posadila tuda {nikakie / kakije-nibud'} ovošči?
Kira not planted there which.NCI which.NIBUD' vegetables
'Did Kira not plant there any/some vegetables?'

- additionally for the secondary experiments – POLARITY (PPQs/NPQs)

Design and materials

А: Лёша подрабатывал летом в службе доставки, где ему нужно было развозить еду. negative context

Б: Не доставлял ли Лёша какие-нибудь посылки?
highNPQs wh-nibud'

Насколько естественно звучит вопрос от Б в данном диалоге?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

1 = абсолютно неестественно, 7 = абсолютно естественно

Продолжить

Figure: Item example from L-Rex

Results: NPQs




Figure: Raw; horizontal line = medians




Figure: NPQs means

Results: NPQs

c1mm by Christensen (2022)

- main effect of all factors




Figure: NPQs means

Results: NPQs

c1mm by Christensen (2022)

- main effect of all factors
- interaction between STRATEGY and INDEFINITE

($z = 10.046$, $p < .001$)

- *wh-nibud'*: fine among all
- NCIs: worse in general but much more in V1




Figure: NPQs means

Results: NPQs

c1mm by Christensen (2022)

- main effect of all factors
- interaction between STRATEGY and INDEFINITE

($z = 10.046, p < .001$)

- *wh-nibud'*: fine among all
- NCIs: worse in general but much more in V1

- interaction between STRATEGY and CONTEXT

($z = 2.855, p = .004$)

- neutral context better in general but much more in V1




Figure: NPQs means

Discussion: NPQs

- 1 What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?

STRATEGY/INDEFINITE interaction

- NCI in V1 *li* (= **HIGHNPQ**)
unnatural → **OUTER**
- V2 (= **LOWNPQ**) → **OUTER** and
INNER




Figure: NPQs means

Discussion: NPQs

- ② How does negation interact with evidential bias?

STRATEGY/CONTEXT interaction

- NPQs are more natural in neutral (unlike in English)
- NCIs + V2 (= **LowNPQ**) + neutral → **OUTER**




Figure: NPQs means

Results: PPQs vs NPQs




Figure: Raw; horizontal line = medians




Figure: PPQs vs NPQs means

Results: PPQs vs NPQs

wh-nibud' indefinites only

- 1 What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?
 - V1 *li* no effect/impact of polarity




Figure: PPQs vs NPQs means

Results: PPQs vs NPQs

wh-nibud' indefinites only

- 1 What is the syntactic-semantic status of the negation depending on the question type?
 - V1 *li* no effect/impact of polarity
- 2 How does negation interact with evidential bias?
 - CONTEXT/STRATEGY/POLARITY interaction
 - **LOW**NPQs unnatural to express positive
 - **HIGH**NPQs in positive context natural




Figure: PPQs vs NPQs means

Results: *razve*-PQs




Figure: Raw; horizontal line = medians




Figure: *razve*-PQs means

Discussion: *razve*-PQs

- ③ How does the particle *RAZVE* correlate with evidential bias?
- effect of negative and positive contexts
 - acceptable in neutral context due to epistemic bias




Figure: Caption

Cross-Slavic comparison




Figure: Russian




Figure: Czech

Conclusion

- ① Negation in Russian PQs is primarily interpreted as OUTER
 - HIGH → OUTER, LOW → OUTER or INNER
 - LOWNPQs with NCIs in neutral contexts are interpreted as OUTER
- ② Neutral evidential bias is more natural for negative PQs
 - negative bias is not required
 - positive is also available for HIGHNPQs
- ③ Naturalness of *razve*-PQs is affected by evidence

Conclusion

- ① Negation in Russian PQs is primarily interpreted as **OUTER**
 - **HIGH** → **OUTER**, **LOW** → **OUTER** or **INNER**
 - **LOWNPQs** with NCIs in neutral contexts are interpreted as **OUTER**
- ② Neutral evidential bias is more natural for negative PQs
 - negative bias is not required
 - positive is also available for **HIGHNPQs**
- ③ Naturalness of *razve*-PQs is affected by evidence

Hypothesis

The use of negation in Russian (Slavic) PQs might be more closely tied to epistemic than to evidential bias. However, this bias may be weak as compared to the one in English **HIGHNPQs**.

Thank you!

References I

- Abels, Klaus. 2005. "Expletive Negation" in Russian: A Conspiracy Theory. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 13(1). 5–74.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599547>.
- AnderBois, Scott. 2019. Negation, alternatives, and negative polar questions in American English. In Klaus von Heusinger, Edgar Onea & Malte Zimmermann (eds.), *Questions in Discourse - volume 1: Semantics*, 118–171. CRISPI.
- Brown, Sue. 1999. *The syntax of negation in russian*. Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Brown, Sue & Steven Franks. 1995. Asymmetries in the scope of russian negation. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 3(2). 239–287.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/24598950>.
- Büring, Daniel & Christine Gunlogson. 2000. Aren't positive and negative polar questions the same? Manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles / Santa Cruz.
- Christensen, Rune Haubo Bojesen. 2022. ordinal: Regression models for ordinal data. R package.
<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/ordinal/index.html>.
- Esipova, Maria & Maribel Romero. 2023. Prejacent truth in rhetorical questions: Lessons from Russian. Talk at *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 32.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Beáta Gyuris. 2017. On delimiting the space of bias profiles for polar interrogatives. *Linguistische Berichte* 251. 293–316.
- Geist, Ljudmila. 2008. Specificity as referential anchoring: Evidence from Russian. In Atle Grønn (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 12, vol. 12, 151–164.
- Goodhue, Daniel. 2022. Isn't there more than one way to bias a polar question? *Natural Language Semantics* 30.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11050-022-09198-2>.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oso/9780198235606.001.0001.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198235606.001.0001>.
- King, Tracy Holloway. 1994. Focus in Russian Yes-No Questions. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 2(1). 92–120.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599026>.

References II

- Korotkova, Natasha. to appear. Conversational dynamics of Russian questions with *razve*. In Maria Onoeva, Anna Staňková & Radek Šimík (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 27, Prague: Institute of Czech Language & Linguistic Theory, Faculty of Arts, Charles University.
- Kuhn, Jeremy. 2021. The dynamics of negative concord. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 45(1). 153–198. doi:10.1007/s10988-020-09318-3.
- Ladd, D. Robert. 1981. A first look at the semantics and pragmatics of negative questions and tag questions. *undefined files/158/8fa9ce7bc1622677e512cf4bee53a9f9716fb96e.html*.
- Martí, Luisa & Tania Ionin. 2019. Wide scope indefinites in russian: an experimental investigation. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Wide-scope-indefinites-in-Russian:-an-experimental-Martí-Ionin/d7e31b68557d9bf8c6a50ac005d624dd2875f834>.
- Repp, Sophie & Ljudmila Geist. to appear. Negative Polar Questions in Russian: Question bias and question concern. In Tue Trinh Anton Benz, Manfred Krifka & Kazuko Yatsushiro (eds.), *Volume on Biased Question* Language Science Press, Language Science Press.
- Restan, Per. 1972. *Sintaksis voprositel'nogo predloženiya: obščij vopros*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Roelofsen, Floris, Noortje Venhuizen & Galit Weidman Sassoon. 2013. Positive and negative questions in discourse. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, vol. 17, 455–472.
- Romero, Maribel & Chung-Hye Han. 2004. On negative yes/no questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(5). 609–658.
- Starschenko, Alexej & Marta Wierzba. 2023. L-Rex Linguistic rating experiments [software], version 1.0.3. GNU General Public License v3.0. <https://github.com/2e2a/1-rex/>.
- Staňková, Anna. 2023. *The expression of speaker's bias in Czech polar questions*. Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav českého jazyka a teorie komunikace MA thesis. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11956/182788>.
- Sudo, Yasutada. 2013. Biased polar questions in english and japanese, vol. 28, 275–295. doi:10.1163/9789004183988_009.
- Zanon, Ksenia. 2023. Expletive negation revisited: On some properties of negated polar interrogatives in Russian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 32, Bloomington, IN.
- Šatunovskij, Il'ja. 2005. Osnovnye kognitivno-kommunikativnye tipy obščix voprosov v ruskom jazyke. *Dialog: Komp'juternaja lingvistika i intellektual'nye texnologii* 502–506. <https://www.dialog-21.ru/media/2422/shatunovskiy-ib.pdf>.