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THE BIG PICTURE

1. In terms of quantifier scope, Russian is very much like English (contra Ionin 2001/2003, Stepanov and Stateva 2009 i.a.): Russian needs QR of the English kind to explain (a) the ambiguity of numerous constructions, and (b) to explain a number of syntactic phenomena (ILC, ACD, scope distribution in ellipsis contexts, etc)

2. Russian is like English in another respect: it allows scope freezing

3. Russian is unlike English in showing many more frozen scope constructions

The Focus Today:

4. The Scope Freezing Generalization: Scope freezing always results from an instance of overt raising of one QP over another.

5. The SF Generalization can be used as a diagnostic tool to probe into Russian ditransitive argument structure.

6. Results: Russian ditransitives are not a homogeneous group, but are subdivided into three distinct Groups, with different base structures needed for each group.
At present, 3 main types of approaches to the structure of Russian ditransitives can be singled out:

(1) a. **Dative Goal object originates in Spec, VP position**, assigned Dative case as sister to V’ (see Harbert & Toribio 1991; Greenberg & Franks 1991; Franks 1995 Richardson 2007)


c. **Dative Goal object is assigned case by an Applicative head** (Dyakonova 2005, 2007, following Pylkkänen 2002)

Antonyuk (2015): none of these accounts are fully correct, since Russian ditransitives are not a homogeneous class, they subdivide into three distinct Groups, schematized in (2).
(2) Group 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>V  NP-ACC  NP-OBL</th>
<th>BASIC ORDER</th>
<th>(ambiguous)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>V  NP-OBL  NP-ACC</td>
<td>&lt;NP-OBL&gt;</td>
<td>DERIVED ORDER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>V  NP-OBL  NP-ACC</th>
<th>BASIC ORDER</th>
<th>(ambiguous)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>V  NP-ACC  NP-OBL</td>
<td>&lt;NP-ACC&gt;</td>
<td>DERIVED ORDER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>V  NP-CASE1  NP-CASE2</th>
<th>BASIC ORDER</th>
<th>(ambiguous)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>V  [...NP-CASE2...]</td>
<td>NP-CASE1</td>
<td>DERIVED ORDER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE NON-HOMOGENEITY OF RUSSIAN DITRANSITIVES

How do we know? => Scope freezing distribution patterns!

(3)  
   a. The teacher gave a book to every student. (∃ > ∀, ∀ > ∃) (Larson 1990)  
   b. The teacher gave a student every book. (∃ > ∀, ∀ > ∃)

(4)  
   a. The teacher gave a different book to every student. (∀ > ∃)  
   b. #The teacher gave a different student every book. (*∀ > ∃)

(5)  
   a. Maud draped a (different) sheet over every armchair. (every > a)  
   b. Maud draped a (#different) armchair with every sheet. *(every > a)

Russian shows a much wider range of constructions where scope is surface frozen:

(6)  
   a. ditransitives  
   b. spray-load alternation  
   c. spray-load type verbs where scope freezing is the result of simple reordering  
   d. “reflexive monotransitives”  
   e. long-distance scrambling of QPs  
   f. local scrambling of QPs
(7) The Big Question: what is so special about the constructions that show scope freezing?

My Answer: SF Generalization

*SF Generalization:* Scope freezing always results from overt raising of one QP over another to a c-commanding position as a result of a single instance of movement.
THE FINDING: 3 GROUPS OF RUSSIAN DITRANSITIVES

Group 1
(8) a. Maša našla [kakuju-to knigu] (každomu studentu) ambiguous
Masha found [some book]_{ACC} [every student]_{DAT}
‘Masha found some book for every student’
b. Maša našla (kakomu-to studentu) [každuju knigu] frozen
Masha found [some student]_{DAT} [every book]_{ACC}
‘Masha found some student every book’

Group 2
(9) a. Maša obeskuražila (kakim-to postupkom) [každogo opponenta] ambiguous
Masha discouraged [some act]_{INSTR} [every opponent]_{ACC}
‘Masha discouraged with some act every opponent’
b. Maša obeskuražila [kakogo-to opponenta] (každym postupkom) frozen
Masha discouraged [some opponent]_{ACC} [every act]_{INSTR}
‘Masha discouraged some opponent with every act’

Group 3
(10) a. Maša zaveščala [*kakoe-to imenie) [*každomu drugu)] ambiguous
Masha bequeathed [some estate]_{ACC} [every friend]_{DAT}
‘Masha bequeathed some estate to every friend’
b. Maša zaveščala [*(kakomu-to drugu)] [*každoc imenie)] ambiguous
Masha bequeathed [some friend]_{DAT} [every estate]_{ACC}
‘Masha bequeathed to some friend every estate’
EVIDENCE: THE ACD TEST

Group 1

(11) a. Maša našla [kakuju-to knigu] [každomu studentu, čto i ja] ambiguous
Masha found [some book]_{ACC} [[every student]_{DAT} that also I]

‘Masha found some book for every student I did’

b. Maša našla [kakomu-to studentu] [každuju knigu, čto i ja] frozen
Masha found [some student]_{DAT} [[every book]_{ACC} that also I]

‘Masha found some student every book I did’

Group 2

(12) a. Maša obeskuražila (kakim-to postupkom) [každogo opponenta, čto i ja] amb
Masha discouraged [some act]_{INSTR} [[every opponent]_{ACC} that also I]

‘Masha discouraged with some act every opponent I did’

(some > every): Masha discouraged every opponent with some act x, such that I also discouraged every opponent with x.
(every > some): for every opponent x that I discouraged with some act, Masha discouraged x with some act or other.

b. Maša obeskuražila [kakogo-to opponenta] [každym postupkom), čto i ja] frozen
Masha discouraged [some opponent]_{ACC} [[every act]_{INSTR} that also I]

‘Masha discouraged some opponent with every act I did’

(some > every): for some opponent x, Masha discouraged x with every act I discouraged x with.
*(every > some): for every act x, such that I discouraged some opponent y with, Masha discouraged y with x.
EVIDENCE: THE ACD TEST

Group 3

(13) a. Maša zaveščala [*(kakoe-to imenie)] *(každomu drugu), čto i ja] ambiguous
Masha bequeathed [some estate]ACC [every friend]DAT that also I
‘Masha bequeathed some estate to every friend I did’

b. Maša zaveščala [*(kakomu-to drugu)] *(každoe imenie),čto i ja] ambiguous
Masha bequeathed [some friend]DAT [every estate]ACC that also I
‘Masha bequeathed to some friend every estate’
EVIDENCE: THE CONTRASTIVE FOCUS TEST

Group 1
(14) a. Vanja prines [kakuju-to novost’] (KAždoj sem’e) F>
Vania brought [some news]_{ACC} [every family]_{DAT}
‘Vania brought some piece of news to every family’

b. Vanja prines (kakoj-to sem’e) [KAžduju novost’] F<
Vania brought [some family]_{DAT} [every news]_{ACC}
‘Vania brought some family every piece of news’

Group 2
(15) a. Maša obozvala (kakim-to prozviščem) [KAždogo mal’čika] F>
Masha called [some nickname]_{INSTR} [every boy]_{ACC}
‘Masha called every boy by some nickname’

b. Maša obozvala [kakogo-to mal’čika] (KAždym prozviščem) F<
Masha called [some boy]_{ACC} [every nickname]_{INSTR}
‘Masha called some boy by every nickname’
Group 3
(16)a. Maša napisala [kakoj-to slogan] (na KAždoj stene) F>
Masha wrote [some slogan]_{ACC} [pp on every wall]_{DAT}
‘Masha wrote some slogan on every wall’

b. Maša napisala (na kakoj-to stene) [KAždyj slogan] F>
Masha wrote [pp on some wall]_{DAT} [every slogan]_{ACC}
‘Masha wrote every slogan on some wall’
EVIDENCE: PASSIVIZATION TEST

Group 1

(17) a. Maša potrebovala [kakoj-to document] (s každogo posetitelja) ambiguous
Masha demanded [some document]_{ACC} [from every visitor]_{GEN}
‘Masha demanded some document from every visitor’

b. Maša potrebovala (s kakogo-to posetitelja) [každyj document] frozen
Masha demanded [from some visitor]_{GEN} [every document]_{ACC}
‘Masha demanded from some visitor every document’

c. [Kakoj-to document] byl potrebovan [s každogo posetitelja] amb
[Some document]_{NOM} was demanded [from every visitor]_{GEN}
‘Some document was demanded from every visitor’

d. [S kakogo-to posetitelja] byl potrebovan [každyj document] frozen
[From some visitor]_{GEN} was demanded [every document]_{NOM}
‘From some visitor was demanded every document’
EVIDENCE: PASSIVIZATION TEST

Group 2

(18) a. Maša obeskuražila (kakim-to postupkom) Masha discouraged [some act]_{INSTR} ‘Masha discouraged by some act every opponent’

b. Maša obeskuražila [kakogo-to opponenta] Masha discouraged [some opponent]_{ACC} (každym postupkom) [every act]_{INSTR} ‘Masha discouraged some opponent by every act’

c. (Kakim-to postupkom) byl obeskuražen [každyj opponent] [Some act]_{INSTR} was discouraged [every opponent]_{NOM} ‘Every opponent was discouraged by some act’

d. [Kakoj-to opponent] byl obeskuražen (každym postupkom) [Some opponent]_{NOM} was discouraged [every act]_{INSTR} ‘Some opponent was discouraged by some act’
**EVIDENCE: PASSIVIZATION TEST**

**Group 3**

(19) a. Maša porekomendovala [kakuju-to proceduru] [každoj pacientke] ambiguous
Maša recommended [some procedure]_{ACC} [every patient]_{DAT}
‘Masha recommended some procedure to every patient’

b. Maša porekomendovala [kakoj-to pacientke] [každuju proceduru] ??frozen
Maša recommended [some patient]_{DAT} [every procedure]_{ACC}
‘Masha recommended some patient every procedure’

c. [Kakaja-to procedura] byla rekomendovana [každoj pacientke] ambiguous
[Some procedure]_{NOM} was recommended [every patient]_{DAT}
‘Some procedure was recommended to every patient’

d. [Kakoj-to pacientke] byla rekomendovana [každaja procedura] ambiguous
[Some patient]_{DAT} was recommended [every procedure]_{NOM}
‘To some patient was recommended every procedure’
PROPOSED STRUCTURES FOR THE THREE GROUPS

Possible Structures for Group 1 Predicates:
(20) (a) OBL has been topicalized to an adjoined position.
(b) OBL has been raised to spec of an applicative head.
(21)

How do we choose between these structures?
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 1 PREDICATES

(22) a. 

b. 

16
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 1 PREDICATES

(23)
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 1 PREDICATES

(24)a.  Maša  special’no  potrebovala  s  Ivan\textsubscript{GEN}  den’gi  
Masha  purposefully  demanded  from  Ivan\textsubscript{(GEN)}  money\textsubscript{(ACC)}

‘Masha demanded money from Ivan’

b.  *Maša  potrebovala  s  Ivan\textsubscript{GEN}  special’no  den’gi  
Masha  purposefully  from Ivan\textsubscript{(GEN)}  demanded  money\textsubscript{(ACC)}

=>$\text{evidence for (23)}$
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 1 PREDICATES

Another possibility for Group 1:

(25) a.

b.
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 2 PREDICATES


(27) (a) [PP P DP(ACC)] can be taken to raise over OBL and adjoin to VP
(b) [PP P DP(ACC)] can be taken to raise over OBL to the spec of ApplP or vP.

(28) V  NP-ACC  NP-OBL  NP-ACC  DERIVED ORDER  (frozen)

\___________________/

(29) a. Maša ugostila (kakim-to pečenjem) každogo rebenka
   Masha treated [some cookie]_{INSTR} [every child]_{ACC}
   ‘Masha treated every child to some cookie’

b. Maša ugostila [kakogo-to rebenka] (každym pečenjem)
   Masha treated [some child]_{ACC} [every cookie]_{INSTR}
   ‘Masha treated some child to every cookie’
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 2 PREDICATES

(30)
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 2 PREDICATES

(31)

(32)
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 2 PREDICATES

(33) a. Maša pobesedovala (na kakju-to temu) [s každym drugom] ambiguous
    Masha talked [pp on [some topic]_{ACC}] [pp with [every friend]_{INSTR}]
    'Masha had a conversation on some topic with every friend'

    b. Maša pobesedovala [s kakim-to drugom] (na každuju-to temu) frozen
    Masha talked [pp with [some friend]_{INSTR}] [pp on [every topic]_{ACC}]
    'Masha had a conversation with some friend on every topic'

(34) a. Maša porugala (za kakju-to ošibku) [každogo druga] ambiguous
    Masha scolded [pp for [some mistake]_{ACC}] [every friend]_{ACC}
    ‘Masha scolded every friend for some mistake’

    b. Maša porugala [kakogo-to druga] (za každuj ošibku) frozen
    Masha scolded [some friend]_{ACC} [pp for [every mistake]_{ACC}]
    ‘Masha scolded some friend for every mistake’
NON-OBJECT-LIKE PROPERTIES OF THE ACCUSATIVE OBJECT
WITH GROUP 2 VERBS

Ability to occur inside a distributive po-phrase (Pesetsky 1982)

(35) ??/*Maša otrugala po drugu za každuju ošibku
    Masha scolded PO [friend]_{DAT} [pp for [every mistake]_{ACC}]
    ‘Masha scolded one friend for each mistake’

(36) *Maša obeskuražila po [opponentu] (každym postupkom)
    Masha discouraged PO [opponent]_{DAT} [every act]_{INSTR}

(cf. Group 1 predicates):

(37) Maša našla po knige každomu studentu
    Masha found PO [book]_{DAT} [every student]_{DAT}
    ‘Masha found one book for every student’
NON-OBJECT-LIKE PROPERTIES OF THE ACCUSATIVE OBJECT WITH GROUP 2 VERBS

Genitive of Negation Test (Babby 1980, Pesetsky 1982)

(38)a. Maša otrugala (za kakuju-to oshibku) kazhduju podrugu
Masha scolded [for some mistake]_{ACC} [every friend]_{ACC}

b. */??Maša ne otrugala podrugi_{GEN}
‘Masha didn’t scold a friend’

(39) */??Maša ne obeskuražila opponentki
Masha not discouraged [opponent]_{GEN}

(cf. Group 1 predicates):
(40) Maša ne našla knigi
Masha not found [book]_{GEN}
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 3 PREDICATES

Two major possibilities: independent derivations or derived order

(41)  
  a. Job blamed [God] [for his troubles] (Larson 1990)  
  b. Job blamed [his troubles] [on God]

(42)  
  a. John blamed some employee for every mistake. $\exists \forall, \forall \exists$  
  b. John blamed some mistake on every employee. $\exists \forall, \forall \exists$

(43)  
  a. John gave [a cute little puppy] [to Mary]  
  b. John gave [to Mary] [a cute little puppy]
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 3 PREDICATES

(44) a.
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 3 PREDICATES

(44) b.

[Diagram showing possible structures for a sentence with a predicate involving a subject, a verb, and an object, including prepositional phrases and noun phrases.]
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 3 PREDICATES

(45)
POSSIBLE STRUCTURES FOR GROUP 3 PREDICATES

(46)a. Maša napisala [kakoj-to slogan] (na každoj stene) (amb)
Masha wrote [some slogan]_{ACC} [pp on every wall]_{PREP}
‘Masha wrote some slogan on every wall’

b. Maša napisala (na kakoj-to stene) [každyj slogan] (amb)
Masha wrote [pp on some wall]_{PREP} [every slogan]_{ACC}
‘Masha wrote every slogan on some wall’

(47)
CONCLUSIONS

Russian QP scope data doesn’t just provide insights into how QR interacts with overt movement, it can also be used as a new diagnostic tool for probing into the argument structure of ditransitives.

The Scope Freezing Generalization based on Russian QP scope and scope freezing distribution data, used as a diagnostic tool, strongly suggests that Russian ditransitives make up 3 distinct Groups, with different syntactic properties and distinct scope behavior of each.

Additional syntactic tests show that we need to posit distinct structures for the three Groups.

The Russian scope data and SFG strongly suggest that while no single structure can be proposed for all Russian ditransitives, the account of Russian ditransitives is nevertheless distinctly derivational, providing support for Larson (2014) and partially for Bailyn (1995, 2012) accounts of ditransitives in English and Russian respectively.

Strong support for the claim that all languages show contexts of scope freezing and scope fluidity, that is, there is no QR Parameter (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2012)

Implications for other languages showing scope freezing in ditransitives (English, Korean, Japanese, etc)
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Contact info for questions and additional data requests: syudina@gmail.com

This PPT presentation as well as related papers can soon be downloaded at my web page: www.lingoscope.org
The “What About Chinese” Question?

Yaobin Liu and Hongchen Wu (NACCL 28, May 2016):

**Empirical Findings:**
Mandarin *actives* typically show *fixed scope*
Mandarin *passives* allow *flexible scope*
Mandarin *double object constructions* (DOCs) show *fixed scope*
Mandarin *preposition datives* (PPDs) allow *flexible scope*
Some PPDs even prefer *inverse scope*
Preverbal PPs show *fixed scope*
Post-verbal PPs allow *flexible scope*

**Aoun and Li (1993):** *(The Scope Principle):* A quantifier A may have scope over a quantifier B iff A c-commands a member of the chain containing B)

1. QP1 x1 QP2 x2 (active)
2. QP2 x2 QP1 x1 t2 (passive)

Incorrect predictions about scope contrasts between Preverbal and postverbal PPs;
Incorrect predictions about scope contrasts between DOCs and PP Datives.
The “What About Chinese” Question?

Yaobin Liu and Hongchen Wu (NACCL 28, May 2016):

SFG (Antonyuk 2015) correctly predicts:
- Scope in Mandarin pre- and post-posed PPs
- Scope in Mandarin DOCs and PPDs
- Scope ambiguity in Mandarin passives

SFG does NOT predict the fixed scope of simple transitives.
Possibilities:
- Simple transitives involve movements in which subject and object cross (in keeping with SFG).
- Some additional factor is involved in simple transitives, e.g., information structure, favoring a wide scope interpretation of the subject (D-linking, definiteness, specificity, etc.)
The “What About Chinese” Question?

Yaobin Liu and Hongchen Wu (NACCL 28, May 2016):

Conclusions:
• Mandarin Chinese is not a strictly scope-rigid language.
• Striking similarities found between Mandarin and English with regard to scope phenomena in ditransitives.
• Parallel analyses can be applied cross-linguistically.