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Present Ukrainian data (Mykhaylyk 2010 & Antonyuk 2015) which raise empirical and theoretical problems for Bruening’s (2001) original formulation of the account of scope freezing.

- The interaction between “specificity” and scope in Ukrainian ditransitives and Spray-Load alternations shows that Bruening’s account, if preserved at all, needs to be reformulated.
bruening (2001) proposes superiority account of scope freezing in english ditransitive structures, such as (1) and (2).

(1) prepositional dative (ppd) and the double object construction (doc)
   a. the teacher gave a (different) book to every student. (every > a)
   b. the teacher gave a (#different) student every book. *(every > a)

(2) spray-load alternation
   a. maud draped a (different) sheet over every armchair. (every > a)
   b. maud draped a (#different) armchair with every sheet. *(every > a)
Introduction: Scope Freezing is due to Superiority

(1) a. The teacher gave a (different) book to every student.

(every >> a)

(1) b. The teacher gave a (#different) student every book.

*(every >> a)
Stepanov and Stateva (2009) extend Bruening (2001) to Russian, crucially assuming that

- Russian is a scope rigid language, as claimed by Ionin (2001) and
- Superiority does not apply to Russian (Stepanov 1998)

and arguing that

scope reversal in the Russian equivalent of English DOC should be available only in the case where scope reversal is generally available, namely, with contrastively focused quantifiers (Ionin 2001) (3):

(3) Ivan pokazal (po krajnej mere) ODNOMU posetitelju KAŽDYJ fil’m.
  Ivan showed at least one visitor (DAT) every movie (ACC)
  ‘Ivan showed every movie to at least one visitor.’
Introduction: Problems for S&S

The S&S example in (3) in fact represents one of the verbs that do not show real scope freezing: see contrastive focus test in (4), and passivization test in (5) (Antonyuk 2015):

(4) Ivan pokazal kakomu-to posetitelju KAždyj fil’m.
    Ivan showed some visitor (DAT) every movie (ACC)
    ‘Ivan showed some visitor EVERY movie.’
    ?(every >> some)

(5) Kakomu-to posetitelju byl pokazan každyj fil’m.
    some visitor (DAT) was shown every movie (ACC)
    ‘Some visitor was shown every movie.’
    (every >> some)
Introduction: A Problem for Bruening (2001)

Bruening's account does not make clear predictions for languages that show both QR and object shift.

One way to interpret his account is that languages that allow object shift will not also allow “feature-driven” QR, thus predicting no Scope Freezing in configurations similar to the ones found in the English, e.g., Russian ditransitives.

However, there is at least one language for which research has shown that it allows both
- Specificity-related object shift as well as
- Scope Freezing in ditransitives and in the with-variant of the Spray-Load C.

Movement of a direct object to a higher pre-verbal landing site (vP-edge) that has been claimed to have certain interpretative correlates, i.e., a loss of nonspecific readings (Biskup 2006, Chomsky 2001, De Hoop 1992, Diesing & Jelenek 1993, Holmberg 1999, Thráinsson 2001, Van Geenhoven 1998).

(6) Divčynka mjačyk dviči kynula.
   girl ball.ACC twice threw
   ‘The girl threw the/a certain ball twice.’
   # ‘The girl threw a (some) ball twice.’
Results of an experimental production study on Russian & Ukrainian show that givenness of an argument prompts the use of a certain structure – with a DAT-ACC or ACC-DAT word order.

Crucially, there was no significant difference between Ukrainian and Russian adults and 3-5-year-old children for two ditransitive verbs tested, ‘give’ and ‘show’.
Scope in Ukrainian Ditransitives
The Three Groups of Ditransitives (Antonyuk 2015)

Ukrainian ditransitives subdivide into three distinct Groups based on their scope distribution, just as Russian ditransitives do.

**Group 1:**
- V NP-ACC NP-OBL BASIC ORDER (ambiguous)
- V NP-OBL NP-ACC <NP-OBL> DERIVED ORDER (frozen)

**Group 2:**
- V NP-OBL NP-ACC BASIC ORDER (ambiguous)
- V NP-ACC NP-OBL <NP-ACC> DERIVED ORDER (frozen)

**Group 3:**
- V NP-CASE1 NP-CASE2 BASIC ORDER (ambiguous)
- V […]NP-CASE2[…] NP-CASE1 DERIVED ORDER (ambiguous)
### Examples of The Three Groups of Ukrainian Ditransitives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>Marijka</th>
<th>znajśla</th>
<th>[jakus’ knygu]</th>
<th>(kožnij dytyni)</th>
<th>ambiguous</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>found</td>
<td>[some book]_{ACC}</td>
<td>[every child]_{DAT}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mary found some book for every child’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Marijka</td>
<td>znajśla</td>
<td>(jakijs’ dytyni)</td>
<td>[kožnu knygu]</td>
<td>frozen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masha</td>
<td>found</td>
<td>[some child]_{DAT}</td>
<td>[every book]_{ACC}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mary found some child every book’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>Marijka</th>
<th>zasmutyla</th>
<th>(jakymos’ žartom)</th>
<th>(kožnogo druga)</th>
<th>ambiguous</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>upset</td>
<td>[some joke]_{INSTR}</td>
<td>[every friend]_{ACC}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mary upset with some joke every friend’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Marijka</td>
<td>zasmutyla</td>
<td>[jakogos’ druga]</td>
<td>(kožnym žartom)</td>
<td>frozen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>upset</td>
<td>[some friend]_{ACC}</td>
<td>[every joke]_{INSTR}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mary upset some friend with every joke’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>Marijka</th>
<th>zapovila</th>
<th>[*jakyjs’ majetok)]</th>
<th>*(kožnomu drugovi)]</th>
<th>ambiguous</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>bequeathed</td>
<td>[some estate]_{ACC}</td>
<td>[every friend]_{DAT}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mary bequeathed some estate to every friend’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Marijka</td>
<td>zapovila</td>
<td>[*jakomus’ drugovi)]</td>
<td>*(kožen majetok)]</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>bequeathed</td>
<td>[some friend]_{DAT}</td>
<td>[every estate]_{ACC}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mary bequeathed to some friend every estate’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spray-Load Alternation in English

Semantic properties

(10) a. Jones loaded [the hay] onto the truck
...and put the left-over hay in the barn.
...and there was still room for the piano.
b. Jones loaded [the truck] with the hay
...and there was still room for the piano.
...and put the left-over hay in the barn.

(Kearns 2011: p.218-219)

The examples above demonstrate the well-known property of the spray-load alternation, namely the holism effect, associated with the direct object in both alternants.

The holism effect consists in the direct object being interpreted as completely (or holistically) involved in the event, being completely ‘used up’.
Example (11) demonstrates the key entailment relation that exists between the two alternants. Thus, the with variant is known to entail the other variant, but not vice versa:

(11) a. Jones loaded the truck with hay entails Jones loaded hay onto the truck (Kearns 2011)
b. Jones loaded the hay onto the truck does not entail Jones loaded the truck with hay

Rappaport & Levin (1988) analyze the with variant as semantically more complex, containing the other variant – hence the entailment relation.

Note that the with variant is the one which is also surface scope frozen, which on Antonyuk’s (2015) analysis results from an instance of overt movement of the structurally lower object above the structurally higher one => the structure Rappaport & Levin treat as semantically more complex is treated here as syntactically more complex as well.
Spray-Load Alternation in Ukrainian

(12) a. Mykhaylo zalyv [pal’ne] [v bak].
     Michael filled [gas]_{ACC} [into tank]_{GEN}
     ‘Michael filled gas into the tank.’

     b. Mykhaylo zalyv [bak] [pal’nym].
        Michael filled [tank]_{ACC} [gas]_{INSTR}
        ‘Michael filled the tank with gas.’

     c. Mykhaylo zalyv [jakes’ pal’ne] [v kožen bak].
        Michael poured [some (kind of) gas]_{ACC} [into every tank]_{GEN}
        ‘Michael filled some gas into every tank.’

     d. Mykhaylo zalyv [jakyjs’ bak] [kožnym vydom pal’nogo].
        Michael poured [some tank]_{ACC} [every type of gas]_{INSTR}
        ‘Michael filled some tank with every type of gas.’

         (some > every), *(every > some)
(13) a. Marijka zabrala [jakus' igrašku] [ u kožnoj dytyny].
Mary took.away [some toy](ACC) [PP at [every child](GEN)]
‘Mary took away some toy from every child.’

b. Marijka zabrala [ u jakojis’ dytyny] [kožnu igrašku].
Mary took.away [PP at [some child] (GEN)] [every toy](ACC)
‘Mary took away from some child every toy.’

'[^\s'\S]*'
Interaction of Specificity and Scope in Group 3

(14) a. Marijka podaruvala [jakus' igrašku] [kožníj dytyni].
Mary presented [some toy] (ACC) [every child](DAT)
'Mary presented some toy to every child.'

b. Marijka podaruvala [jakijs' dytyni] [kožnu igrašku].
Mary presented [some child] (DAT) [every toy](ACC)
'Mary presented some child with every toy.'

The interesting contrast arises once object shift is applied to two objects:

c. Marijka [jakijs' dytyni] [kožnu igrašku] podaruvala.
Mary [some child] (DAT) [every toy] (ACC) presented
'Mary presented some specific child with every toy.'
'For every toy, Mary presented it to some child in a set of children.'
Interaction of Specificity and Scope in Spray-Load Alternations

(15) a. Mykhaylo zavantažyv [jakis’ igry] [na kožen kompjuter].
   Michael loaded [some games]ACC [on every computer]GEN
   ‘Michael loaded some games on every computer.’
   (some > every), (every> some)

b. Mykhaylo zavantažyv [jakyjs’ kompjuter] [usima igrami]/[kožnoju groju].
   Michael loaded [some computer]ACC [all games]INSTR /[every game]INSTR
   ‘Michael loaded some computer with all the games/every game.’
   (some > every), *(every> some)

c. Mykhaylo [jakyjs’ kompjuter] zavantažyv [usima igrami]/[kožnoju groju].
   Michael [some computer]ACC loaded [all/every game]INSTR
   (some > every), *(every> some)

d. Mykhaylo [jakyjs’ kompjuter] [usima igrami]/[kožnoju groju] zavantažyv.
   Michael [some computer]ACC [all/every game]INSTR loaded
   (some > every), *(every> some)
The Account of Scope Freezing: Antonyuk (2015)

SF Generalization (SFG): *Scope freezing always results from overt raising of one QP over another to a c-commanding position as an instance of single movement.*

Antonyuk (2015) proposes to account for Scope Freezing that assimilates it to **Domain Restriction Binding** (Stanley & Szabó (2000), Stanley (2002)) and leverages the fact that all of Russian and Ukrainian scope inversion constructions have the general effect of “topicalizing” the fronted item. Thus, I suggest that when a quantifier is raised over another to a c-commanding position the result is creation of a “domain topic”, with the now higher QP (QP2) binding into the restriction of QP1.

(16)
Antonyuk (2015) Applied to Ukrainian Data

(17) a. Marijka zabrala [jakus' igrašku] [u kožnoji dytyny].
Mary took away [some toy](ACC) [PP at [every child](GEN)]
‘Mary took away some toy from every child.’

b. Marijka zabrala [u jakojis' dytyny] [kožnu igrašku].
Mary took away [PP at [some child] (GEN)] [every toy](ACC)
‘Mary took away from some child every toy.’

LF for (17b):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Marijka zabrala [u jakojis' dytyny]}_i [kožnu igrašku]_i [u jakojis' dytyny] \\
\end{array}
\]

**BINDING**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Marijka zabrala [u jakojis' dytyny]}_i [kožnu igrašku]_i [u jakojis' dytyny] \\
\end{array}
\]

**MOVEMENT**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Marijka zabrala [u jakojis' dytyny]}_i [kožnu igrašku]_i [u jakojis' dytyny] \\
\end{array}
\]
Antonyuk (2015) Applied to Ukrainian Data

Interaction of specificity and scope in Ukrainian:

(17) c. Marijka [u jakojis’ dytyny] zabrala [kožnu igrašku].
Mary [PP at [some child] (GEN)] took.away [every toy](ACC)
‘Mary took away from some specific child every toy’

(∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃)

d. Marijka [u jakojis’ dytyny] [kožnu igrašku] zabrala.
Mary [PP at [some child] (GEN)] [every toy](ACC) took.away
‘Mary took some specific child’s every toy’

(∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃)

LF for (17d):

Marijka [u jakojis’ dytyny], [kožnu igrašku] [vP zabrala [u jakojis’ dytyny] [kožnu igrašku][u jakojis’ dytyny]]

\[\text{BINDING}\]

\[\uparrow\]

\[\text{QP2 SPECIFICITY MVT}\]

\[\text{QP1 SPECIFICITY MVT}\]
Conclusions and Implications

Ukrainian data raises empirical and theoretical problems for Bruening’s (2001) account and fully falsifies the S&S’s Generalization.

- The interaction between specificity and scope in Ukrainian ditransitives and *Spray-Load Alternations* shows that Bruening’s original formulation of the account needs to be altered.

**Implications:**
Other languages with INT(erpretation)-driven object shift....
Other languages that show scope freezing in ditransitives and/or other syntactic contexts


THANK YOU!

Contact us with questions/for additional data:

syudina@gmail.com or roks.mykhaylyk@gmail.com

The slides and related papers will be available at our web pages:

www.lingoscope.org and sites.google.com/site/rmykhaylyk/
Appendix 1: “Specificity” as a Contextually Defined Feature

INT-as-Contextually-Defined-Feature Hypothesis (Mykhaylyk 2010)

- INT is a semantically interpretable feature on v,
- the checking of INT corresponds to the assignment of values to the context-sensitive elements within vP.

**Specificity = Partitivity:** It denotes an individual that is a member of the set introduced by previous discourse (Enç 1991; Diesing 1992).

**Specificity = Referentiality:** the speaker intends to refer to a unique individual in the set denoted by the NP, and considers this individual to possess some noteworthy property (Fodor & Sag 1982; Ionin 2003).

Specificity / definiteness / presuppositionality
Specific direct object

1. a. Maria odnu knyžku maje pročytaty, ale ne može jiji znajty.
   Maria one book has to read but not can her find
   ‘Maria has to read a (certain) book, but she cannot find it.’

b. # Maria odnu knyžku maje pročytaty, ale šče ne vyrišyla jaku.
   Maria one book has to read but yet not decided which
   ‘Maria has to read a (certain) book, but she has not decided yet which one.’
2. a. My vse šče šukaly potribnu literaturu, a Ivan knyhu vže kupyv.
   ‘We were still searching for necessary literature, while Ivan have already bought
   a certain book (from the list of necessary literature).

   b. My vse šče šukaly podarunok, a Ivan uže kupyv knyhu.
   ‘We were still searching for a gift, while Ivan have already bought a/some book.’
Specificity effect in Passive Accusative

3. a. Rik tomu na robotu bulo pryjnjato novu sekretarku.
   year ago on job was accepted new secretary
   ‘A new secretary was hired a year ago.’ (The company needed someone who knew
   English; that is why some changes in our personnel occurred.)

   ‘A new secretary was hired a year ago. She was chosen out of ten candidates.’