

The one boy who kissed every girl: scope and discourse function in Russian

English sentences like (1) that contain two quantifiers typically exhibit scope ambiguity. The corresponding sentences in Russian, on the other hand, allow only scope that corresponds to the surface configuration (cf.: 2). In this paper, I argue that, despite appearances, Russian has covert QR as well as reconstruction; I show that both are directly related to discourse function.

Russian exhibits scope rigidity in both standard SVO order (2a), and scrambled OVS order (2b), in intonationally neutral sentences. Any account of these facts must answer two questions:

Q1: Does covert QR exist in Russian, and (if so) what is its distribution?

Q2: Does scope reconstruction exist in Russian, and (if so) what is its distribution?

Answer to Q1: Contrary to appearances, covert QR exists in Russian, as evidenced by a quantifier's ability to scope over a higher adverb (3). However, a quantifier is unable to scope over another quantifier (2) or over an intensional verb (4). Adopting the framework of Heim and Kratzer (1998) / Fox (2000), I argue that covert QR in Russian is motivated only by type considerations. Assuming that QPs are of type $\langle et, t \rangle$, a QP must move at least as far as the spec of vP in order to be interpretable (Heim and Kratzer 1998). The sentences in (2) would then have the LFs in (5). I argue that in Russian, in contrast to English, QR to a higher position – not motivated by type considerations – is impossible. This difference is tied to the existence in Russian, but not in English, of overt quantifier movement through scrambling (2b): operations that can be done overtly are not done covertly. This explanation raises the question of why QR for type considerations is not overt in Russian – i.e., why (under neutral intonation), cases such as (6) are outlawed. I suggest that this is due to the nature of scrambling in Russian: I will show that in intonationally neutral sentences, leftward scrambling is always motivated by topicalization (King 1995), and that there is typically only one preverbal internal topic position.

Answer to Q2: I suggest that lack of scope reconstruction in Russian is also tied to discourse function. King (1995) argues that all leftward DP-movement in intonationally neutral sentences, including subject raising (5a), is motivated by the discourse property of topicalization. I suggest that full reconstruction of the topicalized DP is impossible, since the reconstructed element would no longer function as the topic. By Economy, vacuous application of topicalization is not allowed. I formulate the constraint in (i):

i) *Preservation of Discourse Function: The topicalizing operator cannot undergo reconstruction at LF*

This constraint predicts that *partial* reconstruction of the leftmost DP should be possible, as long as the topicalizing operator stays in its surface position. I will show that this prediction is carried out in two domains: pair-list readings and anaphor binding.

Sauerland (2000) argues that the pair-list reading of a *how-many* question can be derived through partial reconstruction. In his analysis, the [n-many NP] part of the phrase undergoes reconstruction, while [how(n)] stays in its surface position. On the other hand, Sauerland argues that *which*-phrases cannot undergo partial reconstruction, since that would create a WCO effect. Given the constraint in (i), we then expect to find pair-list readings available for Russian *how-many* phrases (through partial reconstruction), but not for Russian *which*-phrases. This prediction is confirmed, as (7) and (8) demonstrate.

Evidence for availability of partial reconstruction is also found in the domain of anaphor binding. Reconstruction of a scrambled DP for anaphor binding is allowed in Russian (9a). However, when reconstruction for binding results in reconstruction for scope, the sentence becomes ungrammatical under neutral intonation (9b). I suggest that (9a) and (9b) have the logical structures in (10a) and (10b), respectively, with the topicalizing element being separated from the anaphoric part of the phrase, which reconstructs. (10b) describes the pragmatically impossible situation of a single dog (the topic of 9b) belonging to every boy – hence the ungrammaticality of (9b). Full reconstruction of the scrambled DP in (9b) is ruled out by (i).

Given this account of scope rigidity in intonationally neutral sentences, I will also show that sentences in which two constituents receive contrastive focus (and stress) allow for scope ambiguity (11). Unlike topics, contrastively focussed DPs do not have to be in preverbal position (cf.: Junghanns and Zybatow, 1997). Adapting Krifka's (1998) analysis of focus in German to the Russian data, I will suggest that focus creates LF-movement possibilities that are otherwise disallowed, such as optional QR and full reconstruction for scope. Thus (11a) can have either one of the LFs in (12), and (11b) – in (13).

1. one boy kissed every girl (a>every), (every>a)
2. a) *odin mal'chik poceloval kazhduju devochku* (*neutral intonation*)
 one boy-NOM kissed every girl-ACC (one>every) *(every>one)
- b) *odnu devochku poceloval kazhdyj mal'chik t* (*neutral intonation*)
 one girl-ACC kissed every boy-NOM (one>every) *(every>one)
3. *Masha chasto obedaet s kazhdym mal'chikom* (*neutral intonation*)
 Mary often dines with every boy-INSTR ?(often>every), (every>often)
4. *Masha otkazalas' uvolit' bol'she des'jati rabochix* (*neutral intonation*)
 Mary refused fire-INF more ten-GEN workers
 (refuse>more than ten): Mary refused to fire more than ten workers (but she is willing to fire up to ten)
 *(more than ten>refuse): There are more than ten workers whom Mary refused to fire
5. a) [_{IP} *odin mal'chik*₁ [_{VP} *kazhduju devochku*₂ t₁ [_{VP} *poceloval* t₂]]]
- b) [_{IP} *odnu devochku*₂ [_{VP} t₂' *kazhdyj mal'chik*₁ [_{VP} *poceloval* t₂]]]
6. ??/**odin mal'chik kazhduju devochku poceloval* (*neutral intonation*)
 one boy-NOM every girl-ACC kissed
7. (*ja xochu znat'*) *skol'kix devochek poceloval kazhdyj mal'chik* (*neutral intonation*)
 (I want know-INF) how-many girls-ACC kissed every boy-NOM
 “(I want to know) how many girls every boy kissed”
 ?(how many>every): possible answer “Every boy kissed 2 girls”
 (every>how many): pair-list answer “John kissed 2 girls, Bill kissed 3 girls, and Sam kissed 5 girls”
8. (*ja xochu znat'*) *kakuju devochku poceloval kazhdyj mal'chik* (*neutral intonation*)
 (I want know-INF) which girl-ACC kissed every boy-NOM
 “(I want to know) which girl every boy kissed”
 (which>every): possible answer “Every boy kissed Mary”
 *(every>which): *pair-list answer “John kissed Mary, Bill kissed Sue, and Sam kissed Alice”
9. a) [_{svoju}₁ *sobaku*]₂ *videla Masha*₁ t₂ (*neutral intonation*)
 [_{self's}₁ *dog-ACC*]₂ saw Mary₁-NOM t₂
 “Mary saw her own dog”
- b) ??/* [_{svoju}₁ *sobaku*]₂ *videl [kazhdyj mal'chik]*₁ t₂ (*neutral intonation*)
 [_{self's}₁ *dog-ACC*]₂ saw [every boy-NOM]₁ t₂
 “Every boy saw his own dog”
10. a) x such that (x is a dog, and x belongs to Mary, and Mary saw x)
- b) x such that (x is a dog, and y (if y is a boy then x belongs to y and y saw x))
11. a) *ODIN mal'chik poceloval KAZHDUJU devochku* (*double focus*)
 one-FOC boy-NOM kissed every-FOC girl-ACC (one>every), (every>one)
- b) *ODNU devochku poceloval KAZHDYJ mal'chik* (*double focus*)
 one-FOC girl-ACC kissed every-FOC boy-NOM (one>every), (every>one)
12. a) [_{IP} *odin mal'chik*₁ [_{IP} *kazhduju devochku*₂ [_{VP} t₂' t₁ [_{VP} *poceloval* t₂]]]]]
- b) [_{IP} ____₁ [_{IP} *kazhduju devochku*₂ [_{VP} t₂' *odin mal'chik*₁ [_{VP} *poceloval* t₂]]]]]
13. a) [_{IP} *odnu devochku*₂ [_{IP} *kazhdyj mal'chik*₁ [_{VP} t₂' t₁ [_{VP} *poceloval* t₂]]]]]
- b) [_{IP} ____₂ [_{IP} *kazhdyj mal'chik*₁ [_{VP} *odnu devochku*₂ t₁ [_{VP} *poceloval* t₂]]]]]

References:

- Fox, D. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Heim, I., and A. Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Junghanns, U. and G. Zybatow. 1997. Syntax and information structure of Russian clauses. *Proceedings of FASL: The Cornell Meeting, 1995*, 289-319.
- King, T.H. 1995. *Configuring Topic and Focus in Russian*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Krifka, M. 1998. Scope inversion under the rise-fall contour in German. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 662-688.
- Sauerland, U. 2000. “How many”-questions and pair-list situations. *Snippets* 1, 17-18.