

1. The scope puzzle of Mandarin RCs

English relative clauses (RCs) like (1a) are ambiguous. Under the head raising analysis of RCs (Kayne 1994, cf. 1b), the availability of inverse scope in (1a) derives from its availability in simple transitives (1c).

Mandarin RCs (2a) also show the same ambiguity as their English counterparts. However, as widely noted (Huang 1982, Aoun and Li 1993), Mandarin simple transitives (2b) are unambiguous.

- (1) a. I have met three students that speak every language. (3 > 1) $\forall; \forall > 3)$
 - **b.** $[_{DP}$ three students_i $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TP} e_i$ speak every language]]]
 - **c.** Three students speak every language. $(3 > \forall; \forall > 3)$
- (2) a. Wo jian-guo [jiang mei-zhong yuyan de san-ge xuesheng]. language DE three-CL student meet-ASP speak every-CL 'I have met three students who speak every language.'
 - **b.** San-ge xuesheng jiang mei-zhong yuyan. three-CL speak every-CL student language 'Three students speak every language.' $(3 > \forall; *\forall > 3)$
- How can scope ambiguity in (2a) be captured under head raising if the underlying transitive is unambiguous?
- We argue that the apparent puzzle arises from the analysis of (2b). We suggest that Mandarin "simple transitives" are not simple.

2. Fox(2000) on scope interpretation

- Three assumptions for interpreting quantifier scope (illustrated in (3)):
- (i) quantifiers not in interpretable positions (roughly, those sister to a type <e,t> phrase), must raise to an interpretable position;
- (ii) obligatory quantifier raising (QR) and quantifier lowering (QL) obey Shortest Move;
- (iii) optional QR and QL are possible only when they yield a truthconditional (TC) difference.



ences: Aoun, J and A. Li. 1993. The syntax of scope. MIT Press; Fox, D. 2000. Economy and semantic interpretation. MIT Press; Huang, C-T. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese. PhD thesis MIT.; Kayne, R. 1994. The categorical and the thetic judgment. Foundations of Language 9(2), 153-185; Li, C.-N. and S. A. Thompson. 1981. Mandarin Chinese: a functional reference grammar. University of California Press; Liu, Y. and H. Wu. 2016. Quantifier scope in Mandarin is not a scope rigid language. Ms., Stony Brook University. In L. Haegeman. (ed.), Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative synatx, 281-337. Kluwer Publications; Wu, H. 2017. Mandarin is not a scope rigid language. Ms., Stony Brook University.

The 48th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 48) – Reykjavík, Iceland – 29 October 2017

Rethinking quantifier scope in Mandarin Hongchen Wu, Richard Larson, Yaobin Liu, Lei Liu, Gary Mar

Stony Brook University

- Obligatory QR/QL -----Optional QR/QL — - - vP<t> VP<e,t>

3. TopP projection of Mandarin transitives

- Assume Mandarin transitives are identical to English up to TP, but contain <u>an</u> additional, higher TopP projection, to which Mandarin subjects typically raise (cf. Li and Thompson 1981, who characterize Mandarin as a "topic-prominent" language")'
- Assume that Top has no TC content.
- Then scope in (2b) is expected to be frozen under Fox(2002).



4. Predictions and language data

- Predictions of this proposal:
- (i) in clausal environments where TopP is unavailable, Mandarin transitives should show Q-scope ambiguity.
- (ii) ceteris paribus scope freezing in Mandarin should be confined to subjects and objects; directs objects and PP objects should show scope permutation.
- RCs like (2a) are widely held to involve a reduced left periphery that doesn't include TopP (Rizzi 1997). Ambiguity in(2a) is thus expected: minus TopP; Mandarin RCs have essentially the same structure as English (1a), and allow ambiguity in the same way.
- Wu (2017) notes that Mandarin embedded clauses like (5a), strongly disfavor non-contrastive topicalization (5b); they also more freely admit scope ambiguity than the corresponding matrix sentences (5c).
- Mandarin PP Datives like (6a) show scope ambiguity (cf. 6b); the inverse scope is even preferred given the pragmatics (Liu and Wu 2016).
- (5) a. Jingzhang shuo-guo [Zhangsan kanshou nei-ge chukou]. that-CL exit 'The sheriff said Zhangsan guards that exit.'
 - b. ?? Jingzhang shuo-guo [nei-ge-chukou] Zhangsan kanshou.
 - **c.** Jingzhang shuo-guo [san-ming jingcha kanshou mei-ge chukou]. three-CL policeman guard every-CL exit sherif 'The sheriff said three policeman guard every exit.' $(3 > \forall; \forall > 3)$

- (6) a. Laoshi song-le yi-xie pingyu [pp gei mei-ge xuesheng]. teacher give-ASP some comment to every-CL student



- scope.
- Kuroda (1972) notes that subjects of **thetic sentences** are de-topicalized. Suppose thetic sentences lack TopP. E.g., (7) is naturally understood thetically, i.e., as a statement about a quantificational regularity that exists or is required, rather than categorically, i.e., as a statement about particular people. Understood thetically, Mandarin speakers allow (7) to be read ambiguously with respect to scope.
- When Mandarin embedded subjects (e.g., *heiyiren* 'man in black' in (8)) are understood as matrix topics, *de re* readings become possible with respect to modals and attitude verbs (e.g., *xiangxin* 'believe').
- (Anzhao falv guiding) san-ming jingcha kanshou meige chukou. (7) every exit policeman guard 'As required by law, three policemen guard every exit.' $(3 > \forall; \forall > 3)$
- Qinshihuang xiangxin heiyiren shi cike. (8) assassin *de dicto*: 'QSH believes for some x, man-in-black(x), x wants to assassinate him.' || *de re*: 'For some x, man-in-black(x), QSH believes that x wants to assassinate him.'

5. Conclusion

- function as topics.
- In contexts like non-topical subjects, objects, etc., freezing disappears and Mandarin behaves more similarly to English, as expected under Fox (2000).



'The teacher gave some comments to every student.' **b.** Derivations of (6a): both object QPs must raise by obligatory QR to vP $\exists > \forall \forall \forall d \in \mathsf{E}$

		∀ > ∃ — — —
vP <t></t>		
oshi	***	
yi-xie pingy	u	***
	***	mei-ge xuesheng

(iii) quantified subjects understood as non-topical should allow for inverse

(iv) Mandarin subjects should show ambiguity in sentences with intensionals.

- The scope puzzle introduced by Mandarin RCs leads to a wider rethinking of scope in Mandarin in which "scope freezing" is not a general property of the language, but rather found with subjects and objects when the former