FOCUS MOVEMENT AND ASSOCIATION WITH *ONLY* IN RUSSIAN AND CHINESE

Ksenia Zanon (Bucknell University) and Yu-Yin Hsu (Hong Kong Polytechnic University)

Under scrutiny are the syntactic properties of Russian (Rus) and Chinese (Chn) *only* and the strategies involved in associating *only* with a focus-marked constituent. There are two main arguments defended in this paper. First, Rus *tol'ko* and Chn *zhiyou* are adverbial, not adnominal (in contrast to English, in which *only* evinces properties of both, see Taglicht 1984). Further, *tol'ko* and *zhiyou* are generated on the edge of the verbal domain. Second, both languages require syntactic focus movement of the F-marked associate to *only*. The resulting *zhiyou*+XP$_F$ complex is strictly preverbal in Chn; in Rus *tol'ko*+XP$_F$ is eligible to either precede or follow the verb.

Unlike English (1), where *only* can be associated with either argument in the predicate, yielding distinct truth conditional interpretations (Rooth 1985), Rus *tol'ko* and Chn *zhiyou* impose an adjacency requirement, as demonstrated by ungrammatical (2) and (3). In order to render (2) and (3) acceptable, *tol'ko* and *zhiyou* must surface next to their F-marked associates, as in (4a/b) for Rus and (5a) for Chn. The two languages depart from each other in the surface ordering of the *only*-complex and the verb: in Rus, both orders, i.e [**only**+XP$_F$]>V in (4a) and V>[**only**+XP$_F$] in (4b), are fine; Chn tolerates [**only**+XP$_F$]-complex strictly in preverbal positions (cf.: (5a) and (5b)).

(1) a. I **only** introduced [BILL]$_F$ to Sue.
   b. I **only** introduced Bill [TO SUE]$_F$.

(2) a. *Andrej   **tol'ko** ispek   [PIROG]$_F$ dlja sestry.   [Rus]
         Andrey   only   baked   pie   for sister
         Intended: 'Andrey only baked [A PIE]$_F$ for his sister.'
   b. *Andrej **tol'ko** ispek pirog [DLJA SESTRY]$_F$.

(3) a. *Zhangsan **zhiyou** qinzi   kao   [DANGAO]$_F$ gei jiejie.   [Chn]
         Zhangsan only   personally bake   cake   for sister
         Intended: 'ZS only backed [A CAKE]$_F$ for his sister himself'
   b. *Zhangsan **zhiyou** qinzi kao dangao [GEI JIEJIE]$_F$.

(4) a. Andrej **tol'ko** [PIROG]$_F$ ispek dlja sestry.   [Rus]
   b. Andrej ispek **tol'ko** [PIROG]$_F$ dlja sestry.

(5) a. Zhangsan **zhiyou** [DANGAO]$_F$ qinzi kao gei jiejie.   [Chn]
   b. *Zhangsan qinzi kao **zhiyou** [DANGAO]$_F$ gei jiejie.

Though it is tempting to conclude on the basis of the dataset above that *only* in Rus and Chn is adnominal, there are three arguments that militate against such an approach. First, *only* cannot be wedged in between a preposition and an NP, as demonstrated by contrasts in (6) and (7) (see Büring and Hartmann 2001 for German). This follows from the proposal: since *tol'ko* and *zhiyou* are adverbs with a designated base position in the verbal domain, they cannot be merged with the NP. This is further confirmed by Rus Left-Branch Extraction (LBE) facts in (8): (8a) shows that LBE of adverbial modifiers out of a noun phrase is in principle acceptable (but see Talić 2015); (8b), on the other hand, with the attempted movement of *tol'ko*, is infelicitous, which we take to indicate that *only* originates outside of the NP. Finally, consider the issues of interpretation in (9) and (10) (Taglicht 1984): the adnominal (NP-adjacent) *only* in (9) is ambiguous. The adverbial one in (10), however, is not: it is interpreted in the clause, in which it appears. Now consider Chn in (11): despite the adjacency of *only* to its NP-associate, the matrix predicate obligatorily scopes over *only,* hence replicating the interpretation effects of (10a) rather than (9). Russian likewise shows the lack of ambiguity with [**only**+XP$_F$] in embedded contexts like (10).

(6) a. … **tol'ko**   dlja   sestry   [Rus]   (7) a. …**zhiyou** gei   jiejie   [Chn]
           only   for   sister   only   for   sister
   b.* dlja **tol'ko** sestry   b. *…gei **zhiyou**   jiejie

(8) a. Očen'$_i$ on [$t_i$interesnuju knigu] pročital?   b. *Tol'ko on [KNIGI]$_F$ prines?   [Rus]
        very   he interesting book read   only   he books   brought
        'Did he read a very interesting book?'   Intended: 'Did he only bring books?'

(9) I knew that he had learnt only Spanish. [adnominal]
   a. *knew > only*: I knew he hadn't learnt any other language.
   b. *only > knew*: I didn't know he had learnt any other language.

(10) a. I knew that he had <u>only</u> learnt <u>Spanish</u>. ^{OK}*knew > only*; **only > knew*
    b. I <u>only</u> knew that he had learnt <u>Spanish</u>. ^{OK}*only > knew*; **knew > only*

(11) Wo zhidao ta   **zhiyou** [XIBANYAWEN]$_F$ cai   xue-guo. ^{OK}*knew>only;***only>knew*
    I   know   he   only   Spanish   then   learn-ASP
    'I knew that he had learnt only Spanish.'

The proposed derivation is provided in (12a) for Rus (4a) and Chn (5a): *only* is generated on the edge of *v*P; its F-marked associate moves to right-adjoin to it, driven by the syntactic focus feature. Since the verb in Chn is confined to the VP-shell (Huang 1991), we obtain the obligatory preverbal placement of the *only*-complex (hence ruling out (5b)). An additional position is available for *only* in Rus (but not Chn) – on the edge of VP, as in (12b). While Russian too, is argued to lack movement to T, the language is shown to raise the verb out of its base position (Bailyn 1995, Gribanova 2013). If so, the configuration in (12b) results in a string-vacuous focus arrangement (after V-to-*v* raising), exemplified by (4b). Evidence for the latter claim is provided by the interpretation facts in (13). In unambiguous (13a) and (13c) *only* belongs in the relevant clause (matrix in (13a) and embed in (13c)). But there are two possibilities for (13)(13b): either *only* is generated on the edge of the matrix VP, in which case its associate moves to adjoin to it (this gives rise to the wide scope interpretation of *only*), as schematized in (14i), or the *only*-complex belongs in the lower clause, which then yields a narrow scope reading, as in (14ii).

(12) a. [$_{vP}$ [ONLY+XP$_F$] …*v*…[$_{VP}$ V t$_{XP}$]]   <Chn, Rus>
    b. [$_{vP}$ …*v*…[$_{VP}$[ONLY+XP$_F$] V t$_{XP}$]]   <Rus>

(13) a. Ja   ugovoril   dočku   [vyučit'   **tol'ko** [ISPANSKIJ]$_F$].
    I   convinced   daughter   to.learn   only   Spanish
        [i] ^{OK}convinced> only: I convinced her to learn no other language.
        [ii] *only > convinced: I didn't convince her to learn any other language.
    b. Ja ugovoril dočku **tol'ko** [ISPANSKIJ]$_F$ vyučit'. ^{OK}*convinced> only;* ^{OK}*only > convinced*
    c. Ja **tol'ko** [ISPANSKIJ]$_F$ ugovoril dočku [vyučit']. **convinced> only;* ^{OK}*only > convinced*

(14)   i. [$_{CP1}$ **verb** [$_{VP1}$ *only* +**NP** t$_V$ [$_{TP2}$…*t*$_{NP}$]]]
    ii. [$_{CP1}$ [$_{VP1}$ [[$_{TP2}$ …[$_{vP2}$*only* +**NP** **verb** [$_{VP}$…*t*$_V$ … *t*$_{NP}$]]]

Finally, we consider some cases of apparent violations of the adjacency requirement. One such context is in (15): the nominal head is the F-marked element here. In the presence of modifiers, however, the noun cannot be adjacent to *only*. Since the heads are not subject to A'-movement, this focalized N-head cannot be extracted, so the entire phrase must be pied-piped to *only*.

(15) Deduška   znaet   tol'ko (**kvalifitsirovannogo**) [GASTROENTEROLOGA]$_F$.   [Rus]
    pawpaw   knows   only   qualified   gastroenterologist
    (but he does not know a competent surgeon)

Based on (15) and a number of additional contexts of felicitous non-adjacency to *only*, we show that the intervener and the focalized element must be dominated by the same XP. Furthermore, this XP ought to be the minimal element, dominating the focalized element that can move (see Bošković 2004, Chomsky 1995, Stateva 2002 for arguments on minimal pied-piping). This approach allows us to rule in a constrained set of instances where [XP]$_F$ is not adjacent to *only*, while still ruling out examples like (16) with the attempted association inside an island (cf. English translation in (16)).

(16) *Ja   znaju   **tol'ko** čeloveka, kotoryj   vyraščivaet   [ABRIKOSY]$_F$.   [Rus]
    I   know   only   man   who   grows   apricots
    Intended: 'I <u>only</u> know a man who grows <u>apricots</u>.'

We also discuss the behavior of *only* in contexts with multiple foci (e.g., in the presence of Y/N question marker *li* in Rus) as well as some properties of the "second" Chn *only 'zhi'*.

References**: Bailyn, J.** 1995. Underlying phrase structure and "short" verb movement in Russian. *JSL*3. **Bošković, Ž**. Be careful where you float your quantifiers. *NLLT 22*. **Büring, D., & Hartmann, K**. 2001. The syntax and semantics of focus-Sensitive particles in German. *NLLT 19*. **Chomsky, N.** 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge: MIT. **Gribanova, V.** 2013. Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis and the structure of the Russian verbal complex. *NLLT* 31. **Huang C.-T. J**. 1991. Verb movement, (in)definiteness, and the thematic hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Chinese Languages and Linguistics (IsCLL2)*. **Rooth, M.** 1985. *Association with focus*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell. **Stateva, P.** 2002. Possessive Clitics and the Structure of Nominal Expressions. *Lingua* 112.**Taglicht, J.** 1984. *Message and emphasis: on focus and scope in English*. London: Longman. **Talić, A**. 2015. Adverbial Left-Branch Extraction and the Structure of AP in Slavic. In Proceedings of FASL 24.