Title: On Paucal Numerals and Adjectivals in Russian
Author: Asya Pereltsvaig, Stanford University

Quantified constructions, and especially those with paucal numerals, present a problem in Russian morphosyntax that has received much attention in Leonard Babby's work (Babby 1987 and elsewhere). In this paper, we propose an update to Babby's analysis of paucal constructions in Russian by applying two important lessons derived from Babby's own work: that careful examination of data is necessary before an analysis can be attempted, and that a satisfactory synchronic analysis cannot be achieved without considering diachronic aspects of the problem at hand.

Babby (1987) coined the terms "heterogeneous" and "homogeneous" case patterns with respect to Russian quantified constructions, and it is the former pattern – whereby non-paucal numerals always appear with genitive plural complements, as in (1) – that has received much attention in later literature (Franks 1995, Bailyn 2004, Ionin and Matushansky 2004, Rappaport 2004, Pereltsvaig 2006, 2009, and elsewhere). Paucal numerals are particularly interesting because they appear with complements whose morphological form may be genitive singular (2), nominative plural (3a), or genitive plural (3b), depending on the type of the complement. Furthermore, in certain cases, the morphological forms of the elements in the complement of a paucal numeral may be mismatched (4). Most analyses of paucal numerals aim to account for the data in (2) as the core pattern, regarding the data in (3) as exceptional. In this paper, we argue that it is the data in (3) that represent the core pattern, while examples such as (2) require a special analysis, the burden of which we place on morphology, rather than syntax. By doing so, we relate the data of the heterogeneous case pattern to the data of the homogeneous case pattern, while also providing an explanation that makes sense in the diachronic perspective. Our analysis is further supported by extensive original data collected through speaker surveys, as well as corpus research.

(1)   pjat' {stol-ov   /   gor-Ø   /   gorničn-yx}
        five table(MASC)-GEN.PL   /   mountain(FEM)-GEN.PL /   maid(FEM)-GEN.PL
        'five {tables / mountains / maids}'

(2)   a.   tri   stol-a   b.   tri gor-ý
              three   table(MASC)-GEN.SG   three   mountain(FEM)-GEN.SG
              'three tables'   'three mountains'

(3)   a.   tri   gorničn-ye   b.   tri gorničn-yx
              three   maid(FEM)-NOM.PL   three   maid(FEM)-GEN.PL
              'three maids'   'three maids'

(4)   tri   {vysok-ie   /   vysok-ix}   gorý
              three   tall(FEM)-NOM.PL   /   tall(FEM)-GEN.PL   mountain(FEM)-GEN.SG
              'three tall mountains'

Babby, L. 1987. "Case, Prequantifiers, and Discontinuous Agreement in Russian." *NLLT* 5(1): 91–138.
Bailyn, J. 2004. The Case of Q. *FASL 12,* 1–36.
Franks, S. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press.
Ionin, T. & O. Matushansky 2004. The Non-Existence of Numerals. Presented at Linguistic Perspectives on Numerical Expressions, Utrecht, June 2004.
Pereltsvaig, A. 2006. Passing by Cardinals: In Support of Head Movement in Nominals. *FASL 14,* 277–292.
Pereltsvaig, A. 2009. As Easy as Two, Three, Four? *FASL 18.*
Rappaport, G. 2004. Numeral Phrases in Russian: A Minimalist Approach. *JSL* 10: 327–340.