

ON THE SYSTEM STRUCTURE
OF
RUSSIAN RELATIVE QUANTIFIERS

0.1. Before enlarging on our subject proper, allow us to recall a few facts of a more general nature.

It soon became obvious that sentences like

(1) *Everyone in the room knows at least two languages*

or

(2) *Many men read few books*

behaved in a somewhat mischievous way when subjected to transformational attempts, since sentences

(3) *At least two languages are known by everyone in the room*

and

(4) *Few books are read by many men*

do not seem to retain the same meaning as their active counterparts. This quandary is perhaps best described by Chomsky (with reference to sentences (1) and (3), respectively) who thinks it has something to do with "an extraneous factor - an overriding consideration involving order of quantifiers in surface structure - that filters out certain latent interpretations provided by the deep structures" (N. Chomsky 1965:224). (Examples 2, 4 are found in Lakoff 1969:6).

This is not the place to try and solve the intricate problem of English quantification. However, in our view, any such attempt would benefit from a comparison with the system of Russian quantifiers, bearing in mind that this system is conspicuously well developed and rich in forms. This abundance, if anything, does not diminish the need for a systematic approach - earlier attempts

to describe the meaning of Russian quantifiers have unfortunately tended to disregard the relevance of this consideration (e.g. O. N. Seliverstova 1964:80-90 and E. V. Padučeva 1974:78-110).

0.2. Since the days of Saussure (and in Slavonic languages well before him in the Polish scholar J. Baudouin de Courtenay) the systematic approach to language has proved increasingly relevant and fruitful. Language is viewed as a closed system of mutually interdependent entities deriving their value from this relationship, and the synchronic description of how the linguistic content is organized, *la forme de contenu*, has become a primary task for linguistic inquiry. If, for a long period, phonology was in the focus of attention, the systematic approach has proved useful also in the field of semantics. As in phonology, semantic analysis is concerned with distinctive features and oppositions between the elements of the semantic content form.

That language should be viewed as a closed system of coherent elements in a more or less stable state of equilibrium (the latter point is brought out by S. Karcevsky (1964:86): "Chacun 'déborde' les assignés pour lui par son partenaire: le signifiant cherche à avoir d'autres fonctions que sa fonction propre, le signifié cherche à s'exprimer par d'autres moyens que son signe. Ils sont asymétriques; accouplés, ils se trouvent dans un état d'équilibre instable.") is perhaps best illustrated by the so-called asymmetric or privative opposition as introduced by Karcevsky in reference to phonology and as applied on morphology by Roman Jakobson, and other representatives of the Prague School. This concept actually originates from the concept of logical contradiction and as such the ass. opposition is by definition binary. On the basis of a certain shared feature, the *Korrelationsmerkmal*, the two members, or sub-classes, of an opposition

are regarded as marked (*merkmalhaltig*) or unmarked (*merkmallos*) according to whether they explicitly state the existence of a given feature or not.

It should be emphasized that this feature may well be of the negative kind, in fact it will very often be, as we shall have ample opportunity to demonstrate. (This observation seems to be in agreement with Saussure's statement: "Dans la langue il n'y a que des différences" as M. Bogusławsky's view that negation is the crucial point in language and that, in fact, language is negation applied (from a series of lectures in Lund, 1977). Just to give an example of what we are referring to: according to Jakobson *ne u t r u m*, the neuter, is marked in relation to the masculine and the feminine gender. Only the neuter explicitly states the feature Non-Sex (*A-Sexualität*) (Jakobson, *Zur Struktur des russischen Verbuns*).

Jakobson warns against the false assumption that the two members of an opposition are equal in value, if category I stands for the meaning A, category II has the meaning B, or, at least, means the opposite of category I. In reality, however, if category I signalizes the presence of the feature A, category II does not say anything about the existence of this feature. If, with Jakobson's terminology, the general meaning (*Gesamtbedeutung*) of category I is the Signalization of the feature A, the *Gesamtbedeutung* of category II is the Non-Signalization of the feature A. (Jakobson 1932:3).

The *Gesamtbedeutung* (as defined by J. Rybák: "čo nemôžu nechat' nevyjadrené" (Rybák 1975:150) of a category must not be confused with either its contextual or combinatorial meaning (*spezifische Bedeutung*) or with its frequent contextual meaning (*Hauptbedeutung*).

1.1. Absolute and relative quantifiers (these terms have been coined by M. Bierwisch 1970:p. 35) share the following features:

1. they serve to predicate the size of sets,
2. in their linear ordering they precede the adjective,
3. they can appear in attributive as well as in predicative function. This is true only of one kind of rel. Q. (those signaling Non-Relation to the Logical Complement): *pjat' takix knig ~ takix knig pjat', mnogo takix knig ~ takix knig mnogo.*

As opposed to abs. Q. the rel. Quantifiers

1. do not indicate the exact number of the elements of a set,
2. instead they are structured around a certain norm of expectation (E. Leisi's term is "Erwartungsnorm", Leisi:1953) and, as such, they can be modified by various adverbs: *tol'ko, liš, sravnitel'no, očen', krajne, sliškom, počti* etc.,
3. can occupy the front position of an NP, thus preceding also an abs. Q.: *vse desjat' staršix uže byli pri dele* (A. Fadeev, "Molodaja Gvardija"), *esli vzjat' ljubye tri knigi* etc. This characteristic of the rel. Q. enables us to delimit their body on formal grounds: thus the term rel. Q. is defined as that constituent of an NP that can precede any other possible constituent within that phrase. (I emphasize *c a n*, because in the sentence *vse moi dela v porjadke* the word order may be reversed: *moi vse dela v porjadke*. Another instance of this (A. Solženicy'n, "Avgust Četyrnadcatogo"): *I spoxvatilsja Tomčak, čto odnu tol'ko malost' zabyl togda sprositi' u načal'nicy: so svoej vsej gimnaziej - veruet li v Boga ona?*

Notable as this fact may be from the point of view of West European languages, even a cursory look will suffice to show that, the word order where the Q. precedes the other constituents is by far the most frequent.

It is also obvious that this all but fixed word order reflects the semantic task of Q., viz. to delimit, according to some viewpoint, a certain quantity or set from the rest of this quantity or set. In fact, quanti-

fication could be compared with a searchlight illuminating part of a building while leaving the rest of it in darkness, which, of course, does not mean that this part does not exist; on the contrary, in my view, the residuary quantity (the logical complement) plays a crucial role in Russian quantification, since it should be considered the cornerstone, the *Korrelationsmerkmal* of an assymmetric opposition.

1.2. As in an earlier contribution (*Slavica Lundensia*, No. 1, pp.35-54) a distinction is made in the present article between Q. expressing "Gesamtmenge" (this term being too ambiguous we have replaced it with "Vollmenge" - in this article we shall use the term "Non-Relation to the Logical Complement" for the same concept) and "Teilmenge" ("Relation to the Logical Complement"), respectively. In contrast to the earlier version, however, these two categories of Q. have been integrated into one structural system defined by an assymmetric opposition in which the *Korrelationsmerkmal* is taken to be the relation to the logical complement (LC). This novel approach was prompted by the insight that the Q. taken to express "Teilmenge" solely proved to have a broader scope of meaning than that, cf. the treatment of these q. below.

2.1. Thus, with reference to the attached diagram, a first dichotomy can be said to prevail between the marked member of the opp. signaling Non-Relation to the Logical complement (+Non-Relation to the LC) and the unmarked member not signaling this (\pm Non-Relation to the LC).

2.2. A further division is made within either member of the opp. between + Non-Entirety and \pm Non-Entirety. Comment: perhaps contrary to expectation, neither *celyj* (in the member sign. + Non-Relation to the L.C.) nor *ves', vse, vsjaki,j, ljuboj* (in the member sign. + Non-Relation to the L.C.) can be said to have a clearcut meaning of + Entirety.

In sentences like: - *Tak ved' éto ž celaja revoljucija: - voskliknula Paša. - Da, éto nastojaščee otkrytie Ameriki -*, skazal *Lipjan* (V. Tarsis, "Kombinat naslaždenij") where *celyj* can be paraphrased with *nastojaščij* or *istinnyj*, or in a sentence like: *Vse devuški --- prislušivalis' k --- určaščemu rokotu, starajas' razgljadet' samolety v raskalennom vozduxe. - Ne odin, a celyx tri. - Gde, gde, ja ničego ne vižu* (A. Fadeev, "Molodaja Gvardija") where *celyx* serves to express the considerable or impressive size of the set in question (according to Ju. Apresjan *celyx pjat' let* has the meaning: "*pjat' let, i govornjaščij ščitaet, čto éto mnogo*") we are obviously confronted with another meaning than in e.g. the following sentence: *Buduči četyre goda tomu nazad na pervom kurse, on celyj semestr zanimalsja anatomiej na trupax* (B. Pasternak, "Doktor Živago") where it cannot be substituted for *nastojaščij* or *istinnyj*, but where its best paraphrase would be *ne menee* or *ne men'se) odnogo semestra*.

2.2.1. A similar state of affairs obtains, *mutatis mutandis*, in the unmarked member (\pm Non-Relation to the L.C.) where *ves'*, *vse*, apart from signaling (in their spezifische Bedeutung) +Entirety, can express - Entirety (or +Non-Entirety) in sentences like: *Vsja éta ljubov', ee volnenija i pereživanija, vse ničtožnye ličnye dramy vokrug nee - sliškom smakujutsja poëtami* (A. Solženicyn, "Avgust Četyrnadcatogo"), or in exclamations like: *Ves' étot adskij šum. Vsja éta volokita. Vsja éta prokljataja rabota!* Evidently, in these examples *ves'* and *vse* serve to emphasize the considerable or even excessive amount of the set.

On these grounds (and, as I shall further demonstrate below, *vsjakij* and *ljuboj* give additional reason) the member signaling Non-Entirety should be considered marked (+Non-Entirety). It may be argued that in view of the diversity of meaning of *celyj*, *ves'*, *vse* these Q. ought to be treated as separate, homonymous entities. This would lead to an atomization in linguistic analysis (against which Jakobson

warned in his "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums) which is not warranted by the linguistic facts, - after all the identity of forms must somehow be accounted for - and which would disregard the system principle, the relationships holding with other Q.

2.3. +Non-Entirety, comprises a series of assymmetric oppositions where the choice of quantifier takes place according to a certain norm of situational expectation.

(Hence the term "relative Q."). Thus we have a further division between +Non-Excess, and \pm Non-Excess. In the latter the marked member consists of +Excess with *mnogo* and \pm Excess with *nemalo*, whereas +Non-Excess, in its turn, comprises +Non-Deficiency with *neskol'ko*, and \pm Non-Deficiency, the latter, in its turn, splitting into +Deficiency with *malo*, and \pm Deficiency with *nemnogo*. Comment: cf. *U nego malo druzej* \rightarrow *u nego nemnogo druzej* (+Deficiency).

2.3.1. It should be noted that if, at the final stage, the binary opposition defines three lexemes it can optionally be described as tripartite, in which case the three members signalize +, -, and \pm , respectively. Thus, the opposition +Non-Deficiency \sim \pm Non-Deficiency (the unmarked member comprising +Deficiency \sim \pm Deficiency) defining the Q. *neskol'ko*, *malo*, and *nemnogo* can be described as +Deficiency with the implementation *malo*, -Deficiency with *neskol'ko*, and \pm Deficiency with *nemnogo*. Of course, this alternative tripartite way of description is not in conflict with the principal binariness of the structural system - it can be applied only at the final stage and as such it means the dissolution and reduction of the description of the final binary opposition into three members.

2.3.2. In the same conditions the marked member of the opposition can be described either in positive or negative terms, either as +Non-, or as -, e.g. as +Non-Deficiency or -Deficiency. Thus, *neskol'ko* can either be described as

+Non-Deficiency or -Deficiency, *malo* as -Non-Deficiency or +Deficiency, *nemnogo* as \pm Non-Deficiency or \pm Deficiency. Even if there may be said to be some arbitrariness in the choice of the marked member - either *neskol'ko* or *malo* - this is not true of the unmarked member (*nemnogo*) which will remain unmarked whichever Q. is singled out for the marked member, in view of the fact that its scope of meaning will be broader than that of either *neskol'ko* or *malo*. This shows that the relationship holding between the entities in question is not arbitrary but they are concatenated in a rigid structure defined by an asymmetric opposition, which, in its turn is assigned a definite place in a hierarchy of oppositions. That we have chosen to denote the marked member with +Non- has been motivated by a) its being in accordance with the rest of the oppositions, b) the fact that the meaning of *malo* and *nemnogo* are to a greater extent overlapping as compared with that of *neskol'ko* and so it would seem more warranted to place them under the same node (\pm Non-Deficiency). (It should be pointed out that the fact that the term "Deficiency" in itself may be regarded as having a negative meaning does not affect the description of the opposition. If we replace it with the term "Adequacy" the asymmetric opposition will remain: +Adequacy (*neskol'ko*), -Adequacy (*malo*), \pm Adequacy (*nemnogo*), or +Non-Adequacy (*malo*) \sim \pm Non-Adequacy comprising +Adequacy (*neskol'ko*) and \pm Adequacy (*nemnogo*).

3.0. Now let us consider (apart from what has been said about *ves'*, *vse* above) the unmarked member of the primary opposition, \pm Non-Relation to the L.C. As can be seen this member comprises a great deal more forms than the marked one (+Non-Relation) which is a perfectly normal state of things in view of the fact that it is the marked member that will show exclusiveness, its meaning being more restricted and clearcut than that of its unmarked counterpart.

3.1. Here, too, we have a first dichotomy between +Non-

Entirety, and \pm Non-Entirety. Let us first consider +Non-Entirety comprising +Non-Excess, and \pm Non-Excess, the latter with the form *mnogie*. Comment: It should be noted that *mnogie* has a wider range of meaning than *mnogo* in their respective members, since *mnogo* in the marked member is in opposition to *nemalo*. Whereas *mnogo* will always exceed the norm (+Excess), *mnogie* will not necessarily do so. In a sentence like: *Poslednie slova Gleba vzvolnovali raboćix. Mnogie vskoćili s mesta i stali trebovat' slova* (F. Gladkov, "Cement") we have to do with a considerable amount (+Excess), whereas in a sentence like: *Odnako isteričeskaja kampanija v Anglii; vražděbnaja Sovetskomu Sojuzu, zastavila mnogix zadumat'sja nad ee podlinnymi istokami i dvižuščimi silami* (the "Pravda", Dec. 19, 1968) it is not obvious that we are confronted with +Excess - here it could even be substituted for *koe-kogo*, or *nekotoryx*. (It is interesting to note that as a translation of German *manche* (not synonymous with *viele*) a Soviet German-Russian dictionary gives both *nekotorye* and *mnogie*).

3.1.1. +Non-Excess, in its turn, comprises +Non-Deficiency, and \pm Non-Deficiency, the latter consisting of +Deficiency with *malo kto* and \pm Deficiency with *nemnogie*. +Non-Deficiency is divided into +Non-Homogeneous and \pm Non-Homogeneous, the latter having the implementation *nekotoryj*. The feature "Homogeneous" roughly corresponds to Engl. "Uncountable".

3.1.2. +Non-Homogeneous comprises +Non-Collective with *koe-* (*koe-kto*, *koe-ćto*, *koe-kakie*) and \pm Non-Collective with *nekotorye*. Comment: By the term "Collective" I imply that the action denoted by the verb can only be carried out by a collective of elements. It is possible to say: *Nekotorye uexali odnovremenno* but not: **koe-kto uexal odnovremenno*. The same thing applies to: *Nekotorye peli xorom* as compared with: **Koe-kto pel xorom*.

3.3. So much about the marked member, +Non-Entirety. As far as \pm Non-Entirety is concerned it can be said to split

into +Non-Homogeneous and \pm Non-Homogeneous, the latter having the implementation *ves'* (cf. the above comment on its meaning). +Non-Homogeneous comprises +Non-Collective and \pm Non-Collective, the latter with *vse*. +Non-Collective, in its turn, splits into +Non-Alternative with *každyj* and \pm Non-Alternative. By the term "Alternative" I imply the freedom of choice. *Každyj*, thus, has the meaning that what is stated applies to every single element, without exception. In the \pm Non-Alternative member *ljuboj* has the meaning +Alternative (-Non-Alternative), whereas *vsjakij* is unmarked with respect to Alternative: in one sense *vsjakij* is equivalent to *každyj* (-Alternative), e.g. *Vsjakij soldat dolžen borot'sja za svoju rodinu*, in another sense it is equivalent to *ljuboj* (+Alternative): *Vsjakaja popytka svergnut' suščestvujuščij stroj budet podavlena*. In a further sense *vsjakij* even has the meaning of -Entirety: *Ona govorit vsjakuju čepuxu*, or *Za svoju žizn' Proxoru dovelos' perevožit' vsjakie gruzy - i les, i železo, i pšenicu* (Babaev, "Kavaler Zol. Zv.", the example from the Academy Dictionary where *vsjakij* and *vsjakie* could be substituted for *raznyj* and *raznye*. Also *ljuboj'* (according to E. V. Pađučeva, 1974:110, sentences illustrating this usage - which she does not approve of - are often found in the press) can have the meaning of -Entirety and be substituted for *kakoj-nibud'*: *Doplata za produkciju nevozmožna pri ljubom količestve produkcii* or *Šum ne pozvoljaet predskazat' formu ljubogo vyskazyvanija*.

As was the case with *neskol'ko*, *malo*, and *nemnogo* the binary opposition (at the final stage) holding between *každyj*, *vsjakij*, and *ljuboj* can optionally be dissolved into three members: +Alternative (*ljuboj*), -Alternative (*každyj*), and \pm Alternative (*vsjakij*).

4.0. Finally, the following obliqui should be considered neutralized with respect to the primary opposition between +Non-Relation to the L.C. and \pm Non-Relation to the L.C.: *mnogix*, *mnogim*, *mnogimi*, *nemnogix*, *nemnogim*, *nemnogimi*.

Examples: *Želajuščix izučit' nas jazyk možno najti v ljubom ugolke zemnogo šara. Vot, naprimer, odno iz mnogix pisem.* ("Literaturnaja Gazeta", August 21, 1968) where we have the meaning +Non-Relation to the L.C., and *Kniga wlekaet čitatelja živost'ju izloženijsa, svežest'ju mnogix sjužetov, obiljem poznavatel'nogo materiala, stilem točnym, jasnym i krasočnym* (Lit. Gazeta", Dec. 12, 1968) where we are confronted with +Relation (-Non-Relation) to the L.C.

REFERENCES

- Bierwisch M., 1970: "On Classifying Semantic Features", *Progress in Linguistics*, A Collection of Papers selected and edited by Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Heidolph, The Hague.
- Chomsky N., 1965: *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Isačenko A. V., 1961: "O grammatičeskom značenii", *Voprosy jazykoznanija*,
- Isačenko A. V., 1963: "Binarnost', privativnyje oppozicii i grammatičeskoe značenie", *Voprosy jazykoznanija*,
- Jakobson R., 1932: "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbuns", in: *Charisteria Gvilelmo Mathesio ... oblata*.
- Jakobson R., 1936: "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre", *TCLP* 6.
- Karcevskij S., 1964: "Du dualisme asymétrique du signe linguistique", *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics Compiled by Josef Vachek*, Bloomington.
- Lakoff G., 1969: *On Generative Semantics*. (Stencilled paper).
- Leisi E., 1953: *Der Wortinhalt. Seine Struktur im Deutschen und Englischen*, Heidelberg.
- Pađučeva E. V., 1974: *O semantike sintaksisa*. (Materialy k transformacionnoj grammatike russkogo jazyka), Moskva.
- Rybák J., 1975: "Kategória čísla a neurčité zámená", *Jazykovedný časopis*, 26, 2.
- Seliverstova O. N., 1964: "Opyt semantičeskogo analiza slov tipa vse i tipa kto-nibud'", *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 4.

