

Supplementary Materials for: “On the distribution of scope ambiguities in Polish”

Dagmara Grabska
UCL, Gower St, London WC1E 6BT, UK
dagmara.grabska.11@ucl.ac.uk

Klaus Abels
UCL, Gower St, London WC1E 6BT, UK
k.abels@ucl.ac.uk

Contents

Appendix I: Materials for Experiment 1	2
Appendix II: Experiment 2	14
Appendix III: Materials for Experiment 2	26

Appendix I: Materials for Experiment 1

Test items

- (1) a. S1: Każdy pirat atakuje jedną rybę.
every pirate.NOM attacks one fish.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jedną rybę atakuje każdy rekin.
moreover one fish.ACC attacks every shark.NOM
- b. S1: Każdą rybę atakuje jeden rekin.
every fish.ACC attacks one shark.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden rekin atakuje każdego pirata.
moreover one shark.NOM attacks every pirate.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden rekin atakuje każdą rybę.
one shark.NOM attacks every fish.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdą rybę atakuje jeden pirat.
moreover every fish.ACC attacks one pirate.NOM
- d. S1: Jedną rybę atakuje każdy rekin.
one fish.ACC attacks every shark.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każdy rekin atakuje jednego pirata.
moreover every shark.NOM attacks one pirate.ACC
- (2) a. S1: Każdy chłopiec głaszcze jednego kotka.
every boy.NOM strokes one kitten.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jednego kotka głaszcze każda pielęgniarka.
moreover one kitten.ACC strokes every nurse.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego kotka głaszcze jedna pielęgniarka.
every kitten.ACC strokes one nurse.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jedna pielęgniarka głaszcze każdego pieska.
moreover one nurse.NOM strokes every dog.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden chłopiec głaszcze każdego kotka.
one boy.NOM strokes every kitten.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdego kotka głaszcze jedna pielęgniarka.
moreover every kitten.ACC strokes one nurse.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego kotka głaszcze każda pielęgniarka.
one kitten.ACC strokes every nurse.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każda pielęgniarka głaszcze jednego pieska.
moreover every nurse.NOM strokes one dog.ACC
- (3) a. S1: Każdy koń wacha jedną świnkę.
every horse.NOM smells one pig.ACC

- S2: Oprócz tego, jedną świnkę wącha każdy pies.
moreover one pig.ACC smells every dog.NOM
- b. S1: Każdą świnkę wącha jeden koń.
every pig.ACC smells one horse.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden koń wącha każdego psa.
moreover one horse.NOM smells every dog.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden koń wącha każdą świnkę.
one horse.NOM smells every pig.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdą świnkę wącha jeden pies.
moreover every pig.ACC smells one dog.NOM
- d. S1: Jedną świnkę wącha każdy koń.
one pig.ACC smells every horse.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każdy koń wącha jednego psa.
moreover every horse.NOM smells one dog.ACC
- (4) a. S1: Każdy Indianin wita jednego żołnierza.
every Native American.NOM welcomes one soldier.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jednego żołnierza wita każdy rolnik.
moreover one soldier.ACC welcomes every farmer.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego Indianina wita jeden żołnierz.
every Native American.ACC welcomes one soldier.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden żołnierz wita każdego rolnika.
moreover one soldier.NOM welcomes every farmer.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden Indianin wita każdego rolnika.
one Native American.NOM welcomes every farmer.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdego rolnika wita jeden żołnierz.
moreover every farmer.ACC welcomes one soldier.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego Indianina wita każdy rolnik.
one Native American.ACC welcomes every farmer.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każdy rolnik wita jednego żołnierza.
moreover every farmer.NOM welcomes one soldier.ACC
- (5) a. S1: Każdy flaming dziobie jedną pielęgniarkę.
every flamingo.NOM pecks one nurse.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jedną pielęgniarkę dziobie każdy kogut.
moreover one nurse.ACC pecks every rooster.NOM
- b. S1: Każdą pielęgniarkę dziobie jeden flaming.
every nurse.ACC pecks one flamingo.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden flaming dziobie każdego żołnierza.
moreover one flamingo.NOM pecks every soldier.ACC

- c. S1: Jeden flaming dziobie każdą pielęgniarkę.
 one flamingo.NOM pecks every nurse.ACC
 S2: Oprócz tego, każdą pielęgniarkę dziobie jeden kogut.
 moreover every nurse.ACC pecks one rooster.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego żołnierza dziobie każdy flaming.
 one soldier.ACC pecks every flamingo.NOM
 S2: Oprócz tego, każdy flaming dziobie jedną pielęgniarkę.
 moreover every flamingo.NOM pecks one nurse.ACC
- (6) a. S1: Każdy Indianin słucha jednego amisza.
 every Native American.NOM listens one Amish.GEN
 S2: Oprócz tego, jednego amisza słucha każdy żołnierz.
 moreover one Amish.GEN listens every soldier.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego Indianina słucha jeden amisz.
 every Native American.GEN listens one Amish.NOM
 S2: Oprócz tego, jeden amisz słucha każdego żołnierza.
 moreover one Amish.NOM listens every soldier.GEN
- c. S1: Jeden amisz słucha każdego Indianina.
 one Amish.NOM listens every Native American.GEN
 S2: Oprócz tego, każdego Indianina słucha jeden
 moreover every Native American.GEN listens one
 żołnierz.
 soldier.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego żołnierza słucha każdy Indianin.
 one soldier.GEN listens every Native American.NOM
 S2: Oprócz tego, każdy Indianin słucha jednego
 moreover every Native American.NOM listens one
 amisza.
 Amish.GEN
- (7) a. S1: Każdy rolnik doi jedną krowę.
 every farmer.NOM milks one cow.ACC
 S2: Oprócz tego, jedną krowę doi każdy chłopiec.
 moreover one cow.ACC milks every boy.NOM
- b. S1: Każdą krowę doi jeden chłopiec.
 every cow.ACC milks one boy.NOM
 S2: Oprócz tego, jeden chłopiec doi każdą kozę.
 moreover one boy.NOM milks every goat.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden chłopiec doi każdą kozę.
 one boy.NOM milks every goat.ACC

- S2: Oprócz tego, każdą kozę doi jeden rolnik.
moreover every goat.ACC milks one farmer.NOM
- d. S1: Jedną krowę doi każdy rolnik.
one cow.ACC milks every farmer.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdy rolnik doi jedną kozę.
moreover every farmer.NOM milks one goat.ACC
- (8) a. S1: Każdy chirurg bada jednego chłopca.
every surgeon.NOM examines one boy.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, jednego chłopca bada każda pielęgniarka.
moreover one boy.ACC examines every nurse.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego chłopca bada jeden chirurg.
every boy.ACC examines one surgeon.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, jeden chirurg bada każdą pielęgniarkę.
moreover one surgeon.NOM examines every nurse.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden chirurg bada każdego chłopca.
one surgeon.NOM examines every boy.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdego chłopca bada jedna pielęgniarka.
moreover every boy.ACC examines one nurse.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego chłopca bada każdy chirurg.
one boy.ACC examines every surgeon.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdy chirurg bada jedną pielęgniarkę.
moreover every surgeon.NOM examines one nurse.ACC
- (9) a. S1: Każdy amisz prowadzi jedną krowę.
every Amish.NOM leads one cow.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, jedną krowę prowadzi każdy rolnik.
moreover one cow.ACC leads every farmer.NOM
- b. S1: Każdą krowę prowadzi jeden amisz.
every cow.ACC leads one Amish.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, jeden amisz prowadzi każdą owcę.
moreover one Amish.NOM leads every sheep.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden amisz prowadzi każdą krowę.
one Amish.NOM leads every cow.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdą krowę prowadzi jeden rolnik.
moreover every cow.ACC leads one farmer.NOM
- d. S1: Jedną owcę prowadzi każdy amisz.
one sheep.ACC leads every Amish.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdy amisz prowadzi jedną krowę.
moreover every Amish.NOM leads one cow.ACC

- (10) a. S1: Każdy żołnierz szkoli jednego konia.
every soldier.NOM trains one horse.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jednego konia szkoli każdy rolnik.
moreover one horse.ACC trains every farmer.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego konia szkoli jeden żołnierz.
every horse.ACC trains one soldier.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden żołnierz szkoli każdego psa.
moreover one soldier.NOM trains every dog.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden żołnierz szkoli każdego psa.
one soldier.NOM trains every dog.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdego psa szkoli jeden rolnik.
moreover every dog.ACC trains one farmer.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego konia szkoli każdy żołnierz.
one horse.ACC trains every soldier.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każdy żołnierz szkoli jednego psa.
moreover every soldier.NOM trains one dog.ACC
- (11) a. S1: Każdy Indianin karmi jednego pelikana.
every Native American.NOM feeds one pelican.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jednego pelikana karmi każdy rolnik.
moreover one pelican.ACC feeds every farmer.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego pelikana karmi jeden Indianin.
every pelican.ACC feeds one Native American.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden Indianin karmi każdego
moreover one Native American.NOM feeds every
kotka.
kitten.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden rolnik karmi każdego pelikana.
one farmer.NOM feeds every pelican.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdego pelikana karmi jeden
moreover every pelican.ACC feeds one
Indianin.
Native American.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego kotka karmi każdy Indianin.
one kitten.ACC feeds every Native American.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każdy Indianin karmi jednego
moreover every Native American.NOM feeds one
pelikana.
pelican.ACC

- (12) a. S1: Każdy żołnierz niesie jedną rybę.
every soldier.NOM carries one fish.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jedną rybę niesie każdy rolnik.
moreover one fish.ACC carries every farmer.NOM
- b. S1: Każdą rybę niesie jeden żołnierz.
every fish.ACC carries one soldier.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden żołnierz niesie każdego chłopca.
moreover one soldier.NOM carries every boy.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden rolnik niesie każdą rybę.
one farmer.NOM carries every fish.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdą rybę niesie jeden żołnierz.
moreover every fish.ACC carries one soldier.NOM
- d. S1: Jedną rybę niesie każdy żołnierz.
one fish.ACC carries every soldier.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każdy żołnierz niesie jednego chłopca.
moreover every soldier.NOM carries one boy.ACC
- (13) a. S1: Każdy duch straszy jednego aniołka.
every ghost.NOM frightens one angel.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jednego aniołka straszy każdy diabeł.
moreover one angel.ACC frightens every devil.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego aniołka straszy jeden duch.
every angel.ACC frightens one ghost.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden duch straszy każdego diabła.
moreover one ghost.NOM frightens every devil.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden duch straszy każdego aniołka.
one ghost.NOM frightens every angel.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, każdego aniołka straszy jeden diabeł.
moreover every angel.ACC frightens one devil.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego aniołka straszy każdy duch.
one angel.ACC frightens every ghost.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, każdy duch straszy jednego diabła.
moreover every ghost.NOM frightens one devil.ACC
- (14) a. S1: Każdy ksiądz błogosławi jednego diabła.
every priest.NOM blesses one devil.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jednego diabła błogosławi każdy aniołek.
moreover one devil.ACC blesses every angel.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego diabła błogosławi jeden ksiądz.
every devil.ACC blesses one priest.NOM

- S2: Oprócz tego, jeden ksiądz błogosławi każdego aniołka.
moreover one priest.NOM blesses every angel.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden ksiądz błogosławi każdego diabła.
one priest.NOM blesses every devil.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdego diabła błogosławi jeden aniołek.
moreover every devil.ACC blesses one angel.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego diabła błogosławi każdy ksiądz.
one devil.ACC blesses every priest.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdy ksiądz błogosławi jednego aniołka.
moreover every priest.NOM blesses one angel.ACC
- (15) a. S1: Każdy rastafarianin pozdrawia jednego Żyda.
every rastafarian.NOM greets one jew.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, jednego Żyda pozdrawia każdy muzułmanin.
moreover one jew.ACC greets every muslim.NOM
- b. S1: Każdego Żyda pozdrawia jeden rastafarianin.
every jew.ACC greets one rastafarian.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, jeden rastafarianin pozdrawia każdego muzułmanina.
moreover one rastafarian.NOM greets every muslim.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden rastafarianin pozdrawia każdego Żyda.
one rastafarian.NOM greets every jew.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdego Żyda pozdrawia jeden muzułmanin.
moreover every jew.ACC greets one muslim.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego Żyda pozdrawia każdy rastafarianin.
one jew.ACC greets every rastafarian.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdy rastafarianin pozdrawia jednego muzułmanina.
moreover every rastafarian.NOM greets one muslim.ACC
- (16) a. S1: Każdy ludzik-playmobile przegania jednego ludzika-lego.
every playmobile figure.NOM chases away one lego figure.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, jednego ludzika-lego przegania każde zwierzę-playmobile.
moreover one lego figure.ACC chases away every playmobile animal.NOM

- b. S1: Każdego ludzika-lego przegania jeden
every lego figure.ACC chases away one
ludzik-playmobile.
playmobile figure.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, jeden ludzik-playmobile przegania każde
moreover one playmobile figure.NOM chases away every
zwierzę.
animal.ACC
- c. S1: Jeden ludzik-playmobile przegania każdego
one playmobile figure.NOM chases away every
ludzika-lego.
lego figure.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdego ludzika-lego przegania jedno
moreover every lego figure.ACC chases away one
zwierzę-playmobile.
playmobile animal.NOM
- d. S1: Jednego ludzika-lego przegania każdy
one lego figure.ACC chases away every
ludzik-playmobile.
playmobile figure.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, każdy ludzik-playmobile przegania
moreover every playmobile figure.NOM chases away
jedno zwierzę.
one animal.ACC

Fillers

All caps within the fillers indicates non-canonical stress patterns.

- (17) S1: Każda kura zniosła jedno jajko.
every hen.NOM laid one egg.ACC
- S2: Oprócz tego, jedno jajko zobaczyła każda kura.
moreover one egg.ACC saw every hen.NOM
- (18) S1: Jedno jajko zobaczyła każda kura.
one egg.ACC saw every hen.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego każda kaczka zobaczyła jedno jajko.
moreover every duck.NOM saw one egg.ACC
- (19) S1: Każdy chłopiec złamał jedną nogę.
every boy.NOM broke one leg.ACC.

- S2: Oprócz tego jedną nogę zobaczył każdy chirurg.
moreover one leg.ACC saw every surgeon.NOM
- (20) S1: Jednego pelikana zobaczył każdy rastafarianin.
one pelican.ACC saw every rastafarian.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego każdy rastafarianin karmił jednego pelikana.
moreover every rastafarian.NOM fed one pelican.ACC
- (21) S1: Jedno jajko zobaczyła każda kura.
one egg.ACC saw every hen.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jedno jajko zniosła każda kura.
moreover one egg.ACC laid every hen.NOM
- (22) S1: Jedną nogę zobaczył każdy chirurg.
one leg.ACC saw every surgeon.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jedną nogę złamał każdy chirurg.
moreover one leg.ACC broke every surgeon.NOM
- (23) S1: Jedno piórko zobaczył każdy flaming.
one feather.ACC saw every flamingo.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jedno piórko zgubił każdy flaming.
moreover one feather.ACC lost every flamingo.NOM
- (24) S1: Jedno ucho zobaczył każdy pelikan.
one ear.ACC saw every pelican.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jedno ucho szpeciło każdego chłopca.
moreover one ear.NOM distorted every boyACC.
- (25) S1: Jednego kotka głaszcze jedna pielęgniarka.
one kitten.ACC strokes one nurse.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jedna pielęgniarka głaszcze jednego pieska.
moreover one nurse.NOM strokes one dog.ACC
- (26) S1: Jeden żołnierz wita jednego rolnika.
one soldier.NOM welcomes one farmer.ACC
S2: Oprócz tego, jednego rolnika wita jeden
moreover one farmer.ACC welcomes one
Indianin.
Native American.NOM
- (27) S1: Jednego żołnierza dziobie jeden flaming.
one soldier.ACC pecks one flamingo.NOM
S2: Oprócz tego, jeden flaming dziobie każdą pielęgniarkę.
moreover one flamingo.NOM pecks every nurse.ACC

- (28) S1: Jeden żołnierz słucha jednego Indianina.
 one soldier.NOM listens one Native American.GEN
 S2: Oprócz tego, jednego Indianina słucha jeden
 moreover one Native American.GEN listens one
 amisz.
 Amish.NOM
- (29) S1: Jeden pirat opiera się o kilka beczek.
 one pirate.NOM leans refl. on several barrels.ACC
 S2: Oprócz tego, dwóch piratów opiera się o kilka skrzyń.
 moreover two pirates.GEN lean refl. on several boxes.ACC
- (30) S1: Cztery ptaki zajmują jedno drzewo.
 four birds.NOM occupy one tree.ACC
 S2: Oprócz tego, jedno drzewo zajmują cztery lampiony.
 moreover one tree.ACC occupy four lamps.NOM
- (31) S1: Jedną łódkę zaatakowały cztery rekiny.
 one boat.ACC attacked four sharks.NOM
 S2: Oprócz tego, cztery rekiny jedzą jedną rybę.
 moreover four sharks.NOM eat one fish.ACC
- (32) S1: Jednego rekina karmi trzech piratów.
 one shark.ACC feed three pirates.GEN
 S2: Oprócz tego, trzech piratów złapało jedną rybę.
 moreover three pirates.GEN caught one fish.ACC
- (33) S1: Cztery krzesła zajmują cztery dziewczynki.
 four chairs.ACC occupy four girls.NOM
 S2: Oprócz tego, cztery dziewczynki jadą na jednym koniu.
 moreover four girls.NOM ride on one horse.LOC
- (34) S1: Nie każdy pirat karmi rekina.¹
 not every pirate.NOM feeds shark.ACC
 : > δ
 S2: Oprócz tego, pelikana nie karmi KAŻDY rolnik.
 moreover pelican.ACC not feeds every farmer.NOM
 δ > :

¹ The following examples manipulate relative scope of universal quantifiers and negation. Negation attached directly to the quantifier takes scope over said quantifier. Clause level negation is in principle scopally ambiguous with respect to universal quantifiers, though context, order, and intonation can all shift the scope. We indicate scopal possibilities below the glosses.

- (35) S1: Piraci nie złapali każdej ryby.
 pirates.NOM not caught every fish.GEN
 $\mathcal{G} < > :$
 S2: Oprócz tego, każdy pirat NIE ma wędki.
 moreover every pirate.NOM not has fishing rod.GEN
 $\mathcal{G} < > :$
- (36) S1: Nie każdy rolnik karmi pelikana.
 not every farmer.NOM feeds pelican.ACC
 $: > \mathcal{G}$
 S2: Oprócz tego, KAŻDY pirat nie karmi rekina.
 moreover every pirate.NOM not feeds shark.GEN
 $\mathcal{G} > :$
- (37) S1: Nie na każdym koniu siedzi dziewczynka.
 not on every horse.LOC sits girl.NOM
 $: > \mathcal{G}$
 S2: Oprócz tego, dziewczynka nie siedzi też na każdym krześle.
 moreover girl.NOM not sits also on every chair.LOC
 $\mathcal{G} < > :$
- (38) S1: Diabły trzymają w rękach tylko widły.
 devils.NOM hold in hands.LOC only pitchforks.ACC
 S2: Oprócz tego, diabły atakują tylko ANIOŁKI.
 moreover devils.NOM attack only angels.ACC
- (39) S1: Rastafarianie i muzułmanie witają tylko Żydów.
 Rastafarians and muslims.NOM welcome only Jews.ACC
 S2: Oprócz tego, RASTAFARIANIE witają tylko żołnierzy.
 moreover rastafarians.NOM welcome only soldiers.ACC
- (40) S1: Tylko muzułmanie są na spotkaniu z żołnierzami.
 only muslims.NOM are on meeting.LOC with soldiers.INS
 S2: Oprócz tego, MUZUŁMANIE tylko słuchają żołnierzy.
 moreover muslims.NOM only listen soldiers.GEN
- (41) S1: Piraci trzymają tylko butelki.
 pirates.NOM hold only bottles.ACC
 S2: Oprócz tego, trzy butelki trzyma tylko jeden pirat.
 moreover three bottles.ACC holds only one pirate.NOM
- (42) S1: Tylko jeden pirat trzyma trzy butelki.
 only one pirate.NOM holds three bottles.ACC

- S2: Oprócz tego, butelki są tylko w rękach piratów.
moreover bottles.NOM are only in hands.LOC pirates.GEN
- (43) S1: Na jednym drzewie wiszą tylko latarnie.
on one tree.LOC hang only lamps.NOM
- S2: Oprócz tego, latarnie wiszą tylko na LEWYCH
moreover lamps.NOM hang only on left
gałęziach drzew.
branches.LOC trees.GEN

With this in mind, we note that of the two theories still under consideration only Antonyuk's makes a clear prediction: Given that neither V-IO-DO nor V-DO-IO orders represent a crossed configuration, Antonyuk would expect surface and non-surface scope to be available in both configurations. Bobaljik & Wurmbrand's theory does not by itself make a clear prediction about the scopal relations in ditransitive VPs.²

As we will see, the current experiment replicates result reported in Łęska 2019. Łęska showed across four experiments with somewhat different conditions and methods that the V-DO-IO order is ambiguous but that the V-IO-DO order allows only linear scope – setting specific readings of existentials aside for the reasons discussed in section 5 of the main paper. Our experiment supports this conclusion and generalizes it from verbs with an ACC-DAT frame to verbs with an ACC-PP frame. This is an important contribution to the empirical picture, since ACC-DAT verbs are often analogized to double object verbs in English and ACC-PP verbs to to-datives. As noted in section 2 of the main text, the former are scopally frozen and the latter are ambiguous. In English, case-frame and order are fully confounded, but Polish allows us to vary both order and case frame. The result will show that the presence of the ambiguity is driven by the order of the object not the case frame.





In addition to this main difference to Łęska's experiments there are some smaller ones: unlike Łęska's experiment, our experiment uses a truth value judgment task, unlike Łęska's stimuli (except in her experiment 3), our stimuli are fully controlled for animacy, and unlike Łęska's stimuli, our stimuli observe the given-before-new preference of Polish.

As in Experiment 1, test sentences were preceded by a context sentence. Context and test sentences used the same words except for the test sentences' final NP. This ensured that the test sentences respected given-before-new. The order of direct object and indirect object in the context sentences was the opposite of that in the test sentences. For the crucial items, those testing the availability of non-linear scope, the context sentence had a universal quantifier preceding an existential accompanied by a picture of the distributive linear scope reading. For the items testing the availability of linear scope, the context sentence had a universal quantifier preceding an existential accompanied by a picture that made the referentially independent interpretation of the indefinite true.

² In the discussion of the results in the main paper we adapt Bruening's (2001) theory of quantifier raising to the situation in Polish. Bruening's proposal imposes hard constraints on quantifier raising which can easily be combined with the type of soft constraints arising from Bobaljik & Wurmbrand's proposal.

Materials

16 lexicalisations of the two experimental sentence types were developed for a total of 32 sentences. For each sentence two pictures were designed: one showing the distributive reading and the other showing the non-distributive reading. The table below shows one lexicalization (sentences (1) and (2) above) across all four conditions with the accompanying pictures:

	V-IO-DO	V-DO-IO
Inverse $8 > 9$		
	Rybak dał jednemu rekinowi każdą rybę fisherman gave one shark every fish	Rybak dał jedną rybę każdemu rekinowi fisherman gave one fish every shark
Surface $9 > 8$		
	Rybak dał jednemu rekinowi każdą rybę fisherman gave one shark every fish	Rybak dał jedną rybę każdemu rekinowi fisherman gave one fish every shark

All experimental sentences were introduced by the words: *a potem*–‘and then’ and followed the format: S_{NP} - V - O_{9NP_1} - O_{8NP_2} . The NP in the subject position always denoted a human and the nouns in the two object positions had the same animacy status: in half of them both were animate and in the other half both were inanimate. All nouns were unambiguously case-marked.

For each test sentence, a context sentence was constructed. The context sentence contained the same subject NP as the experimental sentence, the same

verb and the same object as the linearly first object in the experimental sentence (NP_1). However, this NP appeared as the second object in the context sentence. The first object in the context sentence was a different NP - NP_3 . NP_3 had the same animacy status as NP_1 and was unambiguously case-marked. The subject in the context sentence, as the subject in the experimental sentence, was a bare NP. In each context sentence, the determiner used in NP_1 was an existential quantifier and the determiner used in NP_3 was a universal quantifier. Thus, the overall pattern was as follows:

(4) $S_1-V_2-\delta N_3-\rho N_4$. A potem, $S_1-V_2-\rho N_4-\delta N_5$

For each context sentence two pictures were developed: one with a distributive scenario matching the linear scope reading and the other with a non-distributive scenario matching the non-linear scope reading of the context sentence. A distributive picture was presented with a context sentence preceding a test sentence in the non-linear scope condition, the condition probing the availability of the distributive reading in the test sentence. Correspondingly, a non-distributive picture was presented with a context sentence preceding a test sentence in the linear scope condition, the condition probing the availability of the non-distributive reading. The pictures used for the context sentences in items (1) and (2) together with these sentences are presented below:

V-DO-IO

 $8 > 9$

Rybak dał każdego raka jednemu rekinowi
 fisherman gave every crab one shark

V-IO-DO



Rybak dał każdej mewie jedną rybę
 fisherman gave every gull one fish

 $9 > 8$

Rybak dał każdego raka jednemu rekinowi
 fisherman gave every crab one shark



Rybak dał każdej mewie jedną rybę
 fisherman gave every gull one fish

Full items with context sentences and images then looked as follows:

Context sentence with picture



Experimental sentence with picture



(1)

Rybak	dał	każdego	raka	jednemu	rekinowi.	A potem	rybak	dał	jednemu	rekinowi	każdą	rybę
fisherman	gave	every	crab	one	shark.	And then	fisherman	gave	one	shark	every	fish
S	V	DO		IO			S	V	IO		DO	



(2)

Rybak	dał	każdej	mewie	jedną	rybę.	A potem	rybak	dał	jedną	rybę	każdemu	rekinowi.
fisherman	gave	every	gull	one	fish.	And then	fisherman	gave	one	fish	every	shark
S	V	IO		DO			S	V	DO		IO	

In addition to the experimental items, 18 fillers were created. Each filler followed the format used in the experimental items, thus had a context sentence followed by a test sentence each accompanied by a picture. Two of the fillers involved sentences with two quantificational NPs in the order $\forall NP_1 - \exists NP_2$ and had the universal quantifier contained in a syntactic island. These filler sentences were accompanied by distributive pictures matching their non-linear scope reading. The context sentences that preceded them contained the same verbs and the same NP as the initial NP in the sentence that followed them. As in the experimental items discussed above, this NP appeared last in the context sentence and was preceded by NP_3 , different to NP_2 . One of the two fillers involving syntactic islands is presented below:

- (5) Każda piosenkarka się kłaniała, bo jeden chłopiec
 every singer REFL was bowing because one boy
 bił brawo. A potem, jeden chłopiec bił brawo, bo każda
 was clapping and then one boy was clapping because every
 tancerka się kłaniała.
 dancer REFL was bowing
 Every singer was bowing, because one boy was clapping. And then, one
 boy was clapping, because every dancer was bowing.

The remaining fillers involved PP (8 items) and AP attachment ambiguities (8 items). The picture accompanying the context sentence systematically made the context sentence true. For the experimental items (though not the fillers) this was verified through a pretest.³ Fillers were paired at the ratio 1:1 with the picture matching or mismatching the second sentence.

³ The availability of the distributive scope reading for the V-DO_g-IO_g context sentences might be suspect in light of the fact that Łęska (2019: Experiment 3) reports that this reading is preferred in only 18% of trials, the non-linear scope reading V-DO_g-IO_g is preferred in 34% of trials in the same experiment. But since this is preference rather than acceptability, we decided to pretest the linear scope interpretation of the context sentences. This pretest combined a picture matching task with a truth value judgement task. The materials used in the pretest comprised all 16 pictures for context sentences from the experiment; these depict the wide-scope interpretation for the indirect object over the direct object. An additional 16 pictures depicting the referential interpretation of the existentially quantified direct object were used. The two pictures were presented side-by-side and paired either with a V-DO_g-IO_g sentence (which we expected to verify picture giving DO wide scope) or with a V-IO_g-DO_g sentence (which we expected not to verify the picture giving DO wide scope). In the picture matching task participants saw the two pictures on the screen and listened to the relevant sentence. They were then asked to select the picture that matched their first interpretation of the sentence by clicking on it. Following this, participants were shown the picture that they hadn't selected in the first instance, were offered the option of listening to the sentence again, and were then asked to indicate whether the sentence could also describe the picture which they hadn't picked as their first interpretation by clicking either *Tak*-'yes' or *Nie*-'no'.

Each participant assessed one sentence from each lexicalisation for a total of 16 sentences equally divided between V-DO-IO and V-IO-DO orders. In addition, each participant answered the same set of 24 fillers which were interspersed with the test items. 35 participants took part in the study. All were Polish native speakers residing in Poland. Seven participants were excluded for not responding correctly to at least 85% of the unambiguous fillers or recognizing the ambiguity in structurally ambiguous fillers less than 40% of the time.

At the picture matching task stage the distributive picture was chosen for the V-IO-DO order as the initial interpretation 11% of the time while for the V-DO-IO order the distributive interpretation was chosen 46% of the time – a maybe surprising result compared to Łęska's 18% on a different kind of preference task mentioned above. Those who had chosen the referential picture at the first stage then accepted the distributive picture at the second stage, the truth-value-judgment task, 25% of the time for the V-IO-DO order and 41% of the time for the V-DO-IO order. Overall, the distributive reading was accepted for the V-DO-IO sentences 68% of the time. On the basis of these results, we proceeded to use these picture-sentence pairs as adequate contextualizations in experiment 2.

All sentences were recorded by a female native speaker of Polish and spoken with neutral intonation. The full list of sentences from the experiment can be found in appendix III.

Procedure

Images and recordings were loaded into SoSci Survey online questionnaire builder. Subjects accessed the experiment via a link sent by the experimenter and did the experiment online.

Participants first signed a consent form, were informed of their rights, and provided some sociometric information. Then they were shown an instruction page informing them that they would see and hear pairs of pictures and sentences. The first sentence would always be a true description of the situation in the first picture and provide context. Their task would be to judge whether the second sentence could describe the situation depicted in the second picture by selecting either 'Prawda' true' or 'Nieprawda' false' as their response.

Each trial began with a presentation of a picture. The subjects then pressed a button to play the recording of the context sentence. Whenever they were ready, participants could swipe down to view the second picture, play a recording of the second sentence, and then select their response below the second picture. After giving the response, the subjects were shown the next trial.

Each participant heard four lexicalisations of each condition and one condition per lexicalisation for a total of 16 experimental stimuli. The four conditions of the 16 stimuli were counterbalanced across four blocks in a Latin Square design. The items were randomised and interspersed with 18 fillers. Each participant was randomly assigned to one list. In total, each participant judged the truth of 34 sentences.

Participants

31 subjects participated in the experiment. All were Polish native speakers residing in Poland. They were recruited via a link on social media and not reimbursed for their participation.

Results

Data from 31 subjects was collected. 29 responded to clearly true and clearly false fillers accurately above 80% of the time and were included in the analysis.

Overall means and standard deviations of the results are reported below:

(6)	word order	scope order	mean	sd
	V IO DO	linear	0.833	0.374
	V IO DO	non-linear	0.176	0.383
	V DO IO	linear	0.657	0.477
	V DO IO	non-linear	0.759	0.430

The results are visualized in the following violinplots with a bee swarm. The first plot shows the rate at which each participant accepted the reading being probed; each dot represents a participant. The second plot shows the rate at which each experimental sentence was accepted with the reading being probed; each dot represents an item.

(7) a.

b.

These plots clearly suggest that linear scope is generally available for both word orders but somewhat less preferred in the DO-IO condition than in the IO-DO condition. In stark contrast, non-linear scope is readily available in the DO-IO condition but appears to be unavailable in the IO-DO condition.

A generalized linear mixed effects model using contrast coding for fixed effects was built using R's lme4 library (R Core Team 2019; Bates et al. 2015). The model treats the response as the dependent variable and word order and scope order as fixed effects, both as main effects and as interaction. The model includes random intercepts for verb and subject with uncorrelated random slopes for scope order by subject and by verb. This was the maximal random effect structure that converged for the main and all of the reduced models. A model summary is given in (8).

(8) Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error
(Intercept)	0.6635	0.2524
word order	0.9340	0.2812
scope order	-1.8334	0.5126
word order:scope order	5.0636	0.6226

A comparison with reduced models shows significant effects for word order [$t = 3.71, df = 11.1, p < 0.0009$], for scope order [$t = -3.58, df = 11.1, p < 0.001$], and for the interaction [$t = 7.95, df = 11.1, p < 0.0001$].

$\chi^2(1) = 11.09, p < 0.0009$], and a highly significant interaction $b\beta = -1.83, SE = 0.51, \chi^2(1) = 93.32, p < 1e-15$]⁴

Discussion

The numerically low acceptance rate of inverse scope in the V-IO-DO word order suggests that this scope order should be treated as ungrammatical. Non-linear scope in the V-DO-IO order is accepted at the high rate of 76% and should be treated as grammatical.

To phrase it in terms of the distribution of ambiguity, we find that V-DO-IO orders are ambiguous while V-IO-DO orders are unambiguous. This finding corresponds rather well to what is known for English, a language in which ditransitive structures are known to be ambiguous and double object constructions are known to be unambiguous. This is also in keeping with Wiland 2009 and Šiska 2019 and the literature on other Slavic languages mentioned in footnote 16 of the main paper. An anonymous reviewer points out that the scopal rigidity of V-IO-DO in our experimental conditions (i.e., where DO is new and IO and DO do not differ in terms of animacy) shows that our results concerning scopal ambiguity in other conditions can not be attributed to the joint action of universal quantifiers' propensity to take wide scope together with the idea that new information is assigned wide scope.

We thank a different anonymous reviewer for pointing out that full parallelism to English would predict that the DO can take scope over the subject even in the V-IO-DO structure despite the frozen relative scope of the objects. Intuitionistically, this expectation is indeed met.

Finally, a third anonymous reviewer asks if 17.6% acceptance of non-linear scope in the V-IO-DO condition is plausibly interpreted as noise. We believe it is. Recall that in experiment 1 inverse scope was accepted roughly 10% of the time in the island condition. We take such examples to be uncontroversially unacceptable on the inverse scope reading (and the 10% acceptance to be noise). In experiment 1, the ungrammaticality of the reading arose from the syntactic structure and was detectable even if participants did not attend to the more subtle intonational and information structure cues. However, the judgment in experiment 2 relies on participants correctly picking up intonational and information-structure cues. Both are probably associated with higher levels of noise. For example, it is not

⁴ An anonymous reviewer wonders whether there is a difference between DP-DP ditransitives and DP-PP ditransitives in the experiment. Adding verb type as a factor in the model makes the effect of word order disappear. Instead a significant interaction between word order and verb type appears. The main effect of scope order stays significant as does, crucially, the highly significant word order-scope order interaction. None of the other two or three way interactions are significant.

straightforward to experimentally elicit crisp responses on the basis of intonation (see e.g. [Alter et al. 2001](#); [Mehlhorn 2013](#)) and we do not know and cannot control in what kind of environment and with which devices participants listened to the recorded stimuli. Moreover, [Boneh & Nash 2017](#) report inverse scope in V-IO-DO to be acceptable in Russian. It is a striking feature of [Boneh & Nash's](#) contexts that the DO is invariably given and under this condition inverse scope improves in Polish V-IO-DO as well. Since both the intonational and the information-structure cues in experiment 2 are much more subtle than the island effect in experiment 1, we can reasonably expect the level of noise to be higher in experiment 2. We therefore set the data points queried by the reviewer aside as noise for the time being.

There is a trend in the data suggesting that speakers prefer the non-linear scope reading for V-DO-IO orders. This is possibly a surprising trend in a language that has been claimed to generally prefer linear scope. However, under the analysis of ditransitive VPs from section 4.3 in the main text, the indirect object c-commands the direct object on the surface in the V-DO-IO structure. Thus, non-linear scope constitutes surface scope. This may explain the trend we see in the data.

A theoretical interpretation of our results in terms of the theory of quantifier raising is provided in the main text.

Appendix III: Materials for Experiment 2

Test items

- (1) daç`give'
- a. S1: Rybak da kazdegoraka jednemurekinowi.
shermangaveevery crab.ACCone shark.DAT
S2: A potem,rybak da jednemurekinowi kazdarybe.
andthen shermangaveone shark.DATevery sh.ACC
- b. S1: Rybak da kazdemurekinowi jednegoraka.
shermangaveevery shark.DATone crab.ACC
S2: A potem,rybak da jednegoraka kazdejmewie.
andthen shermangaveone crab.ACCevery gull.DAT
- (2) odebraç`take away'
- a. S1: owca odebra kazdaowce jednemutygrysowi.
huntertook awayevery sheepACC one tiger.DAT
S2: A potem,owca odebra jednemutygrysowikazda
andthen huntertook awayone tiger.DAT every
geś.
gooseACC
- b. S1: owca odebra kazdemutygrysowijednaowce.
huntertook awayevery tiger.DAT one sheepACC
S2: A potem,owca odebra jednaowce kazdemu
andthen huntertook awayone sheepACC every
lwu.
lion.DAT
- (3) dostarczyç`deliver'
- a. S1: Dostawca dostarczykazdegokonia jednemu
delivery mandelivered every horseACC one
rolnikowi.
farmerDAT
S2: A potem,dostawca dostarczyjednemurolnikowi kazda
andthen delivery mandelivered one farmerDAT every
krowe.
cowACC

- b. S1: Dostawca dostarczykażdemurolnikowi jednego
 delivery mandelivered every farmerDAT one
 konia.
 horseACC
 S2: A potem,dostawca dostarczyjednegokonia
 andthen delivery mandelivered one horseACC
 każdemukowbojowi.
 every cowboyDAT
- (4) przedstawić'introduce'
- a. S1: Dyrektorprzedstawikażdegopacjenta jednemulekarzowi.
 director introduced every patienACC one doctorDAT
 S2: A potem,dyrektor przedstawijednemulekarzowi
 andthen delivery manintroduced one doctorDAT
 każdapięlegniarke.
 every nurseACC
- b. S1: Dyrektorprzedstawikażdemulekarzowi jednegopacjenta.
 director introduced every doctorDAT one patientACC
 S2: A potem,dyrektorprzedstawijednegopacjenta każdej
 andthen director introduced one patientACC every
 pielęgniarce.
 nurseDAT
- (5) przydzielić'assign'
- a. S1: Nauczycielkaprzydzieli akażdegoucznia zerówki
 teacher assigned every studentACC receptionGEN
 jednemulicealiście.
 one high school studentDAT
 S2: A potem,nauczycielkaprzydzieli ajednemu
 andthen teacher assigned one
 licealiście każdegopierwszoklasiste.
 high school studentDAT every rst grade studentACC
- b. S1: Nauczycielkaprzydzieli akażdemulicealiście
 teacher assigned every high school studentDAT
 jednegoucznia zerówki.
 one studentACC receptionGEN.
 S2: A potem,nauczycielkaprzydzieli ajednegoucznia
 andthen teacher assigned one studentACC
 zerówki każdemupierwszoklasście.
 receptionGEN every rst grade studentDAT

- (6) przynieść 'bring'
- a. S1: Zoolog przyniósł każdego szczurą jednemu wezowi.
 zoologist brought every rat.ACC one snake.DAT
 S2: A potem, zoolog przyniósł jednemu wezowi każdą
 and then zoologist brought one snake.DAT every
 mysz.
 mouse.ACC
- b. S1: Zoolog przyniósł każdemu wezowi jednego szczura.
 zoologist brought every snake.DAT one rat.ACC
 S2: A potem, zoolog przyniósł jednego szczura każdemu
 and then zoologist brought one rat.ACC every
 lisowi.
 fox.DAT
- (7) przysłać 'send'
- a. S1: Ktoś przysłał każdego kota jednej nauczycielce.
 someone sent every kitten.ACC one teacher.DAT
 S2: A potem, ktoś przysłał jednej nauczycielce każdego
 and then someone sent one teacher.DAT every
 kota.
 rooster.ACC
- b. S1: Ktoś przysłał każdej nauczycielce jednego kota.
 someone sent every teacher.DAT one kitten.ACC
 S2: A potem, ktoś przysłał jednego kota każdemu
 and then someone sent one kitten.ACC every
 kucharzowi.
 cook.DAT
- (8) pokazać 'show'
- a. S1: Świadek pożaru pokazał każde dziecko jednemu
 witness.NOM re. GEN showed every child.ACC one
 strażakowi.
 reman.DAT
 S2: A potem, świadek pożaru pokazał jednemu
 and then witness.NOM re. GEN showed one
 strażakowi każdą kobietę.
 reman.DAT every woman.ACC

- b. S1: Świadek pożaru pokaza każdemu strażakowi jedno dziecko.
 witnessNOM re.GEN showed every reman.DAT one child.ACC
 S2: A potem, świadek pożaru pokaza jedno dziecko każdemu policjantowi.
 and then witnessNOM re.GEN showed one child.ACC every policeman.DAT
- (9) ustawić 'place'
- a. S1: Ktoś ustawi każdy prezent na jednej skrzyni.
 someone placed every present.ACC on one box.LOC
 S2: A potem, ktoś ustawi na jednej skrzyni każdego misia.
 and then someone placed on one box.LOC every teddy bear.ACC
- b. S1: Ktoś ustawi na każdej skrzyni jeden prezent.
 someone placed on every box.LOC one present.ACC
 S2: A potem, ktoś ustawi jeden prezent na każdym krześle.
 and then someone placed one present.ACC on every chair.LOC
- (10) dobrać 'match'
- a. S1: Ch opieć dobra każdą farbę do jednego krzesła.
 boy matched every paint.ACC to one chair.GEN
 S2: A potem, chłopiec dobra do jednego krzesła każdą poduszkę.
 and then boy matched to one chair.GEN every pillow.ACC
- b. S1: Ch opieć dobra do każdego krzesła jedną farbę.
 boy matched to every chair.GEN one paint.ACC
 S2: A potem, chłopiec dobra jedną farbę do każdego stołka.
 and then boy matched one paint.ACC to every stool.GEN
- (11) dodać 'add'

- a. S1: Dziewczynka doda każdego banana do jednego
 girl added every banana_{ACC} to one
 jab ka.
 apple_{GEN}
 S2: A potem, dziewczynka doda do jednego jabka każda
 and then girl added to one apple_{GEN} every
 marchewke.
 carrot_{ACC}
- b. S1: Dziewczynka doda do każdego jabka jednego
 girl added to every apple_{GEN} one
 banana.
 banana_{ACC}
 S2: A potem, dziewczynka doda jednego banana do
 and then girl added one banana_{ACC} to
 każdej marchewki.
 every carrot_{GEN}
- (12) wlać`pour'
- a. S1: Barman wla każde piwo do jednego kupa.
 barman poured every beer_{ACC} into one beer mug_{GEN}
 S2: A potem, barman wla do jednego kupa a każde
 and then barman poured into one beer mug_{GEN} every
 wino.
 wine_{ACC}
- b. S1: Barman wla do każdego kupa a jedno piwo.
 barman poured into every beer mug_{GEN} one beer_{ACC}
 S2: A potem, barman wla jedno piwo do każdej
 and then barman poured one beer_{ACC} into every
 beczki.
 barrel_{GEN}
- (13) przysunąć`move towards'
- a. S1: Ktoś przysunął każde krzesło do jednego stolika.
 someone moved every chair_{ACC} to one table_{GEN}
 S2: A potem, ktoś przysunął do jednego stolika każde
 and then someone moved to one table_{GEN} every
 fotel.
 armchair_{ACC}
- b. S1: Ktoś przysunął do każdego stolika jedno krzesło.
 someone moved to every table_{GEN} one chair_{ACC}

S2: A potem, ktoś przysunęła jedną ławkę do każdego
and then someone moved one bench_{ACC} to every
biurka.
desk_{GEN}

(14) powiesić 'hang'

- a. S1: Staruszek powiesił każdy plakat na jednej szafce.
old man hung every poster_{ACC} on one cupboard_{LOC}
S2: A potem, staruszek powiesił na jednej szafce każdą
and then old man hung on one cupboard_{LOC} every
age.
age_{ACC}
- b. S1: Staruszek powiesił na każdej szafce jeden plakat.
old man hung on every cupboard_{LOC} one poster_{ACC}
S2: A potem, staruszek powiesił jeden plakat na każdym
and then old man hung one poster_{ACC} on every
krześle.
chair_{LOC}

(15) podłączyć 'connect'

- a. S1: Mężczyzna podłączył każdą klawiaturę do jednego
man connected every keyboard_{ACC} to one
laptopa.
laptop_{GEN}
S2: A potem, mężczyzna podłączył do jednego laptopa
and then man connected to one laptop_{GEN}
każdą drukarkę.
every printer_{ACC}
- b. S1: Mężczyzna podłączył do każdego laptopa jedną
man connected to every laptop_{GEN} one
klawiaturę.
keyboard_{ACC}
S2: A potem, mężczyzna podłączył jedną klawiaturę do
and then man connected one keyboard_{ACC} to
każdego monitora.
one screen_{GEN}

(16) położyć 'put'

- a. S1: Kelnerka położyła każdą serwetkę na jednym stole.
waitress put every napkin_{ACC} on one table_{LOC}

- S2: A potem, kelnerka położyła na jednym stole każdy
and then waitress put on one table.LOC every
wazon.
vase.ACC
- b. S1: Kelnerka położyła na każdym stole jedną serwetkę.
waitress put on every table.LOC one napkin.ACC
- S2: A potem, kelnerka położyła jedną serwetkę na każdym
and then waitress put one napkin.ACC on every
krześle.
chair.LOC

Fillers

- (17) a. S1: Samochód wyprzedził biegacza.
car.NOM overtook runner.ACC
- S2: A potem, samochód wyprzedził autobus.
and then car.NOM/ACC overtook bus.NOM/ACC
- b. S1: Samochód wyprzedził biegacza.
car.NOM overtook runner.ACC
- S2: A potem, samochód wyprzedził autobus.
and then car.NOM/ACC overtook bus.NOM/ACC
- c. S1: Samochód wyprzedził biegacza.
car.NOM overtook runner.ACC
- S2: A potem, samochód wyprzedził ciężarówkę.
and then car.NOM overtook truck.ACC
- d. S1: Samochód wyprzedził biegacza.
car.NOM overtook runner.ACC
- S2: A potem, samochód wyprzedziła ciężarówka.
and then car.ACC overtook truck.NOM
- (18) a. S1: Bizneswoman oskarżała nauczycielkę.
businesswoman.NOM accused teacher.ACC
- S2: A potem, bizneswoman oskarżała
and then businesswoman.NOM/ACC accused
komisarz.
police-officer.NOM/ACC
- b. S1: Bizneswoman oskarżała nauczycielkę.
businesswoman.NOM accused teacher.ACC

- S2: A potem, bizneswoman oskarżała
and then businesswoman.NOM/ACC accused
komisarz.
police-officer.NOM/ACC
- c. S1: Bizneswoman oskarżała nauczycielkę.
businesswoman.NOM accused teacher.ACC
- S2: A potem, bizneswoman oskarżała policjantkę.
and then businesswoman.NOM accused policewoman.ACC
- d. S1: Bizneswoman oskarżała nauczycielkę.
businesswoman.NOM accused teacher.ACC
- S2: A potem, bizneswoman oskarżała policjantka.
and then businesswoman.ACC accused policewoman.NOM
- (19) a. S1: Szczenię kopnęło kota.
puppy.NOM kicked cat.ACC
- S2: A potem, szczenię kopnęło źrebię.
and then puppy.NOM/ACC kicked colt.NOM/ACC
- b. S1: Szczenię kopnęło kota.
puppy.NOM kicked cat.ACC
- S2: A potem, szczenię kopnęło źrebię.
and then puppy.NOM/ACC kicked colt.NOM/ACC
- c. S1: Szczenię kopnęło kota.
puppy.NOM kicked cat.ACC
- S2: A potem, szczenię kopnęło konia.
and then puppy.NOM kicked horse.ACC
- d. S1: Szczenię kopnęło kota.
puppy.NOM kicked cat.ACC
- S2: A potem, szczenię kopnął koń.
and then puppy.ACC kicked horse.NOM
- (20) a. S1: Chłopki kopnęły rolnika.
peasants.NOM kicked farmer.ACC
- S2: A potem, chłopki kopnęły Cyganki.
and then peasants.NOM/ACC kicked Gypsies.NOM/ACC
- b. S1: Chłopki kopnęły rolnika.
peasants.NOM kicked farmer.ACC
- S2: A potem, chłopki kopnęły Cyganki.
and then peasants.NOM/ACC kicked Gypsies.NOM/ACC
- c. S1: Chłopki kopnęły rolnika.
peasants.NOM kicked farmer.ACC

- S2: A potem, chłopki kopnęły Cyganę.
and then peasants.NOM kicked Gypsy.ACC
- d. S1: Chłopki kopnęły rolnika.
peasants.NOM kicked farmer.ACC
S2: A potem, chłopki kopnęła Cyganka.
and then peasants.ACC kicked Gypsy.NOM
- (21) a. S1: Dwóch wikingów pobiło Cygana.
two vikings.GEN beat up Gipsy.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch wikingów pobiło trzech
and then two vikings.GEN/ACC beat up three
rycerzy.
knights.GEN/ACC
- b. S1: Dwóch wikingów pobiło Cygana.
two vikings.GEN beat up Gipsy.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch wikingów pobiło trzech
and then two vikings.GEN/ACC beat up three
rycerzy.
knights.GEN/ACC
- c. S1: Dwóch wikingów pobiło Cygana.
two vikings.GEN beat up Gipsy.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch wikingów pobiło rycerza.
and then two vikings.GEN beat up knight.ACC
- d. S1: Dwóch wikingów pobiło Cygana.
two vikings.GEN beat up Gipsy.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch wikingów pobili trzech rycerze.
and then two vikings.ACC beat up three knights.NOM
- (22) a. S1: Dwóch włamywaczy gonilo Mikołaja.
two burglars.GEN chased Santa.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch włamywaczy gonilo trzech
and then two burglars.GEN/ACC chased three
policjantów.
policemen.GEN/ACC
- b. S1: Dwóch włamywaczy gonilo Mikołaja.
two burglars.GEN chased Santa.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch włamywaczy gonilo trzech
and then two burglars.GEN/ACC chased three
policjantów.
policemen.GEN/ACC

- c. S1: Dwóch włamywaczy goniło Mikołaja.
two burglars.GEN chased Santa.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch włamywaczy goniło policjantów.
and then two burglars.GEN chased policemen.ACC
- d. S1: Dwóch włamywaczy goniło Mikołaja.
two burglars.GEN chased Santa.ACC
S2: A potem, dwóch włamywaczy gonili trzech policjanci.
and then two burglars.ACC chased three policemen.NOM
- (23) a. S1: Policjantki pozdrowiały sędziów.
policewomen.NOM greeted judges.ACC
S2: A potem, policjantki pozdrowiały
and then policewomen.NOM/ACC greeted
lekarki.
doctors.NOM/ACC
- b. S1: Policjantki pozdrowiały sędziów.
policewomen.NOM greeted judges.ACC
S2: A potem, policjantki pozdrowiały
and then policewomen.NOM/ACC greeted
lekarki.
doctors.NOM/ACC
- c. S1: Policjantki pozdrowiały sędziów.
policewomen.NOM greeted judges.ACC
S2: A potem, policjantki pozdrowiały lekarkę.
and then policewomen.NOM greeted doctor.ACC
- d. S1: Policjantki pozdrowiały sędziów.
policewomen.NOM greeted judges.ACC
S2: A potem, policjantki pozdrowiała lekarka.
and then policewomen.ACC greeted doctor.NOM
- (24) a. S1: Krzak przerósł kaktusy.
bush.NOM outgrew cactuses.ACC.
S2: A potem, kaktusy przerosły palmy.
and then cactuses.NOM/ACC outgrew palm trees.NOM/ACC
- b. S1: Krzak przerósł kaktusy.
bush.NOM outgrew cactuses.NOM/ACC.
S2: A potem, kaktusy przerosły palmy.
and then cactuses.NOM/ACC outgrew palm trees.NOM/ACC
- c. S1: Krzak przerósł kaktusy.
bush.NOM outgrew cactuses.ACC.

- S2: A potem, kaktusy przerosły różę.
and then cactuses.NOM outgrew rose.ACC
- d. S1: Krzak przerosł kaktusy.
bush.NOM outgrew cactuses.ACC.
- S2: A potem, kaktusy przerosła palma.
and then cactuses.NOM outgrew palm tree.ACC
- (25) S1: Chłopiec pozdrowił policjanta.
boy.NOM greeted policeman.ACC
- S2: A potem, chłopiec pozdrowił dziewczynkę z szerokim
and then boy.NOM greeted girl.ACC with wide
uśmiechem.
smile.INS
- (26) S1: Sędzia wskazał na piłkarza.
judge.NOM pointed at footballer.ACC
- S2: A potem, sędzia wskazał na kibica ze spuszczoną
and then judge.NOM pointed at supporter.ACC with bent
głową.
head.INS
- (27) S1: Lekarz badał pielęgniarkę.
doctor.NOM examined nurse.ACC
- S2: A potem, lekarz badał pacjentkę ze złamaną
and then doctor.NOM examined patient.ACC with broken
ręką.
arm.INS
- (28) S1: Chłopiec zobaczył dziecko.
boy.NOM saw child.ACC
- S2: A potem, chłopiec zobaczył mężczyznę w okularach.
and then boy.NOM saw man.ACC in glasses.LOC
- (29) S1: Nauczycielka machała do dyrektora.
teacher.NOM waved to headmaster.GEN
- S2: A potem nauczycielka machała do wesołych chłopców i
and then teacher.NOM waved to happy boys.GEN and
dziewczynek.
girls.GEN
- (30) S1: Na stole leżał ananas.
on table.LOC laid pineapple.NOM

- S2: A potem, na stole leżały zielone banany i
and then on table.LOC laid green bananas.NOM and
jabłka.
apples.NOM
- (31) S1: Kelner podał chleb.
waiter.NOM served bread.ACC
S2: A potem, kelner podał dużą pizzę i lemoniadę.
and then waiter served big pizza.ACC and lemonade.ACC
- (32) S1: Ośmiornica pływała w basenie.
octopus.NOM swam in swimming pool.LOC
S2: A potem, trzy ryby i węże pływały w jeziorze.
and then three fish.NOM and snakes.NOM swam in lake.LOC
- (33) S1: Każda pielęgniarzka się kłaniała, bo jeden chłopiec bił brawo.
every singer.NOM refl. bowed because one boy.NOM applauded
S2: A potem, jeden chłopiec bił brawo, bo każda tancerka
and then one boy.NOM applauded because every dancer.NOM
się kłaniała.
refl. bowed
- (34) S1: Każdy supermen się śmiał, bo jeden policjant
every superman.NOM refl. laughed because one policeman.NOM
płakał.
cried
S2: A potem, jeden policjant płakał, bo każdy
and then one policeman.NOM cried because every
lekarz się śmiał.
doctor.NOM refl. laughed

References

- Alter, Kai, Ina Mleinek, Tobias Rohe, Anita Steube & Carla Umbach. 2001. Kon-
trastprosodie in sprachproduktion und -perzeption. *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte*
77. 59–79.
- Bates, Douglas, Martin Mächler, Ben Bolker & Steve Walker. 2015. Fitting linear
mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1). 1–48.
<https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.

- Boneh, Nora & Léa Nash. 2017. The syntax and semantics of dative DPs in Russian ditransitives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 35. 899–953. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s111049-017-9360-5>.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys superiority: frozen scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(2). 233–273.
- Janke, Victoria & Ad Neeleman. 2012. Ascending and descending VPs in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(2). 151–190.
- Łęska, Paulina. 2019. *Quantifier scope as a diagnostic for the position of arguments of ditransitive verbs*. Poznań: University of Poznań dissertation.
- Mehlhorn, Grit. 2013. The prosodic pattern of contrastive accent in Russian. In Anita Steube (ed.), *Information structure: theoretical and empirical aspects*, vol. 1 (Language, Context & Cognition), 241–258. De Gruyter.
- R Core Team. 2019. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Wiland, Bartosz. 2009. *Aspects of order preservation in Polish and English*. Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań dissertation.