

FOCUS ASSOCIATION WITH *ONLY* IN RUSSIAN AND BCS
KSENIA ZANON, BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY

The paper examines the properties of the focalizing adverb *only* in Russian and BCS. I show that, unlike English (1), where *only* can be associated with either argument in the predicate, yielding distinct truth conditional interpretations (Rooth 1985), Russian imposes a strict adjacency requirement, as demonstrated in (2) and (3). In ungrammatical (2), the focused constituent is separated from *only* by a verb in (2a) and a verb+direct object in (2b). (3) shows how to render (2) acceptable: *only* must be next to the constituent under focus; the resulting complex has an option of appearing either before or after the verb. BCS in (11) evinces yet another pattern: the adjacency requirement in this language is not quite as strict as in Russian: *only* can be separated from its associate exclusively by the verb, but not another NP.

In Russian, syntactic focus movement is obligatory for items associated with *only*. I propose that *only* has a designated base-generated spot on the edges of V, T and C-domains and that the verb in Russian raises out of its base position (Gribanova 2013, Bailyn 1995). Focus movement in this case is understood as displacement of an XP endowed with a focus feature, which results in Rudin-style right-adjunction to *only*. This focus movement may result in the configuration (4-i), a string vacuous surface arrangement corresponding to (3c) and (3d). If the focused element moves into a higher domain, as in (4-ii), then this *only*+XP complex appears before the verb on the surface, as in (3a) and (3b).

To defend this analysis I rely on Bošković's (2014) proposals. He contends that in cases of multiple edges (Specs/adjuncts) of a phase, only the highest one counts as the phasal edge for PIC. Abstractly, YP in (5a) is the highest edge, so it is accessible for extraction (5b). (5c) with movement of ZP over an overt higher edge is illicit. However, traces void "edgehood", much like they void the effects of Relativized Minimality (Chomsky 1995); so, in (5d) the extraction of YP renders ZP the highest edge suitable for subsequent operations. Following Bošković (2012) and Despić (2011), I treat adjectives as NP-adjuncts. If so, the paradigm in (6) follows in a straightforward manner: in (6a), *white* constitutes the highest edge, so it can be extracted to move to the edge of the V-domain in order to form a constituent with *only*, but in (6b) it blocks the extraction of the lower adjective. Further evidence for string vacuous movement is provided in (8). Zanon (2015) argues that in order for the anaphoric possessive *svoj* to be bound, it has to occupy the highest NP-edge, which is not the case in (8b) as the adjective intervenes between the binder and the anaphor. However, (8a) with the focalized adjective is acceptable. The reason for this is that the adjectives vacates the NP, rendering the anaphor visible to its binder. Note that we are dealing with movement to *only* (rather than the direct merge of *only* with its associate), since both configurations in (7), with *only* adjacent to the lower adjective in (7a) and a noun in (7b), are prohibited. Additional evidence for movement is in (9) and (10). I argue that the infinitives in (9) are coordinated at the lowest level of the verbal domain. Since *only* occupies the higher edge in the V-domain, the attempt to move the focused NP there results in a CSC violation in (9a). This is true even in the absence of *only* when a contrastively focused adjective moves to a designated focus position in (9b). Similarly, in (10), the gerundive clause is assumed to have a defective T (Weisser 2015), which precludes the movement of V to the tense-domain. Since the verb is confined to its V-domain and *only* is generated at the edge thereof, it follows that the *only*+XP *associate* complex has to precede it, which is borne out by the contrast between (10a) and (10b).

Turning to BCS in (11)/(12): the adjacency of *only* with its associate can be interrupted only by the verb, as in (11d) and (12a). Otherwise, it is like Russian in requiring the focalized element to be adjacent to *only*, as in (11b) and (12b,c). I argue that in BCS focus association obtains via a syntactic agree mechanism, which is subject to an intervention effect: whenever *only* is associated with an XP, another phrase cannot intervene between them. This then explains the infelicity of (11a,c) and (12d).

I also demonstrate that both BCS and Russian prohibit focus association into any islands, as in (13), which follows from the proposed analysis (cf. English translation). In fact, I show that Russian and BCS represent two distinct syntactic ways of associating *only* with the focused element neither of which is present in English.

- (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]
Andrej only baked pie for sister
Intended: 'Andrej only baked [A PIE]_F for his sister.'
b. *Andrej tol'ko ispek pirog [DLJA SESTRY]_F.
- (3) a. Andrej **tol'ko** [PIROG]_F ispek dlja sestry. b. Andrej **tol'ko** [DLJA SESTRY]_F ispek pirog.
c. Andrej ispek **tol'ko** [PIROG]_F dlja sestry. d. Andrej ispek pirog **tol'ko** [DLJA SESTRY]_F.
- (4) [C-domain [T-domain [V-domain (i) [N-domain]]]]
- (5) a. [_{XP} YP [_{XP} ZP X]] c. ***ZP**... [_{XP} YP [_{XP} t_{ZP} X]]
b. ^{OK}**YP**... [_{XP} t_{YP} [_{XP} ZP X]] d. ^{OK}**YP**... ZP... [_{XP} t_{YP} [_{XP} t_{ZP} X]]
- (6) a. Anna kupila **tol'ko** [BELUJU]_F kitajskuju šljapu.
Anna bought only white Chinese hat
'Anna only bought the [WHITE]_F Chinese hat.'
b. ?* Anna kupila **tol'ko** beluju [KITAJSKUJU]_F šljapu.
c. Anna kupila **tol'ko** [KITAJSKUJU]_F beluju šljapu.
- (7) a. *... beluju **tol'ko** [KITAJSKUJU]_F šljapu. b. *... beluju kitajskuju **tol'ko** [ŠLJAPU]_F.
- (8) a. Anna otdala **tol'ko** [STARYE]_F svoi vešči.
Anna gave.away only old self's things
'Anna gave away only her [OLD]_F things.'
b. ?*Anna otdala starye svoi vešči. (neutral prosody)
- (9) a. *My ne budem **tol'ko profesora** slušat' i govorit' s dekanom.
we neg will only professor to.listen and talk with dean
Intended: 'We will not listen to only [the PROFESSOR]_F and talk to the dean.'
b. *My ne budem **profesora** slušat' i govorit' s dekanom.
- (10) a. *Čitaja **tol'ko knigi**, Ivan otvlekalsja. b. **Tol'ko knigi** čitaja, Ivan otvlekalsja.
reading only books Ivan got.distracted
'Only while reading [BOOKS]_F Ivan got distracted.'
- (11) a. *Ja **samo** hranim koze [ŠPINATOM]_F. b. Ja hranim koze samo [ŠPINATOM]_F. [BCS]
I only feed goats spinach_{INST}.
'I only feed goats [THE SPINACH]_F.'
c. *Ja **samo** koze hranim [ŠPINATOM]_F. d. Ja koze samo hranim [ŠPINATOM]_F.
- (12) a. Ja **samo** hranim [KOZE]_F špinatom. b. Ja hranim špinatom samo [KOZE]_F.
c. Ja **samo** [KOZE]_F hranim špinatom. d. ?*Ja **samo** hranim špinatom [KOZE]_F.
- (13) *Mi smo se **samo** upoznali s čovjekom koji ne voli [MARIJU]_F.
we Aux Refl only met with person who neg likes Maria
Intended: 'We only met with a person who doesn't like [MARY]_F'.

References: **Bailyn, J.** 1995. Underlying phrase structure and "short" verb movement in Russian. *JSL* 3. **Bošković, Ž.** 2012. On NPs and clauses. In *Discourse and grammar: From sentence types to lexical categories*. Boston: Walter de Gruyter. **Bošković, Ž.** 2014. Now I'm a phase, now I'm not a phase. *LI* 45. **Chomsky, N.** 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge: MIT Press. **Despić, M.** 2011. *Syntax in the absence of determiner phrase*. Ph.D. diss., UConn. **Gribanova, V.** 2013. Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis and the structure of the Russian verbal complex. *NLLT* 31. **Rooth, M.** 1985 *Association with focus*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell. **Weisser, P.** 2015. *Derived Coordination [...]*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. **Zanon, K.** 2015. *On hybrid coordination and quantifier raising*. Ph.D. diss., Indiana.