

## Predicate Doubling in Russian: One Process or Two?

Andrei Antonenko (Stony Brook University)

**Introduction.** Several analyses of predicate doubling (or clefting; PD below) were proposed in the recent literature for various languages (Yiddish, Russian, Polish, Gungbe, and others, see Abels, 2001; Cable, 2004; Landau, 2006; Aboh and Dyakonova, 2009; Bondaruk, 2009, 2012 a.o.). Their analyses differ on whether the upper instance of the predicate is base-generated within the CP domain, or is a result of movement. In this paper I demonstrate based on data from Russian that it is possible for one language to resort to both strategies.

**Data Description.** The basic sentences from Russian demonstrating PD are given in (1). It is possible to either front a bare V (**V-PD**), or V together with all its arguments (**VP-PD**).

- (1) a. kupit' piva-to zavtra Ivan kupit, no pit' ne budet  
buy.INF beer-TO tomorrow I. buy.FUT but drink.INF not will  
'As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer tomorrow, but won't drink it.'
- b. kupit' piva-to zavtra Ivan (\*piva) kupit (\*piva), ...  
buy.INF beer-TO tomorrow I. (beer) buy.FUT (beer)
- c. kupit'-to Ivan piva kupit, no pit' ne budet  
buy.INF-TO I. beer buy.FUT but drink.INF not will  
'As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer, but won't drink it.'

The particle *-to* marks the topic phrase and is optional; from the examples in (1) one can see that in (1-a), both verb and its arguments occur in the peripheral position, while in (1-c), only V is fronted. Further, argument of the verb cannot be repeated in both locations, (1-b).

The verbs in both instances of the predicate do not need to be identical in case of VP-PD, (2-a).<sup>1</sup> However, in case of V-PD, verbs must be the same, see (2-b).

- (2) a. ?s'ezdit' v Ameriku-to ja zavtra tuda leču  
go.INF to America-TO I tomorrow there fly.FUT  
'As for going to the USA, I'm flying there tomorrow.'
- b. \*s'ezdit-to ja zavtra v Ameriku leču  
go.INF-TO I tomorrow in America fly  
'As for going, I'm flying to the USA tomorrow.'

Interestingly, long-distance PD is possible in Russian only with the indicative complement for VP-PD, and impossible for subjunctives and control infinitives for both V-PD and VP-PD, (3).

- (3) a. ?kupit' piva-to on думаet čto Boris kupit  
buy.INF beer-TO he thinks that B. buy.FUT  
'As for buying beer, he heard that Boris will buy it'
- b. \*kupit'-to on slyshal čto Boris piva kupit  
buy.INF-TO he heard that B. beer buy.FUT  
'As for buying, he heard that Boris will buy beer'
- c. \*kupit' piva-to Ivan xočet čtoby Boris kupil  
buy.INF beer-TO I. wants that.SUBJ B. buy.SUBJ  
'As for buying beer, Ivan wants Boris to buy it.'
- d. \*kupit' piva-to Marina xočet kupit'  
buy.INF beer-TO M. wants buy.INF  
'As for buying beer, Marina wants to buy it'

Such behavior of PD constructions in Russian is unexpected, since it has been shown that subjunctives and infinitives are more transparent for movement and other long distance phenomena (e.g. obviation and easier *wh*-extraction in subjunctives, long-distance binding into control clauses).

Further difference between V-PD and VP-PD comes from consideration of island effects. V-PD constructions are sensitive to islands (relative clauses, *wh*-islands, coordinate structure, etc.) as shown in (5), while VP-PD constructions allow copies to be separated by an island, (4).

<sup>1</sup>While identical verbs are preferred in general, I argue that this is not a syntactic restriction; with a careful choice of examples, my informants found some examples with different verbs to be natural. Notice the strong contrast between (2-a) and (2-b).

- (4) a. ?kupit' piva-to ja ne znaju kogda on kupit (Wh-island)  
 buy.INF beer-TO I not now when he buy  
 b. ?kupit' piva-to on kupit i vodki vyp'et (Coordinate Structure Constraint)  
 buy.INF beer-TO he buy and vodka drink
- (5) a. \*kupit'-to ja ne znaju kogda on piva kupit (Wh-island)  
 buy.INF-TO I not now when he beer buy  
 b. \*kupit'-to on piva kupit i vodki vyp'et (Coordinate Structure Constraint)  
 buy.INF-TO he beer buy and vodka drink

**Analysis.** To analyze the data one needs to answer the following questions: 1). *What triggers PD process?* 2). *Is upper instance of the doubled constituent base-generated or moved?* 3). *Why does it exhibit infinitival morphology?* 4). *Why is long-distance V-PD prohibited, while VP-PD is allowed out of indicatives?* 5). *How to account for the observed behavior of PD with respect to islands?*

Interpretation of PD constructions can be analyzed by postulating that the upper instance is located in the topic projection within the CP domain, and *-to* is a head of this projection; hence the interpretation of PD sentences as having contrastive topics, see (1). The Topic feature on *-to* needs to be valued by having a constituent with a valued uninterpretable instance of Topic feature moved or merged into the CP-domain (I assume Pesetsky and Torrego, 2007 feature system).

Difference in behavior with respect to islands of V-PD and VP-PD constructions can be used as evidence for two different analyses of these constructions. I propose that V-PD, being island-sensitive, involves head-movement to C, while VP-PD involve base-generation of a second instance of *vP* in the CP-domain. As a result, ban on long-distance head movement explains why long-distance V-PD is not allowed. Now, to explain the difference between indicative vs. subjunctive/infinitival complements, I propose that the upper instance of *vP* is generated in the embedded CP. Notice, that Russian subjunctive and infinitival CPs cannot host contrastive topics, see (6) and (7) respectively.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(6) *Maša skazala čtoby Sergeja-to Ivan vstretil<br/>         M. said that.SUBJ S.-TO I. meet.SUBJ<br/>         'Maša wants Ivan to meet Sergej'</p> | <p>(7) *Maša xočet piva-to kupit'<br/>         M. wants beer-TO buy.INF<br/>         'Maša wants to buy beer.'</p> |
|---|--|

This accounts for ungrammatical status of PD with subjunctive/infinitival complements.

Analysis of VP-PD as base-generated in the embedded Spec,CP also predicts its infinitival morphology under assumption that Agreement/Tense is a property of a T-head; since T never probes into the upper instance of *vP*, the upper instance of the verb will be uninflected and surface as infinitive. This analysis correctly predicts that the fronted *vP* need not be identical to the lower *vP* in case of VP-PD. On the other hand, since I argue that V-PD is in fact derived by movement, identity restriction (as in (2-b)) on such constructions follows directly.

I also argue that the arguments within the lower instance of *vP* are deleted under identity, similarly to ellipsis. Notice that the verbs do not delete, since they have different morphology.

Finally, I demonstrate how V-PD constructions are derived through head-movement. I argue that *v* is probed twice: by C, to check its Top features, and by T, to check its T-features, resulting in creation of two chains: C-*v* and T-*v*. Probing by C results in movement of *v* to C directly, while T, being weak in Russian, does not trigger verb movement to T. Both T and C probe simultaneously; as a result, V raised to C will be uninflected; the upper copy in *v*-C chain will be pronounced (need to pronounce the topicalized element). In *v*-T chain, *v* will be pronounced with its inflection; the lower instance of V will have finite morphology. At conclusion, I discuss how these ideas can be implemented in Arregi and Pietraszko, 2018 Generalized Head Movement framework.

- Abels, Klaus. 2001. Predicate cleft constructions in Russian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 9*, ed. Steve Franks and Michael Yadroff, 1–19. Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Aboh, Enoch Olade, and Marina Dyakonova. 2009. Predicate doubling and parallel chains. *Lingua* 119:1035–1065.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Asia Pietraszko. 2018. Generalized Head Movement. Presented at Annual LSA Meeting, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Bondaruk, Anna. 2009. Constraints on predicate clefting in Polish. In *Studies in formal Slavic phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and information structure*, ed. Gerhild Zybatow, Uwe Junghanns, Denisa Lenertová, and Petr Biskup, 65–79. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Bondaruk, Anna. 2012. Copy deletion in Polish predicate clefting. In *Sound, structure and sense. Studies in memory of Edmund Gussmann*, ed. Eugeniusz Cyran, Henryk Kardela, and Bogdan Szymanek, 55–70. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.
- Cable, Seth. 2004. Predicate clefts and base-generation: Evidence from Yiddish and Brazilian Portuguese.
- Landau, Idan. 2006. Chain resolution in Hebrew V(P)-fronting. *Syntax* 9:32–66.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2007. The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features. In *Phrasal and clausal architecture*, ed. Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian, and Wendy K. Wilkins, 262–294. John Benjamins.