

The Predicate Cleft Construction in Russian.

Abels, Klaus. 2001. The Predicate Cleft Construction in Russian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 9*, eds. Steven Franks and Michael Yadroff, 1-19. Bloomington, IN: Michigan Slavic Publications.

The Predicate Cleft Construction in Russian*

1 Introduction

In this paper I will provide a minimalist (Chomsky 1993, 1995, 1999, 2000) analysis of the Predicate Cleft Construction (PCC) in Russian.¹ The construction is familiar from a number of languages (2 Haitian from Lumsden and Lefebvre 1990:765, 3 Hausa *ibid*:762) and is fairly common in spoken Russian (1).

- (1) ✓ Čitat' (-to) Ivan eë čitaet, no ničego
read_{inf} (TO) Ivan it_{fem.acc} reads but nothing
ne ponimaet.
not understands
'Ivan does read it, but he doesn't understand a thing.'
- (2) ✓ Se achte ei te achte flè yo.
it-is buy he PAST buy flowers PL
'That is BUY that he bought flowers.' (he didn't steal them)
- (3) ✓ Cin abincii da saurii, Aka cee SUN yi.
eat-VN food with speed indef. say 3rd.Perf do
'Eating food in a hurry, one said they did.'

In section 2 I present a brief sketch of the semantics of the construction and the basic data. In section 3 I argue that the data is best

*I would like to thank Natalia Rakhlin for long discussions of the data reported here. The judgements are hers! Particular thanks go to Steven Franks and Michael Yadroff, who reviewed this paper for FASL and helped improve it a lot, and to Sarah Felber, who made sure the English was flowing. I would also like to thank • eljko Bošković, Howard Lasnik, Jairo Nunes, Arthur Stepanov and the audience of FASL 9 for comments and suggestions on various stages of the present work. All remaining errors and shortcomings are my own

¹ In fact there is quite a bit of speaker variation. In this paper I keep to a consistent set of data collected from a single speaker: Natalia Rakhlin. Discussion of variation among speakers would go beyond the scope of this paper.

analyzed in terms of remnant VP fronting. Section 4 provides an implementation of this analysis in terms of the copy theory of movement. In this section the main theoretical conclusions are established: (i) the PCC provides support for the copy theory of movement, (ii) pronunciation of multiple copies of a single element from the numeration is possible, and (iii) under a strictly lexicalist view of morphology, a natural account for the PCC is not possible. Section 5 takes up some problematic data. I argue that object shift/Case checking is obligatorily overt for definite DPs in Russian. Section 6 is a brief summary of the main results.

2 The Data

A typical example of the PCC was already provided in example (1). Descriptively, the example is a string containing a non-finite form of a lexical verb *V*, the optional discourse particle *to*, followed by a regular main clause with an occurrence of the same verb *V* in a finite form. Certain examples that do not conform to this description will be discussed below. Not all sentence initial infinitivals will automatically count as examples of the PCC. Fronted complements of verbs that take infinitival complements or sentence initial non-finite adjuncts qualify only if they carry the semantics of the PCC.

I will call the initial part of the clause preceding *to* the *Head* of the cleft; the particle *-to* will be called *TO*; the part following *TO* (or the *Head* if *TO* is absent) will be called the *Body* (cf. 13). The tensed form of the verb in the *Body* will be called the *Finite Verb*, and the unclefted form of the sentence will be called the *Base Line Sentence*. Thus in (1) *čitat'* is the *Head*, *Ivan eë čitaet* the *Body*, *čitaet* the *Finite Verb*. Example (4) is the *Base Line Sentence* corresponding to (1).

(4) ✓ Ivan eë čitaet .
 Ivan it_{fem.acc} read_{3rd.sg}
 'Ivan is reading it.'

Predicate clefting in Russian has clear cut effects on the

information structure of a sentence (see Paillard and Plungjan 1993 for discussion). My own view is that the *Head* provides a S(entence)-topic in the sense of Büring (1995). The *Head* is, roughly speaking, a contrastive topic. In line with Büring's theory, a predicate cleft has a set of questions as its topic semantic value. Its ordinary semantic value is one answer to one of the questions in the topic semantic value. Predicate clefts have two intonational nuclei: one on the non-finite form of the verb in the *Head* and one on the *Finite Verb*. These intonational nuclei indicate the focus and the topic domains. The following is a plausible semantic interpretation of (1):

(5) Topic semantic value:

{Did Ivan read it?, Did Ivan understand it?, Did Ivan throw it away?, ...}

Ordinary semantic value

Ivan read it.

According to Büring, sentences with S-topics conventionally implicate that the answer given in the ordinary semantic value is not exhaustive, i.e. that certain of the questions in the topic semantic value are still under discussion. This can clearly be seen from the continuation of (1): '...but he did not understand it'. This continuation constitutes an answer to the second question listed in (5).

Furthermore, sentences with S-topics cannot be uttered out of the blue. Unless at least one answer to one of the questions in the topic semantic value was already under discussion, such a sentence cannot be felicitously uttered. Since I am assuming the topic semantic value of the PCC to be a set of yes/no-questions that differ in the verb only, it follows that no other element may be new in the context.² These semantics can be used as a diagnostic for predicate clefthood. Space limitations keep me from developing these sketchy remarks further.

The first question to ask with respect to predicate clefting is how

² This last fact will become quite important in section 5 of the present paper when indefiniteness and definiteness are discussed.

general the clefting process is. Is it limited to specific semantic or structural verb classes? The answer is ‘no’. An example of a transitive verb was already given in (1). An example with an unergative verb is given in (6), with an unaccusative verb in (7), with a ditransitive in (8), a PP-embedding verb in (9), and a CP embedding one in (10). These examples also exemplify various semantic classes.³

(6) (Grammatika Russkogo Jazyka 1960 vol 2.1 p404)

Čto • èto on? streljat' ne streljaet, a r u • " ë
der • it.

what • that he? shoot_{inf} not shoots, but rifle hold_{3rd.sg}
‘What’s wrong with him? Holds a rifle but doesn’t fire?!’

(7) ✓ Rasti -to Marina rastët, no často boleet.
grow_{inf} TO Marina grow_{3rd.sg} but often be ill_{3rd.sg}
‘Marina does grow, but she is ill a lot.’

(8) ✓ Dat' (-to) ja eë emu dal, no...
give_{inf} (TO) I her him gave, but...
‘I did give it to him, but...’

(9) ✓ Dumat' o • enit'b e (-to) on dumaet
think_{inf} about marriage (TO) he think_{3rd.sg}
- no nikogda on ne • enitsja.
but never he not marry-self
‘He does think about marriage, but he will never marry.’

³ Example (10) shows that stative/i-level predicates are possible with the PCC in Russian. Larson and Lefebvre (1991) report that this is impossible in Haitian.

- (10) ✓ Dumat' čto Xomskij genij on думаet no čitat'
 think_{inf} that Chomsky genius he thinks but read_{inf}
 ego knigi ne čitaet. /no znat' ne znaet
 his books not reads /but know_{inf} not knows
 'He does think that Chomsky is a genius, but he doesn't
 read his books./ but he doesn't know for sure.'

Having established the full generality of the clefting process, we are in a position to ask questions about the morphology involved. The relevant generalization is as follows: if a *Base Line Sentence* contains an inflected form of a lexical verb, then the infinitive of that verb occurs in the *Head*. The inflected form occurs in the *Body*. All the Russian examples given so far fall under this generalization.⁴ Consider however examples like (11) and (12), where the *Base Line Sentences* (11a) and (12b) contain analytic tense forms. In these cases no doubling takes place as shown by the ungrammaticality of (11b) and (12b) and the grammaticality of (11c) and (12c).

- (11a) ✓ On budet čitat'.
 he will read_{inf}
- (11b) * Čitat' on budet čitat'.
 read_{inf} TO he will read_{inf}
- (11c) ✓ Čitat' on budet.
 read_{inf} TO he will
 'He will read.'
- (12a) ✓ Dom byl postroen.
 house was build_{prt.past.pass}

⁴ The copula is the only clear counterexample I know. It will be discussed in footnote 15.

- (12b) * Postroen (-to) dom byl postroen.⁵
 build_{prt.past.pass} TO house was build_{prt.past.pass}
- (12c) ✓ Postroen dom byl.
 build_{prt.past.pass} house was
 ‘The house was built.’

Put in different terms, if a *Base Line Sentence* has only one exponent of both lexical content of the verb and tense information, then doubling takes place. If a *Base Line Sentence* represents these two pieces of information on independent items, no doubling occurs.

3 The Structure and Derivation of the PCC

Assuming that what I have called the PCC is indeed a coherent phenomenon in Russian, we can now ask how to analyze it. The questions to ask are: What is the structure? How are the sentences derived?

In what follows I will argue for a structure along the lines indicated in (13). A (remnant) VP is moved to a position higher than TP and below CP. The exact nature of the phrase is irrelevant here. The position may or may not be the specifier of the landing site projected by *-to*.⁶

- (13) [CP ... [XP [VP ... V_{inf} ...] ...] [-to ... [TP ... V_{fin} ...]]]
 ---- *Head* ---- TO | --- *Body* ---

On this view the *Body* forms a constituent at least the size of TP. The *Head* is also a phrasal constituent. The claim made in (13) that

⁵ Michael Yadroff (p.c.) accepts this sentence. Jairo Nunes (p.c.) notes that comparable examples are also acceptable in Brazilian Portuguese. Maybe for the speakers who allow doubling of the passive participle, the participle acts as a nominal. In this case the structure is that of a base generated external topic. See below for some discussion of base generated topics in Russian.

⁶ I am not aware of any examples where an adjunct can intervene between the *Head* and *TO*, so that the *Head* presumably is the specifier of the phrase projected by *-to* (or in the absence of *-to* some null counterpart).

the infinitival verb is structurally below C° can be substantiated quite easily.

- (14a) ✓ Pětr skazal čto pročitat' (-to) on eë pročitaet...
Petr said that read TO he it_{fem.acc} read_{fut}
- (14b) * Pětr skazal pročitat' (-to) čto on eë pročitaet...
Petr said read_{inf} TO that he it_{fem.acc} read_{fut}
'Peter said that he would read the book through.'

Example (14) shows that the *Head* can follow the complementizer *čto*, but it cannot precede it. This implies that *čto* is structurally above the *Head*.

The structure in (13) also claims that the *Head* is located above TP. To show this we observe that the *Head* usually precedes the subject of the sentence. It is then higher than the landing site of the subject.⁷ If subjects are in the specifier of TP, then the fact that the *Head* precedes the subject shows that the *Head* is higher than the subject. The position of the subject in Russian is contested, however, so a stronger argument is needed.

Ever since Jackendoff (1973) it has been quite widely believed that different classes of adverbs are attached in different structural positions and that sentential adverbs are attached in a particularly high position, above TP (see Stjepanović 1995). If this is true, then example (15) shows that the *Head* is above TP. The *Head* precedes the subject, which precedes the adverb, which is, by assumption higher than T° . Sentences where a sentential adverb precedes the *Head* are ungrammatical (cf. 17b).

⁷ I will not concern myself here with the exact position of the subject in a theory assuming a split Infl theory (cf. Pollock 1989, Chomsky 1991 among many others). The *Head* is above TP.

- (15) ✓ Čitat' (-to) on naverno čitaet, no...
 Read_{inf} TO he probably reads, but...
 'He probably does read, but...'

The two arguments just given indicate that the Head of the predicate cleft is in a structural position between C° and T°. This conclusion is independent of the exact structure of the *Head* and *TO*.

I will argue next that the *Head* plus *TO* are in fact not plausibly analyzed as a constituent. There are two options for analyzing the *Head* plus *TO* as a constituent: (i) the non-finite verb plus *TO* might form a complex head, or (ii) the *Head* plus *TO* might form a phrasal constituent. Although (i) might be the right analysis for some idiolects of Russian which disallow all examples of the type that follows, the idiolect under consideration provides quite strong evidence that the *Head* is not a complex head.

- (16a) ✓ Dumat' o • enit'b e (-to) on dumaet
 think_{inf} about marriage TO he thinks
 - no nikogda on ne • enitsja.
 but never he not marry-self
- (16b) * Dumat' (-to) on dumaet o • enit'b e - no...
 think_{inf} TO he thinks about marriage but...
 'He does think about marriage, but he will never marry.'

The *Head* of the cleft in the grammatical example (16a) is not just a syntactic head, but a phrase, i.e. the verb plus its complement. If the infinitival verb indeed formed a complex head with *TO*, we would expect (16b) to be grammatical and (16a) to be ungrammatical, the exact opposite of the observed pattern. The data are thus inconsistent with analyzing the *Head* plus *TO* as a complex head.

These data however are not sufficient to show that the *Head* plus *TO* do not form a constituent at all. They might still form a phrasal constituent. I am not aware of any direct evidence bearing on the point. However, an indirect argument will be presented after the movement analysis of the PCC has been defended.

We have already seen some evidence in (16) that the *Head* is roughly the size of a VP. Further evidence is easy to adduce. In (17a) for example, a VP adverb is part of the *Head*. As shown in (17b), a sentential adverb cannot appear in the same position.

- (17a) ✓ Bystro pečatat' (-to) on pečataet, no delaet mnogo ošibok.
 fast type_{inf} TO he types but makes many errors
 'He types fast, but he makes a lot of mistakes.'
- (17b) * Včera pečatat' (-to) on pečatal, no sdelal mnogo
 yesterday type_{inf} TO he typed but made many
 ošibok.
 mistakes
 'He did type yesterday, but he made a lot of mistakes'

I therefore assume that the *Head* is indeed a VP.⁸

Having defended the structure given in (13), let me turn now to the task of analyzing the derivation of the PCC. There are at least two conceivable derivations, one in which the *Head* is base generated in its position and one in which it is moved there. Both of these have been suggested in the literature on other languages.⁹ If we assume base generation of the *Head* in its position, various questions arise. Why does the observed identity (modulo finiteness) between the *Finite Verb* in the *Body* and the non-finite verb in the *Head* obtain? Why can't the lexical verb be doubled in analytic tense forms (cf. 12)? How is the theta grid of the infinitival verb in the *Head* satisfied in examples like (1) where only one object and one subject occur? The same question arises with respect to (16). In fact, we can complement the paradigm in (16) with (16c) below and (1) with (1b) and ask what rules out these sentences.

⁸ I am not concerned here with establishing the exact size of the *Head* (VP, vP, or something slightly bigger) and will use the term VP as a cover term.

⁹ Koopman (1984) is the classic reference for the movement approach. Larson and Lefebvre (1991) argue for base generation for the PCC in Haitian; however, they invoke an additional mechanism of LF VP-movement and replacement of the *Head*.

- (16c) * Dumat' o • enit'be (-to) on dumaet
 think_{inf} about marriage (TO) he thinks
 o • enit'be - no nikogda on ne • enitsja.
 about marriage but never he not marry-self
- (1b) * Čitat' eë (-to) Ivan eë čitaet, no...
 read_{inf} it_{Fem.Acc} TO Ivan it_{Fem.Acc} reads but...

In other words, the data indicate that as far as theta relations go, the non-finite verb can stand in for the finite verb and vice versa. Furthermore, the two verbs are identical (modulo inflection). Both of these properties are typical properties of movement. This suggests that the PCC ought to be analyzed as a movement phenomenon. Otherwise, a good deal of redundancy would have to be introduced into the theory, since there would have to be two ways to derive these properties: movement and whatever is responsible for the PCC. We thus have a theoretical argument from simplicity for a movement analysis of the PCC.

Still, one might be tempted to try to assimilate the PCC to other Russian constructions involving base generation. Base generated topics come to mind as a candidate, especially since the PCC is a structure with an S-topic. However, the PCC behaves quite differently from base generated topics. For some discussion of this, see Franks and House 1982 or King 1995 (esp. 103-106). Example (18) illustrates one of the differences. Unlike the PCC (example 14), base generated topics are a matrix phenomenon in Russian.

- (18a) ✓ Kniga on eë pročital.
 book_{nom.sg.fem} he it_{Fem.Acc} read_{3sg.msc.past}
 'The book - he read it.'
- (18b) Pëtr skazal (*kniga) čto (*kniga) on eë pročital.
 Petr said book that book he it_{Fem.Acc} read
 'Peter said that he had read the book through.'

A second difference, apparent in example (18a), is that the topic

usually doubles an argument in the sentence, but there is no requirement that they both be the same lexical element ('eë' vs. 'kniga') or be otherwise identical (see Franks and House 1982). Furthermore, no material can be scrambled in front of a base generated topic (19a), whereas scrambling in front of the head of a predicate cleft is marginally possible (19b).¹⁰

- (19a) * On, Ivana, ego vidit.
 he, Ivan_{acc} him sees
- (19b) ? On čitat' (-to) čitatet, no...
 he read_{inf} TO reads, but...
 'He does read, but...'

Finally, on a movement approach to the PCC we expect locality effects to appear, as in fact they do (20). To capture these effects on a base generation approach would require further stipulations which would, once again, have to be redundant with conditions on movement or chains.¹¹

- (20) * Kupit' (-to) ty skazal čto ja èto kupil...
 buy_{inf} TO you said that I that bought

Predicate clefting out of embedded infinitives is sometimes possible. There is a parallelism with *wh*-movement in Russian, which is also possible out of infinitivals and subjunctives, but not out of full finite clauses. Notice that in order to derive the examples in (20) we

¹⁰ This kind of scrambling is comparable to scrambling in front of a *wh*-phrase in a real, non-echo question as shown in (i). The similarity provides a further argument for assuming that the *Head* is in a position between TP and CP if Bošković (1999a) and Stepanov (1998b) are on the right track in assuming that *wh*-phrases move to a position between TP and CP in Russian.

(i) (example provided by A. Stepanov p.c.)
 ✓ Ivan kogo znaet
 Ivan who_{acc} knows
 'Who does Ivan know?'

¹¹ I take no stance here on whether chains exist and what properties they have.

would have to move the embedded VP out of the embedding VP.

We have seen that any attempt to analyze the PCC as a base generation phenomenon will end up introducing quite a bit of redundancy into the system, and that the PCC exhibits certain characteristics of movement. Let us take the evidence for movement at face value. If we make the commonly held assumption that movement is to a c-commanding position,¹² we have the missing argument for the structure proposed above and repeated here.

(13) $[_{CP} \dots [_{XP} [_{VP} \dots V_{inf} \dots] \dots] \text{-to} \dots [_{IP} \dots V_{fin} \dots]]]$

The problem above was that we were missing an argument against treating the *Head plus TO* as a constituent. If we assumed now that the *Head plus TO* did form a constituent, the moved VP would not c-command its copy in the base position, and the structure should be out for the same reasons other cases of movement to a non-c-commanding position are out.

To summarize the results of this section, we have seen that the Head of a predicate cleft is a phrasal constituent of roughly the size of VP. This (remnant) VP moves to a position between IP and CP.

4 The PCC and the Copy Theory of Movement

Pre-minimalist generative approaches assumed that when an element is moved it leaves behind a special type of null element, a trace, or nothing at all. Under minimalist assumptions, traces cannot exist as primitive elements. The copy theory of movement is virtually forced by the inclusiveness condition (cf. Chomsky 1995). The properties of traces have to be deduced (cf. Nunes 1996, 1999). Their most salient property is that they are phonetically null. On the face of it, the fact that in the general case a moved element is pronounced in one and only one position speaks against the copy theory of movement (21).

¹²Chomsky (1995) essentially stipulates that movement is to a c-commanding position. For some discussion and important qualifications, as well as attempts to derive the relevant facts, see Epstein et al. (1998), Nunes (1996, 1999) among others.

- (21a) John was arrested (*John)
 (21b) What did you eat (*what)

Arguments have been developed (Franks 1998, Bošković 1999a, b) that syntactic movement can at times be obscured because a lower copy of a moved element is pronounced. Nunes (1999) discusses cases where two copies of a moved element are pronounced. Richards (1997) and Abels (2000) discuss examples where it looks as though LF movement can be anticipated in overt syntax. These can be analyzed as pronunciation of an exceptionally high copy. All of these types of examples are expected to exist under the copy theory of movement, but are incompatible with trace theory.

I would like to suggest that the PCC is an example of the second type, where multiple copies of a single element, namely the verb, are phonetically realized. Consider again examples (1) and (12c).

- (1) ✓ Čitat' (-to) Ivan eë čitaet, no ničego
 read_{inf} TO Ivan it_{fem.acc} reads but nothing
 ne ponimaet.
 not understands
 'Ivan does read it, but he doesn't understand a thing.'
- (12c) ✓ Postroen (-to) dom byl...
 build_{prt.past.pass} TO house was
 'The house was built, ...'

The generalization concerning these examples was that the lexical verb is doubled just in case there is no independent exponent of tense and agreement information hosted in Infl. This suggests that the second copy of the lexical verb is realized in order to keep the morphology on Infl from getting stranded. Russian doesn't have *do*-support. The general strategy in Russian is to pronounce the lexical verb in cases where English shows *do*-support. An example of this is

first occurrence of the verb in the moved VP is forced because semantically, it carries the focus, which needs an audible exponent.

A full discussion of an algorithm for pronunciation of moved elements and of the conditions under which multiple copies can be pronounced is beyond the scope of this paper. A number of suggestions exist in the literature (Franks 1998, Bošković 1999, Nunes 1999, Abels 2000).

Notice that I have talked about two “copies” of the verb. However, the two instances of the verb are not strictly identical; morphologically one is an infinitive and the other a finite form. Calling these two forms copies of the same lexical element requires a theory of morphology in which lexical items are not inserted into the syntax fully inflected, i.e. a theory assuming actual inflectional affixes, and where lexical insertion takes place late, after the syntax. Consequently, the analysis presented here requires some form of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993). The infinitive appears as the realization of the default form of the verb.¹⁴

Indirect evidence that this reasoning is correct comes from the following paradigm where there is an aspectual mismatch between the infinitival in the *Head* and the *Finite Verb* (24a, b).

| | | | | | | |
|-------|----|--------------------------|-------|----|-----------------------|--------------|
| (24a) | * | Čitat' | (-to) | on | eë | pročitaet... |
| | | read _{inf} | TO | he | it _{fem.acc} | perf-reads |
| (24b) | ** | Pročitat' | (-to) | on | eë | čitaet... |
| | | read _{perf.inf} | TO | he | it _{fem.acc} | reads |

On the assumption that the aspectual prefix *pro-* heads its own verbal projection in the syntax (see e.g. Fowler 1994) and merges with the verb in the morphology, (24a) is a simple violation of a pied-piping

¹⁴ As it stands we actually expect the bare verbal stem to appear in the PCC. However, this is not an option, since the bare stem realizes the imperative in Russian and can otherwise occur only in a limited number of marked constructions. It seems that the bare stem is more marked than the infinitive. I would like to thank Steven Franks (p.c.) for reminding me of these facts.

requirement. (24b), on the other hand, is not derivable at all. The principle of Distributed Morphology to insert an element which is maximally specific, compatible with the information present, and never more specific than the information present in the syntactic tree would have to be violated. This is reflected in the judgments.¹⁵

In this section we have seen that the movement analysis of the PCC provides indirect arguments for the copy theory of movement and for Distributed Morphology.

5 The PCC, Verb Movement and Object Shift

In this section I will address some examples that seem to undermine the analysis developed so far. The idea that the PCC is derived via VP movement was justified on the basis of examples like (9) and (17a). The *Head* of the cleft indeed looks like a VP in those examples.

However, the examples with nominal complements of the verb (including (1) repeated as (25a)) are systematically not of this general form. DP complements are never part of the *Head* -- at least for the speaker consulted.

- (25a) ✓ Čitat' (-to) Ivan eë čitaet, no ...
 read_{inf} TO Ivan it_{fem.acc} reads but...
- (25b) * Čitat' eë (-to) Ivan (eë) čitaet (eë), no
 read_{inf} it_{fem.acc} TO Ivan it_{fem.acc} reads it_{fem.acc} but...
 'Ivan does read it, but he doesn't understand a thing.'

Example (25b) illustrates two points: DP arguments behave like other arguments in that they cannot be doubled; DP arguments are never part of the *Head* of the predicate cleft. The object in this example is pronominalized, but the same kind of pattern holds with

¹⁵ Catherine Chvany (p.c.) points out the following examples:

(i) ✓ est'/*byt' -to on est'...
 is_{3sg}/BE_{inf} TO he is...

This example can be accommodated if *byt'* is not the infinitive of *est'* (see Chvany 1996 for discussion of the relevance of this conclusion).

full DPs. This pattern is understandable only if the fronted VP is a remnant in (25a). What prompts the DPs to evacuate VP?

One important observation with respect to DP complements is that they cannot be indefinite, as shown in (26).¹⁶

- (26) * Čitat' (-to) on kakuju-nibud' knigu čitaet,...
read_{inf} TO he which-NIBUD' book reads,...
'He is reading some book or other, ...'

This fact should not surprise us, since the ban on indefinite arguments follows from the semantics, as pointed out above. To explain why the moved VP is always a remnant, I am led to conjecture that object shift/Case checking is obligatorily overt in Russian. The verb can, but need not move past this object shift position.¹⁷ Whether indefinite objects move to the same position overtly to get Case must be left open here.

Finally, there is another class of examples where the internal argument of a verb is not fronted along with the verb itself, but where we cannot invoke object shift or movement to a Case position as an explanation.

- (27) ? Dumat' (-to) on думаet o pesni, kotoruju pel Ivan...
think TO he thinks about song which sang Ivan...
'He does think about the song that Ivan sang, but...'

¹⁶ Laurent Dekydtspotter (p.c.) informs me that a similar ban on indefinites is found with the PCC in other languages, too. Judgments vary on the status of (26).

¹⁷ It is uncontroversial that there is a certain amount of verb movement in Russian. Just how far the verb moves is unclear. We have already seen some evidence that the verb does indeed leave its base position in Stepanov's VP-ellipsis examples in (22). Further evidence that the verb sometimes moves as high as Σ P comes from the fact that a yes/no question can be answered in Russian by repeating just the verb and eliding everything else. Martins (1994) argues that this indicates that the verb is in Σ P and IP is deleted. Finally, John Bailyn (p.c.) points out that the order VS with unergative sentences is most plausibly derived by assuming that the verb moves past the base position of the subject in these sentences. This would entail that the verb moves past the base position of the subject (contra Bailyn 1995).

(28) ? Dumat' (-to) on dumaet čto Xomskij genij no...
 think_{inf} TO he thinks that Chomsky genius but..
 'He does think that Chomsky is a genius, but...'

Comparing (27) and (28), which, according to Michael Yadroff (p.c.), are perfect if a pause precedes the complement, with the corresponding examples (16a), (16b) and (10) reveals that it is heaviness that allows the complements to appear in final position.

In this section we have seen that the movement analysis argued for in this paper leads us to conclude that object shift/overt Case checking (at least with definite DPs) is obligatory in Russian and that the verb can optionally move past the object shift position or stay below it.

6 Conclusion

In this paper the basic data concerning the predicate cleft construction in Russian were introduced. The following structure was defended:

(13) [CP ... [XP [VP ... V_{inf} ...]...[-to ... [IP ...V_{fin} ...]]]

The construction was accounted for as an instance of remnant VP movement. This analysis is justified because a whole range of chain properties hold of the PCC: locality constraints, identity of theta relations, identity of content, etc. It was further concluded that object shift/Case movement is obligatorily overt for Russian definite DPs and that the verb optionally moves past this object shift/Case position. The fact that in predicate clefts with synthetic verb forms, two occurrences of the verb appear provides a strong argument for the copy theory of movement. The fact that the two copies of the verb differ morphologically was taken as an argument for late lexical insertion and for a model of morphology along the lines of Distributed Morphology.

References

- Abels, Klaus. (2000) "Move?". Ms., U. of Connecticut.
 Bailyn, John F. (1995) "Underlying Phrase Structure and 'Short' Verb

- Movement in Russian". *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 3(1): 13-58.
- Bošković, • eljko. (1999a) "What is special about multiple Wh-fronting". Paper presented at NELS 1999.
- Bošković, • eljko. (1999b) *On the Syntax Phonology Interface - Clitics in South Slavic*. Ms. University of Connecticut.
- Büring, Daniel. (1995) *The 59th-Street Bridge Accent - On the Meaning of Topic and Focus*. Ph.D. dissertation, U. Tübingen.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1993) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory". Hale and Keyser, eds., 1-52.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1998) *Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework*. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL. (MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 15.)
- Chomsky, Noam. (1999) *Derivation by Phase*. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL. (MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 18.)
- Chvany, Catherine V. (1996) "Syntactic Accessibility and Lexical Storage: The distribution of the Russian infinitive Form 'moč' and Its Theoretical Implications." Olga T. Yokoyama and Emily Klenin, eds. *Selected Essays of Chatherine V. Chvany*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Epstein, Samuel D. et al. (1998) *A Derivational Approach to Syntactic Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, George. (1994) "Verbal Prefixes as Functional Heads". *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 24(1-2), 171-85.
- Franks, Steven. (1998) "Clitics in Slavic". Position Paper presented at the *Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop*. (<http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/index.html>)
- Franks, Steven and Richard House. (1982) "Genitive Themes in Russian". *Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*. 156-68.
- Hale, Ken and Jay Keyser, eds. (1993): *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. (1993) "Distributed Morphology and

- the Pieces of Inflection”. Hale and Keyser, eds., 111-76.
- Institut Jazykoznanija - Akademia nauk SSSR. (1960) *Grammatika Russkogo Jazyka*. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii Nauk.
- Jackendoff, Ray. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- King, Tracy. H. (1995) *Configuring Topic and Focus in Russian*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Koopman, Hilda. (1984) *The Syntax of Verbs*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Larson, Richard K. and Claire Lefebvre. (1991) “Predicate Clefting in Haitian Creole”. *Proceedings of NELS 21*, 247-61.
- Lumsden, John S. and Claire Lefebvre. (1990) “Predicate Cleft Constructions and Why They Aren’t What You Might Think”. *Linguistics* 28(4), 761-83.
- Martins, Ana-Maria. (1994) “Enclisis, VP-deletion and the nature of Sigma”. *Probus* 6(2-3), 173-205.
- Nunes, Jairo. (1995) *The Copy Theory of Movement and Linearization of Chains in the Minimalist Program*. Ph.D. dissertation, U. of Maryland.
- Nunes, Jairo. (1996) “On why traces can’t be phonetically realized”. *Proceedings of NELS 26*, 211-25.
- Nunes, Jairo. (1999) *Linearization of Chains In the Phonological Component and Phonetic Realization of Traces*. Ms., Universidade Estadual de Campagnas.
- Paillard, Denis and Vladimir A. Plungjan. (1993) “Ob odnom tipe konstrukcij s povorotom glagola v Russkom jazyke”. *Russian Linguistics* 17(3), 263-77.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. (1989) “Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(3), 365-424.
- Richards, Norvin W. III. (1997) *What Moves Where When in Which Language?* Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Stepanov, Arthur. (1998a) “Preliminary Remarks on VP Ellipsis in Russian”. Ms., U. of Connecticut.
- Stepanov, Arthur. (1998b) “On Wh-Fronting in Russian”. *Proceedings of NELS 28*, 453-67.

Stjepanović, Sandra. (1995) "Short Distance Movement of wh-phrases in Serbo-Croatian Matrix clauses". Ms., U. of Connecticut.

Klaus Abels
Department of Linguistics U-1145
341 Mansfield Road
Storrs, CT 06269
klaus.abels@uconn.edu