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5.1 Introduction

To remind the reader, the data description in chapter three revealed the following picture. There are two main reasons for word order variation in Russian. First, the base order can be altered by the IS rule repeated in (1). And secondly, constituents can be preposed due to the Scrambling Rule given in (2).

(1) *IS Ordering Rule*
Topic > Discourse Neutral Material (DNM) > Focus

(2) *Scrambling Rule*
A D-linked constituent should be preposed to a position in the pre-verbal area.

The outcome of the two rules largely coincides in case of non-focal constituents. Since Topic and DNM are usually D-linked, both (1) and (2) license their movement. With respect to Focus, however, (1) and (2) contradict each other: (1) requires focus to be postposed, while (2) opens the possibility of preposing. The Scrambling Rule does not impose any requirements on the exact position of the moved constituent. As we saw in chapter three, scrambling in Russian subsumes movements of various distances. An element can move to the area between the subject and the verb (referred to as the middle field), or it can be moved to a peripheral pre-subject position. This is summarized in (3).

(3) \[CP \text{ XP, } [\text{IF } S\ldots(\text{XP})\ldots V [vP t_1]]\]

What differentiates between the two domains is the IS rule in (1). Leaving Focus aside for a moment, the middle field hosts DNM, i.e. elements which are discourse-anaphoric but do not figure prominently in the information structuring of the sentence. The constituent moving to a pre-subject position automatically gets interpreted as Topic, as it was defined in chapter one.

Given that topicality can be understood as aboutness (Reinhart 1982) and as familiarity (Prince 1981), we can say that an element moved to the CP field is topical primarily in the sense of aboutness, and only optionally in the sense of familiarity. By and large, the CP-internal topic is chosen among the constituents denoting familiar discourse referents, but it can also be otherwise. This happens when a new Topic is introduced into the discourse. New Topics are not so pervasive in the oral discourse and are mostly restricted to the literary style, e.g. in the beginning of a story. However, their existence points to the fact that familiarity is not crucial for an aboutness topic. Movement to the middle field, on the other hand, is related to topichood in the sense of familiarity only. Usually both kinds are referred to as Topic in syntactic literature, due to their similar syntactic behavior. However, we will see later that the distinction is important, and in order to maintain it, I will refer to the aboutness topic as strong and to simply discourse-anaphoric
ones as weak. If we decompose Topic into features [+/-about] and [+/-D], a strong Topic is defined as [+about, +/-D]. A weak topic is necessarily [-about, +D].

Recall that focus can also be D-linked, in which case it can leave its canonical clause-final position. It means that [D] is freely assigned to any element independently of its IS status. The defining characteristic of Focus is that it is the informative part of a sentence. I encode this property by the feature [+info]. Thus Focus can be characterized by the feature complex [+info; +/-D]. Recall that a D-linked focus can occur either inside the middle field or sentence initially. The latter position was shown to require a much stronger link to the previous discourse and to relate to the speaker’s attitude. I indicate this special property of the sentence-initial focus by putting a star on its [+D] feature. As will be shown later on, this interpretive component of the CP-internal focus is a by-product of its being at the Edge of the phase which is semantically a proposition.

Given the data described earlier in this thesis, the correlation between the position of an element and its discourse function can be summarized in the following way.

Table 5. The correlation between the position and the interpretation of a constituent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>Middle Field</th>
<th>vP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>topic</td>
<td>[+/-D]</td>
<td>[+D]</td>
<td>[+D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+about]</td>
<td>[-about]</td>
<td>[-about]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus</td>
<td>[+D]</td>
<td>[+D]</td>
<td>[+/-D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+info]</td>
<td>[+info]</td>
<td>[+info]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 5, there is no purely focal or topical domain. For example, the vP domain, i.e. post-verbal positions (recall from chapter two that I assume V-to-Asp movement), although used primarily for focusing can also host a topical element, as in (4), where the pronoun follows the verb but precedes the focus.

(4) (Context: Who did you give my book to?)
Ja otdala [ee]DNM [Volode]Focu-
I.NOM give.PST.FEM it.ACC Volodya.DAT
‘I gave it to VOLODYA.’

Nevertheless, depending on the IS function, a given domain will impose certain requirements. For instance, with respect to topics, only CP can accommodate a strong topic. As to focus, a CP-internal or a middle field focus is necessarily [+D], and a CP-internal one implies a special interpretation, indicated in the table by the star.

Given that the syntactic position of a constituent depends on its pragmatic (or semantic) feature composition, it is plausible to assume a direct syntax-semantics correlation in what concerns IS. My goal here is to find out to what

---

37 [+info] stands for [+informative]. This feature does not relate to the New Information versus Contrastive Focus distinction.
extent syntax predetermines IS. Or in other words, how much of IS is encoded
directly in syntax.

As shown above, clausal edges figure prominently in IS encoding. The
middle field is a more obscure area. It is only sensitive to D-linking properties of an
element. Moreover, the exact architecture of the IP domain is still largely under-
explored not only for Russian, but generally. Therefore I leave out the discussion of
the Russian middle field scrambling and concentrate rather on the clausal edges. In
what follows, I discuss the role of vP and CP in IS encoding in the language
addressing the following questions:

(i) How can we explain the clause-final orientation of focus?
(ii) Which IS-related positions are activated within the Russian left
periphery?

The chapter is organized as follows. I start out by addressing question (ii). Section
5.2 deals with Topicalization and Focus movement to the left periphery of the
clause. These are operations that were well attested cross-linguistically. It will be
shown that, by and large, the Russian CP is structurally similar to the template
proposed by Rizzi (1997) and widely accepted in the literature. However, a certain
modification will be introduced to the assumption concerning topic iteration. It will
be shown that not all types of topics are freely recursive, and a typology of topic
will be introduced that finds syntactic motivation. In the second part of the chapter
(section 5.3) I consider question (i). I argue against the in-situ analysis of the
canonical clause-final focus in Russian. The major claim defended in this section is
that there is a dedicated focus position low in the clause. This position is assumed
to be a constituent of the clause-internal edge domain that crowns the verb phrase
(vP). Section 5.4 concludes the chapter.

5.2 IS encoding within CP

5.2.1 Background
The seminal work of Rizzi (1997) paved the way to explorations into the structure
and function of the clausal periphery. The original format of the CP domain
proposed by Rizzi is repeated in (5).

(5) \[ ForceP \ Force^0 \ [TopP \ Top^0 \ [FocP \ Foc^0 \ [TopP \ Top^0 \ [FinP \ Fin^0 ]]]] \]

The schema in (5) was developed on the basis of Italian data a sample of which is
given in (6). The demonstrative questo is assumed to be in the focus position
surrounded by topics: a Gianni on the left, and domani on the right.

(6) A Gianni QUESTO domani gli dovete dire.
to Gianni this tomorrow him you.should tell
‘To Gianni, THIS, tomorrow, you should tell.’ [Rizzi 1997: 291]
In his later works Rizzi further refines the structure of CP including a separate position, ModP, for fronted modifiers (Rizzi 2001a) and another slot, InterP, for interrogative phrases (Rizzi 2001b). The revised schema looks like (7).

(7) \[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ForceP} & \text{Force}^o \\
\text{TopP} & \text{Top}^o \\
\text{InterP} & \text{Inter}^o \\
\text{FocP} & \text{Foc}^o \\
\text{ModP} & \text{Mod}^o \\
\text{FinP} & \text{Fin}^o \\
\end{array}
\]

The appearance of the two new positions in the CP structure, although providing more room for movement, does not alter the order of the discourse-related projection, namely TopP and FocP, which are of crucial importance for the present work. The idea of TopP recursion is preserved. Moreover, as becomes clear from (7), topics can occur in practically any position within the CP. Rizzi (2001a) exempts topics from Minimality principles, which can be expected if TopP can project freely relative to other functional heads.

Benincà and Poletto (2004) and Benincà (2006) criticize Rizzi in what concerns the relatively free placement of TopPs. It is instead argued that no topic position exists lower than FocP. The authors propose that topic and focus are related not just to distinct positions but to distinct fields within the CP, strictly ordered with respect to each other. On their analysis the topic field necessarily precedes the focus field. Each of the fields is internally complex. They distinguish between different types of topics and foci which occur in a rather strict order within the respective fields. The generalized schema of the clausal periphery drawn by Benincà (2006) is represented in (8). The fields are separated from each other by curly brackets. The topic field is given in italics and the focus field in bold face.

(8) \[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ForceP} & \\
\{\text{Frame}\} & \{\text{SceneSetP}\} \{\text{HangTop}\} \\
\{\text{Theme}\} & \{\text{LD}\} \{\text{ListTop}\} \\
\{\text{I FocP}\} & \{\text{II FocP}\} \\
\text{FinP} & \\
\end{array}
\]

As shown in (8), the topic field is made up of two sub-fields: Frame and Theme domains. The former hosts scene setting adverbials and Hanging Topics in the order shown in (8). This Frame sublayer of the topic field encodes the global Topic and/or sets the spatio-temporal frame of the sentence. The lower Theme layer corresponds to the sentence-level topic which can be of two kinds: Left-Dislocated (LD) Topic and List Topic. LD Topics stand for simply known referents. A List Topic is what is otherwise known as Contrastive Topic, i.e. it is chosen from a closed set of known entities and contrasted to the other members of the set. An LD and a List Topic can co-occur in a fixed order shown in (8).

As to the focus field, the authors argue that it is comprised of a Contrastive (I FocP) and a New Information (II FocP) Focus. These can be present simultaneously in which case I FocP precedes II FocP. Such a situation is illustrated in (9).

(9) \[
\begin{array}{ll}
A & \text{Giorgio} \text{CF, questo libro} \text{NIF, devi dare.} \\
to & \text{Giorgio} \text{this book must give} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘You must give this book to Giorgio.’

[Benincà and Poletto 2004: 61]
The two accounts (i.e. Rizzi’s versus Benincà and Poletto’s) differ most crucially with respect to the focus position. For Rizzi, recursion is one of the factors on which topic differs from focus in that the latter is subject to the uniqueness requirement – there can be only one focus per clause. Benincà and Poletto, on the other hand, allow for recursion of focus within the CP as well. Thus what counts as New Information Focus in (9) for Benincà and Poletto is analyzed as Topic by Rizzi.

All of the abovementioned left-peripheral structures were worked out on the basis on Italian data. However, crosslinguistic research has revealed that the structure can be successfully applied to other languages, albeit some additional assumptions and minor language-particular modifications (Puskas 1997, Oshima 2001, Schwarz 2003, Aboh 2004, Frey 2006, Frascarelli and Puglielli 2007, Bocci 2007, etc.). In what follows, I examine the composition and the internal structure of the CP in Russian. The discussion will evolve around the IS-related information encoding, i.e. I will be interested in the part of the structure sandwiched between ForceP and FinP. Properties associated with the latter two phrases will not be touched upon here.

5.2.2 Structuring the Russian CP

5.2.2.1 Topicalization

Before we start the discussion, I would like to remind the reader that I take a preverbal subject as delineating the inflectional field on the left. Thus constituents preceding it are assumed to be situated within the CP domain.

In Russian more than one topical constituent can be fronted to a pre-subject position. This is illustrated by the examples given below (the peripheral constituents are in square brackets).

(10) a. [Ob etom dele] [so mnoj] Kira ešče ne about this matter with I.INST Kira.NOM yet NEG говорила.
talk.PST.FEM
‘Kira has not talked to me about this matter yet.’

b. [Na včerašnej večerinke] [etu devušku] [nam] Saša on yesterday party.LOC this girl.ACC we.DAT Sasha.NOM так i ne представил.
PTCL PTCL NEG introduce.PST.MASC
‘Sasha did not introduce this girl to us at yesterday’s party.’

Topics fronted into the CP are quite freely ordered with respect to each other: (11) illustrates possible alternations of (10b).
In fact, topic preposing generally does not induce any Minimality effects. As evidenced by (12), topics scrambled into the middle field also exercise the freedom of ordering.

(12) a. My Sergey, [etu novost’]k ne rasskažem t_j tk.
we.NOM Sergey.DAT this news.ACC NEG tell.FUT.1PL
b. My [etu novost’]k Sergey, ne rasskažem t_j tk.
we.NOM this news.ACC Sergey.DAT NEG tell.FUT.1PL

‘We will not tell Sergey this news.’

The above description seems to fit nicely into Rizzi’s template shown in (5) and (7) and repeated below, wherein TopPs are generated quite freely in the left periphery of the clause relative to its other inhabitants.

(13) a. [ForceP Forceo [TopP Topo [FocP Foco [TopP Topo [FinP Fino ]]]]]
   [Rizzi 1997]

b. [ForceP Forceo [TopP Topo [InterP Intero [TopP Topo [FocP Foco [ModP Modo
   [TopP Topo [FinP Fino ]]]]]]]]
   [Rizzi 2001a]

Because of the lack of Minimality Rizzi (2001a) proposes that topic chains are special species among A’- dependencies. He attributes their special behavior to the fact that topics do not carry any positive feature specification relevant for Minimality, which are +/-Arg(umental), +/-Mod(ificational), +/-Q(uantificational). In other words, topics are neither argumental nor modificational or quantificational entities.
Given the data in (11-12), I adopt Rizzi’s assumption concerning the “special” nature of topics in my work, but with a little proviso. Namely, I propose that not all topics are so plain in what concerns their feature specification. And this brings us to the question concerning TopP recursion.

As mentioned above, the idea about sporadic iteration of topic projections has been refuted by Benincà and Poletto (2004) and Benincà (2006), who argue for a typology of Topics and a well-defined order in which they are projected. The hypothesis that Topic classification has a syntactic reflex has found some crosslinguistic support (Frascarelli and Puglielli 2007, Frey 2006, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007). Russian can be regarded as another empirical evidence for a differentiated approach to Topicalization.

While both (10b) and (11) are grammatical, there is a certain pragmatic difference between these examples. The leftmost constituent is felt to stand for the most relevant subject of the discussion. For example, (10b), given without any context, simply describes what happened during the party. (11a-b) are more felicitous if the interlocutors are talking about a new girl present at the party. Finally, (11c) is coherent in the discourse where the center of attention is the speaker. In other words, the leftmost element is perceived as the most salient topic in the discourse situation, i.e. it functions as a strong aboutness topic. The constituents that follow it are simply given or weak topics. Moreover, the leftmost constituent is often felt to involve a certain degree of contrast. This is especially clear in (11c), where the fronted constituent is a personal pronoun.

As a matter of fact, when one of the topics is clearly contrastive, it has to precede all the others. Apart from a typical contrastive accent, there is a discourse particle in Russian that disambiguously signals a contrastive topic. This particle is – to. A comprehensive study on this particle is provided in McCoy (2001) who defines its function as “marking the set of sets of propositions which is generated by introducing alternatives to the kontrastive link and the contrastive rheme” (2001: 121), and states that “– to cliticizes to the kontrastive element within the link” (2001: 121).

Using –to as an indicator of contrastive Topicalization, we can see from (14) that the position of a contrastive topic relative to other topical constituents within the CP is restricted to the left edge of the clause. The deviance of (14 b-c) shows that it cannot follow or intermingle with weak topics fronted to the CP. For illustrative purposes, I put the contrastive topic in italics, and weak topics are given in square brackets.

(14) a. Mužčine-to [v takuju bumagu] [podarok] ja by man.DAT-TO into such paper.ACC gift.ACC I.NOM COND ne stala upakovyvat’.
    NEG AUX.PST.FEM pack.INF

b. ?? [V takuju bumagu] mužčine-to [podarok] ja by into such paper.ACC man.DAT-TO gift.ACC I.NOM COND ne stala upakovyvat’.
    NEG AUX.PST.FEM pack.INF
It is often claimed in literature that, what I call, strong topic should be further split into two subtypes: contrastive topic and aboutness topic, and that they are hosted by two separate projections within the CP (Benincà and Poletto 2004, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007). I would like to oppose this view, at least for Russian. The reason for this is the following: an aboutness topic may or may not be contrastive, while a contrastive topic is, as a rule, an aboutness topic at the same time. I illustrate this point with the following discourse situations.

(15) a. (Context: What can you tell me about Camilla?)
   Kamillu vse sčitajut nesnosnoj.
   Camilla.ACC all.NOM consider.PRS.3PL unbearable.INST
   ‘Everybody considers Camilla unbearable.’

b. (Context: How old is Camilla?)
   Ee drugu pjat’desjat, a ona let na desjat’
   her boyfriend.DAT fifty but she.NOM years.GEN for ten
   moloţe.
   younger.
   ‘Her boyfriend is fifty, and she is approximately ten years younger.’

In both examples Camilla is a global discourse topic. In (15a) this DP is also an ordinary strong sentence-level topic. The sentence tells us something about the individual this DP refers to. In (15b), consisting of two propositions, the sentence topic in the first one is switched from Camilla to her boyfriend. Due to this topic switch there arises a contrastive implicature. Put differently, the subject DPs in (15b) are contrastive strong topics, which is indicated in the examples by italics. Despite being contrastive, they still function as aboutness topics, since the propositions in (15b) are interpreted as providing information about her boyfriend and her, respectively. Therefore, I conclude that a contrastive topic is a subtype of the aboutness topic. In terms of structure, it means that there is only one position for a strong topic which is taken by a [+about] DP which can, under certain conditions, attain contrastive interpretation.

It was stated in chapter one, that there can only be one aboutness topic per clause. Given that a contrastive and an aboutness topic is one and the same type, the fact that there can only be one contrastive topic (16) follows naturally.

(16) * My-to Novyj God-to budem vstrečat’ doma.
    we.NOM-TO New Year.ACC-TO FUT.1PL meet.INF home.LOC
    ‘As for us, as for the New Year, we will celebrate it at home.’
The above discussion implies that topical constituents fronted to the CP-domain and following the strong topic are, what I call, weak topics. They can be iterated and in this case they are all interpreted in a similar way. They encode simply given information. This can partly account for the freedom of their mutual ordering.

To distinguish between strong and weak topics I use the notation TopP for the projection dedicated to the strong topic and topP for the phrase hosting a weak topic.

Going back to the question of topic iteration, I assume that only topP is recursive. TopP, on the other hand, is subject to the uniqueness requirement.

The two types of topic heads differ in their feature specification. The definitive feature of TopP is [+about]. The choice for the value of [D] is left open, i.e. [+D] is neither a sufficient nor a necessary property of a strong topic. Besides, TopP can be optionally marked as [+contr]. In this case TopP can be overtly realized by the morpheme –to. But as we have seen above, contrastiveness is not of crucial importance for TopP. As for topP, [+D] is its only specification.

Now we can try to understand what is so “special” about weak topics that they are exempt from Minimality principles. My suggestion is that their feature specification, set to just [+D], is not specific enough. Recall from chapter three that in CR focus can also leave its canonical sentence-final position and move leftwards. To do so it should refer to a contextually familiar concept, or, in other words, be D-linked. Given that D-linking is reflected in syntax via [+D] feature, we see that [+D] is also a possible feature of focus, or, for that matter, of a wh-item (Pesetsky 1987). With respect to focus and wh-, [+D] functions as a “bonus” feature which gives these elements some additional capacities. For focus, [+D] opens up the possibility to leave its canonical clause-final position. For wh-elements, [+D] allows them to stay in situ. And for both, [+D] licenses extraction from Weak Islands (Starke 2001). However, both focus and wh-items have their own characteristic features that distinguish them from other type of elements. Strong topic in this respect is similar to focus or wh- in that it also carries the type-defining feature [+about]. In case of a weak topic, [+D] is its only relevant feature. Basically, it only licenses preposing and does nothing else. In particular, it does not exclusively specify a type, or a class. This feature indistinctiveness of topP, I suggest, underlies the lack of Minimality as well as the possibility of free recursion.

So far we have come up with the bipartite classification of topics relevant for syntax. It has been proposed above that there are two types of topic projections within the CP in Russian: TopP hosting a strong topic, and multiple topPs following TopP which serve as landing sites for weak topics. There is yet another category that is linked to the notion of topicality. Consider the sentence in (17).

(17) (What do you know about your neighbor?)

V sem’e Patrick nastojaščij tiran.
in family.LOC Patrick.NOM real tyrant.NOM

‘In the family, Patrick is a real tyrant.’

Judging from the context, the topic of the sentence in (17) is Patrick. In our classification it is a strong aboutness topic since the sentence clearly provides information about the referent of this DP. According to the proposed analysis, this
DP should be hosted by TopP, which was said to be the leftmost projection among those accommodating topical constituents. However, in (17) there is another constituent preceding the strong topic. The PP v sem’e ‘in the family’ can hardly be an aboutness topic here, for the proposition characterizes Patrick rather than his family.

In order to account for sentences like (17), following Benincà and Poletto (2004), I suggest that we need another category – Frame. Frames are sometimes conflated with topics, especially with the aboutness topic. The reason for this is that frames are often encoded by the same means as the aboutness topic. This is clearly the case in (17): the PP v sem’e ‘in the family’ occupies the leftmost position which is otherwise taken by the aboutness topic. Moreover, in languages with morphological marking of topicality the same marker is used for a frame as for an aboutness topic.

(18) Nihon-zentai de wa, ki no waribashi wa ichien ni yaku Japan-all at PTCL tree LNK waribashi PTCL 1.year in about 10,000-oku-zen mo tsukawaru sooo da. 10,000-million-pairs also use.PASS hearsay COP
‘In Japan, about 10,000 million pairs of waribashi (wooden chopsticks) are used each year.’

[Hinds 1987: 97]

The Japanese particle wa is usually characterized as indicating the topic of the sentence. Example (18) is taken from a short text about the history of chopsticks. Ki no waribashi ‘wooden chopsticks’ is a continuous topic which is indicated in the given example by wa. However, the constituent preceding it is marked with the same particle, although Nihon-zentai de ‘in Japan’ is not what the sentence is about.

The data in (18) clearly show that framing is related to topicality in some way, which can explain the identical marking strategy. Nevertheless, following previous research (Jacobs 2001, Maienborn 2001, Kriřka 2006), I argue that frames should be kept separate from the (strong) topic, although the two share a certain functional similarity.

In terms of similarity, both can be said to identify the domain within which a given proposition is evaluated. In chapter one, I used the file card metaphor for the definition of Topic. Assuming that all the information is thematically organized, a strong topic functions as an address pointer. It identifies the address, or the file card, under which the information carried by the message has to be stored. Presumably, any new piece of information is assessed against that already stored on a certain card. Suppose that speaking about some individual X, I tell you that X lives in London. Later on you receive another message saying that X lives in Barcelona. The latter information will be evaluated against that already present under the corresponding address, and, as a result, either the latter news will be rejected as false, or else the previously received input will be corrected. Frames have a similar function. They delimit the domain of application of a given proposition. However, unlike a strong topic, a frame does not signal where in the system of file cards information has to be stored. In other words, a frame is not marked [+about]. The sentence in (17) is not about the family. It is about Patrick.
What the frame does is it restricts the applicability of the proposition (e.g. the fact that Patrick is a tyrant) to a specific area. The job of a frame can be defined as thematic organization of information within a given file card. This implies that the global function of a strong topic and a frame is very similar: they both accommodate the incoming information according to the domain of its application. However, the scale of the job is different: a topic points to the address of the entry, and a frame further specifies the domain within the address where the information is to be stored.

In terms of syntactic structure, there is a crosslinguistic tendency for a frame to precede a strong topic. This was shown in (17-18). This ordering reflects the interpretive load carried by the two IS entities: a frame contextualizes the discussion and the strong topic refers to what the discussion is about. Along the lines of Benincà and Poletto (2004), I propose that there is a separate projection for framing adverbials, call it FrameP, which dominates TopP (see also Maienborn 2001 for a similar proposal).

As described above, there is a certain functional similarity between a strong topic and a frame. At the same time, frames also share some properties with weak topics. Unlike a strong topic, which I assume is obligatory, a frame is optional. In this respect frames are similar to weak topics, which are also activated upon necessity. Another superficial similarity between weak topics and frames is that the latter can be stacked, i.e. multiple frames are allowed. Weak topics are recursive as well, as we saw earlier. However, in case of stacking, frames are subject to an ordering constraint. Namely, if we look at framing adverbials in Russian, when multiplied, they occur in the following order: time > place > reason > manner. This is illustrated by the following examples.

(19) (Context: Olga is an extremely beautiful woman. Wherever she appears men just go crazy and do their best to impress her.)

a. Prošloj noč’ju, na prieme, ščedro odarivaja last night.INST at reception.LOC generously dispense.PART ee komplimentami, Ol’gu prosto presledoval she.ACC compliments.INST Olga.ACC just chase.PST.MASC francuzskij posol. French ambassador.NOM

b. *Naprieme, ščedro odarivaja ee at reception.LOC generously dispense.PART she.ACC komplimentami, prošloj noč’ju, Olgu presledoval compliments.INST last night.INST Olga.ACC chase.PST.MASC francuzskij posol. French ambassador.NOM

‘Last night, at the reception, generously bathing her in compliments, a French ambassador was simply chasing Olga.’
(20) (Context: Normally, Olga is very cool whatever happens. Nobody has seen her screaming or making a scene before.)

a. Odnako včera, na rabote, posle razgovora s načal’nikom, however yesterday at work.LOC after talk.GEN with boss.INST Olga v pervye prishla v nastojaščee bešenstvo. Olga.NOM first.time come.PST.FEM into real rage.ACC

b. * Odnako posle razgovora s načal’nikom včera, na however after talk.GEN with boss.INST yesterday at rabote, Olga v pervye prishla v nastojaščee work.LOC Olga.NOM first.time come.PST.FEM into real bešenstvo. rage.ACC

‘However, yesterday, at work, after talking to the boss, Olga got really mad.’

In (19), we have three adverbials: of time, place, and manner. As shown by (19a), if they are ordered in the time > place > manner sequence, the sentence is fully acceptable, while the order place > manner > time produces an ungrammatical sentence (19b). Similarly, in (20), where instead of a manner we have a reason adverbial, the order time > place > reason (20a) is grammatical, while the reason > time > place sequence (20b) yields an ungrammatical result.

Moreover, if there are several framing adverbials of the same type, they should be ordered in such a way that the more specific ones follow the more general ones. This is depicted in (21), which contains a number of time adverbials.

(21) (Context: Igor was accused of adultery. He keeps on refusing it. But there appeared some facts not really in his favor.)

a. Včera, večerom, posle raboty, primerno v 19.00 yesterday evening.INST after work.GEN approximately at 19.00 Igorja videli s kakoj-to molodoj devuškoj. Igor.ACC see.PST.PL with some young girl.INST

b. * Večerom, včera, primerno v 19.00, posle raboty, evening.INST yesterday approximately at 19.00 after work.GEN Igorja videli s kakoj-to molodoj devuškoj. Igor.ACC see.PST.PL with some young girl.INST

‘In the evening, yesterday, after work, approximately at 19.00, Igor was seen with some young girl.’

On the basis of this ordering rule frames differ from weak topics, which are freely-ordered with respect to one another.
Based on the differences between frames, weak, and strong topics, I argue that all the three categories should be independently recognized. In structural terms this means that each of them projects its own phrase, their ordering being as shown in (22).

(22) \{FrameP_{\text{TIME}} \rightarrow FrameP_{\text{PLACE}} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \text{TopP} \rightarrow \text{topP}\}^\star

The star notation is borrowed from Rizzi (1997) and indicates that topP is a freely-recursive projection.

The situation with frames is a bit tricky. We have seen above that, although there can be multiple frames, their order is constrained. Thus there is a possibility that every framing adverbial is linked to a dedicated projection. Interestingly, crosslinguistic data indicate that multiple frames can also be treated as one complex constituent, which is indicated in (22) by curly brackets.

For instance, German, being a V2 language, can contain only one constituent in the prefield. The relevant data are given in (23).

(23) a. Das Buch hat Hans gelesen.
   the book has Hans read
   
   b. * Das Buch Hans hat gelesen.
   the book Hans has read
   
   ‘As for the book, Hans has read it.’

The above examples show that there cannot be two topicalized constituents in a German clause, assuming that everything that precedes the finite verb in a main clause is situated within the CP. At the same time, there can be more than one framing adverbial in a clause (24).

(24) \{In zwei Tagen am Strand wenn die Sonne untergeht\} wirst
   in two days on beach when the sun sets will
   du es sehen.
   you it see
   
   ‘In two days on the beach when the sun sets you will see it.’

[Haider 2000: 99]

As shown in (24), framing adverbials behave as a cluster with respect to the V2 requirement, which is indicated by enclosing them all together into curly brackets.

Data like those in (24) suggest that FrameP can, in fact, be unique. Multiple frames on such an analysis would always form a cluster occupying SpecFrameP.

Alternatively, we can account for (24) by assuming that there are several semantically distinct FramePs that are composed into an integral indivisible domain, so that syntactically they count as one syntactic object. In the present work I remain agnostic as to the final answer to this question. The main idea that I
wanted to defend in this part is that framing adverbials occur in a position distinct from that dedicated to a strong or a weak topic.

There is one last issue that I would like to touch upon in this subsection. I assumed earlier that TopP, unlike FrameP or topP, is an obligatory constituent of the CP. This equals to saying that there are no topicless clauses. And this is indeed what I assumed in chapter one (section 1.2.1). But how should sentences like (25) be analyzed in light of such an assumption?

(25) a. Temnelo.
darken.PST.NEUT
‘It was getting dark.’

b. Idet dožd’.
go.PRS.3SG rain.NOM
‘It is raining.’

The above examples are thetic statements, i.e. the entire sentence corresponds to Focus. At first glance, it is difficult to say what the sentences in (25) are about. They are all-new, thus seemingly topicless propositions. However, on a closer look the examples in (25) are not exactly about nothing.

It has been long proposed that thetic statements are also subject to the topic-comment partition (Gundel 1974, Erteschik-Shir 1997, 2007, Kiss 2002). The only difference between categorical and thetic sentences on such an account is that the latter possess an implicit “stage” topic (the term is from Erteschik-Shir 1997). And this is what I assumed about thetics earlier (section 1.2.1). The idea about the existence of stage topics was inspired by research on argument structure (Davidson 1967, Parsons 1990, Kratzer 1994) which has shown that a verb’s argument structure includes not only traditionally recognized arguments (e.g. Agent, Patient, Goal, etc.) but also an event argument. The latter specifies that the relation described by the verb is an event that takes place in a particular situation. The event argument is sometimes referred to as the Davidsonian spatio-temporal argument. Thus the proposed stage topic is argued to establish the “here-and-now” discourse referent. In other words, in thetics the spatio-temporal argument functions as the topic.

Erteschik-Shir (2007) argues that a stage topic, on a par with the “speaker”/“hearer” topic, “is always available since a conversation always takes place at a specific time and in a specific location” (2007: 17). It is further argued that stage topics are not always invisible and that they can often be expressed by overt spatio-temporal adverbials. This is a very tempting conclusion given that there is a crosslinguistic tendency to resort to the so-called Locative Inversion for expressing thetics. This is illustrated in (26) for English.

(26) Into the room came an elderly lady all in black.

Moreover, in some discourse configurational languages thetics containing spatio-temporal adverbials must have them obligatorily preposed. This is shown in (27) and (28) for Russian and Finnish, respectively.
(27) (Context: I came up to the window to see what’s happening.)

a. Vo dvore igrali deti.
in  yard.LOC play.PST.PL children.NOM
b. *Igrali vo dvore deti.
play.PST.PL in  yard.LOC children.NOM
c. #Deti igrali vo dvore.
children.NOM play.PST.PL in  yard.LOC

‘There were children playing in the yard.’

(28)

a. Sataa vettä.    a’. *Sataa vettä nyt.
rains water       rains water now
water rains      now rains water

‘It rains.’        ‘It’s raining now.’

[Holmberg and Nikanne 2002: 86-87]

The context in (27) shows that the example sentences should be interpreted as thetics. (27c), although not ungrammatical, is infelicitous because the subject automatically gets interpreted as the topic of the sentence. To obtain the desired “all-new” interpretation the preposed constituent should be the adverbial (27a). Moreover, its fronting is obligatory in this case (27b).

A similar situation is attested in (28). As evidenced by the opposition of (28a) vs. (28b) the only argument of the verb to rain cannot be moved in front of the verb because in this position it would function as the topic but this would be pragmatically infelicitous in this case. However, if an adverbial of time is added to the same sentence, it must be preposed (28a’ vs. 28b’).

On the basis of data like those in (26-28), many researchers have concluded that the fronted adverbials in thetics should be treated as the topic. Within the proposed analysis this implies that the adverbial in (27) occupies the SpecTopP position. However, I see some incompatibility between the semantic property of Top and the meaning of the adverbial. Strictly speaking, the proposition in (27a) does not characterize the yard. In a similar vein, it does seem to be correct to say that (28b’) is about now.

Moreover, taking spatio-temporal adverbials to be the overt realization of the event argument is semantically incorrect. First, as argued in Kratzer (1994), the event argument and the theme argument are the only true arguments of a verb. At the same time, it would be too far-fetched to claim that spatio-temporal framing adverbials are true arguments.

Furthermore, Maienborn (2001), in her analysis of locative modifiers, shows that framing adverbials do not relate to the event argument at all. The author suggests classifying locative modifiers into three semantically and syntactically distinct classes: internal, external, and frame-setting ones. The first two classes constrain the eventuality argument. For instance, an external locative denotes the
location of an event (e.g. She signed the contract in Argentina), while internal locatives denote an internal aspect of the eventuality (e.g. She signed the contract on the last page). Frame-setting adverbials, on the other hand, pertain not to the event argument but to the topic, or rather the topic-comment structure, of the sentence. Thus the author argues that internal and external modifiers come into the derivation at the point when the eventuality is being constructed, while frame-setting ones are introduced only when the topic-comment partition has taken place. The following examples from Russian confirm this claim.

(29)  a.  V Moskve, Alina brala uroki tango
       inMoscow.LOC Alina.NOM take.PST.FEM lessons.ACC tango.GEN
       u Argentineans.GEN
       ‘In Moscow, Alina took tango lessons with Argentineans.’

       b.  Alina brala uroki tango v Moskvе
           Alina.NOM take.PST.FEM lessons.ACC tango.GEN inMoscow.LOC
           u Argentineans.GEN
           ‘Alina took tango lessons in Moscow with Argentineans.’

(29a) exemplifies the frame-setting usage of a locative adverbial. (29b) is a case of external modification. The distinguishing property of framing locative modifiers is that they can have not only locative but also time interpretation (Maienborn 2001). The data in (29) support this claim.

Given an appropriate context, v Moskve ‘in Moscow’ in (29a) can be interpreted as a temporal modifier, meaning when living/staying in Moscow. The same adverbial in (29b) cannot get such a meaning. As a result, (29a) but not (29b) can be felicitously followed by a sentence like: Dlya etogo ona často ezdila v Argentina ‘For this she often went to Argentina’. Put differently, in (29b) the adverbial denotes the location of the event, while the framing adverbial in (29a) does not restrict the location of the event to Moscow.

The above description shows two things. First, it clearly indicates that equating an eventuality argument with a spatio-temporal frame is incorrect. Second, the assumption that a framing modifier comes into play once the topic-comment structuring has been carried out implies that the modifier itself cannot be treated as a topic.

Based on this, I propose that thetic sentences like (25-28) are more accurately characterized as describing the state-of-affairs, rather than a particular time or location. The role of an adverbial is to anchor a given state-of-affairs to a particular spatio-temporal region. Therefore, my suggestion is that a topic always remains implicit in a thetic irrespective of the presence of an adverbial. In structural terms, SpecTopP is never overtly filled in such sentences. Instead, it hosts an event argument e. As a result, the proposition is understood as being about an event. An adverbial functions as a frame, i.e. it is situated in SpecFrameP. From this position it binds e restricting the application of the proposition to a specific spatio-temporal region. Thus (27a) is assumed to have the structure shown in (30).
As shown in (30), e is the lowest argument of the verb. In the spirit of Kratzer (1994), I assume that the external argument is merged later on in the derivation. Following Maienborn (2001), I take the adverbial in (30) to merge above e from where it constrains the event argument by specifying the location of the event. From their respective base positions, e moves to SpecTopP where it provides the implicit topic for the sentence, and the adverbial undergoes movement to SpecFrameP acquiring the corresponding pragmatic function. In what concerns this last step, my analysis differs from that of Maienborn. The author argues that frame-setting modifiers are base-generated within the CP domain (adjoined to TopP in her work). I propose that SpecFrameP is not always a first-merge position. In order to show the contrast between frame-setting and external adverbials Maienborn uses Condition C effects as one test. She shows that while external modifiers exhibit reconstruction for Condition C with respect to the subject, framing adverbials do not show any reconstruction effects relative to the subject. The data given below, however, indicate that the lack of reconstruction does not hold for all the frames in Russian.

(31) So slov Olega, oni prišel tuda
fromwords.GEN Oleg.GEN he.NOM come.PST.MASC there
tervym.
first.INST
‘According to Oleg’s words, he came there first.’

(32) *V Mišinoj i seме oni bol’še vseh ljubit
in Misha.LOC family.LOC he.NOM more all.GEN love.PRS.3SG
staršuju doc’.
eldest.ACC daughter.ACC
‘In Misha’s family, he loves the eldest daughter more than anybody else.’

In (31) the proper name within the frame can refer to the same individual as the pronoun inside the clause. In (32), where the adverbial is also within the frame, the condegradation with the subject is impossible. Therefore, I conclude that FrameP can host both moved and first-merged constituents.

What concerns the idea about Topicalization of e in thetics, there is a piece of supportive evidence for this claim. It has been noted that individual level
predicates are impossible in thetic sentences (Jäger 1997). This fact finds a natural explanation on the present analysis since the stage topic, I argue, is represented by the eventuality argument \( e \) which is assumed to be missing from the argument structure of individual level predicates (Kratzer 1989, Felser 1998, Katz 2003). If a spatio-temporal adverbial played the role of the topic in thetics we would predict that individual level predicates are incompatible with spatio-temporal modifiers. However, this prediction is not borne out. As shown by Maienborn (2001), frame-setting adverbials, i.e. the same kind that figures in thetics, are compatible with individual level predicates.

(33) At home, Jack is really lazy.

This is so because, as stated above, this type of modifiers is related not to the eventuality but to the topic. For example, in (33) the adverbial restricts the application of the proposition that \( \text{Jack is lazy} \) to a particular situational frame. The inference \( \text{Jack is lazy} \) does not arise from the sentence in (33), i.e. if the modifier is omitted the truth of the sentence is not preserved. Thus what we observe is that individual level, just like stage level, predicates are compatible with framing adverbials, but only the latter type can figure in thetic sentences. This leads to the conclusion that a framing adverbial is not a possible stage topic, while the event argument is.

To recap, in this section we considered the question of which positions within the clausal left periphery can be targeted by Topicalization, where Topicalization is understood as a broad term for movement of non-focal constituents. It was shown that there are several such positions. However, contrary to what has been proposed previously (Rizzi 1997, 2001a), in Russian these positions are not freely recursive. In particular, I argued that we have to distinguish three types of Topicalization landing sites: FrameP, TopP and topP which occur in the order FrameP > TopP > topP. TopP is the only possible landing site for a strong topic, i.e. a topic in the traditional sense of the word (‘what the sentence is about’). It is obligatory and is filled either by an overt constituent or by an implicit event argument. Simply discourse-anaphoric constituents, or weak topics, are hosted by freely generated topPs. Besides I argued for the existence of a separate projection for frame-setting adverbials, FrameP, which can be conceived of either as a domain or a single position.

5.2.2.2 Focalization
As described earlier in this work, focus can also occur in a pre-subject position, i.e. within the CP. This is typical of CR only. In the present section we are going to address the question of the position of focus relative to the other constituents in the CP.

First of all, recall that Russian does not tolerate multiple foci. This immediately dispenses with the possibility of multiple focus sites within the CP.

With respect to focus/topic co-occurrence in the CP, it has been proposed that the focus (field) necessarily follows the topic (field) (Benincà and Poletto 2004, Benincà 2006). We have seen above that the Topic field in Russian is comprised of frames, strong, and weak topics. If the mentioned authors are correct,
focus fronted to the CP should not be able to occur higher than any of the topic-field positions. Let us investigate whether this really holds.

In determining the position of focus relative to the components of the topic field, the notion of contrast plays an important role. In the previous section it was established that a contrastive topic qualifies as strong topic and occurs in SpecTopP. Relying on the morphological manifestation of contrast within topic, i.e. \textit{–to}, we can see from (34) that focus cannot precede a \textit{to}-marked topic, but must obligatorily follow it.

\begin{equation}
\text{(34)} \quad \begin{align*}
a. \, *\text{Včera Irina-to ja videla, a Maksima davno ne vstrečala.} \\
& \text{yesterday Irina.ACC-TO I.NOM see.PST.FEM but Max.ACC long.time NEG meet.PST.FEM}
\end{align*}
b. \, Irina-to včera ja videla, a Maksima davno ne vstrečala. \\
& \text{Irina.ACC-TO yesterday I.NOM see.PST.FEM but Max.ACC long.time NEG meet.PST.FEM}
\end{equation}

‘As to Irina, I saw her YESTERDAY, but I have not seen Max for a long time.’

It was stated earlier in this thesis (section 3.2.1.2) that focus fronted to the CP is always contrastive. The data in (34) indicate that the simultaneous occurrence of a contrastive focus and a contrastive topic is possible in Russian. Another example of this taken from spontaneous speech is given below.

\begin{equation}
\text{(35)} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{Doma-to stekljannaja kryška u skovorodki, a zdes’, vidiš’, takaja.} \\
& \text{home.LOC-TO glass.NOM cover.NOM at frying.pan.GEN but here see.PRS.2SG such.NOM}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

‘At home the frying pan has a GLASS cover, but here, you see, like THIS.’

Based on the CR data in (34-35), I conclude that the landing site of the fronted focus is necessarily lower than that of a strong topic. Assuming the existence of a dedicated focus head within the CP, this means that Foc″ must be structurally lower than Top″.

The examples in (36) illustrate that the position of focus relative to non-contrastive topics is very flexible: it can precede both topics (36a), follow them (36b), or be sandwiched in between (36c).

\begin{equation}
\text{(36)} \quad \begin{align*}
a. \, \text{Zavtra [Arine] [den’gi] ja verno.} \\
& \text{tomorrow Arina.DAT money.ACC I.NOM return.FUT.1SG}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}
b. [Arine] [den’gi] zavtra ja vernu.
   Arina.DAT money.ACC tomorrow I.NOM return.FUT.1SG

   Arina.DAT tomorrow money.ACC I.NOM return.FUT.1SG

‘I will return Arina the money TOMORROW.’

In relation to (36) I assume that both topics in (36a) are weak, i.e. none of them occurs in TopP. In (36b), on the other hand, the leftmost constituent can, and preferably does, function as the strong topic. The same holds of the clause-initial DP in (36c).

Given this, I conclude that the position of Foc is fixed only with respect to Top, and, by transitivity, Frame. Weak topics, the occupants of topPs, can occur on either side of the focus. This fact is predictable on the assumption that TopP is a freely recursive projection.

As a rule, wh-words are considered a sub-case of focus. Therefore, it might be tempting to assume that they have the same distribution within the CP in Russian as non-wh focus. Interestingly, though, this prediction is not borne out.

As evidenced by (37), if the adverbial in (36) is substituted by a wh-item, the freedom of placement is preserved.

(37) a. Kogda [Arine] [den’gi] oni vernut?
    when Arina.DAT money.ACC they.NOM return.FUT.3PL

b. [Arine] [den’gi] kogda oni vernut?
   Arina.DAT money.ACC when they.NOM return.FUT.3PL

c. [Arine] kogda [den’gi] oni vernut?
   Arina.DAT when money.ACC they.NOM return.FUT.3PL

‘When will they return Arina the money?’

But while in (36a) the topics following the focus must be weak, in (37a) this is not necessarily the case. In fact, if there is an unambiguously contrastive topic in the sentence, it can both precede (38a) and follow (38b) a wh-word. In this respect, (38) contrasts with (34).

(38) a. Kuda [den’gi-to] ona ubrala?
    where money.ACC-TO she.NOM put.PST.FEM

b. [den’gi-to] kuda ona ubrala?
   money.ACC-TO where she.NOM put.PST.FEM

‘Speaking about the money, where did she put it?’
Thus we face a situation in which the relative order of a strong topic and a focus is restricted to topic > focus, while that of a strong topic and a *wh*-word varies between topic > *wh* and *wh* > topic.

The discrepancy between focus and *wh* suggests that the two are not necessarily linked to one and the same position within the CP. This is not an unexpected result provided that semantically a *wh*-word and a non-*wh* focus are clearly different (Cable 2007). Moreover, recent research (Rizzi 2001b, Aboh and Pfau forthcoming) has shown that activation of Foc° is not sufficient for question formation and that the interrogative force comes from a higher head, namely Inter rogative). For instance, Aboh and Pfau (forthcoming) argue that *wh*-words, which are usually associated with Foc° and question formation, are not necessary for interrogation at all. They provide ample evidence in support of this idea from spoken (Oro Nao) and sign (Indian Sign Language) languages wherein *wh*-questions can miss *wh*-words but still be interpreted as questions. Instead of using *wh*-words these languages form questions with the help of a generic noun plus a question morpheme. The authors conclude that it is the question morpheme, which they associate with the head Inter°, that is crucial for clause-typing purposes. The role of focus, they argue, is to identify the content of the question. In terms of Aboh and Pfau, “Foc ranges over variables (e.g. argument, event, adjunct) and provides a value to new information” (forthcoming: 33).

I am going to interpret the difference between focus and *wh*- in Russian along these lines. In particular, I assume that for an ordinary focus there is only one position available within the CP, i.e. FocP. *Wh*-items, on the other hand, are related not only to Foc° but also to Inter°. This means that in principle both projections are possible landing sites for a question word. Leaving aside some details to be discussed in chapter six, I propose that a *wh*-word in Russian can be situated either in FocP or in InterP.

The fact that a question word can precede a strong topic, as shown in (38), suggests that InterP dominates TopP. The data in (39) illustrate the position of a *wh*-word relative to a framing adverbial.

(39)  

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Na rabote | s | kem | Patrik | družit? |
|   | at work.LOC | with | who.INST | Patrick.NOM | be.friends.PRS.3SG |
| b. | ?(?) S | kem | na rabote | Patrik | družit? |
|   | with | who.INST | at work.LOC | Patrick.NOM | be.friends.PRS.3SG |

‘At work, who is Patrick friends with?’

As shown in (39b), a *wh*-word preceding a framing adverbial produces a deviant sentence, which can be interpreted as indicating that InterP follows FrameP in the structure. As a result, we obtain the following functional sequence within the Russian CP domain.

(40)  

FrameP > InterP > TopP > topP > FocP > topP
The sequence in (40) closely resembles that proposed by Rizzi (2001a,b), repeated in (41), with the only difference that in (40) the topic positions are not simply iterated but are assigned their own specific features and interpretation.

\[(41) \quad \text{[ForceP Forceo [TopP Topo [InterP Intero [TopP Topo [FocP Foco [ModP Modo [TopP Topo [FinP Fino ]]]]]]]]}
\]

The last point I want to touch upon with respect to CP-internal Focalization is the interpretive peculiarity of the left-peripheral focus. As noted on several occasions earlier in this work, the left-peripheral focus, unlike the one preposed into the middle field, cannot project to the entire clause and always requires topic continuity. I consider the peculiar interpretation of the left-peripheral focus as a side effect of its being located inside the CP domain. As proposed by Rizzi (1997), the CP is special relative to other clausal domains in that it “looks outside” into the discourse. Therefore it is not surprising that an element moves to the CP domain to signal a bond with the preceding context.

There is one property that unifies the CP-internal and the middle field focus – both are marked [+D]. However, the former moves to a dedicated focus position, while the latter presumably does not. At present, it is not clear to me what the final destination of the middle-field focus is. But I underline that the trigger for movement into the CP is different from the trigger for movement into the middle field. Movement into the middle field is one of the means to encode referential givenness. Movement into the CP, on the other hand, is a way to encode IS status of a constituent, or in terms of Gundel and Fretheim (1998) relational givenness/newness. The two notions are independent of each other, as has already been argued above (section 1.2.1).

Note that a D-linked focus does not have to move. It can equally well stay in its canonical clause-final position. In other words, [+D] allows for but does not force movement. There is a one-way implication: every preposed focus is [+D], but not every [+D] focus is preposed.

Based on my assumptions about referential versus relational (IS) statuses of lexical items, [+D] is not crucial for identifying an element as topic or focus, but [Foc] or [Top] features are. Thus, as argued earlier, movement of focus into the middle field has nothing to do with the focus encoding per se. What it has to do with is encoding of givenness, which is orthogonal to IS. In contrast to that, movement of focus into the CP domain implies movement to FocP, i.e. movement driven by the [Foc] feature.

I conclude that the difference in interpretation between the middle-field and the CP-internal focus in CR is, at least partially, explained by the difference in motivation for the two types of focus movement plus the special status of the CP, namely its potential to relate to the preceding context.

5.2.3 Summary
The present section dealt with the structure of the left periphery in what concerns IS encoding. It was shown that Russian has an articulated IS-related domain within CP.
We considered two types of movement to the CP: Topicalization and focus movement. The latter is only attested in CR. Both operations can take place independently and simultaneously. Topicalization as well as Focalization targets a dedicated position within the CP. Topicalization was shown to be a complex phenomenon. The elements undergoing this operation were classified into three distinct types: strong topic, weak topic, and frame.

Strong topic is what is traditionally understood under this notion, i.e. what the sentence is about. It was argued to be hosted by the unique and obligatory TopP. Structurally, TopP occupies a middle position in the topic field: it is preceded by FrameP accommodating framing adverbials, and followed by topP hosting weak topics.

Weak topic stands for a discourse-anaphoric non-focal IS entity. Unlike the strong topic, weak topics can be iterated, which means that numerous topPs are allowed. The main constraint on topP placement is that it must follow the strong topic. However, its position relative to other CP projections, in particular FocP, is not fixed. Presumably, topP is special in that it is not restricted to the clausal periphery, but can also quite freely project inside the middle field.

Finally, framing adverbials were singled out into a separate category – Frame, projecting its own FrameP. FrameP dominates TopP, and thus also topP.

With respect to Focalization, it was shown that FocP hosting a focused constituent is also unique and is structurally lower than TopP, and thus FrameP, but can be surrounded by iterated topPs. An important observation made in the present section is that the distribution of focused phrases and wh-words within the CP is somewhat different. Wh-words were shown to have more freedom of placement than non-wh-focus. The latter always occurs in FocP, while a question word can additionally be situated in InterP, a phrase that provides a question interpretation.

All the IS-related heads inside the clausal edge have their defining features. TopP is specified as [+about]. FrameP carries the feature [+Frame]. FocP is marked [+Foc]. For all these heads the specification for [D] is irrelevant. For weak topics, on the other hand, [+D] is the only relevant feature. As argued above, this specification is not restrictive enough, a fact which underlies the freedom with which topPs are generated. In fact, topP might not even be a dedicated peripheral projection, since weak topics can also freely occur within the middle field. However, in light of the empirical facts, I include topP into the structure of CP, which is summarized below.

(42) \[
\text{[ForceP ForceP \{FrameP FrameP \{InterP InterP \{TopP TopP \{topP topP \{FocP FocP \}}\}\}\}\]}\]

5.3 The syntax of focus in Russian

5.3.1 Recapitulation of the data

In the first part of this chapter we considered the structure of CP. It was shown that the clausal edge in Russian is structured more or less in the same way as had been proposed for other languages. The IS-oriented projections inside the CP host topic and focus. However, as argued in chapter three, focus preposing is characteristic only of a certain type of focus ([+D]) and only of a certain type of register (CR).
The main focus position in the language is clause-final. It is used in both registers and irrespective of [D] specification. Let us recap the facts. For convenience, only SR data are presented.

Any constituent functioning as focus should occur clause-finally. A number of examples with focus on various categories are given below.

(43)  
- a. Mila včera polučila **pis’mo**.  
  Mila.NOM yesterday get.PST.FEM letter.ACC  
  ‘Yesterday Mila got a LETTER.’
- b. Mila pis’mo polučila **včera**.  
  Mila.NOM letter.ACC get.PST.FEM yesterday  
  ‘Mila got the letter YESTERDAY.’
- c. Pis’mo včera polučila **Mila**.  
  letter.ACC yesterday get.PST.FEM Mila.NOM  
  ‘MILA got a letter yesterday.’
- d. Mila včera pis’mo **porvala**.  
  Mila.NOM yesterday letter.ACC tear.PST.FEM  
  ‘Mila TORE the letter yesterday.’

In some languages focus is subject to the V-adjacency requirement. Thus, for example, in Hungarian there is a dedicated focus position immediately preceding the verb, and nothing can intervene between the verb and the focus (Puskas 1997). Similarly, some Bantu languages (e.g. Aghem, Zulu, Makhwana) display a strict right-adjacency between the focus and the verb (Hyman 2007, Buell 2007, van der Wal 2006). In contrast, focus in Russian does not have to be right-adjacent to the verb. Thus the DO in (43b) or the adverb in (43c) can intervene between the verb and the sentence-final focus. This is illustrated in (44).

(44)  
- a. Mila polučila **pis’mo včera**.  
  Mila.NOM get.PST.FEM letter.ACC yesterday  
  ‘Mila got the letter YESTERDAY.’
- b. Pis’mo polučila **včera Mila**.  
  letter.ACC get.PST.FEM yesterday Mila.NOM  
  ‘MILA got a letter yesterday.’

The generalization we arrive at is that Focus in Standard Russian is restricted to the clause-final rather than to the post-verbal position. Since discourse-anaphoric constituents tend to move leftwards, past the verb, it is often the case that focus directly follows the verb.

A question that arises is how we should account for the clause-final requirement on focus in Russian. One hypothesis is that the position is derived by moving everything else across the focus, thus leaving it in situ. In the following
section, I present some such analyses and argue against treating Russian focus in this way.

5.3.2 Against “in-situ” accounts of the canonical focus
In chapter four, I already touched upon the in-situ type of analyses of canonical clause-final focus in Russian. They are built on, what can be called, the VP-evacuation hypothesis (a name borrowed from Junghanns and Zybatow 1997). On this approach non-focused constituents vacate the VP since VP is assumed to be the focus domain. The VP-evacuation analysis seems appealing since it is based on some widely accepted ideas such as the Tree Splitting Hypothesis (Diesing 1992) and the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR) (Cinque 1993). Let us briefly consider them in turn.

The Tree Splitting Hypothesis is a way to derive the interpretation of sentences containing quantifiers. It is known since Heim (1982) that a quantificational meaning is decomposed into a quantifier, a restriction, and a nucleus. The Tree Splitting mechanism provides a structural basis for the tripartite system of quantification in that the nucleus is mapped onto VP, the restriction onto IP, and a quantifier sits in the CP. The hypothesis was proposed to account for the interpretation of indefinites. Thus non-specific indefinites are argued to reside inside the nuclear scope, i.e. inside VP, where they are bound by the Existential Operator, while specific and generic indefinites are assumed to move into the IP, where they are properly bound by the Generic Operator. Since Focus is often represented by constituents that are non-presupposed, or new, the VP has been assumed to be a default Focus domain.

As for the NSR, its purpose is to derive prosodic properties of Focus. It requires that the main stress of the sentence falls on the most deeply embedded constituent. By moving other elements to the left, it is possible to make any constituent deeply embedded and assign stress to it.

The VP-evacuation analysis of Russian focus seems to produce a desirable result with respect to both the Tree Splitting Hypothesis and the NSR. If focus is a constituent in its first-merge position, i.e. within the VP, it is correctly located inside the nucleus, or in other words, in the default Focus domain. Moreover, by evacuating all the non-focal material, the focus in situ turns out to occupy the correct stress position.

However, I show below that taking the Tree Splitting Hypothesis or the NSR as the motivation for an in-situ analysis leads to some problems.

First, if one takes the Tree Splitting seriously and builds the syntax of focus on it, one would predict that focus on elements whose semantics is incompatible with the VP-internal position should be impossible. That there is in fact a correlation between semantic type and IS has been shown previously. For instance, individual level predicates were shown to be incompatible with theetic interpretation (Ladusaw 1994, Jäger 1997). Since strongly quantified DPs, e.g. subjects of individual level predicates, are assumed to be bound by the Generic rather than by the Existential Operator (Diesing 1992), we expect that they cannot function as clause-final, i.e. in-situ, focus. However, this expectation is not borne out, as shown in (45) for focused subjects and in (46) for focused objects.
Pervymi v kosmos poleteli sobaki.
first.INST to space.ACC fly.PST.PL dogs.NOM ‘DOGS were the first to go to space.’

Ja očen’ ljublju sobak.
I.NOM much love.PRS.1SG dogs.ACC ‘I like DOGS very much.’

The subject in (45) and the object in (46) are both bare plural DPs which are interpreted generically. In both sentences they are narrowly focused. Thus according to VP-evacuation analyses they are in situ. However, the Tree Splitting operation demands that they are interpreted outside the nucleus scope, i.e. outside VP.

Note that with respect to postposed subjects Russian contrasts with the English existential there-construction, which is analyzed as involving a VP-internal subject. As is well know, there-constructions are incompatible with strongly quantified DPs, as shown in (47).

* There are the/all/most books in the library.

I conclude from this that using the Tree Splitting Hypothesis to account for the focus position as in situ in Russian does not produce a desirable result. Data like those in (45-46) undermine the VP-evacuation analysis.

As for the role of the NSR in focus placement, I am going to follow Büring (2006) in assuming that accent placement is not structurally preconditioned. What this means is that there is not necessarily a causal relation between the position of an element and its ability to carry sentential stress. In his paper, Büring provides numerous examples to argue for the idea that referential giveness plays a crucial role in stress assignment. In particular, he assumes that stress is assigned to an element which is discourse new rather than to an element which is most deeply embedded within the focused constituent. This assumption allows the author to account for cases like (48).

(48) (Alan sent a bouquet of roses to Mary. I wonder what her husband’s reaction was.)
a. He BURNT the roses.
b. He made a terrible SCENE.

As seen from the context as well as from the felicity of (48b), the Focus in (48a) is not just the verb, it is the entire VP. However, since the object is contextually given it resists stress assignment. And, indeed, stressing roses in (48a) would make the response infelicitous.

It is more difficult to construct examples like (48a) in Russian because discourse anaphoric constituents have a strong tendency to precede new ones. However, it seems possible to produce a Russian counterpart of (48a) if a demonstrative is added to the object, as in (49).
On sžege tiet rozy.
he.NOM burn.PST.MASC these roses.ACC
‘He BURNT these roses.’

Data like (48) and (49) undermine any theory which explains focus position by stress assignment rules. Although it is often the case that, due to the Scrambling Rule, D-linked, or given, elements undergo leftward movement, associating scrambling with stress requirements, namely de-stressing, is a misconception (see also section 4.2.4).

Finally, when we compare the Russian clause-final focus with the focus in other languages for which an in-situ analysis has been proposed, we find certain crucial differences.

Zerbian (2006) argues quite convincingly for such an approach to focus encoding in Northern Sotho, a Southern Bantu language. Northern Sotho is an SVO language with the base order of constituents corresponding to S V IO DO XP (XP ranges over temporal, locative and modal adjuncts). Focus in Northern Sotho is encoded either in situ or by means of a cleft. Here we are only interested in the in-situ strategy.

Any constituent, except for the subject, can be focused in situ, the only cue for the focal status of a constituent being the discourse. Zerbian argues that no prosodic differences, such as phonological phrasing or lengthening, are attested under focusing. Note that the clause-final position in Northern Sotho is phonologically prominent. This is expressed by lengthening of the penultimate syllable of the clause-final word. However, if some constituent which is not in the clause-final position is focused the prominence rule applies in its usual way, i.e. it falls on the clause-final element. Thus, this language serves as a good example for the independence of prominence from focus.

Although focus tends to occur clause-finally and immediately following the verb, the author argues that this positioning is due to the fact that Northern Sotho widely resorts to deletion of given elements and their pronominalization. Pronouns occur as clitics preceding the verb. However, if for some reason a non-focused constituent is present in the sentences as a full XP, it occupies its canonical position. This is illustrated in (50-52) (examples are from Zerbian 2006).

(50) (What is the old man planting in the garden?)
     CL1-old.man CL1plant CL3-tree CL7-garden-LOC

58 CL in the gloss stands for Noun Class.
b. * Mo-kgalabje o jwala se-rape-ng [mo-hlare].

‘The old man is planting a TREE in the garden.’ [2006: 85]

(51) a. O fa mo-kgalabje [eng]?  
1CL give CL1-old.man what

b. *O fa[eng] mo-kgalabje?

‘What does he give the old man?’ [2006: 82]

(52) (What are you doing with the orange?)
Ke [ja] namune.
1 eat CL9.orange

‘I am EATING the orange.’ [2006:100]

As shown in (50), the focused constituent cannot exchange its position with the clause-final adjunct, even though the clause-final position is prominent. (51) is provided to show that the immediately postverbal position is not a dedicated focus position either: *wh*-words have the same distribution in Northern Sotho as focus. The sentence in (52) exemplifies verb focus. Note that the object in (52) cannot be right-dislocated. Dislocation triggers resumption by a clitic. Thus under dislocation (52) would look like (53).

(53) Ke a e [ja] namune.
1 PRS CL9 eat CL9.orange

‘I am EATING it, the orange.’

The data in (50-52) clearly show that focus in Northern Sotho should be in its canonical position relative to other elements. Thus Northern Sotho can be regarded as a true in-situ-focus language. A sentence with basic word order is ambiguous with respect to the IS due to the absence of any phonological focus marking.

If we compare Northern Sotho with Russian, we notice immediately that the two differ significantly. As shown in chapter three, any category under focus should occur clause-finally in the standard language. Because of this requirement, we find sentences with inverted word orders. For instance, internal arguments change their base positions (i.e. DO > IO instead of IO > DO). Verbs follow their arguments if the verb is in focus. And most importantly, we find subject-final clauses.

As mentioned above, subject focus in Northern Sotho cannot be expressed in its canonical preverbal position, i.e. in SpecTP. Instead, it is encoded by a cleft. There exists another strategy which is restricted to subjects of intransitive verbs. These can also be focused in the so-called impersonal construction, exemplified in (54).
Go fihl-ile [mo-nna] geli.  
CL17 arrive-PST CL1-man only  
‘Only the MAN arrived.’

A morphosyntactic property of this type of structure is that the subject occurs post-
verbally and there is no agreement between the verb and the subject which is
obligatory otherwise. Instead, the invariable agreement of class 17 is used. The lack
of S-V agreement can be taken as an indication of the VP-internal position of the
subject in (54). In fact, Zerbian explicitly claims that agreement in Northern Sotho
happens only with elements which are outside of VP. In this respect it is
noteworthy that inverted subjects always agree with the verb in Russian.

To sum up, Russian is similar to Northern Sotho in that in both languages
discourse-anaphoric non-focal elements tend to be dropped or pronominalized. This
results in the impression that in both languages focus stays in the first-merge
position with everything else vacating the VP. However, the difference between the
two languages is that in Northern Sotho given elements, when present, occupy their
canonical positions, while in Russian they always occur to the left of focus which is
always clause-final.

To account for the clause-finality of focus in Russian, I suggest in the
sections that follow that the language has a dedicated focus position clause-
internally to which a focused constituent moves.

5.3.3 On the existence and structure of the vP periphery
In my analysis of Russian focus, and IS encoding in general, I adopt the idea that
the discourse-related information is encoded by dedicated functional heads, Top°
and Foc°, which enter into agreement with the corresponding [Top] and [Foc]
features on the lexical items. Traditionally, TopP and FocP are associated with the
left periphery of the clause. In the first part of this chapter we saw how Topic and
Focus are realized within the CP in Russian. In the present part I am going to argue
that IS-related heads are also present inside the clause. This idea is not new. It was
defended by a number of linguists to explain data from various languages.

Ndayiragije (1996, 1999) proposes a low FocP to account for focus in
FocP to account for VS inversion and Right Dislocation in Italian. Jayaseelan
(2001) resorts to the same idea to explain such diverse phenomena as wh-
movement in Malayalam, heavy NP-shift and clefts in English, as well as
scrambling in German and Dutch. Göbbel (2007) employs the low FocP analysis to
account for the marked clause-final position of manner adverbs in English. Finally,
Aboh (2007b) argues for the existence of low FocP to explicate the Kwa-Bantu
asymmetry with respect to IS encoding. This list is far from being exhaustive. The
hypothesis about the existence of a low periphery akin to CP has gained much
attention recently and is becoming more and more popular. There is a good
motivation for it.

As pointed out, and rightfully so, by Butler (2004) the notion of a Phase,
although well accepted in the theory, is quite poorly defined. The extensional
definition, i.e. CP and vP are phases, have been disputed on several occasions
(Legate 2003, Matushansky 2003). The intentional definition (i.e. what it means to
be a phase) is even more obscure. The general assumption is that a phase is a substructure sent to Spell Out and thus a relatively independent construct. However, as shown by Matushansky (2003), it is far from clear whether Spell Out to both PF and LF happens simultaneously, and the tests that are supposed to prove PF/LF independence of a phase often produce contradictory results. The issue of “independence” is also taken up by Butler, who doubts Chomsky’s (2001) definition of a phase as “a relatively independent propositional unit”. Citing the author, “[…] a proposition is something that can be evaluated in terms of truth or falsity. It is clear that this latter, more usual use of the term proposition doesn’t apply to vP.” (Butler 2004: 95). Under Butler’s view, vP and CP clearly do not exhibit similar semantics. Butler argues that in order to maintain the Derivation by Phase, which is indeed necessary, phases should be structurally similar. To implement this idea he proposes that a phase should be defined quantificationally, as a part of the structure that is closed off by a quantificational domain. The following generalized phase structure (55) is proposed, wherein H stands for a lexical head, h corresponds to a number of functional “little” heads (e.g. v, V_APPL, etc.), and C is a quantificational domain, or Edge.

\[
\begin{align*}
 & \text{(55)} \\
 & \text{CP} \\
 & \text{C} \\
 & \text{hP} \\
 & \text{h} \\
 & \text{HP} \\
 & \text{H} \\
 & \text{…} \\
& \text{[Butler 2004: 16]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

According to (55), a phase is a structural unit consisting of the Domain and the Edge (CP). The Domain is further decomposed into the lexical core (H) and a number of functional heads (h). The Edge encodes quantificational information, such as Topic, Focus, Force, etc.

Butler argues that a clause should be considered as consisting of a number of CPs. The role of the Edge, according to the author, is to convert a chunk of structure into a referential unit: referential in the sense that it can be selected as a complement (or rather an argument) by higher heads.

I consider Butler’s argumentation a very attractive way to motivate the necessity of the Edge on top of every phase. It also helps us to better understand why phases are considered independent, in a way, self-contained units. The structure in (55) does not only provide a better characterization of a phase. Most importantly, it captures the intuition that Language is a recursive system. Furthermore, (55) complies with the assumption that all movements target, and proceed via, the Edge (Chomsky 2005b). In other words, the stipulation that the Edge of the clause is CP while the Edge of vP is v and its specifier can be dropped in favor of the idea that the Edge of every phase is a structural unit separate from the Domain of the phase. From now on I will refer to the traditionally recognized phases, vP and CP, as the lower phase and the higher phase, respectively.

On the basis of the assumptions made above, I propose to analyze the canonical focus in Russian as situated in FocP within the Edge of the lower, i.e. vP,
phase. Given the generalized phase structure in (55), the following question arises - how similar is the internal structure of the Domain and the Edge of the two phases?

As to the Domain, Butler argues that Domains in general deal with predication. However, the type of predicational relations that hold within the lower phase are different from those that are established within the higher phase. The lower phase carries information related to argument and event structure. The higher phase encodes propositional content, i.e. information that can be assessed with respect to possible worlds and truth value. The author coins, what I call, the lower phase a situational phase, and the higher one a propositional phase.

How about the Edge? In section 5.2 we discussed the internal structure of the higher phase Edge in Russian, which was shown to closely resemble Rizzi’s (1997, 2001a, 2001b) schemas. The structure I argued for is repeated in (56).

(56) \[ \text{TopP top} \text{TopP Top} \text{IntP Int} \text{FrameP Frame} \text{FrameP Frame} \text{InterP Inter} \text{TopP Top} \text{TopP Top} \text{FocP Foc} \text{FocP Foc} \]

Does the lower phase have the same Edge as the higher phase? In what follows, it will be shown that the structure of the lower phase in Russian differs from that represented in (56). In particular, some projections are argued to be missing. The reason for the less articulated Edge of the lower phase, I assume, comes from the fact that the information encoded within the Domain of the two phases is different. As stated above, the lower phase only provides information about the structure of the event. Information concerning the location of the event on the temporal line, which transforms an event into a proposition, is provided only by the higher phase Domain. The information encoded in the higher phase is associated with the act of speaking. Tense, for example, is determined relative to the “now”, “before”, and “after” the moment at which the sentence is produced, i.e. this grammatical category relates to knowledge beyond the realm of a given sentence. What this means is that the two phases differ with respect to how much of the “outer”, discourse-related, information must be accessible when the phase is being constructed.

As stated above, the internal structure of the two Edges will be shown to differ: some projections present in the higher phase Edge are assumed to be missing in the lower phase Edge. However, some projections are present in both Edges. This leads us to another question, namely - do similar heads present in both phase Edges differ with respect to their feature content? It is a fact that in most languages that have more than one focus strategy, focus displacement to the left periphery results in a somewhat different interpretation as compared to the in-situ focus. As was discussed in chapter three, the two focus sites are argued to be associated with different types of Focus: the in-situ one is a New Information Focus and the ex-situ is Contrastive and/or Exhaustive (Kiss 1998). If we assume that the in-situ focus is, in reality, a focus moved to the lower FocP, we expect the two focus heads to carry different features, e.g. [+info] for the lower phase focus head (henceforth Foc\textsuperscript{0}) and [+cont; ±exhaust] for the higher phase focus head (henceforth Foc\textsuperscript{1}). This is indeed what Kiss (1998) and Drubig (2003), among others, argue for.

In chapter three, I rejected the widely-accepted Focus typology (New Information vs. Contrastive). There, it was shown that the tests devised to
differentiate between the two Focus types, when applied to Russian data, do not produce the expected results. Therefore, I concluded that the distinctive feature for any type of focus is [+info]. For the present purposes this means that both Foc0 and Foc1 carry the same feature specification. Contrast on my account is a pragmatic effect, resulting from the referential givenness of a constituent, rather than a proper syntactic feature. [+D], which gives rise to Contrast, is not a relevant focus feature. It is simply a licenser for fronting, but not a trigger for movement. Recall that a contrastive focus in Russian can equally well occupy the canonical clause-final position.

With respect to the contrastive implicature arising when focus moves to Foc1, I propose that it is generated due to the type of information encoded in the Domain of the higher phase. Since the seminal work of Diesing (1992) the area above the VP is associated with discourse anaphoricity. Discourse anaphoricity is thus an inherent semantic property of the higher phase. Therefore, I assume that by moving into this area a constituent gets the corresponding interpretation as a side effect, just by virtue of being in the higher phase.

The idea is that the interpretational capacity of the first phase is limited to mere extraction of Information, i.e. to sorting out what is known and what is new. Basically, it echoes the outcome of Tree Splitting, where the verb phrase is mapped onto the nucleus and is assumed to be the domain of new information. Thus, on the level of the first phase the informative part of the proposition is separated from the rest. It is the function of the higher phase to establish how this new information relates to interlocutors’ intensions, beliefs, and to the overall discourse, because the relevant semantic information is introduced only at that level. This is the stage at which such notions as Speech Time, Modality, etc. come into play. In other words, at the higher phase it is established how the situation described by the nucleus relates to the world of the discourse.

To conclude, I assume that the feature content of Foc0 and Foc1 is the same. What differs is the semantics of the Domain the focus head scopes over. This produces the described interpretive effects, e.g. Contrast, emphasis, strong commitment on the part of the speaker vs. the lack thereof.

That the attachment site of a functional projection brings about certain interpretational effects has been noted for other phenomena as well. For example, Ramchand (2004b) reports on the existence of two ways to express negation in Bengali. A negative sentence is formed by using one of the two negative particles clause-finally: na or ni. The two are in complementary distribution, and exhibit syntactic as well as semantic differences.

Ni can only be used if the verb in the sentence is in the Perfect Tense. Sentences with Simple and Progressive Present, Simple Past and Future can be negated exclusively by na. The two options are illustrated in (57): (a) is a sentence with the Simple Past Tense, and (b) contains a verb in the Perfect Past Tense.

(57)  a. ami  am-Ta khel-am  na/*ni.
      I.NOM  mango-CLASS eat.PST-1SG  NEG
      ‘I didn’t eat the mango.’
Despite the same translation provided for both (57a) and (57b), the sentences differ with respect to the context in which they can be used. (57a) means that a specific event of *eating mango* did not take place. Thus it can be used in a situation when a mango which was on the table suddenly disappears and a person inquired about the mango refuses to have eaten it. (57b), on the other hand, encodes that the event of the designated type has never occurred at all. In other words, it can be paraphrased as *at no point in time is it the case that I ate the mango*.

To capture the syntactic and semantic differences between *na* and *ni*, Ramchand proposes that the two negative operators bind different variables. *Na* is an operator over event variables, while *ni* binds time variables. This analysis is very much in line with Butler’s analysis of phases. In his terms, *na* should be considered as taking scope over the situational, our lower, phase and *ni* over the propositional, our higher, phase.

Another illustration of how structural position can affect interpretation, also involving negation, was provided by Zanuttini (1997). She shows that post-verbal negative markers in some Romance languages yield different interpretations depending on their position relative to some other elements in the clause. In particular, Piedmontese has two post-verbal negative markers: *pa* and *nen*. The former is used as a presuppositional negation, i.e. it negates a proposition assumed in the discourse. The latter is a simple negation which is used in sentences without any discourse presupposition. The two markers occupy different positions in the clause: *pa* occurs higher than such adverbs as *gia* ‘already’ and *pi* ‘no more’. *Nen*, on the other hand, follows these adverbs. The contrast between the two markers is illustrated in (58) and (59): (58) shows pre-adverbial position of the negation markers and (59) their post-adverbial position, using the adverb *gia* ‘already’.

(58) a. A l’e *pa* gia andait a ca’.
   SBJ.CL SBJ.CL’is NEG already gone to home

b. *?A l’e *nen* gia andait a ca’.
   SBJ.CL SBJ.CL’is NEG already gone to home

‘He hasn’t already gone home.’

(59) a. *?A l’avia gia *pa* vulu ‘ntlura.
   SBJ.CL SBJ.CL’had already NEG wanted then
b. A l’avia gia nen vulu ‘ntlura.
   SBJ.CL SBJ.CL had already NEG wanted then

   ‘Already at that time he had not wanted to.’       [Zanuttini 1997: 70]

In explaining the difference between Piedmontesian pa and nen, the author claims that the difference is rooted not so much in the lexical meaning of the markers but in the structural position they occupy. This echoes the analysis proposed by Ramchand for the corresponding Bengali data.

The discussion about negation in Bengali and Romance strengthens my proposal concerning the interpretive nuances with Focus. The conclusion we arrive at is that the lower phase FocP encodes basically the same information as the higher phase FocP. Namely, for both focus heads the defining feature is [+info]. Any additional meanings arise as the result of the two FocPs taking scope over phase Domains with different semantics.

In the sections that follow I substantiate my proposal concerning the position of the canonical clause-final focus in Russian, namely the existence of the dedicated FocP. I will also propose a structure for the lower phase Edge.

5.3.4 FocP approach to canonical focus: arguments
In this section we will consider the derivation of sentences with Focus on arguments, i.e. I am discussing only cases of narrow Focus. Let us start with objects. (60a) is a sentence with focus on the DO, and (60b) illustrates the IO focus.

(60) a. (Context: What did Olga send you in the package?)
   Ona nam vyslala fotografii.
   she.NOM we.DAT send.PST.FEM photos.ACC
   ‘She sent us the/some PHOTOS.’

b. (Context: Who did Olga give our pictures to?)
   Ona ih otnesla babuške.
   she.NOM they.ACC take.PST.FEM grandmother.DAT
   ‘She took them to the GRANDMOTHER.’

Based on the assumptions made in the previous section, I propose that the DO in (60a) and the IO in (60b) move to SpecFocP, where they check their [+info] feature against that of the FocP’s head. The other object moves to SpectopP which in (60) can be taken to project either inside the Edge of the higher phase or in the middle field. The subject is assumed to move to the SpecTopP, as it is the strong topic in both examples. The grammatical subject position, SpecTP, is occupied by a null expletive. The latter point will be addressed shortly.

The derivations for (60a) and (60b) can be schematized as in (61a) and (61b), respectively. To indicate the flexibility of topP placement, it is given as an Edge constituent in (61a), and as a middle-field projection in (61b).
The subject position, SpecTP, in both representations in (61) hosts a silent expletive. Why do we have to postulate a silent expletive here? The obvious answer is to satisfy the EPP requirement. But this brings in the next question - does the EPP requirement play any role in the grammar of Russian? After all, it has been argued that in topic-prominent languages [EPP] is dependent on topicality, i.e. only a topic can satisfy the EPP (Holmberg and Nikanne 2002, Kiss 2002). In our terms, this would mean that the EPP is a requirement that SpecTopP rather than SpecTP be filled. However, I would like to follow Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007) and treat EPP as a universal requirement on predication. As argued in section 5.3 predication is a relation which is resolved in the Domain of the phase, not at the Edge. Therefore shifting the burden of EPP from TP to TopP is theoretically inadequate within the phase theory maintained in this work. Moreover, there is some empirical evidence for independence of EPP from topicality in Russian.

Consider the examples below. The sentence in (62) is a thetic. The subject here is clearly not topical in any sense. This follows from the Focus structure of the sentence as well as from the fact that the subject is expressed by a non-specific DP. Nevertheless it has to move to the preverbal position.
As stated in chapter three, there is a transitivity constraint on the VS inversion in Russian: the subject of a transitive verb cannot remain postverbal under sentential Focus. This requirement rules out (62b). I see no other way to explain this restriction but to admit that some requirement independent of topicality forces the subject to move in (62a), presumably the EPP.

Data like (62) show that we have to distinguish between topic and subject in Russian. However, the question concerning the relevance of the null expletive in (61) still remains. The subject in (60) is a strong topic. In my terms this means that the constituent carries a [+about] feature and must move to SpecTopP. Why should it move to SpecTopP by-passing SpecTP? Can’t it move to SpecTP first, satisfying the EPP, and then raise to SpecTopP to check [+about]? The answer to this question comes from works of Rizzi (2004) and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007), where it is argued that EPP should be considered a Criterion.

To remind the reader, Rizzi (2004) argues at length that head positions of various A’-movements qualify as criterial positions, in other words, as positions that are linked to some scope/discourse-related properties. Criterial positions are contrasted with thematic positions; the latter are always first-merge positions that relate to the argument structure. Rizzi proposes that the subject position, for which he postulates a separate phrase - SubjP, is a criterial position on a par with the topic, focus, or why-positions. His argument in favor of this assumption comes from the fact that subjecthood is traditionally conflated with topicality. According to Rizzi, the similarity between topic and subject is reflected in their having a common feature - [+about], and this is the reason for treating EPP (a requirement that a clause must have a subject) as a Criterion. Thus, if the subject position is a criterial position, it means that a subject moved to this landing site is frozen in place. Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007) substantiate this hypothesis by showing that languages generally resist extraction from the subject position (the well-known Subject/Object asymmetry). The authors provide ample evidence that those cases which seem to contradict the ban on extraction from the subject position are, in fact, cases where the subject criterion is satisfied by some other means. These include using a resumptive pronoun, pied-piping a bigger chunk of structure containing the subject, and various expletive strategies. The crux of their analysis is that if a subject has to satisfy some Criterion other than the Subject Criterion, the movement takes place from the first-merge position, and the Subject Criterion is satisfied by one of the alternative ways mentioned above. This is very much in line with Chomsky (2005b), who puts a ban on mixed A’-A-A chains.
I adopt the view that EPP is a Criterion and induces freezing. Accordingly, a subject moved to SpecTP to satisfy EPP is frozen in place. That Russian does, in fact, exhibit the effects of Criterial Freezing is illustrated by (63).

(63) a. Mne interesno kuda Dina dela moi
    I.DAT interesting.ADV where Dina.NOM put.PST.FEM my
    očki.
    glasses.ACC
    ‘I am interested where Dina put my glasses.’

   b. *Kuda tebe interesno Dina dela
      where you.DAT interesting.ADV Dina.NOM put.PST.FEM
      tvoi očki?
      your glasses.ACC
      ‘Where are you interested Dina put your glasses?’

In (63a) we have an indirect question selected by the higher predicate meaning *to be interested in*. By assumption, the position to which the *wh*-word moves is a criterial position, for it encodes questioning. If we try to move the *wh*-word further so as to construct a question with matrix scope, the sentence is ruled out (63b). The ungrammaticality of (63b) is caused by the *wh*-word trying to satisfy the *wh*-Criterion in both the embedded and the matrix clause.

To sum up so far, I have argued that when an external argument is endowed with some criterial feature it has to move to the dedicated IS-related position skipping SpecTP not to be trapped there due to Criterial Freezing. SpecTP in this case is filled by an expletive. Russian does not contain any overt expletives. But it was argued that null expletives must be postulated for Russian (Perlmutter and Moore 2002). Therefore, the expletive satisfying the EPP in (61) is phonologically null.

Let us next turn to the subject focus, illustrated in (64a). On the present analysis, (64a) is derived as shown in (64b).

(64) a. (Context: Who sent you these pictures?)
    Nam ih prislala moja sestra.
    we.DAT they.ACC send.PST.FEM my.NOM sister.NOM
    ‘MY SISTER sent them to us.’
(64) is another illustration of the Criterial Freezing in action. The subject in (64) has to satisfy the Focus Criterion by entering into local agreement with Foc\(^o\). Once it is moved to SpecFocP\(_1\), it is stuck in this position and the EPP has to be satisfied in some other way. Again, this is achieved by merging a null expletive in SpecTP.

As in the previous representations (61a-b), the verb in (64b) undergoes its usual movement to Asp\(^o\). One of the objects occupies SpecTopP of the higher phase. The other moves to SpecTopP projected either within the Edge or inside the middle field, the exact position being irrelevant. The sentence would be fully acceptable if the order of the two objects were reversed, as shown in (65). Which of the objects moves where depends on which of them functions as a strong and which one as a weak topic.

(65) Ih nam prislala moja sestra.

\[\text{they.ACC we.DAT send.PST.FEM my.NOM sister.NOM} \]

\[\text{‘MY SISTER sent them to us.’} \]

Sentences with focused subjects constitute the strongest argument for the existence of the low FocP in Russian. There is, however, some additional empirical evidence in favor of this idea. It comes from the effects of focusing on Binding and quantifier scope relations.

Scope relations in Russian can be fixed by movement. Before we proceed, it should be mentioned that scope is a very intricate issue which has not been paid much attention in Russian linguistics so far. The only substantial works I am aware of at the moment are Ionin (2001) and Antonyuk (2006). The authors express radically different opinions on the matter: while Ionin argues for a frozen linear scope between two quantifiers, Antonyuk insists on Russian being essentially similar to English in that inverse scope is easily obtained in both languages.

My position on this issue lies somewhere in between these proposals. According to my intuitions, inverse scope is easily obtained with indefinites, namely with *odin* ‘one’, when an indefinite follows a universal quantifier (UQ) (contrary to Ionin’s opinion), as in (66).

---

(66) Their brother sent a car. He gave it to me. He gave it to me. They gave it to me.

\[\text{They sent a car.} \]

\[\text{He gave it to me.} \]

\[\text{They gave it to me.} \]

\[\text{They sent a car.} \]

An important remark – we are
now speaking only about sentences pronounced with the neutral stepwise ascending intonation, with no special accenting involved.

(66) a. Každyj vrač osmotrel odnogo child.ACC every doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC one.ACC rebenka.
    ‘Every doctor examined one child.’
    every doctor > one child; one child > every doctor

b. Každogo rebenka osmotrel odin vrač.
    every.ACC child.ACC examin.PST.MASC one doctor.NOM
    ‘One doctor examined every child.’
    every child > one doctor; one doctor > every child

Although (66) might be argued not to be very illustrative since scope of indefinites can be obtained without QR via choice function (Fox 1995, Reinhart 1997), it is worth mentioning that if the order of the quantified DPs is reversed, i.e. indefinite > UQ, only the linear scope emerges, under the neutral intonation (as argued by Ionin and contra Antonyuk).

(67) a. Odin vrač osmotrel každogo child.ACC one doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC every.ACC rebenka.
    ‘One doctor examined every child.’
    one doctor > every child; ?? every child > one doctor

b. Odnogo rebenka osmotrel každyj vrač.
    one child.ACC examin.PST.MASC every doctor.NOM
    ‘Every doctor examined one child.’
    one child > every doctor; ?? every doctor > one child

If we take real quantifiers, Russian has morphological means to disambiguate quantifier scope. None of the previous studies touch upon this fact. The Russian existential quantifiers *(many) and *(several) can be either unmarked for case themselves and assign Genitive to the following noun, or a quantifier and a noun can be assigned case as a single DP and exhibit case concord. This is illustrated in (68): in (68a) *(neskol’ko) ‘several’ assigns Genitive to the following noun, while in (68b) a quantifier and a noun are both marked Accusative.

(68) a. Každyj vrač osmotrel neskol’ko detej.
    every doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC several children.GEN
    ‘Every doctor examined several children.’
    every > several; * several > every

b. Každyj vrač osmotrel neskol’kikh detej.
    every doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC several.ACC children.ACC
    ‘Every doctor examined several of the children.’
    every > several; several > every
If a quantifier assigns Genitive, the existentially quantified phrase cannot take wide scope. Thus scope relations in (68a) are unambiguous. If, on the other hand, an existential quantifier and a noun share the same case, scope reversal becomes possible, i.e. (68b) is ambiguous. Therefore, sentences with two quantifiers give rise to the same range of readings as those with a quantifier and an indefinite. Namely, if the UQ comes before an existential or an indefinite, scope reversal is possible.

Verbal agreement can also disambiguate quantifier scope. When a verb shows default agreement, i.e. SG.NEUT (in the past) and 3SG (in the present/future), an existentially quantified subject can only take narrow scope relative to a universally quantified object, i.e. only every > several in (69a). Agreement with the subject, as in (69b), can give rise to ambiguity.

(69) a. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrelo každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.NEUT every child.ACC

b. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrei každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.PL every child.ACC

‘Several doctors examined every child.’

However, the ambiguity of (69b) is attested only under one condition: the quantifier within the subject has to be heavily stressed, as in (70).

(70) a. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrelo každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.NEUT every child.ACC

b. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrei každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.PL every child.ACC

‘SEVERAL doctors examined every child.’

If the sentence is pronounced with the neutral intonation, only the surface scope is possible, i.e. several > every. In this respect, (70) contrasts with (68b) and (66) which are ambiguous irrespective of stress.

The same scope-changing effect of stress applies to (67). As can be seen from that example, under the neutral intonation only the surface scope is possible. But, as shown in (71), stressing odin ‘one’ allows for the inverse scope interpretation.

(71) a. Odin vrač osmotrel každogo rebenka.
    one doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC every child.ACC

Odin > every; every > one

b. Odnogo rebenka osmotrel každyj vrač.
    one child.ACC examin.PST.MASC every doctor.NOM

Odnogo > every; every > one

If a quantifier assigns Genitive, the existentially quantified phrase cannot take wide scope. Thus scope relations in (68a) are unambiguous. If, on the other hand, an existential quantifier and a noun share the same case, scope reversal becomes possible, i.e. (68b) is ambiguous. Therefore, sentences with two quantifiers give rise to the same range of readings as those with a quantifier and an indefinite. Namely, if the UQ comes before an existential or an indefinite, scope reversal is possible.

Verbal agreement can also disambiguate quantifier scope. When a verb shows default agreement, i.e. SG.NEUT (in the past) and 3SG (in the present/future), an existentially quantified subject can only take narrow scope relative to a universally quantified object, i.e. only every > several in (69a). Agreement with the subject, as in (69b), can give rise to ambiguity.

(69) a. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrelo každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.NEUT every child.ACC

b. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrei každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.PL every child.ACC

‘Several doctors examined every child.’

However, the ambiguity of (69b) is attested only under one condition: the quantifier within the subject has to be heavily stressed, as in (70).

(70) b. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrei každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.PL every child.ACC

‘SEVERAL doctors examined every child.’

If the sentence is pronounced with the neutral intonation, only the surface scope is possible, i.e. several > every. In this respect, (70) contrasts with (68b) and (66) which are ambiguous irrespective of stress.

The same scope-changing effect of stress applies to (67). As can be seen from that example, under the neutral intonation only the surface scope is possible. But, as shown in (71), stressing odin ‘one’ allows for the inverse scope interpretation.

(71) a. Odin vrač osmotrel každogo rebenka.
    one doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC every child.ACC

Odin > every; every > one

b. Odnogo rebenka osmotrel každyj vrač.
    one child.ACC examin.PST.MASC every doctor.NOM

Odnogo > every; every > one

If a quantifier assigns Genitive, the existentially quantified phrase cannot take wide scope. Thus scope relations in (68a) are unambiguous. If, on the other hand, an existential quantifier and a noun share the same case, scope reversal becomes possible, i.e. (68b) is ambiguous. Therefore, sentences with two quantifiers give rise to the same range of readings as those with a quantifier and an indefinite. Namely, if the UQ comes before an existential or an indefinite, scope reversal is possible.

Verbal agreement can also disambiguate quantifier scope. When a verb shows default agreement, i.e. SG.NEUT (in the past) and 3SG (in the present/future), an existentially quantified subject can only take narrow scope relative to a universally quantified object, i.e. only every > several in (69a). Agreement with the subject, as in (69b), can give rise to ambiguity.

(69) a. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrelo každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.NEUT every child.ACC

b. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrei každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.PL every child.ACC

‘Several doctors examined every child.’

However, the ambiguity of (69b) is attested only under one condition: the quantifier within the subject has to be heavily stressed, as in (70).

(70) b. Neskol’ko vračej osmatrei každogo rebenka.
    several doctors.NOM examin.PST.PL every child.ACC

‘SEVERAL doctors examined every child.’

If the sentence is pronounced with the neutral intonation, only the surface scope is possible, i.e. several > every. In this respect, (70) contrasts with (68b) and (66) which are ambiguous irrespective of stress.

The same scope-changing effect of stress applies to (67). As can be seen from that example, under the neutral intonation only the surface scope is possible. But, as shown in (71), stressing odin ‘one’ allows for the inverse scope interpretation.

(71) a. Odin vrač osmotrel každogo rebenka.
    one doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC every child.ACC

Odin > every; every > one

b. Odnogo rebenka osmotrel každyj vrač.
    one child.ACC examin.PST.MASC every doctor.NOM

Odnogo > every; every > one
That stress influences scope in Russian has been pointed out before by Ionin (2001). However, she argues that focusing only one of the quantified arguments does not license the inverse scope. According to the author, the inverse scope is licit only if both quantifiers are stressed, as in (72).

(72) a. Odin vrač osmotrel každogo rebenka.
    one doctor.NOM examin.PST.MASC every.ACC child.ACC

b. Každogo rebenka osmotrel odin vrač.
    every child.ACC examin.PST.MASC one doctor.NOM

‘ONE doctor examined EVERY child.’

I strongly disagree with Ionin’s judgments in this case. In (72) one of the arguments necessarily functions as Contrastive Topic and the other one as Focus. Naturally, the leftmost DP can only correspond to the topic and the rightmost to the focus. This is reflected in the rising accent on the quantifier within the first DP and the falling accent on that inside the second DP. To get the opposite distribution of accents, i.e. falling on the first and raising on the second, is next to impossible. With the correct intonation, scope possibilities of (72a) and (72b) are the same as shown for (67) and (68b), respectively, i.e. it is unambiguously one > every for (72a) and ambiguous for (72b).

The picture that we get for quantifier scope interactions in Russian can be summarized as in (73).

(73) a. One NP…every NP → one > every; ?? every > one
b. ONE NP…every NP → one > every; every > one
c. ONE NP…EVERY NP → one > every; ?? every > one
d. Several NP…every NP → several > every; ?? every > one
e. SEVERAL NP…every NP → several > every; every > one
f. SEVERAL NP…EVERY NP → several > every; ?? every > one
g. Every NP…several NP → every > several; several > every
h. EVERY NP…several NP → every > several; several > every
i. EVERY NP…SEVERAL NP → every > several; several > every

As illustrated in (73 g-i), when a universal quantifier precedes an existential, the sentence is always ambiguous. But when the order is the opposite (73 a-f), scope is determined on the basis of intonation. In the unmarked case as well as when both
quantifiers are stressed only linear scope is possible. However, when the first quantifier gets the main stress ambiguity arises.

The data presented above lead to two questions: (i) how to explain the universal/existential asymmetry, i.e. why (73g) is ambiguous while (73a) and (73d) are not, and (ii) why stress plays a role in determining scope, i.e. why (73b) and (73e) become ambiguous. I am going to leave the first question for future research for it requires an in depth study of quantification which is beyond the scope of this thesis. But I will suggest an answer to the second question. Thus cases under consideration are (73a-f).

Both IS and scope relations are matters relevant for the C-I module. Suppose that the most economic way to deal with sentences carrying both types of information is to interpret a constituent with respect to IS and scope in one and the same position, and whenever possible, this is exactly how it is done. This seems to always happen when a quantified expression is a topic. That Topicalization cannot be undone at LF has been proposed before (Vallduvi 1992). Why this is the case can be explained by the fact that when a quantifier (remember that we are only concerned with existentials here) has narrow scope it gets a non-specific interpretation. A Topic, on the other hand, must be specific and/or definite because it points to the discourse referent about whom information is provided. This requirement on topicality precludes the narrow scope. Since in (73c) and (73f) the sentence-initial quantified phrase functions as a strong topic it cannot scope under the universal. The interpretation of (73a) and (73d) can be accounted for by assuming that SpecTP is a criterial position as well and that reconstruction from criterial positions is highly restricted in a discourse configurational language. The interesting cases are (73b) and (73e). Here the main stress on the existential indicates its focushood. As I noted above, the inverse scope becomes possible under focusing. What this means is that focus on the existential makes it possible to interpret the constituent as if it occupied some lower position in the sentence. I propose that scope shifting is obtained via reconstruction of the focused QP. Based on the syntax of focusing developed in this work, I assume that reconstruction targets the position inside the low FocP. At this site a constituent can get both IS and scope interpretation. In fact, given the theory of quantification, a quantifier should not be able to reconstruct into any lower position, e.g. first-merge. Otherwise, an operator variable configuration will not be obtained at LF.

The explanation proposed for scope ambiguity under focusing is not without a complication though. Let us look again at (71), illustrating the scope-changing capacity of focus. The focused constituent here is presumably in the left periphery of the clause. Based on what I said in section 5.2.2.2, the focused constituent in (71) should occupy the SpecFocP2 position. Given that FocP2 is a dedicated focus position, just as FocP1, it is not clear why reconstruction to FocP1 should take place here at all. It seems to be a superfluous operation. To solve the problem I make the following suggestion.

I assume that the observed facts indicate that the two FocPs are not in complementary distribution. Projecting FocP1 does not block projecting FocP2 and vice versa. In fact, if we assume that a structure is built incrementally without any look-ahead, we expect FocP1 to always be available. This follows from the following assumptions made earlier in this thesis: (i) any sentence must carry new
information, i.e. have Focus; (ii) the category-defining feature of Focus is [+info] and in this respect FocP₁ and FocP₂ are similar with respect to the information they encode, and (iii) [+D] is not a trigger for movement, it is simply a license to do so. Once we allow simultaneous projection of FocP₁ and FocP₂, the putative reconstruction from FocP₂ into FocP₁, as in (71), is in fact the instantiation of simultaneous, or parallel, chains à la Chomsky (2005b). The derivation I propose for (71b) is given in (74).

(74)

\[ \text{FocP}_2 \]

\[ \text{odnogo rebenka}_3 \]

\[ \text{TP} \]

\[ \text{expl} \]

\[ \text{AspP} \]

\[ \text{Asp} \]

\[ \text{osmotrel} \]

\[ \text{XP} \]

\[ \text{každyj vrač} \]

\[ \text{odnogo rebenka}_2 \]

\[ \text{vP} \]

\[ \text{odnogo rebenka}_1 \]

The two chains \textit{odnogo rebenka}_1 – \textit{odnogo rebenka}_2 and \textit{odnogo rebenka}_1 – \textit{odnogo rebenka}_3 are built in parallel. The heads of the chains are at the respective Edges and the common tail is in the first-merge position. When the structure is sent to Spell Out, at the PF side only the highest copy, i.e. the one in SpecFocP₂, gets phonetically realized. But at the LF side the heads of both chains, i.e. \textit{odnogo rebenka}_2 and \textit{odnogo rebenka}_3, are visible because both positions are semantically interpretable. The copy within the first phase is deleted at both PF and LF, as copies within the first phase seem to be always deleted (Chomsky 2005b, Abol and Dyakonova 2009). Importantly, we cannot have a single A’-chain: \textit{odnogo rebenka}_1 – \textit{odnogo rebenka}_2 – \textit{odnogo rebenka}_3, because as soon as the DP moves to SpecFocP₁, it freezes in place. A consequence of the derivation represented in (74) is that both focus positions participate in interpreting the structure.

Another piece of evidence in favor of the proposed analysis of the canonical focus in Russian comes from Binding. We have seen earlier that binding relations are usually established on the basis of the surface configuration. This is especially noticeable with respect to Condition C: (75a) and (76a) are bad on the indicated coreference, while scrambling in (75b) and (76b) improves the sentences. To feel the contrast these sentences should be judged under neutral intonation.
Interestingly, if we stress the moved constituent, making it a D-linked focus, the coindexation turns impossible, as shown in (77).

The data in (77) replicate those in (73b and e) in that the focused arguments are interpreted as if they were reconstructed into some lower position. I assume that the reconstruction effect of focusing with respect to Binding finds the same explanation as was provided for reconstruction for scope. It has been claimed previously that Condition C applies at LF only (Chomsky 1993). If this is so, the ungrammaticality of (77) follows naturally because one of the A’-chains violates Condition C at LF, namely the one with the head in the low FocP. The derivation showing this for (77b) is given below.

(78)
One may want to interpret the data in (77) as an example of WCO effects. However, as noted previously, Russian does not seem to exhibit WCO, as shown again in (79).

(79) Kogo i obolgali ego, kollegi t?  
who.ACC belie.PST.PL his collegues.NOM  
‘Who did his colleagues belie?’

To sum up, in the present section I provided an analysis of argument focus in Russian. Argument focus was argued to be derived by moving the relevant constituent into the FocP of the lower phase, i.e. FocP1. Moreover, on the basis of data from quantifier scope and Binding, it was shown that FocP1 and FocP2 can be projected simultaneously in which case the derivation involves formation of parallel chains.

5.3.5 Verb focus
Focus on the verb in SR is encoded in the usual clause-final focus position. This is shown in (80).

(80) (Context: I see you walking to the office every morning. What happened to your car?)  
Ja ee prodala.  
I.NOM it.ACC sell.PST.FEM  
‘I SOLD it.’

In CR, on the other hand, a focused verb can also surface in what looks like a canonical verb position, i.e. before the object yielding an SVO sentence. The object in this case is usually expressed by a pronoun.

(81) (Context: I see you walking to the office every morning. What happened to your car?)  
Ja prodala ee / % mašinu.  
I.NOM sell.PST.FEM it.ACC / car.ACC  
‘I SOLD it/the car.’

Interestingly, unlike the situation with arguments, there is no semantic difference between (80) and (81) with respect to D-linking. As argued before, a preposed argument focus is always D-linked. In (81), where the focused verb superficially appears to be preposed, it is not required that the verb is D-linked.

There are two ways to explain the focusing possibilities shown in (80-81): (i) the focused verb surfaces not in the low FocP1 but, as usual, in Asp, or (ii) the focused verb moves to the low FocP1 and the pronoun in (81) is in some lower position.

Option (ii) seems suspicious for the following reason. With non-verbal focus, backgrounding elements especially pronouns are highly degraded in the post-focal position, as shown in (82).
a. (What are you going to give your husband for his birthday?)

Ja podarju chasy (*emu / ??mužu)
I.NOM give.FUT.1SG watch.ACC he.DAT/ husband.DAT
'I will give him/my husband a WATCH.'

b. (When did you see your neighbors last time?)

Ja videla včera (*ih/ ?? sosedje).
I.NOM see.PST.FEM yesterday they.ACC/neighbors.ACC
'I saw them/my neighbors YESTERDAY.'

The fact that the backgrounding constituent in (82) cannot follow the focus indicates that there is no position lower than FocP, which can host it. Therefore, if the verb in (80-81) is within FocP, as is the object in (82a) and the adverbial in (82b), the contrast between the two sets of data is unexpected.

I suggest that the contrast between (81) versus (82) indicates that the position of the focused verb in (80-81) is different from the position of the focused elements in (82). Namely, I assume that the verb is always in its usual position in AspP, whether or not it is focused. Two questions arise in connection with this assumption: (i) why does the position of a focused verb differ from that of other focused elements? and (ii) how is focusing achieved in this case?

I propose that the difference between verbs versus arguments with respect to focusing comes from the difference in the semantic type of the two categories and the type of grammatical information they carry.

Arguments can be assumed to be semantically more independent than verbs, or predicates in general. Most of the morphosyntactic information relevant for arguments is encoded DP-internally. This concerns gender, number, definiteness, and perhaps even case.

Verbs, on the other hand, check all their features in the course of the derivation of a given clause. To put it differently, a clause is an extended projection of its predicate. A verb carries information concerning the location of the event on the temporal axis (Tense), the way in which the event is viewed (Aspect), and the way in which the verb is linked to its arguments (Agreement). Without this information a structure cannot be properly interpreted.

The tendency of verb focus to be encoded differently from argument focus is well-attested cross-linguistically. For example, Northern Sotho, a Bantu language already mentioned above, does not have any special means to express argument focus. A focused argument occupies its canonical position and is not marked otherwise, neither prosodically nor morphologically. Verb focus, on the other hand, is signaled by the special tense morpheme a. As described in Zerbian (2006), when a is present in the sentence the verb is unambiguously focused.

(83) (Context: Are you singing at the party?) [Zerbian 2006: 98]

Aowa, ke a bina (mo-nyanye-ng).
no I dance CL3-party-LOC
'No, I am DANCING (at the party).’
In many languages verb focus is encoded by a special construction known as Predicate Cleft. This is a very common strategy across African languages. A few examples are given below.

(84) a. kpłön Séná kpłön hàn ví lè teach Sena teach-PERF song child NUM
   ‘Sena TAUGHT the children a song.’ [Gungbe, Aboh 2004: 264]

b. φο-φο- é wó- φο- é RED-hit -FOC 3SG hit 3SG
   ‘S/he BEAT him/her.’ [Ewe, Aboh 2004: 272]

c. Kamau ne-kw-ɛndia ɛnd-iri-ɛ nyomba
   Kamau FOC-SM(INF)-sell (SM)-sell-ASP-FV 9.house
   ‘Kamau SOLD the house.’ [Kikuyu, Schwarz 2003: 96]

Apart from involving doubling of the verb, verb focus in Gungbe differs from argument focus in that the focus marker wé, obligatory with arguments, is dropped with verbs (84a). In Ewe reduplication of the verbal root is observed in addition to doubling (84b).

Given that verbs are somewhat special with respect to focus marking across languages, my assumption concerning the different position of a focused verb in comparison to focused arguments in Russian acquires some additional support.

Let us consider the derivation of verb focus in Russian. My analysis is built on the analysis of Predicate Cleft, or predicate fronting with doubling, proposed in Aboh and Dyakonova (2009). The authors consider Predicate Clefts in Gungbe (84a) and Russian (85).

(85) Prodat’(-to) my ee prodali.
    sell.INF -TO we.NOM it.ACC sell.PST.PL
    ‘As to selling, we DID sell it.’

Although attested in both Gungbe and Russian, the construction has different pragmatic and syntactic properties in the two languages. In Gungbe it is used to express focus on the verb. In Russian, on the other hand, it is used not to focus the verb but rather to contrastively topicalize the event. This is indicated by the use of the contrastive topic marker –to which is usually attached to the fronted copy. Syntactically, the constituent moved to the focus position in Gungbe, i.e. the highest doublet, cannot be bigger than a verb, while in Russian the Topicalization can apply to a phrase, as shown in (86).

(86) Prodat’ mašinu (-to) my prodali.
    sell.INF car.ACC -TO we.NOM sell.PST.PL
    ‘As to selling the car, we DID sell it.’
Aboh and Dyakonova argue that constructions like those in (84-86) result from parallel chains. The verb in such sentences simultaneously enters into checking relations with two different probes: Foc⁰ or Top⁰ within the clausal left periphery, and Asp⁰ within the inflectional domain. As a result, two chains are formed, both linked to the same foot. The form of the two chains varies cross-linguistically. While in Gungbe both chains are of X⁰-type, in Russian one chain is of X⁰- and the other is of XP-type. Based on data like (86), Top⁰ is assumed to attract the entire vP as a result of generalized pied-piping, since the ultimate goal is assumed to be the predicate. At Spell Out, the tail of these two chains is deleted and the heads are pronounced. Consequently, we get what looks like spell out of multiple copies within one and the same chain, while in reality we have two distinct chains, each subject to the usual chain reduction operation. By participating simultaneously in two types of agreement relations (one checking inflectional features and the other one satisfying the discourse Criteria), the verb gets the corresponding discourse status (either Topic or Focus) and at the same time checks its Tense/Aspect features. The derivation proposed by Aboh and Dyakonova for a Russian Predicate Cleft, e.g. (85), can be represented as follows.

(87)

The data in (85-86) show that Predicate Cleft is available as a syntactic phenomenon in Russian. Therefore, I would like to extend Aboh and Dyakonova’s analysis of Russian Predicate Clefts to verb focus. I assume that verb focus is derived basically in the same way as contrastive event Topicalization, which means by parallel chains. The two chains involved in the derivation of the Russian verb focus are also an X⁰-chain and an XP-chain. The X⁰-chain is the same as that observed in (87), i.e. formed by V-to-Asp movement. On the other hand, the size of the constituent undergoing phrasal movement under verb focus is smaller than vP. I assume that Foc⁰₁ targets the lexical verb and the phrase pied-piped to SpecFocP₁ is VP. Thus the representation we get is the one shown in (88).
As can be seen from (88), I assume that there is, in fact, a copy of the verb in SpecFocP₁ albeit the lack of any phonological content. This might sound as a rather ad hoc solution, given that usually copies at the phase Edge are pronounced (Chomsky 2005b). However, in the following I will present some motivation for this assumption.

The representation in (87) differs from that in (88) with respect to the size of the verbal constituent that satisfies the discourse Criterion: vP in (87) but VP in (88). In (87) the verb within the fronted vP is spelled out as an infinitive, while in (88) it is not lexicalized at all, which I indicate in (88) by representing this copy simply as V rather than by some lexical item. Why can Russian not resort to the doubling strategy under focusing as well and lexicalize V in (88)? Put differently, why is a structure like (89) impossible in Russian, although not in other languages, as will be shown shortly?

(89) *My ee prodali prodat’.
we.NOM it.ACC sell.PST.PL sell.INF
‘We SOLD it.’

I suggest that the lack of phonological content in the focus position in (88) is due to morpho-phonological reasons.

An important observation about the grammatical predicate doubling structures in Russian is that both verb copies are always marked for Aspect and that Aspect marking on the non-finite doublet must be identical to that on the finite copy, otherwise the sentence is ruled out.
Aboh and Dyakonova (2009) argue that the aspectual identity between the lower and the higher copy follows from the parallel chain formation, i.e. because both aspectual and discourse features are checked simultaneously.

Going back to verb focus, note that in (88) Foc o'1 targets the lexical core not the verb resulting from the merger of “light” functional shells. The problem of spelling out V inside the fronted VP in (88) follows from the fact that there is no possible way to spell out a bare verb stem, which would result in an existing lexical item. An infinitive cannot fulfill this function because infinitives in Russian are always marked for Aspect. An infinitive for any verb comes in two morphological forms: perfective and imperfective (91).

Therefore, in order to get a proper infinitival verb form, aspectual features of a verb must be checked. Following Ramchand (2004a), I assume that Aspect expresses the relation between the event and the reference time. The aspectual head takes an event as its complement and by binding the event variable sets the aspectual properties. The event variable is not introduced as low as the lexical core of the predicate. And that is why the V in the representation in (88) cannot be spelled out as an infinitive. Infinitives in Russian require a more complex structure.

The proposed analysis implies that an infinitive is not always the default form. For instance in Russian, it is not. Another language supporting this idea is Yiddish. In Yiddish, as described by Davis and Prince (1986), the non-finite copy used in the Predicate Cleft construction differs from a normal infinitive. As shown in (92), the infinitive visn ‘to know’ is excluded and instead, the so-called, pseudo-infinitive is used. The pseudo-infinitive is formed by adding the suffix –n to the stem. The authors take this form to be the default verb form in Yiddish and the suffix is proposed to be a way to form a legitimate word, i.e. it is a kind of PF repair strategy.

It is a distinguishing characteristic of Predicate Clefts across languages that the copy in a discourse related position is devoid of any Tense-Mood-Aspect specification. For instance, in Gungbe the fronted verbal form is a bare root, the aspectual morphology is observed only on the lower copy (84a). Similarly, in Kikuyu the fronted verb does not carry any TMA specification, the aspectual morpheme being stranded on the lower copy (84c). Russian does not have an equivalent of a bare root verbal form, which could be a well-formed phonological
word. Nor does it have a light “support” verb akin to English *do*. As a result no overt realization of the low FocP is possible in cases like (88).

There is a language that provides some evidence in favor of the proposed analysis of verb focus in Russian. It is a Gur language - Kabiye. Kabiye has a counterpart of (89) which is grammatical.

(93) esó yá-ki kókósi ki yáb-u
Esso buy-IMPF bean.cakes KI buy-INF
‘Esso is just BUYING bean cakes.’

[Collins and Essizewa 2007: 192]

As shown in (93), the higher copy of the verb is marked for usual verb properties, here Aspect, and the lower one encodes focus on the verb39. As we can see, in Kabiye Aspect is marked only on the higher copy.

The verb focus construction in Kabiye and in Russian can be given the uniform analysis in terms of parallel chains. The only difference between Kabiye and Russian is that in the latter the copy of the verb inside FocP1 cannot be pronounced.

The analysis depicted in (88) finds some additional support language-internally as well. In particular, I argue that in certain cases we can actually see some overt material inside the fronted VP. It can be a PP complement as in (94).

(94) (What did you do with your picture collection?)
Odnu kartinu ja [otdala v muzej]_{Foc}
one.ACC picture.ACC I.NOM give.PST.FEM to museum.ACC
‘One of the pictures I gave away to the museum.’

As follows from the context provided for this example, Focus here corresponds to the phrase containing the verb and the PP. The phrase moved to the low FocP can be represented by any of the VP-shells. For the sake of the discussion, I refer to it simply as VP. Given the proposed analysis for verb focus, (94) is derived as illustrated below.

39 Note that the Kabiye morpheme *ki* is not an overt focus marker. For some discussion see section 7.2.2.
Sentences like (94) can be taken as evidence that what moves to FocP₁ under verb focus is not just a V head but a phrase. The analysis in (95) captures the fact that the PP introduced by the verb forms part of the Focus.

To conclude, in this section we considered verb focus in Russian, which on the surface differs from argument focus in that the focused verb occupies a position higher than FocP₁. However, it was argued that on closer investigation the difference between argument and predicate focus boils down to whether or not the head of the chain formed by movement to SpecFocP₁ can get a legitimate PF instantiation. A focused verb was claimed to check its focus feature by being moved to SpecFocP₁ pied-piping the whole VP. Because bare verb roots are not well-formed phonological words in Russian, the verb inside the fronted VP phrase remains silent. The verb we see on the surface is claimed to occupy its canonical position inside AspP.

5.3.6 How articulated is the vP periphery?
So far in our discussion of the vP Edge we only concentrated on one peripheral position, namely FocP₁. Are there equivalents of other peripheral heads inside this field?

Let us recall the structure of the clausal left periphery defended in this thesis, which is repeated in (96).

(96) \[
\text{forceP}\text{forceo}\text{frameP}\text{frameo}\text{interp}\text{intero}\text{topP}\text{topo}\text{topP}\text{topo}\text{focP}\text{foco}\text{topP}\text{topo}\text{finP}\text{fino}\text{[interPintero[...]]]}
\]

There is clearly no ForceP inside the lower phase Edge since the information encoded inside this domain does not relate to the speech act. A partial confirmation for this conclusion comes from the interpretational differences attested between clause-final versus clause-initial focus. As shown in chapter three, preposing of a focused constituent into the left periphery of the clause produces a special emphatic effect. Such sentences have acoustic properties of an exclamation (Yokoyama 1986) and are often interpreted as such. This effect is not attested with canonical clause-final focus. Sentences with clause-initial focus seem to be intrinsically
exclamative, while no special effects on clause-typing are found with the unmarked focus. This difference in interpretation can be linked to the more impoverished structure of the lower phase Edge, namely the lack of ForceP.

The absence of FinP within the vP periphery is also rather obvious – Tense-Agreement specifications, crucial for Fin\(^6\), are not encoded within the lower phase.

As will be shown in chapter six, there is no clause-internal counterpart of InterP in Russian either. Pre-empting the discussion, the basis for such an assumption comes from the following observation. A wh-word in Russian cannot occur in the unmarked focus position, as illustrated by the mismatch between the question and the answer in (97). This indicates that a wh-word should not only check the focus feature, which is possible inside the lower phase, but also have access to the head related to questioning, i.e. InterP.

\[(97) \begin{align*}
a. & \text{ * Ty na seminar \, budeš\' \, rasskazyvat\’ \, o \, čem?} \\
    & \text{you.NOM on \, seminar.LOC \, FUT.2SG \, tell.INF \, about \, what} \\
    & \text{‘What are you going to talk about at the seminar?’}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
b. & \text{ Na seminar \, ja \, budu \, rasskazyvat\’ \, o \, vojne \, 1812} \\
    & \text{on \, seminar.LOC \, I.NOM \, FUT.2SG \, tell.INF \, about \, war.LOC \, year.GEN} \\
    & \text{‘At the seminar I am going to talk about the war of 1812.’}
\end{align*}\]

Thus we are only left with discourse-related heads as potential inhabitants of the vP Edge. As argued in chapter three, an aboutness, i.e. a strong, topic must occur sentence-initially in Russian. It follows that there is no equivalent of TopP within the Edge of the lower phase. Frames, as the name suggests, are also restricted to the beginning of the clause. This means that no FrameP can be found at the periphery of the vP either. The only legitimate constituent of this domain, besides FocP, is topP. A weak topic was shown to be able to occur anywhere in the clause.

It has been mentioned previously that backgrounding material in the form of a pronoun is not allowed in the post-focal position. Full DPs are also quite bad in this position. The relevant examples are repeated below.

\[(98) \begin{align*}
a. & \text{ (What are you going to give your husband for his birthday?)} \\
    & \text{Ja \, podarju \, časy \, (*emu / ?? mužu).} \\
    & \text{I.NOM \, give.FUT.1SG \, watch.ACC \, he.DAT / husband.DAT} \\
    & \text{‘I will give him/my husband a WATCH.’}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
b. & \text{ (When did you see your neighbors last time?)} \\
    & \text{Ja \, videla \, včera \, (*ih / ?? sosedej).} \\
    & \text{I.NOM \, see.PST.FEM \, yesterday \, they.ACC / neighbors.ACC} \\
    & \text{‘I saw them/my neighbors YESTERDAY.’}
\end{align*}\]

These data indicate that there is no position which can host a weak topic lower than FocP\(_1\). However, there is some evidence for such a position preceding FocP\(_1\). If our
analysis of verb focus is on the right track, sentences like (81) repeated here as (99), provide some ground for postulating a topP above FocP₁.

(99) (Context: I see you walking to the office every morning. What happened to your car?)
Ja prodała ee / mašinu.
I.NOM sell.PST.FEM it.ACC / car.ACC
‘I SOLD it/the car.’

The pronoun in (99) is assumed to reside in topP dominating FocP₁. Even though FocP₁ is phonologically empty in (99), the topP hosting the pronoun cannot be assumed to follow FocP₁ on the basis of the fact that a non-verbal focus cannot be followed by the backgrounding material (98). Some more obvious cases in favor of this idea are given in (100). Here we have a focused constituent, which was argued to be in SpecFocP₁, and some backgrounding material preceding it, indicated by italics, which I take to be situated in SpectopP.

(100) a. (Context: Who did you give my CD to?)
Ja dala ego svoej podruge.
I.NOM give.PST.FEM it.ACC REFL girlfriend.DAT
‘I gave it to my GIRLFRIEND.’

b. (Context: When did they tell you about my new position?)
Oni rassказали mne ob etom только вчера.
they.NOM tell.PST.PL I.DAT about this.LOC only yesterday
‘They told me about it only YESTERDAY.’

Topic iteration inside the vP periphery was proposed for languages that exhibit Right Dislocation (RD) constructions (Villalba 2000, Belletti 2004). For instance, Belletti (2004) proposes that RD constructions in Italian, like that in (101), can be taken as evidence for a low topic position inside the vP periphery.

(101) L’ha comprato Maria, il giornale.
it has bought Maria the newspaper
‘MARIA has bought it, the newspaper.’

The postverbal subject in (101) is argued to occupy the specifier position of the clause-internal FocP, i.e. our FocP₁. The possibility of dislocating constituents to the right of focus, according to Belletti, signals the existence of a topic position below FocP₁.

I showed above that nothing can follow focus in standard Russian. Nevertheless one can find constructions which formally resemble (101), i.e. a clause-final DP is resumed by a pronoun clause-internally. An example is provided in (102).
(102) My ego nikogda ne obižali, našego soseda.
We.NOM he.ACC never NEG offend.PST.PL our neighbor.ACC
‘We have never offended him, our neighbor.’

As noted by Averintseva (in press), constructions like (102) are quite rare for Russian: they are genre-specific and used mostly in poetry for rhythmical purposes. Most importantly, on closer investigation, they are not true RDs. Clitic RD was shown to possess a number of specific properties that include (i) clitic resumption; (ii) strict clause-finality, (iii) recursiveness, (iv) free order of attachment, (v) island sensitivity (Villalba 2000). As shown by the following examples, Russian constructions involving resumption of a right-detached DP do not exhibit any of these properties.

(103) My opyat’ etogo pridurka včera vstretili, našego
we.NOM again this fool.ACC yesterday meet.PST.PL our
soseda.
neighbor.ACC
‘We again met this idiot yesterday, our neighbor.’

(104) a. Ja v nem prosto duši ne čaju, v etom Nikitke.
I.NOM in he.LOC simply soul.GEN NEG feel.PRS.1SG in
this Nikitka.LOC

b. Ja v nem, v etom Nikitke, prosto duši ne čaju.
I.NOM in he.LOC in this Nikitka.LOC simply soul.GEN NEG
feel.PRS.1SG

c. Ja v nem prosto duši, v etom Nikitke, ne čaju.
I.NOM in he.LOC simply soul.GEN in this Nikitka.LOC NEG
feel.PRS.1SG

‘I simply adore him, this Nikitka.’

(105) * Ja ne vstrečala ee tam uže mesjaca
I.NOM NEG meet.PST.FEM she.ACC there already month.GEN
dva, v clube, Annu.
two in club.LOC Anna.ACC
‘I have not seen her there for about two months already, in the club, Anna.’
As illustrated by (103), a right detached DP in Russian can refer back to an epithet. (104) shows that the placement of a coreferential DP is quite free in the clause. Example (105) proves the impossibility of multiple detachments. And finally, (106) indicates that extraction out of a relative clause, otherwise prohibited in the language, can be carried out under right detachment.

Based on these data I conclude that sentences with resumption of a right-detached DP in Russian are not true RD constructions. Following Averintseva (in press), I take them to be derived by a post-syntactic operation. The resumed DP functions basically as a parenthetical. Therefore, I conclude that there is no evidence in Russian for the existence of a topic position following FocP.

Given the empirical facts discussed in the present chapter we can postulate only two lower phase Edge positions both of which are discourse-related, namely FocP and topP. There is still a possibility that the vP Edge can host some other scope-discourse related projections. One such candidate can be negation. The fact is that the position of a negated verb in Russian affects interpretation in the way predicted by Zanuttini (1997). If a negated verb is placed sentence-initially (107a), negation gets, what Zanuttini calls, the ‘presuppositional’ reading: it is negating the presupposed proposition. At the same time, when the negated verb occurs low (107b), negation applies to a proposition which may or may not be presupposed. As shown by the felicitous questions for each of the sentences in (107), they have different Focus structure: in (107a) Focus can only be on the polarity while (107b) can also have focus on the entire proposition.

(107) a. Ne videli my tvoe vystuplenie.
     NEG see.PST.PL we.NOM your.ACC performance.ACC
     ‘We did not see your performance.’
     Did you see my performance?
     # Why are you so sad? What happened?

b. My ne videli tvoe vystuplenie.
     we.NOM NEG see.PST.PL your.ACC performance.ACC
     ‘We did not see your performance.’
     Did you see my performance?
     Why are you so sad? What happened?

Provided that Zanuttini’s (1997) analysis of negation is on the right track, NegP can be another peripheral projection present at both phasal Edges. This issue requires some further investigation. For the time being, the structure of the lower phase Edge in Russian we arrive at can be schematized as follows.
5.3.7 Summary
In section 5.3 the issue of our primary concern was the canonical clause-final focus in Russian. The question was- is there a dedicated structural slot for a focused constituent? We considered the option of analyzing canonical focus as resulting from VP evacuation, whereby all the non-focal elements vacate the verb phrase leaving the focus in its first-merge position. However, this was shown not to be the optimal solution for a number of reasons. Therefore, I took another track and argued that there should be a dedicated FocP low in the structure of a Russian clause that hosts the focused constituent. This analysis is built on the idea that vP, being a phase, contains a peripheral domain akin to the complementizer domain of the clause. The proposed analysis has been substantiated both theoretically and empirically.

From the theoretical point of view, assuming a CP-like Edge on top of the vP, helps to better characterize the notion of Phase. In the spirit of Butler (2004), I assumed a phase to uniformly represent a three-layered construct wherein the deepest layer introduces the lexical core, the middle layer corresponds to the Domain and encodes formal grammatical properties, and the topmost Edge layer is responsible for quantificational and discourse-related meanings.

Empirically, the facts on the order and interpretation of postverbal elements in Russian served as arguments in favor of the vP periphery hypothesis. It was proposed that the Edge of the lower, i.e. vP, phase in Russian should minimally include FocP. Optionally a topP can be projected on top of FocP to host weak topics. Forceo and Fino heads are assumed to be missing from the lower phase Edge. Moreover, it was argued that, at least for Russian, there is no positive evidence for inclusion of TopP, FrameP or InterP into this domain. The structure of the lower phase Edge proposed here is repeated in (109).

(109) \[(\text{topP}^o \ [\text{focP} \ Foc^o \ [\text{vP}]]\]

Whether or not any other Edge positions are available in the lower phase is unclear at the moment and requires some further investigation.

5.4 Conclusions
Chapter five was dedicated to the analysis of Topic and Focus encoding in Russian. I adopt the idea that different interpretational nuances related to IS have a structural basis. In other words, constituents of various discourse statuses are assumed to occur in the dedicated structural slots. As the basis for my analysis I adopted Rizzi’s (1997, 2001a, 2001b) articulate architecture of CP. I also followed the hypothesis that IS features can be checked clause-internally and that certain criterial heads are replicated inside the clause (Ndayiragije 1996, 1999, Belletti 2001, 2004, Villalba 2000, Jayaseelan 2001). As a result, we arrived at the conclusion that phases which build up a clause, vP and CP, must be structurally similar. The generalized format of a phase adopted from Butler (2004) and assumed in the present work is repeated in (110).
The lower, vP, and the higher, CP, phases are identical with respect to the overall skeleton. However, the internal architecture of CP, hP, and HP of the two phases is not identical. Information encoded inside each phase is clearly different. The lower phase is responsible for constructing an eventuality, while the higher phase anchors this eventuality in time and transforms an event into a proposition. This functional difference between the two phases reflects the fact that phase Domains are not isomorphic. The ‘little’ heads constituting the Domain of the lower and the higher phase are not identical.

An aim of this chapter was to show that the architecture of the Edges is also different, using Russian data as an empirical basis. The periphery of the lower phase was shown to be considerably less complex than that of the entire clause. This seems like a natural conclusion given that the higher phase is more ‘out-looking’ in the relevant sense than the lower one. Because of its propositional nature, the higher phase is sensitive to a larger variety of discourse-related information. The extent to which the lower phase is sensitive to IS was shown to be limited to mere extraction of the most prominent (or new) information. This idea is much in line with previous proposals which regard vP as the Focus domain. In the present work I attempted to substantiate this claim by granting the lower phase a formal way to encode Focus. The proposed FocP analysis of the canonical focus in Russian raises an issue that deserves some explication.

Certain derivations argued for in this chapter involve a string vacuous movement. For example, in a sentence with a narrowly focused DO, e.g. (111), the proposed focus-induced movement does not change the linear order of the constituents.

(111) (Context: What are you eating?)
    I.NOM eat.PRS.1SG orange.ACC
    ‘I am eating an ORANGE.’

Suspicious as it may be, string vacuous movement seems to be independently necessary in the theory. One such case is described in Svenonius (2000). Negative quantifiers in Norwegian obligatorily move out of VP. As the author assumes, this movement is motivated by the need to create a proper tripartite structure for quantifier interpretation. This requirement accounts for the ungrammaticality of (112).
(112) * Statsrådet kan sende ingen befullmektiget til forsamlinga.
   the.minister can send no delegate to the.assembly
   ‘The minister can send no delegate to the assembly.’

Besides the quantifier movement requirement, H(olmberg’s) G(eneralization) is operative in Norwegian. To remind the reader, HG bans movement over overt material left in VP. Thus, even if the required quantifier movement takes place in (112) the result is still bad, this time due to violation of HG (113).

(113) * Statsrådet kan ingen befullmektiget sende til forsamlinga.
   the.minister can no delegate send to the.assembly
   ‘The minister can send no delegate to the assembly.’

Given these facts, Svenonius concludes that the grammaticality of examples like (114a) indicates that the quantifier movement took place in a string vacuous manner, as shown in (114b). The verb in this case undergoes V-to-C movement (Norwegian being a V2 language), and nothing prevents the quantifier movement. That the latter indeed takes place is indicated by the contrast between grammatical (114a) versus ungrammatical (112).

(114) a. Knut leveret ingenting inn.
    Knut handed nothing in
    ‘Knut didn’t hand anything in.’

   b. Knut leveret ingenting [VP t, t, inn]

Another empirical argument in favor of string-vacuous movements is provided by Son (2003). The author uses this type of analysis to account, among other things, for the interpretation of wh-elements in negative questions in Korean.

Normally a wh-word inside a negative question in Korean can only be interpreted as an existential quantifier but not as a question word (115). It is possible to interpret a wh-item as a question word in such an environment only if the wh-word is scrambled. In this case the wh-word is interpreted as D-linked (116).

(115) Mary-ka nwukwu-rul coahhaci-anh-ni?
    M.-NOM wh-ACC like-not-Q
    a. ‘Mary likes someone, doesn’t she?’
    b. ?? ‘Who doesn’t Mary like?’

(116) nwukwu-rul Mary-ka coahhaci-anh-ni?
    wh-ACC M.-NOM like-not-Q
    ‘Who is it (among them) that Mary doesn’t like?’
Interestingly, (115) can also obtain the \textit{wh}-question interpretation, but in this case the \textit{wh}-word must be heavily stressed (the word order remains the same). The result is a D-linked \textit{wh}-question (117).

(117) Mary-ka nwukwu-rul coahhaci-anh-ni?
    M.-NOM wh-ACC like-not-Q
    ‘Who is it (among them) that Mary doesn’t like?’

To explain these data Son proposes that stress in (117) is a PF reflex of the string vacuous short-distant scrambling of the \textit{wh}-word.

The Norwegian and the Korean facts represent additional independent sets of data that require string vacuous movement. On a closer look, there is, in fact, a common base for Norwegian negative movement, Korean \textit{wh}-scrambling and Russian focus movement. They are all motivated by the C-I interface requirements. Speaking about the legitimacy of string vacuous movement, Sabel (2005) argues that it is allowed only if it has an LF and, most importantly, a PF effect. That focus movement in Russian has an LF reflex is beyond any doubt. Interpretive effects can be considered the prime motivation for the existence of syntactic [Foc]/[Top] features (Grewendorf and Sabel 1999, Sabel 2005). Similarly obvious are PF effects. First, this is reflected in focus accent on the designated constituent. And second, as discussed in section 3.2.3, focusing affects phonological phrasing in Russian.

Therefore, the invisibility of the proposed focus movement does not constitute a problem from a theoretical point of view.

In the following chapter we will consider \textit{wh}-movement. Question formation is another operation that falls into the class of peripheral, or criterial, phenomena. This chapter sheds some more light onto the architecture of the lower and the higher phase Edges and highlights differences in their internal make-up.