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In Predicate Doubling constructions, either an entire predicate (VP-Doubling) or a bare verb (V-Doubling) occurs in the CP-domain. In both cases, the doubled verb in the CP-domain exhibits non-finite morphology, while the lower instance of the verb is finite. In the case of VP-Doubling, the arguments of the verb only occur in the higher position; in the case of V-Doubling, verb arguments are in their base position. I will discuss the novel data from Russian and argue that while similar, VP-Doubling and V-Doubling must be analyzed differently.

1 Introduction

The Predicate Doubling construction, also known as Predicate Clefting, appears in a variety of languages, such as Russian, Spanish, Yiddish, Hebrew, and others. In such constructions, the predicate is fronted and occurs at the beginning of the sentence, presumably in the CP-domain. There are two versions of these constructions which were observed in previous literature. In the first one, an entire predicate, i.e. verb and all its arguments, is clefted. In the second version of the construction, only the verb is fronted. In the both versions, the verb in the “cleft” exhibits non-finite morphology. According to the generalization by Landau (2006), in
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predicate doubling construction either all verbal arguments are fronted together with the verb (we will refer to this version of the construction as VP-doubling), or they all stay in their base-positions (we will refer to this version as C-doubling). Examples of the Predicate Doubling construction from a variety of languages are given below. The doubled constituent is bolded. In what follows, I will refer to the upper instance of the V/VP as “cleft,” without actually assuming that clefting in traditional sense is involved in deriving such constructions.

(1) Verb-Doubling: only the verb is fronted:

a. Čitat’-to Ivan knigu čitaet, no ničego ne ponimaet.
readINF-TO Ivan book reads, but nothing not understands
‘Ivan does read the book, but he doesn’t understand a thing.’
Russian (Abels 2001)

b. Leer, Juan ha leído un libro. Spanish (Vicente 2009)
readINF Juan has read a book
‘As for reading, Juan has read a book.’

c. Liknot, hi kanta et ha-praxim. Hebrew (Landau:2006)
buyINF she bought ACC the-flowers
‘As for buying, she bought the flowers’

d. Essen est Maks fish. Yiddish (Cable 2004)
eatINF eats Max fish
‘As for eating, Max eats fish’

(2) VP-Doubling: the entire VP is fronted:

a. Čitat’ knigu-to Ivan čitaet, no ničego ne ponimaet.
readINF book-TO Ivan reads, but nothing not understands
‘Ivan does read it, but he doesn’t understand a thing.’

b. Leer el libro, Juan lo ha leído. Spanish
readINF the book Juan CL has read
‘As for reading the book, Juan has indeed read it.’

c. Liknot et ha-praxim, hi kanta. Hebrew
buyINF ACC the-flowers she bought
‘As for buying, she bought the flowers.’

d. Essen fish est Maks. Yiddish
eatINF fish eats Max
‘As for eating, Max eats fish.’
In this paper I concentrate on predicate doubling in Russian, which, as (1a) and (2a) show, also exhibits two versions of the construction. Notice the presence of an optional particle -TO in Russian Predicate Doubling construction. I assume that this is a topic-marking particle, and occurs in the left periphery of the clause. The fact that the clefted constituent occurs before it indicates that it is also located in the CP-domain. For the purposes of this paper, I will leave the question of the exact position of the clefted constituent within the left periphery for future research.

Data in (3a-b) provide additional examples of V-D and VP-D in Russian, and (3c) demonstrated the fact that the verb arguments cannot appear both in their base position and in the clefted constituent.

(3) a. Kupit*-to Ivan piva kupit, no pit’ ne budet. V-D
   buyINF-TO I. beer buyFUT but drinkINF not will
   ‘As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer, but won’t drink it.’

b. Kupit’ piva-to Ivan kupit, no pit’ ne budet. VP-D
   buyINF beer-TO I. buyFUT but drinkINF not will
   ‘As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer, but won’t drink it.’

c. Kupit’ piva-to Ivan (*piva) kupit (*piva), ...
   buyINF beer-TO I. beer buy beer

2 Previous analyses

A number of analyses have been proposed to account for the data in various languages, such as Yiddish, Russian, Polish, Gungbe, Spanish in (Abels 2001, Cable 2004, Landau 2006, Aboh and Dyakonova 2009, Bondaruk 2009, 2012 a.o.). These analyses can be divided into two main categories: 1) Movement analysis; and 2) Base-generation analysis. In this paper I argue that both these analyses are necessary for Russian and that two types of Predicate Doubling in Russian have to be analyzed differently. Verb-Doubling is generated via movement, while VP-Doubling cleft is base generated in the left periphery.

For example, one of the first analyses of Russian Predicate Doubling by Abels (2001) argues that this construction can be “accounted for as an instance of remnant VP movement.” Abels cites locality constraints, but limits the scope of his examples to the instances of V-Doubling. As I show below, this does not capture the entire paradigm, and locality
constraints on Predicate Doubling in Russian are not as strong as Abels suggests.

Bondaruk (2009, 2012) proposes an analysis of Polish predicate clefts “based on a single chain with or without a multiple realization of copies”. According to her analysis, Polish predicate clefts are derived via remnant V(v)P movement, and the copy deletion is a purely phonological process along the lines of Nunes (2004).

Vicente (2009) analyses the predicate clefting construction in Spanish and argues that movement theory must be extended to allow head-to-spec movement. He then advocates for the analysis of predicate doubling as an instance of such head-to-spec movement of the verb.

On the other end of the spectrum is the analysis of Yiddish predicate clefting by Cable (2004), where he argues that the topic-constituent (VP-cleft) is base-generated in a peripheral topic position.

Below I show that the full range of data in Russian cannot be accounted for by these analyses, and that Russian resorts to both of these analyses to derive the variety of the Predicate Doubling constructions.

### 3 Properties of Predicate Doubling in Russian

In this section I outline previously unreported properties of the predicate doubling construction in Russian, and demonstrate that VP-Doubling and V-Doubling constructions behave differently with respect to the island constraints, identity requirements, and long-distance extraction.

#### 3.1 Issues of Identity

It has always been claimed that the verbs in the cleft and in the base position must be identical in PD constructions. However, this is not always the case. Interestingly, while identity of the verb in the cleft and in the base is strongly required in V-Doubling constructions, this requirement becomes only a preference in VP-Doubling constructions. Even though some speakers find sentences which violate this identity odd, all my informants agree on the strong contrast between a. and b. sentences below.

(4) a. ?S’ezdit’ v Ameriku-to ja zavtra tuda poleču. VP-D
go_{NSF} to America-TO I tomorrow there fly_{FUT}
‘As for going to the USA, I’m flying there tomorrow.’
As the data above show, the verb does not have to be identical in the case of VP-Doubling. There is, however, a restriction on the content of the cleft and the content of the base VP. The data that can explain this restriction are provided in (6).

(6) a. *Najti 100 rublej-to on deneg najdet.  
   find$_{SNF}$ money$_{TO}$ he 100 rubles find$_{FUT}$  
   ‘As for finding money, he will find 100 rubles.’

If we assume that the cleft is a topic based on the meaning of the predicate doubling sentences and the presence of the particle -TO, same as in sentences in (6), we can see that the topic must be less specific than the predicate. This is reminiscent of the requirement on topics seen in English sentences such as (7):

(7) a. As for fruits, I like apples.  
   b. *As for apples, I like fruits.

This is a semantic restriction on the nature of topics, which I will not be concerned with in this paper. The crucial observation here is that it does not account for the identity requirement in V-Doubling constructions. For example, in (4b), the cleft s’ezdit ‘to go’ is less specific than the VP v Ameriku leču ‘go to America,’ but the sentence is still ungrammatical. That suggests that something else is at stake in V-Doubling constructions that renders them ungrammatical.
3.2 Island Effects

One of the previously unnoticed differences between the V-Doubling and VP-Doubling constructions concerns their behavior under islands. Examples below demonstrate it.

(8) wh-island
   a. *Kupit’ piva-to ja ne znaju kogda on kupit. VP-D
      buyINF beer-TO I not now when he buy
      ‘As for buying beer, I don’t know when he will do so.’
   b. *Kupit’-to ja ne znaju kogda on piva kupit V-D
      buyINF-TO I not now when he beer buy
      ‘As for buying, I don’t know when he will buy beer.’

(9) Coordinate Structure Constraint
   a. Kupit’ piva-to on kupit i vodki vyp’et. VP-D
      buyINF beer-TO he buy and vodka drink
      ‘As for buying beer, he will buy it and drink some vodka.’
   b. *Kupit’-to on piva kupit I vodki vyp’et V-D
      buyINF-TO he beer buy and vodka drink
      ‘As for buying, he will buy beer and drink vodka.’

(10) Complex NP Constraint
   a. *Kupit’ piva-to, ja znaju čeloveka, kotoryj kupit. VP-D
      buyINF beer-TO I know person which buy
      ‘As for buying beer, I know a person who will buy it.’
   b. *Kupit’-to ja znaju čeloveka, kotoryj kupit piva. V-D
      buyINF-TO I know person which buy beer
      ‘As for buying, I know a person who will buy beer.’

(11) Adjunct Island Constraint
   a. *Vypit’ piva-to, on ušel tak kak Maša vypila. VP-D
      drinkINF beer-TO he left because M. drank
      ‘As for drinking beer, he left because Maša drank it.’
   b. *Vypit’-to on ušel tak kak Maša piva vypila. V-D
      drinkINF-TO he left because M. beer drank
      ‘As for drinking, he left because Maša drank beer.’
In the examples above, a. sentences demonstrate that VP-Doubling is immune to island violations, while b. sentences show that V-Doubling is impossible out of an island.

3.3 Long-distance Predicate Doubling

In this section I show that VP-Doubling and V-Doubling constructions behave differently if applied long-distance. It is well known that Russian exhibits (at least) three types of embedded clauses: indicative, subjunctive, and infinitive (control). With respect to various syntactic phenomena, such as extraction and binding, the indicative clause is the least transparent, and the control clause is the most transparent. For example, as shown in (12), long-distance reflexive binding is possible into control clauses, and impossible into indicatives and subjunctives.

(12) a. *Ivan_ skazal čto Maša l’ubit sebj_.
   I. said that M. loves self
   ‘Ivan said that Maša loves him.’

   b. *Ivan_ skazal čtoby Maša narisovala sebj_.
   I. said thatSUBJ M. draw self
   ‘Ivan told Maša to draw him.’

   c. Ivan_ skazal Maše narisovat’ sebj_.
   I. said MašaDAT drawINF self
   ‘Ivan told Maša to draw him.’

In addition to the long-distance anaphoric binding, subjunctives also exhibit obviation effects (see Avrutin & Babyonyshev 1997 for Russian), when the pronominal subject of the embedded clause cannot be coreferential with the matrix subject when the embedded clause is subjunctive (potential Principle B violation across the clause boundary). This effect is absent when the embedded clause is indicative. Further, the long-distance wh-extraction is more acceptable out of subjunctives than out of indicatives:

(13) a. ??Čto ty skazal čto Ivan vypil?  Indicative
   what you said that I. drank
   ‘What did you say that Ivan had drunk?’
b. Čto ty xočeš čtoby Ivan vypil? Subjunctive
   what you want thatSUBJ I. drank
   ‘What do you want for Ivan to drink?’

However, if we consider PD, we will discover a pattern inconsistent with
the expectations. The only environment where long-distance predicate
doubling is allowed is VP-Doubling out of indicative clauses; both long-
distance V-Doubling and VP-Doubling are ungrammatical out of
subjunctive and control clauses:

(14) *Indicative complements
   a. *Kupit’ piva-to on dumaet čto Boris kupit. VP-D
      buyINF beer-TO he thinks thatB. buyFUT
      ‘As for buying beer, he heard that Boris will buy it.’
   b. *Kupit’-to on slyshal čto Boris piva kupit. V-D
      buyINF-TO he heard thatB. beer buyFUT
      ‘As for buying, he heard that Boris will buy beer.’

(15) *Subjunctive complements
   a. *Kupit’ piva-to Ivan xočet čtoby Boris kupit. VP-D
      buyINF beer-TO I. wants thatSUBJ B. buy
      ‘As for buying beer, Ivan wants Boris to buy it.’
   b. *Kupit’-to Ivan xočet čtoby Boris piva kupit. V-D
      buyINF-TO I. heard thatSUBJ B. beer buy
      ‘As for buying beer, Ivan wants Boris to buy it.’

(16) *Control complements
   a. *Kupit’ piva-to Marina xočet kupit’ VP-D
      buyINF beer-TO M. wants buyINF
      ‘As for buying beer, Marina wants to buy it.’
   b. *Kupit’-to Marina xočet piva kupit’ V-D
      buyINF-TO M. wants beer buyINF
      ‘As for buying beer, Marina wants to buy it’

Based on the transparency restrictions in different types of embedded
clauses in Russian, such behavior is unexpected. Even though both
subjunctive and control clauses are more transparent than indicative
clauses, both types of predicate doubling out of them are ungrammatical.
Also, as before with islands and identity effects, we see fewer restrictions on VP-Doubling, compared to V-Doubling, which is allowed out of the indicative embedded clauses.

3.4 Summary of Data
In this section I showed that two types of Predicate Doubling in Russian behave differently, and thus we need two distinct analyses which account for the observed differences. The summary is given in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VP-Doubling</th>
<th>V-Doubling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Effects:</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands/Constraints:</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-Doubling out of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicatives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctives</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of Russian Predicate Doubling properties.

4 Analysis of Data
As pointed out in the previous section, VP-Doubling and V-Doubling exhibit very different properties with respect to several syntactic phenomena. In this section I propose the following:

(17) Predicate-Doubling in Russian:
   a. **VP-Doubling** involves *base-generation* of the VP-cleft in the left periphery of the clause;
   b. **V-Doubling** can be derived via *head-movement* of the verb to the peripheral position in the CP-domain.

Taking this proposal into consideration, there are several questions which should still be answered:

a. Why is identity necessary in the case of Verb-Doubling and optional in the case of VP-Doubling?
b. How to account for the observed behavior of PD with respect to islands?
c. Why is long-distance V-Doubling prohibited, while VP-Doubling is allowed out of indicatives?

4.1 Identity Requirements and Island Effects
The first two questions can be addressed straightforwardly under the proposed analysis. Since VP-Doubling involves base-generation, it is not subject to island effects: VP-cleft does not need to move to the peripheral position from its base. For the same reason, identity is not required for VP-Doubling: the cleft generated in the peripheral position does not need to be identical to the main VP of the clause. V-Doubling is generated through the head-movement, and therefore, the clefted verb needs to be identical to the verb in the base position. Further, if we assume that head-movement respects islands, the analysis immediately predicts that V-Doubling out of islands is ungrammatical, which is confirmed by the data.

4.2 Trigger of the Predicate Doubling
As can be seen from the semantics of the predicate doubling constructions, the cleft is interpreted as a contrastive topic (following Abels 2001), (18). Compatibility with the topic particle - TO confirms this. Examples with this particle serving as a head of the projection hosting the contrastive topic are given in (19).

(18) a. Prigotovit'-to on rybu prigotovit, no est' ne budet.
    cookINF-TO he fish cookFUT but eat not will.
    ‘As for cooking, he will cook the fish, but he won’t eat it.’

b. Prigotovit’ rybu- to on prigotovit, no est’ budet m’aso.
    cookINF fish-TO he cookFUT but eat will meat.
    ‘As for cooking the fish, he will do it, but he will eat meat.’

(19) Pivo- to ja ljublju, a vodku net.
    beer-TO I love but vodka not
    ‘As for beer, I like it, but not vodka.’

I assume that the particle -TO is the head of the TopP projection within the CP-domain of the clause. For the purpose of the analysis, the precise
nature of this position is not crucial; the analysis would not change as long as this position is in the CP-domain.

Adopting the framework of Pesetsky & Torrego, 2007, I assume that Top-head (-TO) bears an interpretable unvalued instance of the Topic feature \(<\text{Top} -\text{val}>\). The phrase to be topicalized, in our case, vP, is headed by \(v\) with an uninterpretable valued instance of the Topic feature, \(<\text{uTop} +\text{val}>\). The Agree relation between the Top-head and \(v\) drives the Merge (internal or external) of the topicalized element into the Top,P projection. This way, it is possible to value the Top-feature of the Top-head by either movement or merge into its specifier, or head-movement, deriving both V- and VP-Doubling constructions.

4.3 Infinitival Morphology in VP-Doubling Constructions

The next issue to be explained is why the verb in the cleft bears infinitival morphology. In the case of VP-Doubling, the non-finite form of the verb can be explained in the Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) framework. According to them, the finite form of the verb bears an uninterpretable valued instance of the T-feature \(<\text{uT} +\text{val}>\). This feature needs to be checked by T, which has an interpretable unvalued instance of the T-feature \(<\text{iT} -\text{val}>\), which serves as a probe. According to the proposed analysis of VP-Doubling, the verb in the cleft is generated in the CP-domain, higher than T. This means that T can never probe it (I assume that probing is done top-down universally), and the T-feature on the verb in the cleft will be left without an interpretable instance, leading the derivation to crash. The only way to save this derivation is to use the non-finite form of the verb in the cleft, a form which lacks the T-feature altogether. I assume that this is indeed the case in VP-Doubling construction. If such form of the verb is used in the cleft, it does not need to be checked by T, and the derivation will converge. As a consequence, the verb in the cleft without a T-feature will exhibit non-finite morphology. Note that this explanation only works for VP-Doubling construction. I will explain the non-finite morphology in V-Doubling constructions below when I show how head-movement derives them.

4.4 Deletion of Arguments in VP-Doubling Constructions

As I demonstrated above, in the VP-Doubling construction, the arguments of the verb cannot be repeated in the base position and in the cleft. I argue that this process is similar to deletion process under ellipsis.
Verb arguments, having the same form in the base-generated cleft in the vP, delete under identity in the lower instance. However, we also need to explain why the lower copy of the verb does not undergo ellipsis. While verbs in PD constructions are different morphologically, having the same form is not a requirement for deletion under ellipsis, as shown in (20):

(20) Who has **done it** today and who will **do it** tomorrow?

In this example, the lower instance of the verb _do_ undergoes ellipsis even though its morphology is different from the upper instance of the verb.

I argue that at stake here is not the morphology, but the featural content of the verb. As I argued above, the verb in the cleft lacks the T-feature completely, as it cannot be checked by the T-head. The verb in the lower position, on the other hand, has a valued T-feature. This difference in the featural content of the two instances of the same verb prevents deletion, since the T-feature of the lower verb cannot be recovered if ellipsis takes place. Notice that in example (20), both higher and lower instances of the verb are finite. However, if we use a non-finite version of the verb in the lower or the upper instance, the sentence becomes ungrammatical as in (21a-b). In (21a-b) the verb _to do_ is embedded under raising predicate, but as (21c) shows, ellipsis is possible in the embedded clauses as well. Therefore, it confirms the hypothesis that the featural content of the two instances of the verb, i.e. the presence of the valued T-feature, must be the same to license ellipsis.

(21) a. *Who has **done it** today and who is likely to **do it** tomorrow?  
   b. *Who is likely to **do it** today and who will **do it** tomorrow?  
   c. John has **done it** today and Mary thinks that Bill will **do it** tomorrow.

In the VP-Doubling constructions, the T-feature is missing on the upper instance of the verb, and therefore ellipsis is impossible.

Note that the arguments of the verb do not delete if they are not identical. The relevant example is given in (6a), repeated below:

(6) a. ?Najti **deneg**-to on 100 rubej najdet.  
   ﬁnd_{INF} money-TO he 100 rubles ﬁnd_{FUT}  
   ‘As for finding money, he will find 100 rubles.’
4.5 On Long-Distance Predicate Doubling

As I have shown above, the long-distance Predicate Doubling is only possible for VP-Doubling out of indicative clauses. To explain this pattern, we need to answer two questions: 1). Why is long-distance V-Doubling disallowed; and 2). Why is long-distance VP-Doubling restricted to indicative complements only?

The impossibility of long-distance V-Doubling can be explained if we assume that long-distance head-movement is universally not allowed. Under the proposed analysis, V-Doubling is derived through head-movement, and we would not expect it to be possible out of the embedded clauses at all.

Now I will present the differences between the indicative and the subjunctive/control clauses and show how they explain why VP-Doubling is only possible out of indicative embedded clauses.

The contrastive topic position is unavailable in subjunctive and control complements, as shown in (22).

(22) a. Maša skazala čto Lenu-to Ivan vstretil, a Annu net.  
M. said that L.-TO I. met but A. not  
‘Maša said that Ivan to met Lena, but not Anna.’

b. *Maša xočet čtoby Lenu-to Ivan vstretil, a Annu net.  
M. wants that₃₄ L.-TO I. meet₃₄ but A. not  
‘Maša wants Ivan to meet Lena but not Anna.’

M. wants beer-TO buy₅ but vodka not  
‘Maša wants to buy beer, but not vodka.’

In (22a), the embedded clause is indicative, and the contrastive topic is allowed in the left periphery of the embedded CP. (22b) and (22c) are the examples of the subjunctive and control complements respectively, and the embedded topic is not allowed in their CP-domain. It is beyond the scope of this paper to explain why the TopP is incompatible with the embedded subjunctive and control clauses. It is possible that the complementizer needs to enter into a relation with the T in clauses with the defective tense (subjunctives and control), in order to establish dependency between the embedded T and the matrix T. The non-empty TopP with the head -TO serves as a blocker of such a relationship, and as
a result, the examples (22b,c) are ungrammatical. In the indicative embedded clauses there is no need to establish the tense dependency, and therefore it is possible to have an intermediate projection between the CP, hosting the complementizer, and the embedded TP.

In order to account for the facts about the long-distance VP-Doubling I assume that the topic cleft has to be base-generated in the CP-domain of the clause with the vP, which is doubled by the cleft. That is, the clefts in the long-distance VP-Doubling constructions are generated in the embedded clauses, and they further can move to the matrix left periphery position. Since it is impossible to base-generate a VP in the embedded CP-domain of subjunctive and control clauses as shown in (22b-c), the long-distance VP-Doubling is impossible in such cases.

Further, note that the upper instance of VP does not necessarily move to the matrix Spec,TopP, and can stay in the embedded Spec,TopP, if this position is available.

(23) a. Maša skazala čto vstretit’ Sergeja-to Ivan vstrelil, a
M. said that meet_{INF} S.-TO I. met but
Petra net.
P. not
‘Maša said that as for Sergej, Ivan met him, but didn't meet
Peter.’
b. Maša xočet čtoby vstretit’ Sergeja-to Ivan vstrelil,
M. wants that_{SUBJ} meet_{INF} S.-TO I. met
a Petra net.
but P. not
‘Maša wants Ivan to meet Sergej, but not Peter.’
c. Maša xočet vstretit’ Sergeja-to PRO vstretit’,
M. wants meet_{INF} S.-TO meet_{INF} but
Petra net.
P. not
‘Maša wants to meet Sergej, but not Peter.’

The base generation of the cleft in the embedded TopP, and its subsequent movement is shown in (24).
(24)  *Generation of the cleft vP in the embedded TopP*

> |CP_{matrix}|
> |------------|
> | Spec,CP    |
> | C          |
> | C'         |
> | ...        |
> | TopP_{emb} |
> | vP_{upper} |
> | vP_{lower} |

4.6  *Deriving V-Doubling via Head-Movement*

Finally in this section I demonstrate how V-Doubling constructions are derived through head-movement and show how my analysis derives the properties of the V-Doubling construction. This approach is similar to the analysis suggested by Aboh and Dyakonova (2009) and involves reduction of multiple chains. As before I assume the Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) framework.

Let us once again consider the featural content on the elements involved in the derivation. The little *v* has an uninterpretable valued instance of the T-feature `<uT +val>`, and T has a matching interpretable unvalued instance of the T-feature `<iT -val>`. In addition to the T-feature, *v* also has the Top feature `<uTop +val>`, which is matched by an interpretable instance of the Top feature on Top-head, `<iT -val>`. Unvalued instances of the features search their domain for valued instances of the features and agree with them. This way, the T-feature on T triggers it to probe *v*, and the Top-feature on the Top-head triggers it to probe *v* as well. In Russian, the T-feature on T is weak and does not trigger the movement of *v* to T. The Top-feature on the Top is strong, and triggers movement of its Goal.

Following Chomsky 2008, I assume that both T and C/Top probe simultaneously, and both of them have *v* as their Goal. As a result of these two instances of probing, two chains are created: 1) Top-*v*/V chain (based on Top-probing) and 2) T-*v*/V chain (based on T-probing).

Each of these chains will have to have one of its links pronounced. In case of Top-*v* chain, the upper link is spelled-out, since the Top-feature is
strong, and Topics need to be pronounced. In this chain, the verb is still uninflected, as it has not yet entered in an Agree relation with T. On the other hand, in T-v chain, the lower link of the chain is pronounced, since T is weak in Russian; in addition, since T is in a probe-goal relation with v, the instance of the verb inside the vP will show up with finite morphology. These two chains are shown in (25).

(25) Two chains: Top-v and T-v:

This analysis explains the infinitival morphology on the doubled verb in the Top,P position.

5 Conclusions and the Future Research

Previous analyses of Predicate doubling construction in Russian did not differentiate between V-Doubling and VP-Doubling, proposing a similar analysis for both, when the difference in the form of the cleft was either a spell-out phenomenon (where the arguments are pronounced is decided post-syntactically) or is conditioned by the presence of argument movement out of the VP before fronting it via remnant movement. In this paper I demonstrated the different syntactic properties of these constructions, and proposed that the two types of Predicate Doubling construction in Russian should be analyzed differently: through the base-generation for VP-Doubling and through the head-movement for V-Doubling. This analysis accounts for the novel data on syntactic properties of these constructions.
A few questions are left for future research. I claimed that the embedded TopP projection does not exist in subjunctive and control clauses, but is available in the indicative clauses. While I proposed the preliminary explanation of this fact, more work needs to be done to assess the validity of this argument and whether it holds crosslinguistically. In addition, more evidence is needed to establish that the cleft VP must originate in the embedded TopP projection prior to moving to the matrix left periphery. While this proposal accounts for the observed data, it needs an independent motivation.

A further question only tangentially related to this project is the restriction on topics. As I showed above, the topic must be less specific than the corresponding element in the clause (see English examples in (7)). This restriction is semantic in nature, and must be further explored.

Another question concerns the crosslinguistic consequences of this analysis. To my knowledge, the data similar to the ones presented in this paper have not been gathered for other languages with Predicate Doubling construction, and all analyses that I am aware of treat VP-Doubling and V-Doubling uniformly. It would be important to check if the patterns observed in Russian extend to the entire Slavic family, and also beyond Slavic, e.g., to Spanish, Yiddish, and German.

This analysis also presents several questions regarding the copy theory of movement. How is the upper copy of the vP created? Are the vP-internal elements doubled in the numeration? If so, are they exactly the same, but occur in the numeration twice, or are they different in their feature content? It is also important to understand how we can deal with the proposed Base-Generation analysis within the copy theory of movement directly. Is it possible that the upper copy of the vP is internally merged, but is not subject to movement constraints from the lower position, as the data indicate?

Finally, the last set of questions for further research concerns the properties of infinitives. What is the featural content of the infinitival form of the verb? What exactly is ellipsis sensitive to? We know it is not just morphology, so what would be the right generalization?
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