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

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

(1) a. kupit’ piva-to zavtra Ivan kupit, no pit’ ne budet
   ‘As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer tomorrow, but won’t drink it.’
   kupiINF beer-TO tomorrow I. buyFUT but drinkINF not will

b. kupit’ piva-to zavtra Ivan (*piva) kupit (*piva), . . .
   kupiINF beer-TO tomorrow I. (beer) buyFUT (beer)

(c. kupit’-to Ivan piva kupit, no pit’ ne budet
   kupiINF-to I. beer buyFUT but drinkINF not will
   ‘As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer, but won’t drink it.’

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

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

(3) a. kupit’ piva-to on dumaet chto Boris kupit
   kupiINF beer-TO he thinks that B. buyFUT
   ‘As for buying beer, he heard that Boris will buy it’

b. kupit’-to on slyshal chto Boris piva kupit
   kupiINF-to he heard that B. beer buyFUT
   ‘As for buying, he heard that Boris will buy beer’

c. kupit’ piva-to Ivan xoˇcet chtoby Boris kupil
   kupiINF beer-TO I. wants thatSUBJ B. buySUBJ
   ‘As for buying beer, Ivan wants Boris to buy it.’

d. kupit’ piva-to Marina xoˇcet kupit’
   kupiINF beer-TO M. wants buyINF
   ‘As for buying beer, Marina wants to buy it’

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

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

While identical verbs are preferred in general, I argue that this is not a syntactic restriction; with a careful choice of examples, my informants found some examples with different verbs to be natural. Notice the strong constrast between (2-a) and (2-b).
(4)  a. *kupit’ piva-to ja ne znaju kogda on kupit INF beer-TO I not now when he buy
   b. *kupit’ piva-to on kupit i vodki vyp’et INF beer-TO I buy and vodka drink
(5)  a. *kupit’-to ja ne znaju kogda on piva kupit INF-TO I not now when he buy
   b. *kupit’-to on piva kupit i vodki vyp’et INF-TO he buy and vodka drink

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

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

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

(6)  *Maša skazala čtoby Sergeja-to Ivan vstrelitel
     M. said that.SUBJ S.-TO I. meet.SUBJ
     ‘Maša wants Ivan to meet Sergej’
(7)  *Maša xočet piva-to kupit’
     M. wants beer-TO buy-INF
     ‘Maša wants to buy beer.’

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

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

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

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