On Triggered Inversion in Hebrew

Erez Levon

Triggered Inversion (TI) in Hebrew has been previously analyzed as canonical A'-movement to the specifier position of a functional projection in the CP-layer (Doron & Shlonsky 1990, Shlonsky 1997). This article examines the semantic properties of TI constructions in Hebrew, specifically the cross-linguistic similarities between TI in Hebrew and pseudoclefts (PC) in English, as discussed in Heycock & Kroch (1999). A structure is proposed for Hebrew TI that parallels the structure given for equatives in Hebrew by Rothstein (1995), in which the trigger is base-generated in the operator layer and the inverted surface word order is an artifact of subject movement to a position below that of the verb. Finally, TI is considered in the cross-linguistic typology of focus constructions outlined in Kiss (1998).

1. Introduction

Modern Hebrew normally manifests an SVO word order in declarative clauses, as in (1) below. Additionally, there exists a construction in Modern Hebrew in which this canonical word order can be "inverted", yielding the XP VS(O) order illustrated in the matrix environment in (2) and the embedded environment in (3), below:

(1) ha-mištara ʕacra arbe peʕilim ba-pšita ha-leilit
the-police detained many activists in-the-raid the-nightly
'The police detained many activists in the nightly raid.'

(2) arbe peʕilim ʕacra ha-mištara ba-pšita ha-leili
many activits detained the-police in-the-raid the-nightly
'Many activists was who the police detained in the nightly raid.'

(3) Dani amar-li še arbe peʕilim ʕacra ha-mištara ba-pšita
Dani said-to-me that many activists detained the-police in-the-raid
(Doron & Shlonsky 1990)

Doron & Shlonsky (1990) discuss this "inverted" word order, and label it Triggered Inversion (TI). Their analysis conceives of TI as overt movement of some XP constituent from low in the clause to some specifier position in

COMP. This XP movement triggers verb movement from its position within the IP-layer up to C^0, yielding the observed surface word order. The term "triggered inversion" is descriptively accurate insofar as the subject/verb inversion is only possible when some XP trigger has moved from lower in the clause to a position preceding the subject. The required presence of this trigger thus differentiates TI in Hebrew from other known inversion structures, such as Stylistic Inversion in French, as described in Kayne & Pollock (1978, 2001). TI can also be distinguished from other types of inversion in Hebrew, such as Wh-Inversion, Negative Inversion, and Free Inversion. These types of inversion in Hebrew will be returned to below.

This article preserves the insights into the nature of TI developed in Doron & Shlonsky (1990) and Shlonsky (1997). These descriptive generalizations are presented in Section 2. In Section 3, I combine these descriptive generalizations with a more rigorous examination of certain semantic properties of TI, specifically comparing the semantic and syntactic behavior of TI in Hebrew and pseudoclefts (PC) in English. Based on their similar behaviors, I argue that TI in Hebrew and PC in English deserve identical analysis, and I adopt the analysis for PC in English given in Heycock & Kroch (1999), in which PC in English are argued to be equative copular constructions. In section 4, I pursue this analysis of TI as an equative construction by adapting the structure given in Rothstein (1995) for equatives in Hebrew. Section 5 argues for the existence of a third subject position in the Hebrew clause, adapting the argument for a third subject position in the Spanish clause given in Ordóñez (2000). Section 6 then combines the structure given for the top of the clause in Section 4 and the structure given for the rest of the clause in Section 5, resulting in a structure in which TI is analyzed as a null-pronominal copular construction interpreted with equative semantics, in which the first argument of equation in base-generated in specifier position of a functional projection in the CP-layer, and the second argument of equation is a null-headed complex DP residing in the complement position of this functional projection. The inverted surface word order is shown to be an artifact of overt movement of the subject to a position in the clause below that of the moved verb. Section 7 will briefly discuss the ramifications of this analysis of TI in Hebrew for the taxonomy of focus constructions given in Kiss (1998).

2. Descriptive generalizations

2.1. TI and the V2 phenomenon

TI can be distinguished from the V2 phenomenon familiar from Germanic languages. Shlonsky (1997) enumerates two factors that serve to distinguish TI from most Germanic V2 phenomena: a) TI can appear embedded under an overt complementizer, b) TI is not sensitive to the type of constituent under which it is embedded. These properties are exemplified in (4), below, where the constituent under which TI is embedded is not a matrix bridge verb and the overt complementizer is present:

(4) mipney še ba-pšita ha-leilit ʕacra ha-ništara peʕilim
because that in-the-raid the-nightly detained the-police activists
rabim hexlatnu lə-ʕargen hafgana
many decided-1PL to-organize demonstration
'Because in the nightly raid was when the police detained many activists, we decided to organize a demonstration.'

These two factors are not sufficient, however, to distinguish TI in Hebrew from Germanic V2. As Doron & Shlonsky (1990) note, V2 in Icelandic and Yiddish can be embedded under overt complementizers. However, TI manifests certain extraction restrictions (which are returned to below) that are not evidenced in either Icelandic (Rognvaldsson & Thráinsson 1990) or Yiddish (Vikner 1990). These three distinguishing characteristics between TI and different varieties of Germanic V2 are sufficient to warrant a unique analysis for TI in Hebrew.

2.2. Other inversion constructions in Hebrew

As was noted in §1, TI is one of four possible inversion constructions in Hebrew. The other types of inversion, however, can be crucially distinguished on both syntactic and stylistic grounds. Wh-Inversion, the phenomenon by which the surface word order of the subject and verb is inverted when a Wh-operator appears clause-initially, is very common cross-linguistically, and is theoretically enforced by the Wh-Criterion (Rizzi 1997, 2000). This phenomenon in Hebrew is, in fact, not straightforward, as Hebrew seems to optionally allow inversion or lack thereof when a Wh-Operator is fronted, without any discernible semantic effect. This is distinct from TI, which is a stylistically stilted construction in Hebrew, and is furthermore required when the trigger appears clause-initially. Negative Inversion is also common cross-linguistically, and is mandatory in Hebrew, like TI, though it also bears none of the stylistic marginality of TI constructions. Finally, Free Inversion, or inversion with passive and ergatives verbs is also mandatory in Hebrew and common cross-linguistically, yet also carries no stylistic marginality, and requires no constituent to appear clause initially to be licensed. Because of these somewhat fundamental differences, this article analyzes TI as distinct from these other types of inversion in Hebrew, a position which differs from the one taken in Shlonsky (1997).

2.3. Constituents which can act as triggers

A wide variety of constituents can act as triggers, though triggers must be co-extensive with a full XP. Consider the illustrative (though not exhaustive) examples below, taken from Shlonsky (1997):

(5) a. **Direct Object**
peʕilim rabim ʕacra ha-ništara ba-pštia ha-leilit

activists many detained the police in-the-raid the-nightly

b. **Indirect Object**
la-taxana šalxa ha-mištara et-ha-ʕacurim
to-the-station sent the-police ACC-the-detainees

c. **Prepositional Phrase**
ba-pšita ha-leilit ʕacra ha-mištara arbe peʕilim
in-the-raid the-nightly detained the-police many activists

d. **Clausal Adverb**
mi-bli lə-kabelišur mi-gavoʕa ʕacra ha-mištara
without to-get permission from-above detained the-police
peʕilim rabim
activists many

e. **Clausal Complement**
lə-ševet be-šeket bəmesex ha-nesia tavʕa ha-mištara min
to-sit in-silence during the-drive demaned the-police from
ha-jeladim
the-children

f. **Temporal Adverb**
ʕetmol ʕacra ha-mištara arbe peʕilim
yesterday detained the-police many activists

The examples in (5) illustrate that a wide variety of constituents can serve as triggers for TI constructions. Shlonsky (1997) states that any constituent which can appear clause-initially via some other mechanism (e.g., Topicalization) can serve as a trigger of TI. We should further note that while sentence level adverbs, such as the one in (5f), can serve as triggers, VP-adverbs cannot, as is shown in (6) below. This makes sense under our current assumption that triggers must be co-extensive with an XP, given the notion that sentence level adverbs are, in fact, XPs, while VP-adverbs are not (Travis 1988, referred to in Doron & Shonsky 1990, fn. 4).

(6) *bə-adinut patax Dani et-ha-delet
gently opened Dani ACC-the-door

Moreover, though I will not provide examples here for reasons of space, constituents from higher up in the clause (e.g., functional projections in the IP-layer) cannot serve as triggers either. It therefore seems that triggers must be full XPs that originate low in the clause (i.e., below the VP).

2.4 Trigger and Topics

Triggers for TI and topics in Hebrew can be distinguished by two distinctive properties: long-distance topicalization in Hebrew is fine, and topics must be definite DPs. Triggers in Hebrew are totally clause-bounded, while topics, on the other hand, can extract long-distance, as in (7) below.

(7) la-peʔilimha-ništara hodiʔa še ha-memšala tagiš tviʔa
to-activists the-police announced that the-government press charges
a. [To the activists] the police announced t that the government would press charges.
b. [Against the activists] the police announced that the government would press charges t.

The topic *la-peʔilim* 'to/against the activists' in (7) is ambiguous, and can be interpreted as either having originated in the matrix clause as the complement of the verb *hodiʔa* 'announced', or in the embedded clause as the complement to the verb *tagiš tviʔa* 'press charges.'

Topics in Hebrew must also be definite DPs, a condition on topics in various other languages, which Kayne & Pollock (2001) label the 'counter-indefiniteness effect'. Consider (8) and (9) below.

(8) a. * harbe peʔilim ha-ništara ʔacra ba-pšita ha-leilit
many activists the-police detained in-the-raid the-nightly
b. harbe peʔilim ʔacra ha-ništara ba-pšita ha-leilit
many activists detained the-police in-the-raid the-nightly

(9) a. et-ha-peʔilim ha-politijim ha-ništara ʔacra ba-pšita ha-leilit
ACC-the-activists the-political the-police detained in-the-raid the-nightly
b. et-ha-peʔilim ha-politijim ʔacra ha-ništara ba-pšita ha-leilit
ACC-the-activists the-political detained the-police in-the-raid the-nightly

The indefinite DP *arbe peʔilim* 'many activists' cannot serve as a topic in (8a), and the sentence is ungrammatical, whereas the definite DP *et-ha-peʔilim ha-politijim* 'the political activists' is a grammatical topic in (ex. 9a). Note that both the indefinite and definite DPs are grammatical triggers for the TI sentences in (8b) and (9b).

Finally, triggers and topics cannot co-occur. The issue of determining whether a fronted DP is a topic or a trigger is not a trivial one. We know that topics cannot be indefinite, and so any fronted indefinite DP must be a trigger. However, both topics and triggers can be definite. Therefore, the only way to determine whether a fronted definite DP is a topic or a trigger is to rely on the second unique property of topicalization in Hebrew, namely that it can extract from an embedded clause. Consider the examples in (10) below:

(10)a. * la-peʔilim ha-politijim bə-jom rišon hodiʔa ha-mištara
to-the-activists the-political on-day first announced the-police
še ha-memšala tagiš tviʔa
that the-government press charges

b. *? bə-jom rišon la-peʔilim ha-politijim hodiʔa
on-day first to-the-activists the-political announced
ha-mištara še ha-memšala tagiš tviʔa
the-polici that the-government press charges

'The police announced on Sunday that the government will press charges against the political activists.'

The PP *la-peʔilim ha-politijim* 'against the political activists' is topicalized from the object position of the embedded verb, indicated both by the translation given and the lack of inversion in the embedded clause. Because of the inversion in the matrix clause, and our assumptions about the clause-boundedness of triggers, we must assume that the PP *bə-jom rišon* 'on Sunday' is a trigger. (10a,b), therefore, illustrate that topics and triggers cannot co-occur in either order of linear precedence.

3. Hebrew TI and English Pseudoclefts

Consider the first example of a TI construction, given in (2) repeated as (11).

(11) arbe peʔilim ʕacra ha-mištara ba-pšita ha-leilit
many activits detained the-police in-the-raid the-nightly
'Many activists was who the police detained in the nightly raid.'

Notice that the translation given for the Hebrew TI sentence in (15) is a pseudocleft (PC) construction in English, based on the observation that a PC is the most accurate translation of the TI construction in (11). TI is some sort of focus construction in Hebrew. Kiss (1998) differentiates between focus constructions that manifest an exhaustive operator and focus constructions that do not. Both Hebrew TI and English PC do not manifest an exhaustive operator, as exemplified in the examples below.

(12)a. Dani natan šaršeret saʔav le-Rina.
Dani gave necklace gold to-Rina
'Dani gave a golden necklace to Rina.'

b. Gam praxim natan Dani le-Rina.
Also flowers gave Dani to-Rina
'Flowers was what Dani also gave to Rina.'

(13)a. Et-praxim ve chocolad natan Dani le-Rina.
ACC-flowers and chocolate gave Dani to-Rina
'Flowers and chocolate was what Dani gave to Rina.'

b. Et-praxim natan Dani le-Rina.
ACC-flowers gave Dani to-Rina

'Flowers was what Dani gave to Rina.'

(14)a. lo le-hasot ra?aš bikša ha-mištara min ha-?acurim
NEG to-make noise asked the-police from-the-detainees
'Not to make noise was what the police asked of the detainees.'

b.? lo, gam lo liftoax ha-einajim bikša ha-mištara
no also NEG to-open the-eyes asked the-police
'?No, also not to open their eyes was what the police asked.'

The sentences in (12)-(14) present tests for exhaustive identification for both the Hebrew TI sentences and their English PC translations. The sentences in (12) are a test for exhaustive identification described in Kiss (1998), where the grammaticality of the sentence in (12b) indicates that the trigger is not exhaustively identifying the direct object of the verb *natan* 'gave'. (13) illustrates a test for exhaustive identification outlined in Szabolcsi (1981), where if the sentence in (13b) is a logical consequence of the sentence in (13a), then the sentence in (13a) does not express exhaustive identification. This is the case in the sentence in (13) above, thus lending support to the claim that Hebrew TI and English PC do not contain an exhaustive operator. Finally, the sentences in (14) together constitute a test for exhaustive identification conceived of by Donka Farcas (cited in Kiss 1988). In this test, if the first sentence in the pair contains an exhaustive operator, the negation of the second sentence should result in a grammatical sentence in which the assertion of the original sentence is not negated, but the exhaustivity of the original sentence is. If the second sentence receives a downgraded grammaticality rating, this indicates that there is no exhaustive operator to be negated. Again, (14) supports the notion that Hebrew TI and English PC do not express exhaustive identification.

Because of their similar semantic behavior, this analysis argues that English PC and Hebrew TI are language specific manifestations of the same construction. Heycock & Kroch (1999) analyze PCs in English as a sub-type of equative construction, which they label specificational copular constructions. This goes against the popular analysis of PCs in English as inverse predicative copular constructions (Moro 1990, 1997). I accept Heycock & Kroch's (1999) analysis of English PCs as equative specificational copular constructions and, consequently, analyze Hebrew TI sentences as equatives as well. This argument is supported by the similar behavior of TI and PC with respect to two distinct syntactic/semantic phenomena: Wh-extraction and scope capabilities.

We have already seen that TI constructions in Hebrew do not allow Wh-extraction. Consider the examples below, where the ungrammaticality of the Hebrew TI sentence and it English PC translation serve as evidence that neither construction allows Wh-extraction:

(15)a. arbe sfarim natan Dani le Rina ?etmol.
many books gave Dani to Rina yesterday
'Many books was what Dani gave to Rina yesterday.'

b. le-mi arbe sfarim natan Dani t ʔetmol?
to-who many books gave Dani t yesterday
'*To who many books was what Dani gave yesterday?'
c. * mi arbe sfarim natan t le-Rina ʔetmol?
who many books gave t to-Rina yesterday
'Who many books was what t gave to Rina yesterday?'

Additionally, both specificational copular construction (i.e., PCs) and TI manifest similar scoping capabilities. Consider the English examples below:

(16)a. Every article bothered a friend of mine.
b. A friend of mine was who every article bothered.

The canonical predicative sentence in (16a) is ambiguous with reference to scope. The specificational PC sentence in (16b) has only one reading, namely, the reading in which the universal quantifier scopes over the indefinite. Heycock and Kroch (1999) explain this property of equative sentences by claiming that the constraints on equative semantics require that the two arguments of equation be of the same semantic type. Thus, the post-copular DP in (16b) above cannot be analyzed as a purely quantificational DP, but must rather denote a plural individual to match the semantic type of the pre-copular argument. Because of this, only the quantifier embedded within the pre-copular argument can take scope. There are apparent counter-examples to this analysis. Consider (17), below (example (74) in Heycock & Kroch 1999).

(17)A friend of his was who every boy saw.

The PC sentence in (17) seems to allow for an ambiguous reading in which each boy is seeing a different friend. Heycock & Kroch (1999) argue that this ambiguity arises from within the free relative, where multiple scope relations are possible between the universal quantifier and the Wh-operator *who*. They, therefore, conclude that examples of the type in (17) are not true counter-examples to their explanation of the restricted scope capabilities of PCs in English. Let us now consider the Hebrew examples in (18, Tal Siloni pc).

(18)a. Rut lo zaxra et-kol-ha-xomer. (NEG>…, …>NEG)
Rut NEG remembered ACC-all-the-materials
'Ruth did not remember all of the materials.'
b. Et-kol-ha-xomer lo zaxra Rut. (…>NEG only)
ACC-all-the-materials NEG remembered Rut
'All the materials was what Ruth did not remember.'

We see that the same pattern of scoping capabilities emerges in the Hebrew paradigm as well: the canonical sentence in (18a) is ambiguous with reference to scope, while the TI sentence in (18b) is not. Only the quantifier embedded in the first argument can take scope. Because of their similar behavior with

respect to this scope phenomenon and their similar restrictions on Wh-extraction, TI in Hebrew and PCs in English deserve to be analyzed similarly, namely as specificational copular constructions interpreted with equative semantics.

4. Equatives in Hebrew

Hebrew is said to have a defective present tense copula. Consider the three sentences in (19).

(19)a. ani hajiti šamen
I be-PAST fat
'I was fat.'

b. ani ʔihje šamen
I be-FUT fat
'I will be fat.'

c. ani šamen
I fat
'I am fat.'

As these sentences illustrate, there is an overt copula in both the past and future tenses, yet present tense copular constructions in Hebrew take the form of matrix small clauses. There is a certain construction which manifests a copula-like element in the present tense. Consider the example below.

(20) Dani hu Mar Josef.
Dani 3MS Mr. Josef.
'Dani is Mr. Josef.'

This pronominal copula, which Doron (1983) labeled *Pron*, is the phonetic realization of agreement features in INFL, and is present in equative constructions. Rothstein (1995) argues that *Pron* is required in these constructions to create a syntactic relationship between the two arguments of equation. Rothstein (1995) contrasts the equative sentence with *Pron* in (20) with the predicative sentence without *Pron* in (21).

(21)Dani nexmad.
Dani nice
'Dani is nice.'

According to Rothstein (1995), predicative sentences, like the one in (21) do not manifest *Pron* because they are licensed internally via saturation. The adjective *nexmad* 'nice' has a subject θ-role that needs filling. The DP subject *Dani* 'Dani' fills this θ-role and the matrix small clause in licensed internally. This process is schematized in (22). Equative constructions, on the other hand, bear no saturation relation, and therefore require the presence of *Pron* to project a syntactic host for the two arguments of equation. This process is schematized in (23b).

(22)$[[\text{Dani}]_{DP}[\text{nexmad}]_{AP}]_{SC}$

(23)a. * $[\text{Dani}]_{DP}[\text{Mar Josef}]_{DP}$

b. $[\text{Dani}[\text{hu}[\text{Mar Josef}]_{DP}]_{I'}]_{IP}$

4.1 TI and Pron

Pron, therefore, allows for the syntactic licensing of these types of equative constructions in Hebrew. TI constructions are a different type of equative, however, where the arguments of equation are not DPs that agree in INFL features (e.g., number, gender). Rather TI constructions are specificational copular constructions that require syntactic hosting in the CP-layer. Consider the schematic structure given by Déchaine (2001) for focus constructions in Yorùbá:

(24)[FOC$_i$][*ni*][$_{DP}$ *pro*$_i$[$_{CP}$ Op$_i$[$_{IP}$ … t$_i$]]]

In her analysis, the focalized element sits in some left-periphery position, presumably in the specifier of *ni*, which is a focus particle in Yorùbá. The complement of *ni* is a null-headed complex DP, where the *pro* head and the null operator in the complex DP are co-indexed with the moved focalized constituent. I will adopt this structure and modify it slightly to fit with Rothstein's (1995) theory of equatives in Hebrew. I propose an additional pronominal copular element in Hebrew, which is a null manifestation of some CP-layer features, which I call *Pron*$_{arb}$.[1] *Pron*$_{arb}$ is similar to the *Pron* proposed by Doron (1983) in that it is also a realization of functional features, though this syntactic realization has no phonetic counterpart.[2] A partial schematic structure for TI in Hebrew is given in (25), where G^0 is some arbitrary head in the CP-layer:

(25)[XP$_{trigger,\ i}$[*Pron*$_{arb}$[$_{DP}$ *pro*$_i$[$_{CP}$ Op$_i$[$_{IP}$ … t$_i$]]]]$_{G'}$]$_{GP}$

In the structure given in (25), the trigger is base-generated in the specifier position of the G^0 projection, which hosts the *Pron*$_{arb}$ realization of the CP-layer feature. The second argument of equation is a null headed complex DP that is co-indexed with the XP trigger, creating a chain linking the trigger to its interpretation site.

5. Post-verbal subjects in Hebrew

Let us now turn to the position of subjects in the Hebrew clause. Shlonsky (1997) argues that subjects in Hebrew cannot remain VP-internal because nominative case-assignment into VP is blocked in Hebrew. According to Shlonsky's (1997) theory, AspectP is the universal assigner of VP-internal nominative case, and its position is configured universally by UG. Agr(eement)

[1] For the moment I choose not to make claims about the exact nature of the CP-layer features realized by *Pron*$_{arb}$. I propose that it may be a realization of [finite], thus making the syntactic host for TI constructions FiniteP in Rizzi's (1997) articulated structure of the left-periphery. For our current purposes, however, I remain intentionally non-committal.

[2] I conjecture that the lack of phonetic realization of *Pron*$_{arb}$ is somehow due to the lack of overt morphemes in Hebrew that correspond to CP-layer features, though I will not explore this here.

P(hrases), however, are configured locally by language. In Hebrew, the position of AgrOP directly dominating the VP blocks the possibility of nominative case assignment to a VP-internal subject, creating the difference between Italian (26) and Hebrew (27) below:

(26) Ha telefonato Gianni.
has telephoned Gianni.
'Gianni telephoned.'
(26)* Cilcel Dani.
telephoned Dani
'Dani telephoned.'

In Italian, AspP directly dominates VP, therefore nominative case assignment is possible, whereas in Hebrew, according to the assumptions in Shlonsky (1997), the AgrOP projection intervenes between the VP and AspP, thus preventing nominative case assignment. Subjects in Hebrew must therefore move out of the VP to receive case, and Shlonsky (2000) identifies two position to which the subject can move. Both of these position are, however, crucially above the position of the moved verb; one of them corresponding to the canonical position of nominative case-assignment, the second the landing site for subjects of ergatives and passives who receive partitive case assignment from the verb. There is evidence from the position of certain VP manner adverbs, however, that a third subject position exists in Hebrew. Consider the sentences below:

(28) ha-boker patax be-šeket Dan et-ha-delet
this-morning opened quietly Dan ACC-the-door
'Dan quietly opened the door this morning.'
(29) ha-boker hecig bə-ʔofen recini Dan et-ha-pitaron šelo
this-morning proposed in-manner serious Dan ACC-the-idea of-3MS
'Dan proposed his idea seriously this morning.'

Under current assumption the VP manner adverbs, *be-šeket* 'quietly' and *be-ofen recini* 'seriously', in (28) and (29), respectively, mark the upper edge of the lexical layer. In the sentences in (28) and (29), the subjects reside directly below these adverbs, and directly above the accusative case-marked objects, presumably sitting in the AgrOP position. This seems to indicate the existence of an additional subject position in Hebrew within the lexical layer.

Ordóñez (2000) argues for three subject positions in Spanish, while he claims that French, Italian, and Catalan only contain two subject positions. His first piece of evidence is the ungrammaticality of the word order evidenced in (28) and (29) above, namely the VSO order. Consider the ungrammatical VSO sentences and the grammatical VOS counterparts below.

(30)a. * Scrisse Gianni la lettera. (Italian)
wrote Gianni the letter
b. Scrisse la lettera Gianni.
wrote the letter Gianni

'Gianni wrote the letter.'

(31)a. * Quand a écrit Jean la lettre? (French)
when has written Jean the letter

b. Quand a écrit la lettre Jean?
when has written the letter Jean
'When did Jean write the letter?'

(32)a. * Quan va discutir el professor lingüística? (Catalan)
when will discuss the professor linguistics

b. Quan va discutir lingüística el professor?
when will discuss linguistics the professor
'When will the professor discuss linguistics?'

Spanish and Hebrew, however, both accept this VSO word order:

(33) ¿Cuándo compró usted manzanas? (Spanish)
when bought you apples
'When did you buy apples?'

(34) abaita šalxa ha-mištara et-ha-ʕacurim (Hebrew)
to-home sent the-police ACC-the-detainees
'Home was where the police sent the detainees.'

In addition to the fact that Spanish and Hebrew both allow subjects to reside between the verb and the object, both Spanish and Hebrew share the characteristic that subjects in this position receive neutral interpretation, in opposition to post-verbal subjects in French, Italian, and Catalan, which all receive some form of topicalized interpretation. In fact, Shlonsky (2000) states that both of the preverbal subject position he enumerates are positions in which the subject receives a topic-like interpretation. I propose that in TI constructions in Hebrew, an additional subject position becomes available where the subject receives neutral interpretation.[3] Ordóñez (2000) reaches the same conclusion for Spanish, and identifies what he calls a Neut(ral)P. I adopt Ordóñez's (2000) terminology and claim that a NeutP resides directly above AgrOP and below AspP in the structure of TI sentences. Subjects residing in the specifier position of NeutP can therefore receive nominative case assignment in the canonical fashion. The structure for the TI clause is outlined in (35) below:

(35) [AgrSP[TP[AspP[NeutP[AgrOP[VP …]]]]]]

6. Putting it together

Combining the structure for the top of the clause given in §4, and the structure for the lexical layer of the clause given in §5, we have a schematic structure for a TI clause in (36):

[3] Thank you to J. van Craenenbroeck for pointing out the necessity for this motivation.

(36) $[_{GP}$ trig$_i[_{G'}$ G$^0[_{DP}$ *pro*$_i[_{CP}$ Op$_i[_{AgrSP}$ *pro*$_j[_{AgrS'}$ V$_k[_{TP}$ t$_k[_{AspP}[_{NeutP}$ S$_j[_{AgrOP}[_{VP}$ t$_j$ O t$_k$ t$_i$]]]]]]]]]]]

The initial TI sentence from (2) above, reproduced as (37) is represented by the structure in (38).

(37) arbe peʕilim ʕacra ha-mištara ba-pšita ha-leilit
many activists detained the-police in-the-raid the-nightly
'Many activists was who the police detained in the nightly raid.'

(38) $[_{GP}$ arbe peʕilim$_i[_{G'}$ *Pron*$_{arb}[_{DP}$ *pro*$_i[_{CP}$ Op$_i[_{AgrSP}$ *pro*$_j$ ʕacra$_k[_{TP}$ t$_k[_{AspP}[_{NeutP}$ ha-mištara$_j[_{AgrOP}[_{VP}$ t$_j$ ba-pšita ha-leilit t$_k$ t$_i$]]]]]]]]]]]

The structure given in (36) justifies the descriptive generalizations given in §2, above. Extraction out of the TI structure, either via topicalization or Wh-movement, is blocked by the presence of the complex noun phrase residing as the sister to *Pron*$_{arb}$ (CNPC). The requirement that the trigger be co-extensive with an XP is a result of the fact that the trigger is base-generated in the specifier position of the functional phrase in the operator layer.

TI constructions are also strictly local, as was detailed in §2.4. This can be explained by the structure of the Hebrew clause in (36). If we assume base-generation in the trigger position, a long-chain is required to connect the trigger with its place of interpretation as the object of the downstairs verb. This long chain would violate conditions on locality as given in Brody (1995), e.g., Subjacency, Relativized Minimality. Unfortunately, this explanation does not translate directly to English PC, which I am arguing are an analogous construction, yet seems to allow long-distance extraction. There are certain similarities between the locality condition of TI in Hebrew and those on English "tough"-constructions. Though a cross-linguistic comparison of locality restrictions on clause-bound A'-movements would no doubt be illuminating, I will not explore it here.

7. TI in Kiss's (1998) typology of focus constructions

Kiss (1998) identifies a taxonomy of focus constructions based on a list of six criteria. She distinguishes between *identificational* focus and *information* focus. The six criteria are listed below:

- identificational focus express exhaustive identification; information focus express the new, non-presupposed nature of the information
- the types of constituents which may function as identificational focus are restricted, while those that can function as information focus are not
- identificational focus takes scope, information focus does not
- identificational focus involves movement to a specifier position of a functional projection; information focus does not involve movement
- identificational focus is always an XP category available for operator movement; information focus can be smaller or larger

- identificational focus can be iterated, information focus can project

Hebrew TI does not express exhaustive identification, based on the diagnostics for exhaustive identification given by Kiss (1998), Szabolcsi (1981), and Farkas (cited in Kiss 1998). TI resembles what Kiss (1998) would call information focus. Hebrew TI is very non-restrictive in terms of what constituents it allows to act as triggers, as was shown in §2.3. Hebrew TI seems to behave like information focus. TI constructions do not take scope, as was shown in §3, and thus behaves like what Kiss (1998) labels information focus. Kiss (1998) claims that identificational focus involves movement, while information focus does not. Hebrew TI structures pass the standard diagnostics of A'-movement (i.e., they license parasitic gaps and exhibit crossover effects), though I am assuming a base-generation analysis. This is line with reformulation of the notion MOVE α, as given in Brody (1995). Therefore, with respect to this criterion, TI seems to behave as identificational focus. As was shown in §2.3, triggers for TI constructions must be co-extensive with an XP, thus behaving like identificational focus. Finally, triggers of TI constructions cannot iterate, but can, to some extent, project their domain of focus. With respect to this final criterion, Hebrew TI behaves like information focus.

Hebrew TI, therefore, defies straightforward classification in Kiss' (1998) typology of focus constructions. While it behaves like information focus on the more semantically driven criteria, Hebrew TI does manifest the syntactic characteristics of information focus. The main conceptual difference for Kiss (1998) in distinguishing between informational and identificational focus is the presence of a semantic operator. Her six criteria, listed above, are based on the semantic and syntactic ramifications of an additional semantic operator in a focus construction. Hebrew TI, and English PC, seems to provide preliminary evidence for the need to expand the taxonomy of focus constructions to include syntactically driven focus, as opposed to phonological focus, that may contain a zero-operator and, more crucially, are interpreted with equative semantics.

8. Conclusion

TI structures in Hebrew have been shown to be instances of specificational equative constructions, of the type described in Heycock and Kroch (1999). Because of this, Hebrew TI structures manifest a syntactic structure mediated by the presence of a functional projection (GP), which I conjecture may be a realization of the finiteness feature. The triggers in TI structures were shown to be unclassifiable according to the diagnostic typology established in Kiss (1998), and may in fact indicate the need to expand the established taxonomy of focus constructions. This analysis of triggers, in fact, fits nicely into the concept of the focus/ground opposition presented in Prince (1978), whereby the trigger in a TI structure serves as the value for the variable in the free relative (Heycock and Kroch 1999).

Though this analysis has accepted most of the descriptive insights regarding Hebrew TI structure from the earlier work by Doron and Shlonsky (1990) and Shlonsky (1997), it has rejected their analyses of TI as canonical I-to-C

movement. The semantic examination of TI structure in this analysis has instead lead us to represent TI in Hebrew as in the structure given in (36).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people for their comments and suggestions: Mark Baltin, Michael Brody, Julia Horvath, Richard Kayne, Francisco Ordóñez, Ur Shlonsky, Tal Siloni, Michal Starke, Anna Szabolcsi, those who heard an earlier version of this paper at NYU, and the entire audience at ConSOLE X in Leiden.

References

Brody, M. (1995). *Lexico-Logical Form*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Déchaine, R.M. (2001). Yorùbá in the typology of focus. Talk given at NYU, New York.

Doron, E. (1983). *Verbless predicates in Hebrew*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Doron, E. & U. Shlonsky (1990). Verb second in Hebrew. Bates, D. (ed) *Proceedings of the Tenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford University CSLI, Stanford, pp. 431-445.

Heycock, C. & A. Kroch (1999). Pseudocleft connectedness: Implications for the LF-interface. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, pp. 365-397.

Kayne, R. & J.Y. Pollock (1978). Stylistic Inversion, successive cyclicity, and Move-NP in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, pp. 595-621.

Kayne, R. & J.Y. Pollock (2001). New thoughts on Stylistic Inversion. A. Hulk & J.Y. Pollock (eds.) *Subject Inversion in Romance and the theory of Universal Grammar*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Kiss, K. (1998). Informational focus versus identificational focus. *Language* 74, pp. 245-273.

Moro, A. (1990). *There*-raising: Principles across levels. Paper presented at the GLOW colloquium, Cambridge, England.

Moro, A. (1997). *The raising of predicates: Predicate noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ordóñez, F. (2000). *The clausal architecture of Spanish: a comparative study*. Garland Publishing Inc., New York.

Prince, E. (1978). A comparison of Wh-clefts and It-clefts. *Language* 54, pp. 883-906.

Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. Haegeman, L. (ed) *Elements of grammar: A handbook of generative syntax*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Rizzi, L. (2000). *Comparative syntax and language acquisition*. Routledge, London.

Rognvaldsson, E. & H. Thráinsson (1990). On Icelandic word order once more. J. Mailing & A. Zaenen (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics* 24. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 3-40.

Rothstein, S. (1995). Small Clauses and Copular Constructions. A. Cardinaletti & T. Guasti (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics* 28. Academic Press, New York.

Shlonsky, U. (1997). *Clause structure and word order in Hebrew and Arabic: An essay in comparative Semitic Syntax*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Shlonsky, U. (2000). Subject position and copular constructions. H. Bennis, M. Everaert, & E. Reuland (eds.) *Interface Strategies*. Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam.

Szabolcsi, A. (1981). The semantic of topic-focus articulation. J. Groenendijk, T. Janssen, & M. Stokhof (eds.) *Formal Methods in the Study of Language*. Matematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.

Vikner, S. (1990). Verb movement and the licensing of NP positions in the Germanic languages. Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.