On Triggered Inversion in Hebrew

Erez Levon

Triggered Inversion (TI) in Hebrew has been previously analyzed as canonical A'-movement to the specificer 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 (2) below:

(1) ha-mištara ℵacra   arbe peℵilim 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 peℵilim ℵacra   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.'
                              (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 & Krock (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 (3), below, where the constituent under which TI is embedded is not a matrix bridge verb and the overt complementizer is present:

(3) mipney še ba-pšita   ha-leilit   ℵacra   ha-mištara peℵilim rabim
     because that in-the-raid the-nightly detained the-police activists many

    hexlatnu   l↔-ʔargen   hafgana
    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 is able to 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 1996, 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 articles 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:

(4)a. Direct Object
    peℵilim rabim ℵacra   ha-mištara ba-pštia   ha-leilit
    activists many detained the police in-the-raid the-nightly
    b. Indirect Object
    la-taxana   šalxa ha-mištara et-ha-ℵacurim
    to-the-station sent the-police ACC-the-detainees
    c. Prepositional Phrase
    ba-pšita   ha-leilit   ℵacra   ha-mištara arbe peℵilim
    in-the-raid the-nightly detained the-polcie many activists
    d. Clausal Adverb
    mi-bli l↔-kabel išur   mi-gavo?a ℵacra   ha-mištara peℵilim rabim
    without to-get   permission from-above detained the-police activists many
    e. Clausal Complement
    l↔-ševet be-šeket b↔mesex ha-nesia tav?a   ha-mištara min   ha-jeladim
    to-sit   in-silence during   the-drive demanded the-police from the-children
    f. Temporal Adverb
    ?etmol   ℵacra   ha-mištara arbe peℵilim
    yesterday detained the-police many activists

The examples in (4) 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 in (ex. 4f), can serve as triggers, VP-adverbs cannot, as is shown in (ex. 5) 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, mentioned in Doron & Shonsky 1990, fn. 4).

(5) *b↔-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 TI in root and embedded clauses

TI can appear in both root and embedded clauses, with the restriction that the trigger is totally clause-bound and must be interpreted in the clause in which inversion occurs (and the trigger

appears). Finite embedded clauses in Hebrew always manifest the overt finite complementizer *še*, and the trigger, in an embedded TI clause, always appears following the finite complementizer. Consider the examples below, illustrating both the position of the trigger with respect to the overt complementizer and the required interpretation of embedded TI constructions:

(6) le-arbe peℵilim hodi?a   ha-mištara še ha-memšala   tagiš tvi?a
   to-many activists announced the-police that the-government press charges
   a. [To many activists] was who the police announced t that the government will press charges.
   b. *The police announced that [against many activists] is who the government will press charges t.

As (ex. 6) illustrates, the only possible interpretation of the TI sentence in (ex. 6) is the translation given in (ex. 6a), where the trigger is interpreted as having originated in the matrix clause. The translation given in (ex. 6b) is infelicitous: it is impossible to interpret the trigger as having originated in a clause other than that in which inversion occurs.

2.5 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. We have just seen that triggers in Hebrew are totally clause-bounded. Topics, on the other hand, can extract long-distance, as in (ex. 7) below:

(7) la-peℵilim ha-mištara hodi?a   še   ha-memšala   tagiš tvi?a
   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.

In direct contrast with the TI examples given in (ex. 6) above, the topic *la-peℵilim* 'to/against the activists' in (ex. 7) is ambiguous, and can be interpreted as either having originated in the matrix clause as the complement of the verb *hodi?a* 'announced', or in the embedded clause as the complement to the verb *tagiš tvi?a* '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 (exx. 8 and 9) below:

(8)a. *harbe peℵilim ha-mištara ℵacra   ba-pšita   ha-leilit
       many activists the-police detained in-the-raid the-nightly
   b. harbe peℵilim ℵacra   ha-mištara ba-pšita   ha-leilit
       many activists detained the-police in-the-raid the-nightly
(9)a. et-ha-peℵilim   ha-politijim ha-mištara ℵacra   ba-pšita   ha-leilit
       ACC-the-activists the-political the-polcie detained in-the-raid the-nightly
   b. et-ha-peℵilim   ha-politijim ℵacra   ha-mištara ba-pšita   ha-leilit
       ACC-the-activists the-political detained the-police in-the-raid the-nightly

The indefinite DP *arbe peℵilim* 'many activists' cannot serve as a topic in (ex. 8a), and the sentence is ungrammatical, whereas the definite DP *et-ha-peℵilim 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 (ex. 8b) and (ex. 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) and (11) below:

(10) a. *la-peℵilim   ha-politijim b↔-jom rišon hodi?a   ha-mištara še
          to-the-activists the-political on-day first   announced the-police that

          ha-memšala   tagiš tvi?a
          the-government press charges
     b. *?b↔-jom rišon la-peℵilim   ha-politijim hodi?a   ha-mištara še
          on-day first   to-the-activists the-political announced the-polcie that

          ha-memšala   tagiš tvi?a
          the-government press charges
          'The police announced on Sunday that the government will press charges against the political activists.'

The PP *la-peℵilim 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 *b↔-jom rišon* 'on Sunday' is a trigger. (Exx. 10a and 10b), therefore, illustrate that topics and triggers cannot co-occur in either order of linear precedence.

2.6 TI and Wh-extraction

TI constructions create an island for all types of Wh-extraction. Consider the illustrative sentences below:

(11) *le-mi   arbe   sfarim natan Dani ?etmol?
       to-who many books gave Dani yesterday
       '*To who many book was what Dani gave yesterday?'
(12) *le-mi   Rina xoševet še   arbe   sfarim natan Dani?
       to-who Rina thinks   that many books gave Dani
       '*To who does Rina think that many books was what Dani gave?'

(13) *ze ha-sefer še   le-Rina natan Dani.
       this the-book that to-Rina gave Dani
       '*This is the book that to Rina was who Dani gave.'
(14) *eix xašavta   še   et-ha-mexonit tiken Dani?
       how think-2MS that ACC-the-car   fix   Dani
       '*How do you think that the car was what Dani fixed?'

3. Hebrew TI and English Pseudoclefts

The first example of a TI construction, given in (ex.2) above, is repeated below as (ex. 15):

(15) arbe peℵilim ℵacra   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 is (ex. 15) is a pseudocleft (PC) construction in English. 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:

(16)   arbe   sfarim natan Dani le Rina ?etmol.
       many books gave   Dani to Rina yesterday
       'Many books was what Dani gave to Rina yesterday.'
       a. *le-mi arbe   sfarim natan Dani t ?etmol?
           to-who many books gave Dani t yesterday
           '*To who many books was what Dani gave yesterday?'
       b. *mi arbe   sfarim natan t le-Rina ?etmol?
           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:

(17)   a. Some boy is the problem in every school. (…>∣, ∣>…)
       b. The problem in every school is some boy. (…>∣ only)

   The canonical predicative sentence in (ex. 17a) is ambiguous with reference to scope. The specificational sentence in (ex. 17b) has only one reading, namely, the reading in which the universal quantifier scopes over the existential. Heycock and Kroch (1999) explain this property of equative sentences by claiming that the constraints on equative semantics require that the two argument of equation be of the same semantic type. Thus, the post-copular DP in (ex. 17b) 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. Consider now the Hebrew examples in (ex. 18, given to me by 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 (ex. 18a) is ambiguous with reference to scope, while the TI sentence in (ex. 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 (ex. 19) below:

(19)a. ani hajiti   šamen
      I   be-PAST   fat
      'I was fat.'
   b. ani ?ihje   šamen.
      I   be-FUT fat
      'I will be fat.'
   c. ani šamen.
      I   fat
      'I am fat.'

As the examples in (19) illustrate, there is overt attestation of the 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 examples 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 (ex. 20) with the predicative sentence without *Pron* in (ex. 21):

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

According to Rothstein (1995), predicative sentences, like the one in (ex. 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 (ex. 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 (ex. 23b).

(22) [[Dani]$_{DP}$[nexmad]$_{AP}$]$_{SC}$
(23)a.   *[Dani]$_{DP}$[Mar Josef]$_{DP}$
   b. [Dani[hu[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 (ex. 25 below), 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 (ex. 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) 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 (in ex. 26) and Hebrew (in ex. 27) below:

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

---

[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.

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   b↔-?ofen 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 (exx. 28 and 29), respectively, mark the upper edge of the lexical layer. In the sentences in (exx. 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 position. His first piece of evidence is the ungrammaticality of the word order evidenced in (exx. 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.   (It.)
          wrote   Gianni the letter
       b. Scrisse la lettera Gianni.
          wrote Gianni/ the letter
          'Gianni wrote the letter.'
(32) a. *Quand a écrit Jean la lettre?   (Fr.)
          when   wrote Jean the letter
       b. Quand a écrit la lettre Jean?
          when   wrote the letter Jean
          'When did Jean write the letter?'
(33) a. *Quan va discutir el professor lingüística?   (Cat.)
          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:

(34) ¿Cuándo compró usted manzanas?   (Sp.)
        when   bought you   apples
       'When did you buy apples?'
(35) abaita   šalxa ha-mištara et-ha-ℵacurim   (Heb.)
       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 (ex. 36) below:

(36)   [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 (37):

(37) [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 (ex. 2) above, reproduced as (ex. 38) is represented by the structure in (ex. 39).

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

   The structure given in (ex. 37) 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 (ex. 37). 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. Consider the English examples in (ex. 40):

(40) To the store is where John thinks Susan went.

The locality constraints on Hebrew TI constructions seems to resemble the locality constraints on English "tough"-constructions, as in (ex. 41):

---

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

(41) *John is difficult I think to please.

Though comparing restriction on locality in Hebrew TI, English "tough"-constructions, and other clause bound A'-movement constructions may prove fruitful, I will not pursue this 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. Kiss (1998) distinguishes between *identificational* focus and *information* focus. Kiss' (1998) 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). In this way, TI resembles what Kiss (1998) would call information focus. Hebrew TI is very non-restrictive in terms on what constituents it allows to act as triggers, as was shown in §2.3. In this way, again, 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 describes 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 (ex. 37), above.

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. Hulk, A. & 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. Mailing, J. & A. Zaenen (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 24*. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 3-40.

Rothstein, S. (1995). Small Clauses and Copular Constructions. Cardinaletti, A. & 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. Bennis, Everaert, & Reuland (eds.) *Interface Strategies*. Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam.

Szabolcsi, A. (1981). The semantic of topic-focus articulation. Groenendijk, Janssen, & 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.