

## Focus without movement or operators: syntax-prosody interface in Georgian

*Lena Borise (Harvard U) and Maria Polinsky (U of Maryland)*

This paper analyzes the syntax and prosody of focus and wh-questions in Georgian (Kartvelian) and argues that Georgian does not have a dedicated syntactic projection for focus or wh-words. Instead, both foci and wh-words are found in situ, which is motivated by Georgian-specific requirements on prosodic prominence of these elements. All other material is base-generated in peripheral positions. While preverbal placement of focus/wh-words is found in other head-final languages (e.g. Basque, Hungarian, Turkish), we argue that Georgian differs from these languages in the absence of operator movement. These results point to two sets of implications: (i) head-final languages with preverbal focus do not form a homogenous group; (ii) information structure (IS) can be read off minimal syntactic structure, and its analysis does not require dedicated syntactic projections for IS categories.

**Syntactic design of Georgian.** Georgian is generally head-final, as shown by PPs, possessive expressions, participial relative clauses (RCs), small clauses (SCs), and verb-object idioms. At the same time, CPs and tensed RCs exhibit head-initial order, consistent with the Final-Over-Final Condition [13]. This serves as evidence countering Richards' [9] account of Georgian prosody, built on the idea that Georgian CP is head-final. Both OV and VO orders are found in all-new contexts. SCs, being strictly head-final (1), show that Georgian is underlyingly SOV.

- (1) a. Manana [sc Gela-s č'k'vian-ad] tvlis. ([6]: 294)  
 Manana.NOM Gela-DAT clever-ADV consider.PRS.3SG  
 'Manana considers Gela smart.'

- b. \*Manana [sc č'k'vian-ad Gela-s] tvlis.

Georgian exhibits no evidence for operator-driven A-bar movement: there is no weak crossover in RCs or root clauses (2), no cross-clausal focus- or wh-movement (3), no island effects (4), and no subextraction out of NPs [5]. Availability of single-pair reading of multiple wh-questions in addition to pair-list reading provides further evidence against wh-movement. The only movement for which there is independent evidence is A-scrambling [1, 7].

- (2) Mis-ma<sub>i</sub> kmar-ma vin<sub>i</sub> aghuc'era Giorgi-s?  
 3SG.POSS-ERG husband-ERG who describe.AOR.3SG Giorgi-DAT  
 'Whose husband described her to Giorgi?' (lit.: Whom did her husband describe to Giorgi?)

- (3) \*Vi-s/vin tkva Nino-m [CP (vi-s) unda vuqrot]?  
 who-DAT/who.NOM say.AOR.3SG Nino-ERG who-DAT must watch.SUBJ.1PL  
 ('Whom did Nino say that we must watch?')

- (4) Levani šexvda kal-s [CP romeli-c ra-s at'arebs]?  
 Levan.NOM meet.AOR.3SG woman-DAT which-COMP what-DAT wear.PRS.3SG  
 'What is x such that L. met the woman who wears x?' (lit: L. met a woman who wears what?)

**Properties of focus/wh-words.** Georgian foci/wh-words appear in the immediately preverbal position; certain foci, strictly non-contrastive and non-wh (except for echo), can appear in the immediately postverbal position (not discussed in this talk). With few exceptions, focus and wh-words are mutually exclusive (5), which suggests that they occupy the same position within a clause. As a result, intervention effects [3] cannot be tested.

- (5) a. ??(Manana-m-ac k'i)<sub>Foc</sub> (romeli tojina)<sub>wh</sub> misc-a švil-eb-s?  
 Manana-ERG-also yes(=even) which doll.NOM give-AOR.3SG child-PL-DAT  
 ('Which doll did even Manana give to the children?')

- b. \*(Romeli tojina)<sub>wh</sub> (Mananamac k'i)<sub>Foc</sub> misca švilebs?

In order to express focus and wh-words in the same utterance, a biclausal structure is needed:

- (6) (Romeli ist'oria)<sub>wh</sub> aris [CP romeli-c (bič'-ma-c k'i)<sub>Foc</sub> c'aik'itxa]?  
 which story.ABS is which-COMP boy-ERG-also yes(=even) read.AOR.3SG  
 'Which story did even the boy read?' (lit.: Which was the story [that even the boy read]?)

Unlike in typologically similar Hungarian, *mxolod* 'only' behaves in the same way as *-ac k'i* 'even', (5, 6). Focus can but doesn't have to be interpreted exhaustively [11]; there are no syntactic differences between exhaustive and non-exhaustive foci. Using evidence from scope (7), binding, scalar interpretation of focused numerals, verbal idioms, and language-specific distributional facts, we show that the focus/wh-word stays in its base position.

- (7) a. Sam-ze ara-nak'leb bič'i (q'ovel čanta-s)<sub>Foc</sub> caighebs.  
 three-on NEG-less boy.NOM all bag-DAT carry.PRS.3SG

