### Set I. Word order: Focus-(non)/neutral

- **Looking at focus in ditransitives** because lots of arguments to move around
- **Uttered out of the blue or as a response to a maximally broad question like aaj kyaa huaan?** What happened? only one word order is good: the one with immediately preverbal vaapas (1a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1a) ✓ (aa) benu-ne anu-ko kitaab vaapas de dii ✓ (today) Benu-ERG Anu-DAT book back give GIVE.PFV 'Today, Benu gave the book back to Anu.'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1b) ✗ (aa) benu-ne anu-ko vaapas kitaab de dii ✗ (today) Benu-ERG Anu-DAT book back give GIVE.PFV 'Today, it was a book that Benu gave back to Anu.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Out of these, (1a) is focus-neutral; the others (1b/1c/1d) are all non-neutral

- I’ll call the word order (1a) neutral order; (1b/1c/1d) non-neutral orders

### Focus-neutrality and vaapas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus-neutrality and vaapas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus-neutrality orders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S IO DO vaapas V all-Given; can prosodically Focus S, IO, or DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-neutral orders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S IO vaapas DO DO can’t be all-Given; non-Given can be DO NOT S/IO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S vaapas IO DO DO can’t be all-Given; non-Given can be DO/IO NOT S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaapas S IO DO DO can’t be all-Given; non-Given can be S/IO/DO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In non-neutral orders, (1b/c/1d): the argument in blue is the preferred one for where focus is interpreted; to focus other stuff (in blue box) needs prosodic prominence

### Semantics of vaapas ‘back’

- **Basic meaning contribution: “movement to original state/location”**
- **Does not affect assertoric content, only adds presupposition:**
  - There exists an event prior to the event being asserted in the sentence such that the two events are the reverse of each other' (3a) Anu gave the book back to Benu
  - (Today,) It was Anu that Benu gave the book back to.' (3b) Benu gave the book back to Anu

- All speakers allow vaapas to also mean ‘again’ in some specific circumstances
- Some speakers allow vaapas to mean ‘again’ in many different circumstances
- Judgments of ✗ in Set I and pattern in Set II arise only with vaapas ‘back’
- With vaapas ‘again’:
  - All orders are fine all-Given (different from Set I.)
  - Focus-alternatives can be created on any constituent regardless of position relative to repetitive-meaning adverb (different from Set II.)

### “Non-Given” = “focused”

- **Diagnostics based on Bhatt & Dayal (2020)**
- You can target material following the adverb (but not preceding) for:
  - The Y/N question: (add rising intonation)
    - (1c) benu-ne vaapas [anu-ko] kitaab dii...? Benu-ERG book [Anu-DAT], book give.GIVE.PFV 'Was it [Anu], that Benu gave the book back to...?'

- **Extending the question: (add an alternative)**
  - (4a) ✓ ...ya alishaa-kh? ✓ (4b) ✗ ...ya baalaan-ne? ✗ 'or Alisha-DAT?... or Bala-ERG?'
  - 'or was it (to) Alisha?'

- **Correcting:** (answer the Y/N question with N + alternative)
  - (4c) ✗ nahin, alishaa-kh ✗ (4d) ✓ nahin, baalaan-ne ✓ 'No, Alisha-DAT.'
  - 'No, Bala-ERG.

- **How to get this?**
  - **Step 1: F-constituent moves to Spec,FocP**
    - Word order produced at the end of Step 2 in this case
  - (5) benu-ne kitaab [anu-ko] vaapas dii...? Benu-ERG book [Anu-DAT], book give.GIVE.PFV 'It was [Anu], that Benu gave the book back to.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FocusP account can’t capture the word order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There is a FocusP above vP; a single F-bearing item [XP], moves to its Spec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Everything other than [XP], must evacuate the vP to explain word order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ForceP account of focus-partitioning: N.A.

- **Focus-partitioning was first noticed by Bhatt & Dayal (2014/2020)**
- But it was not a vP-adverb that created the partition, it was the polar question particle kya which Bhatt & Dayal argue is in ForceP
- There’s no motivation to put sentence in ForceP because it doesn’t interact with stuff that goes on in the Force layer (e.g. clause type), so can’t apply an analysis that hinges on the “partition-ing”-er being in ForceP

### Takeaways

- **Order of arguments wrt to each other not the only way to indicate focus**
- Immediately preverbal position not sole place to interpret focus
- Focus-partitioning is general, not a property of kya/ForceP
- Neither ForceP account not FocusP account capture the facts
- There are multiple options for where to interpret focus in in focus zone, but highest option easiest to access – looks like a job for AGREE
- Prosodic focus interacts with focus-partitioning, not totally independently
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