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

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

(1a) ✓ (aat) benu-ne anu-ko kitaab vaapas de dii
(b) ✓ (aat) benu-ne anu-ko vaapas kitaab de dii
(c) ✓ (aat) benu-ne vaapas anu-ko kitaab de dii
(d) ✓ (aat) vaapas benu-ne anu-ko kitaab de dii

- 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

**Set II. New info? Follow vaapas**

- Just 1 focus-neutral order; interpreted as all-Given (Schwarzchild 1999)
- All non-neutral orders introduce “new” info (i.e. info not already Given)
- The “new” (non-Given) info can be anything as long as it follows *vaapas*

- Context in (2) can be followed by a non-neutral order sentence if something non-Given follows *vaapas*
- Adverb *vaapas* partitions sentence into *focus zone* and no-focus zone
- True of all non-neutral orders, illustrated below using (1c)

(2) alishsha-ne benu-ko kitaab dii, baad mein... Alishsha-ERG Benu-DAT book give.FPV then... ‘Gave Alishsha a/the book, then...’

(1c) ✓ benu-ne vaapas [alishsha, anu-ko] kitaaab dii ✓
              [alishsha, anu-ko] DAT book give.FPV
              ‘It was [Anu], that Benu gave the book back.’

(1c’) ✓ benu-ne vaapas alishsha-ko [kitaab, baalaa-maazgin] dii ✓
                alishsha-ko DAT book, magazine give.FPV
                ‘It was [a magazine], that Benu gave book back to Alishsha.’

(1c’)# benu-ne vaapas alishsha-ko kitaab dii ✓
              alishsha-ko DAT book give.FPV
              ‘It was [Alishsha], that gave the book back to Alishsha.’

- Reason for #(1c’): non-Given is in no-focus zone (& focus zone is empty)
- Note: Biezma et al. (2017) noticed that when the focus-partition is created using polar question particle *kaas,* a sentence similar to (1c’) can be “rescued” if we prosodically focus the offending constituent
- This doesn’t happen with focus-partition created using *vaapas* (1c’ is #)

**Focus-neutrality and *vaapas***

**FOCUS-NEUTRAL ORDERS**

- S IO DO *vaapas* V all-Given; can prosodically Focus S, IO, or DO

**NON-NEUTRAL ORDERS**

- S IO vaapas DO V can’t be all-Given; new info can be DO not S/IO
- S vaapas IO DO V can’t be all-Given; new info can be IO/DO not S
- vaapas S IO DO V can’t be all-Given; new info can be S/IO/DO

In non-neutral orders, (1b/1c/1d): preference for focus to be interpreted on argument in ‘blue’ (highest arg); an argument in blue box needs proodic prominence in addition

**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 to Alishsh is the reverse of
(3b) Benu gave the book back to Alishsh

- All speakers allow *vaapas* to also mean ‘again’ in some specific circumstances
- Some speakers allow *vaapas* to mean ‘again’ in many different circumstances
- # Judgments or ✓ 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:
  - Y/N question: (add rising intonation)
    (1c-qa) benu-ne vaapas [anu-ko] kitaaab dii...?
    Benu-ERG book [ANU-DAT], book give.FPV
    ‘Was it [Anu], that Benu gave the book back to...?’

  - Extending the question: (add an alternative)
    (4a) ✓ ...ya vaalisah-sha-ko? ✓
    (4b) # ...ya baalaam-nee? ✓
    ‘Was it, or Alishsha-ERG? ...or Balaam-nee?’

  - Correcting: (answer the Y/N question with N + alternative)
    (4c) ✓ nahi, vaalisah-sha-ko ✓
    (4d) # nahi, baalaam-nee ✓
    ‘No, Alishsha-ERG ...no, Balaam-nee’

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

- Focus-partitioning was first noticed by Bhatt & Dayal (2014/2020)
- But it was not a ?-adverb that created the partition, it was the polar question particle *kaas* which Bhatt & Dayal argue is in *ForceP*
- Their analysis hinges on the “partition-er” *kaas* being in *ForceP* – there’s no motivation to apply this to *vaapas*, because *vaapas* simply doesn’t interact with stuff that goes on in the Force layer (e.g. clause type)
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**Step 1: F-constituent moves to Spec,FocP**

- There is a FocusP above it; a single F-bearing item [XP] moves to its Spec
- Everything other than [XP], must evacuate the F to explain word order

- FocusP account always produces this linear order; [XP]$_2$ = *vaapas* – V
- Wrong 2 ways: fixes Adv position; requires [XP]$_1$ – *vaapas* adjacency
- Shown below with focus on Indirect Object

**Step 2: Whatever’s left in the O somehow evacuates it**

- Word order produced at the end of Step 2:
  (5) benu-ne kitaab [anu-ko], vaapas dii
    Benu-ERG book [ANU-DAT], back give.FPV
    ‘It was [Anu] that Benu gave the book back to.’

**Takeaways**

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