Russian OVS: towards a Better Understanding of the Construction's Properties and Significance

SVITLANA ANTONYUK
University of Graz

ABSTRACT

In this paper I discuss some familiar data as well as novel syntactic evidence that allows us to map the position of the internal and the external arguments in the Russian OVS construction. I argue that the evidence unequivocally points to the object occupying the canonical subject position, Spec,TP, thus excluding this position from consideration as far as the position of the subject is concerned. I then provide evidence that may constitute new support for the subject extraposition accounts of OVS, while also considering what the remaining viable possibilities may be and fleshing out the details of one such promising account. The significance of the emerging picture for our theories of Syntax-Information Structure relation is briefly discussed.

KEYWORDS Russian · OVS · that-trace effect · quantifier float · information structure

1 INTRODUCTION

Slavic languages are known for the discourse configurational properties of their numerous possible word orders, with permutations of the basic order, SVO in (1-b), giving rise to various information structural effects (see Bailyn 1995, 2004 for Russian). The OVS order (and variations of it, such as OVPPS, OPPVS, OdoOioVS, etc), see (1-a), present an interesting and challenging problem for syntactic analysis, which has led to a proliferation of accounts that attempt to capture the construction's complex and somewhat paradoxical syntactic properties. This paper attempts to understand the relation between Syntax and Information Structure of OVS and related constructions by examining some of the already known as well as the newly available evidence that offers new insights into the syntax of the construction.

(1)   a.   Etu knigu   Miške   peredali   deduška s   babuškoj.
            This book.ACC Mishka.DAT pass.PST.PL [grandpa and grandma].NOM
            'This book was sent to Mishka by his grandparents'   **OdoOioVS**
     b.   Deduška s   babuškoj   peredali   Miške   etu knigu.
            [grandpa and grandma].NOM pass.PST.PL Mishka.DAT this book.ACC
            '(His) grandparents sent Mishka this book'   **SVOioOdo**

It is worth noting outright that no analysis of OVS, even one focusing solely on its syntactic properties, can be considered comprehensive or even adequate without accounting for its peculiar discourse properties. Research on OVS in various Slavic languages commonly references the givenness of the object and the necessarily (narrowly) focused nature of the subject in OVS as compared to the discourse-neutral SVO, in which both the object and the subject can be either discourse-new or discourse-given (Bailyn, 1995; Slioussar, 2011, i.a.).[1] Erechko (2003) makes the additional and, in my opinion, correct (for a large subpart of OVS cases), observation that the verb in OVS constructions is also given (by virtue of previous discourse mentioning), while Aksënova

---

[1]In the latter case, however, a change in prosody is required, with the strongest falling pitch accent being realized on the verb.

(2016) observes that the object is also interpreted as specific, a conclusion I agree with.[2]

The above IS-related properties of OVS thus have to be kept in mind when considering competing analyses and will play an important role in the analysis sketched here. I will argue that the cumulative available evidence suggests that the object in OVS occupies the canonical subject position, Spec,TP, and will then present my own Antonyuk (2015) evidence from the *that*-trace effect paradigm that further supports and strengthens this conclusion. Novel evidence from the Quantifier Float test (in which I analyze the data from Russian relying on the analysis in Bošković 2004) further supports this conclusion and yields insight into exactly what type of movement the object of OVS undergoes in Russian. As far as the position of the subject in OVS is concerned, the novel data presented here strongly argue against placing the subject of OVS into its canonical Spect,TP position, as is done in a number of recent accounts (Erechko, 2003; Slioussar, 2011; Stjepanović, 2003; Willand, 2013; Ionin & Luchkina, 2018). Thus, the evidence presented here can be used to limit significantly the analytical search space within which one will have to operate in mapping the position of the subject.

2 THE SYNTACTIC PROFILE OF OVS

The data to be discussed in section 2.1 of this paper focus on the so-called "subject" properties of the object phrase in OVS. I take the position that these subject properties of the object follow naturally if we assume that the object phrase undergoes movement into the canonical subject position, Spec,TP (Bailyn 2004, 2018; also Pereltsvaig, this volume, i.a.). The subject phrase, despite being postverbal, has subject properties as well; most saliently, it is the postverbal subject that agrees with the verb, never the object, and it is the only true syntactic subject. A review of some of the other properties of the subject in OVS, coupled with the preliminary conclusion that the object in OVS must occupy the canonical subject position, Spec, TP, will demonstrate part of the conundrum that is OVS. I then present additional evidence suggesting that the object must indeed be in Spec,TP, thus the subject clearly cannot be, despite any evidence to the contrary.

2.1 "SUBJECT" PROPERTIES OF O IN OVS

2.1.1 WEAK CROSSOVER, BOUND VARIABLE INTERPRETATION AND BINDING OF RECIPROCALS

One of the curious properties of Slavic OVS that has been demonstrated in the literature is the fact that the Object Phrase in OVS possesses some of the properties typically associated with the subject's derived position, assumed to be Spec,TP. Thus, the object in OVS has been noticed to have binding properties the object of SVO does not have, in that it does not induce Weak Crossover violations, (see esp. Lavine & Freidin 2002; Bailyn 2004, 2018; Williams 2006).[3]

(2)   a.   *Eë$_i$ mama   ljubit každuju devočku$_i$.
           her mother.NOM loves every   girl.ACC

           'Her mother loves every girl.'   **SVO**

      b.   *Každuju devočku$_i$ eë$_i$ mama   ljubit.
           every   girl.ACC   her mother.NOM loves

           'Every girl her mother loves.'   ***OSV (WCO)**

      c.   Každuju devočku$_i$ ljubit eë$_i$ mama.
           every   girl.ACC   loves her mother.NOM

           'Every girl is loved by her mother.'   **√OVS (bound var.)**

      d.   Každaja devočka$_i$ ljubima eë$_i$ mamoj.
           every   girl.NOM loved   her mother.INSTR

           'Every girl is loved by her mother.'   **√passive (bound var.)**

---

[2]I will not repeat any of the illustrative and rather well-known examples from the literature for space reasons. See Aksёnova (2016), Erechko (2003), Slioussar (2011) and other papers cited in the main text for interesting discussion of the information-structural properties of the construction.

[3]As far as I am aware Lavine & Freidin (2002) were the first to cite the WCO data for Russian and to show that OVS structures are grammatical in such contexts.

Example (2-a), an SVO structure, is ungrammatical due to the Weak Crossover violation, with the QP *every girl* presumably undergoing covert movement to a high A-Bar position, crossing a co-referenced pronoun to its left (Chomsky 1977; Lasnik & Stowell 1991; Ruys 2000 i.a.). The contrast in grammaticality between (2-b) and (2-c) is expected if the OSV order is derived by Scrambling, thus leading to the WCO violation when the object QP overtly crosses a co-referenced pronoun contained within the subject phrase. Thus, (2-b) is believed to involve an overt instance of the same movement that arguably takes place covertly in (2-a). The grammaticality of (2-c), in which no similar violation is incurred, is explained if the Object Phrase in OVS raises overtly into the surface subject position, Spec,TP, the highest A-position. Thus, the two object-initial word orders, OSV and OVS, differ not only in the relative ordering (and the syntactic position) of their medial and final constituents, but, crucially, also in the *type* of movement that the sentence-initial object phrase undergoes in each case (A-Bar vs A-movement respectively), cf. Slioussar (2011).

What should be noted in addition to the fact that OVS configurations such as (2-c) do not induce a Weak Crossover violation, is that (2-c) also gives rise to a bound variable interpretation, with the object QP binding a pronoun inside the subject phrase. Thus, on the bound variable interpretation the sentence means, 'for every girl x, x's mom loves x'. Notice that this does not contradict the key assumption that the object of OVS occupies an A-position, namely Spec,TP, since passives allow bound variable interpretations as well (cf.(2-d)). The comparison between (2-c) and (2-d) is thus crucial, with passives undoubtedly being configurations created by object movement into the same A-position, i.e., Spec,TP that is arguably implicated in OVS structures.[4]

The object in OVS is also able to feed anaphor binding relations in its derived position (Bailyn 2004; Kučerová 2007, (cf. (3-a) and (3-b)). This fact again suggests that the object occupies Spec,TP in OVS sentences, since movement into an A position is known for its ability to create new binding relations, in contrast to movement into A-Bar positions, which cannot, and instead behaves for binding purposes as if the moved phrase were reconstructed to one of its intermediate positions or to the pre-movement, base position.[5]

(3) a. *Pis'ma   **drug drugu**$_i$ podderživali **podrug**$_i$.
         letters.NOM **each other**.DAT supported   **friends**.ACC.PL
         'Letters to each other supported the friends.'   ***SVO**

     b. **Podrug**$_i$ podderživali pis'ma   **drug drugu**$_i$.
         friends.ACC.PL supported   letters.NOM **each other**.DAT
         'The friends were supported by each other's letters.'   **OVS**

---

[4]The situation described above arises quite generally, for a variety of predicates. Examples in (i) provide evidence for this, indicating that the availability of the bound variable interpretation seen in (2c) above is not due to the predicate's exceptional status as a psych predicate (see Belletti & Rizzi 1988).

(i) a. Každuju knigu$_i$ podpisal eë$_i$ avtor.
         Every   book.ACC signed   her author.NOM
         'The author of every book signed it' = 'For every book x, the author of x signed x'   ***OVS**
     b. Každaja kniga$_i$ byla podpisana eë$_i$ avtorom.
         Every   book.NOM was signed   her author.INSTR
         'Every book was signed by its author.'   **passive**

[5]An anonymous reviewer points out that an OSV sentence related to the examples in (3) appears to lead to new binding relations in the same way OVS does, which, if true, would considerably weaken the argument for object movement into the Spec,TP position provided by examples such as (3-b). I agree with the reviewer that the example in (i) does indeed allow for the binding relation between the object and the reciprocal contained within the subject. I will put this example aside as an outstanding problem for the moment, but will come back to it in section 3 and argue that it really isn't.

(i) Podrug$_i$ pis'ma drug drugu$_i$ podderživali.
     frends.ACC.PL [letters each other.DAT].NOM support.PST.PL
     'The friends were supported by each other's letters.'   **OSV**

2.1.2 QUANTIFIER SCOPE RELATIONS IN OVS

A somewhat lesser discussed property of OVS that I argue is suggestive of the positions occupied by the subject and the object of OVS is the quantifier scope relations in doubly quantified OVS sentences.[6] The quantificational relations in OVS structures, and, most relevantly for us, the contrast in quantifier scope relations between SVO and OVS (Antonyuk, 2015), are shown in (4-a) and (4-b) respectively. While clearly far from being a scope-rigid language (cf. Ionin 2003), Russian doubly quantified SVO sentences do show some surface scope preference for some speakers. In other words, the most salient interpretation of (4-a) is the wide scope for the subject QP, an interpretation which tracks the overt c-command relations between the two QPs. The wide scope for the object QP (or the so-called *inverse scope interpretation*) is less salient, at least for speakers who tend to favor surface scope relations in quantificational structures (see Antonyuk 2015, 2019 for a detailed theoretical discussion of Russian QP scope; Ionin & Luchkina 2018 for experimental work as well as Zanon 2015).

Things are different in the related OVS structure in (4-b): the wide scope for the object QP now corresponds to the surface scope relation, one tracking overt c-command, and is thus highly salient. That the object-wide scope is now salient (compared to (4-a)) is, of course, not surprising, since the object QP now precedes the subject QP, and, as the possibility of binding in (3-b) has demonstrated, c-commands the subject as well. For one, this relative change of salience implicates the derivational nature of OVS structures (cf. Titov 2013). Secondly, the similarity in salience of object-wide scope in OVS to the subject-wide scope in SVO suggests that the object QP in OVS does not just c-command the sentence-final subject QP, but, indirectly, that it is likely taking scope over the subject QP from a comparable structural position. Finally, notice that if the object QP were in a higher A-Bar position, as suggested, e.g., in Slioussar (2011), the prediction would be that the object would undergo reconstruction to a position below the subject, which would be reflected in the obligatory subject wide scope relative to the object QP, contrary to fact.[7]

(4) a. [Kakaja-to devuška] pročitala   [každuju stat'ju].
          some   girl.NOM read.PST.FEM every   article.ACC
          'Some girl read every article.'   **SVO: amb., surface preference**
          Surface scope: for some girl x, x read every article y (in some relevant set of articles);
          Inverse scope: for every x, x an article (in some relevant set of articles), some girl or other read x.
     b. [Kakuju-to stat'ju]   pročitala [každaja devuška].
          some   article.ACC read   every   girl.NOM
          'Some article was read by every girl.'   **OVS: amb., inverse preference**
          Surface scope: for some x, x an article, every girl y read x;
          Inverse scope: for every girl x (in some relevant set of girls), x read some article y, so that y potentially varies with the choice of x.

---

[6]Scope relations in XPVS structures are discussed in Slioussar (2011), where it is argued that external Nominative arguments in Russian must always raise to Spec,TP, including in OVS, while internal Nominative arguments stay in situ. Slioussar's judgments on the scope properties of OVS are essentially aligned with mine. However, I disagree with her judgments regarding the example involving an internal Nominative argument, which I find to be equally ambiguous.

Context: 'At a school show, six girls and three boys were performing folk dances. All the girls and only one boy took part in the first number. Then only the girls remained on the stage and came out to dance, sometimes together, sometimes separately.'

(i) a. A   potom dva raza   pojaviľsja každyj maľčik. **two > every**
          and then two times appeared every boy.NOM
     b. A   potom dva raza   stanceval každyj maľčik. **two > every, every > two**
          and then two times danced   every boy.NOM

[7]While this is the default expectation for A-Bar scrambled elements, Antonyuk-Yudina (2009) and Antonyuk (2015, 2020) show that raising one QP overtly across another QP in Russian leads to a strong surface scope bias for the A-Bar scrambled QP and surface scope freezing for VP/vP-internal crossing. Thus, the expectation for an object QP in OVS on accounts which posit A-Bar scrambling of the object is that doubly quantified OVS structures should exhibit a strong surface scope bias, which is not what we observe.

c. [Kakuju-to stat'ju]   [každaja devuška] pročitala ___.
    some   article.ACC every   girl.NOM read
    'Some article, every girl read.'   **OSV: strong surface scope bias**
    Surface scope: for some x, x an article, for every girl y, x was read by y;
    Inverse scope: for every x, x a girl, for some article y, x read y.

d. [Kakaja-to stat'ja]   byla pročitana   [každoj devuškoj].
    some   article.NOM was read.FEM.SG every   girl.INSTR
    'Some article was read by every girl.'   **passive: amb., surface scope pref.**
    Surface scope: for some x, x an article, every girl y read x;
    Inverse scope: for every girl x (in some relevant set of girls), x read some article y (so
    that y potentially varies with the choice of x).

An interesting additional difference between SVO and OVS in this context is that the wide scope for the subject QP in OVS (i.e., the sentence's inverse scope) is a much more salient interpretation compared to the wide scope for the object QP in SVO structures. To put it differently, it appears significant that the overall general preference for surface scope in SVO sentences is relaxed or even reversed in OVS, with the inverse scope suddenly being much more readily accessible, if not preferred. Note that OVS sentences also differ significantly in this respect from OSV sentences (cf. (4-b) and (4-c)), the latter, as already mentioned, are generally believed to involve A-Bar Scrambling. Finally, the similarity in scope between an OVS (4-b) and a related passive (4-d) (as far as the object QP scope-taking abilities are concerned), suggests these relations are established from comparable, perhaps even identical positions; in fact, this is just as was shown to be the case for the bound variable interpretation in (2-b) and (2-c) above. It is also interesting to note that the subject QP scope-taking abilities in OVS and in passives diverge, with passives showing preference for surface scope relations, while it is the opposite for OVS. To conclude, what we observe is that the object in OVS behaves similarly to the subject in SVO and to the object of passives with respect to its scope-taking abilities, suggesting similar or identical structural positions. The subject's scope taking ability in OVS, on the other hand, show where the similarities with passives end: clearly, the subject of OVS must be in a structurally more prominent position than that of the demoted subject of a passive.

2.2 VP-EXTERNAL "SUBJECT" PROPERTIES OF S IN OVS

The well-known paradox of OVS is, of course, that while accommodating the "subject" properties of the object in OVS can be achieved by assuming object moving overtly into the Spec,TP position in OVS, the subject in OVS also appears to have retained its subject properties and moreover, behaves as if it were higher in the structure than it seems to be, its scope-taking ability, as just discussed, being a case in point. To demonstrate this point further, Slioussar (2011) shows that the subject in (5) is still able to bind into a PP object that contains an anaphor, despite being sentence-final in OVS.

(5) Otvetstvennost'   vzjala na sebja_i terrorističeskaja banda_i.
     responsibility.ACC took   on itself terrorist   group.NOM
     'Responsibility was taken by a terrorist group.'   **OVPPS**
                                                       (Slioussar, 2011, pg.2055)

As noted in Slioussar (2011) and Bailyn (2018), such properties of OVS sentences present a particular challenge for analysis due to the presumed lack of v-to-T raising in Russian, which could otherwise have accommodated a higher position of the sentence-final subject (cf. Bailyn, 2004; Koenemann & Zeijlstra, 2014).[8] This paradoxical situation has led some to argue that, despite appearances to

---

[8]Without v-to-T, unless something else is said, we cannot even accommodate a vP-internal subject in its Spec,vP base position, since the lexical verb, raised to little v, will still be to the right of the subject, thus deriving SV, rather than the VS order. I will assume that the verb in Russian routinely raises out of vP, head raising to Asp (the head of Aspectual Phrase), which I assume must happen for morphosyntactic unification of the verb complex with aspectual morphology (Gribanova, 2017). This assumption derives the correct word order of OVS without any additional steps.

the contrary, the subject in OVS does raise into the canonical subject position.[9] As it happens, the subject in OVS shows a number of properties, which appear to be compatible only with a vP-external position, thus indeed lending support for such accounts. On the other hand, the obligatorily focused nature of the subject in OVS, the fact that it is associated with nuclear stress suggests not only its vP-internal position, but also that it is likely the only remaining element in the vP, vacated by other vP-internal material. Positing the subject as the only remaining element inside the vP would also straightforwardly account for the subject's obligatory sentence-finality in OVS (Erechko, 2003; Slioussar, 2011)[10] However, a vacated vP entails a vP-external verb, a contentious premise for many researchers (though see ft.8), and Slioussar (2011) successfully demonstrates the lack of head raising of the French variety in Russian. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that the subject in OVS might not be vP-internal after all:

(6)   **the vP-external properties of the subject in OVS** (all due to Erechko 2003):
   (i)   the lack of *Definiteness Effect* in OVS,
   (ii) presuppositinal interpretaton of OVS subjects;
   (iii) the grammaticality of subjects of individual-level predicates in OVS

To elaborate on these briefly, interaction with negation, for instance, clearly demonstrates the presuppositional nature of Russian postverbal subjects (examples from Erechko 2003):

(7)   Etu zadaču   ne rešili   dva studenta.
      this problem.ACC NEG solve.PST.PL two students.GEN.PL
      a.   'Two students didn't solve this problem.'
      b.   *'It is not the case that two students solved this problem.'

(8)   Moroženoe   ljubjat   deti.
      ice-cream.ACC love.PRES.PL children.NOM.PL
      'Children like ice-cream.' (generic interpretation ok)

The logically possible, but unavailable interpretation (7-b) represents the narrow scope of the subject with respect to negation, which would arguably obtain if the subject QP remained vP-internal.[11] Additionally, subjects of individual-level predicates (argued by Diesing 1992 to be generated outside the VP and thus ungrammatical in VP-internal positions), are allowed in Russian OVS sentences (8), suggesting further that subjects in Russian OVS sentences are not VP- (or, in current terms, vP-) internal.

2.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROPERTIES OF OVS

To summarize the empirical profile of the construction, the binding data paradoxically suggest that both the object and the subject both have properties associated with subjecthood or at least with the canonical subject (Spec,TP) position. The subject, nevertheless, is the true grammatical subject, as only the subject can agree with the verb in OVS. The construction is characterized by its peculiar Information Structural import, with the object and very often the verb as well being interpreted as *given* and the object of OVS being additionally interpreted as specific. The subject of OVS is necessarily focused and moreover, it is often the only element in focus in OVS (i.g., it is narrowly focused). Finally, despite being interpreted as focused and carrying the nuclear stress, the subject of OVS must apparently not remain vP-internal, as suggested by Diesing's (1992) tests

---

[9] See Slioussar (2011); Stjepanović (2003); Willand (2013) i.a., for various instantiations of the proposal that the subject in OVS is in Spec,TP position.

[10] Stjepanović (2003) is an account of OVS that aims to capture the paradoxical properties of subjects of OVS by positing a vP-internal subject while appealing to the copy theory of movement Chomsky (1993, 1995), arguing that in OVS the subject (raised to its canonical subject position in Spec,TP) is pronounced in its merge position (Spec,vP), but interpreted in its surface position. The verb and the object are pronounced in the raised position, thus deriving the correct word order and most known properties of the construction. However, the data on the *that*-trace effect discussed in the following section present a serious problem for Stjepanović as they strongly suggest that the object in OVS does indeed occupy the surface subject position, which is plainly incompatible with Stjepanović's analysis.

[11] This fact is consistent with our earlier observations about the subject's scope-taking properties in OVS.

from Erechko (2003) briefly reviewed above. While assuming the object in Spec,TP position comes with the benefit of straightforwardly accounting for the object's newly derived binding and scope-taking properties, on the widely held view that Russian does not allow V-to-T (Bailyn 2012, 2018; Kallestinova & Slabakova 2008; Slioussar 2011 i.a.), accommodating the observed "high" properties of the subject while assuming it to be postverbal poses problems. Specifically, the subject's "high" properties, e.g., its ability to bind into higher XPs and obligatory vP-external interpretation have led some to propose that the subject is, in fact, in its canonical, Spec,TP position (Erechko, 2003; Slioussar, 2011; Stjepanović, 2003; Ionin & Luchkina, 2018; Willand, 2013). In the remainder of the paper I will argue *against* placing the subject (or any of its copies, see ft.10) in the Spec,TP position, by providing new evidence that it is indeed occupied by the object in OVS.

3 NOVEL EVIDENCE

3.1 THE *THAT*-TRACE EFFECT

The *that*-trace effect arises when the subject is extracted from Spec,TP in the presence of an overt complementizer, to an ungrammatical effect (9-b) (Pesetsky, 1982; Rizzi, 1990, i.a.). Extracting the object in a similar fashion is grammatical (9-c) In the Russian paradigm below, the object extraction in OVS sentences patterns with subject extraction in SVO sentences, with both being ungrammatical in the presence of an overt complementizer.[12]

(9)   a.   Who do you think [CP *t* [C′ *e* [TP *t* would win]]]?
       b.   *Who do you think [CP *t* [C′ that [TP *t* would win]]]?
       c.   What do you think [CP *t* [C′ that [TP John would win *t*]]]?

(10)   a.   *[Kakaja-to devuška] [každyj student]   xočet čtoby [___ pročitala [ego
              some   girl.NOM every student.NOM wants that   read   his
              stat'ju]   ].
              article.ACC
              'Every student wants some girl to read his article.' (***S extraction from [*that* SVO])**
       b.   [Kakaja-to devuška] [každyj student]   xočet, čtoby [[ego stat'ju]
              some   girl.NOM every student.NOM wants that   his article.ACC
              pročitala ___].
              read
              'Every student wants some girl to read his article.' (**✓S extraction from [*that* OVS])**

(11)   a.   [Kakuju-to stat'ju]   [každyj student]   xočet, čtoby [[ego devuška]
              some   article.ACC every student.NOM wants that   his girlfriend.NOM
              pročitala ___].
              read
              'Some article every student wants his girlfriend to read.' (**✓O extraction from [*that* SVO])**
       b.   *[Kakuju-to stat'ju]   [každyj student]   xočet, čtoby [___ pročitala [ego
              some   article.ACC every student.NOM wants that   read   his
              devuška]].
              girlfriend.NOM
              'Every student wants his girlfriend to read his article.'   (***O extraction from [*that* OVS])**

As shown above, subject extraction is prohibited from an SVO sentence with a filled complementizer (10-a); however, subject extraction from an OVS sentence is fully grammatical (10-b), implicating extraction from some other position, rather than Spec,TP. This strongly suggests that the subject in OVS structures does not occupy the canonical subject position, contra Stjepanović (2003),

---

[12]The Russian paradigm in (10)-(11) is technically not new evidence, since it was discovered in Antonyuk (2015). It remained largely unnoticed though, hence the need to 'rediscover' it and present it for what it is.

Erechko (2003), Slioussar (2011), Willand (2013) and Ionin & Luchkina (2018).[13] Interestingly, the conclusions about the object in OVS occupying the Spec,TP position can be strengthened further, by the following evidence from the extension of the *that*-trace effect paradigm (cf. ex.(10)-(11)). Looking at patterns of object extraction across a filled complementizer (COMP) position, we see that such extraction is grammatical when taking place from an SVO structure ((11-a) below; cf. (9-c)). Strikingly, object extraction across a filled COMP in an OVS structure yields ungrammaticality (11-b). This is fully parallel to subject extraction across a filled COMP in SVO, thus suggesting that the position the object is extracted from in (11-b)) is identical to the position the subject is extracted from in (10-a), namely, the Spec,TP position.[14]

If one were to disregard these data by suggesting the paradigm above is unrelated to the *that*-trace effect phenomenon, there are additional similarities between the Russian paradigm above and the *that*-trace effect found in English and other languages. Such similarities would be completely unexpected unless they were due to the same underlying cause, thus their existence supports the position defended here that the effect observed in (10-b)-(11-b) is in fact true *that*-trace effect

---

[13] Notice that since we don't yet know which position the subject occupies in OVS structures the paradigm above does not tell us whether subject extraction in (10-b) takes place from a vP-internal position or from some vP-external position. It does say though that this position cannot be Spec,TP.

[14] Željko Bošković (p.c.) and Steven Franks (p.c.) both point out that the above paradigm does not in itself present conclusive evidence in favor of object extraction taking place from of the Spec,TP position. They suggest that (11-b) is compatible with the object phrase being extracted from a VOS structure instead, and that such a possibility must first be ruled out. The data in the above paradigm indeed do not exclude this possibility. However, the fact that object extraction is ungrammatical in the exact configuration where there are independent reasons to believe that the object is in the Spec,TP position, and furthermore, that such extraction from Spec,TP itself yields ungrammaticality (cf. (9-b) & (10-a)), the possibility of the ungrammaticality in (11-b) being unrelated to the *that*-trace effect violation seems negligible.

For the sake of the argument, suppose the objection holds. Does this mean that the data in (11-b) is no evidence of *that*-trace effect, and thus no evidence for the object being in Spec,TP in OVS? I suggest this conclusion is not correct. In fact, I suggest the correct way to look at the data is that, rather than assuming that (11-b) is ungrammatical because it is really an extraction from an VOS structure, I argue that the extraction from VOS which indeed looks identical to (11-b) is ungrammatical for the same reason, namely due to whatever principle causes the *that*-trace effect to begin with. While I will not attempt to provide an account of the *that*-trace effect here, I will take it at face value, that is, as a descriptive generalization that in some languages, extraction from the surface subject position across a filled complementizer leads to ungrammaticality, while extraction from other positions, most notably from an object position, does not. Let us consider extraction from embedded VOS (i) with this characterization in mind. The default prediction seems to be that extraction of the object from an embedded VOS clause should ameliorate the infelicitous (i-a), which is presumably only infelicitous due to the embedding of a V-initial clause. Instead, we end up with a fully ungrammatical sentence, and the question is why. Abstracting away from a lot of details, schematically, (i-b) looks like (ii-a), while (11-b), our object extraction from an OVS, looks like (ii-b):

(i)   a.   ??[Každyj student]   xočet, čtoby pročitala   [kakuju-to (ego) staťju]   [ego devuška].
           every student.NOM wants that read.PST.FEM some   his article.ACC. his girlfriend.NOM
      b.   *[Kakuju-to (ego) staťju]   [každyj student]   xočet, čtoby pročitala   __ [ego devuška].
           some   his article.ACC every student.NOM wants that read.PST.FEM   his girlfriend.NOM

(ii) a.   O.EMB S V [CP that [TP V _ S _]]
      b.   O.EMB S V [CP that [TP _ V S _]]

On the general understanding of the descriptive generalization of the *that*-trace effect violation, there is simply no reason why object extraction from a VOS structure should yield an ungrammaticality. In fact, the whole reason object extraction is believed to not result in the same violation observed with subject extractions is that (to use outdated parlance), the trace of the object is always lexically governed by the verb, while the trace of the subject in Spec,TP is not, and the overt complementizer in C does not allow the extracted subject in Spec,CP to bind its trace in the Spec,TP position. As can be seen in (ii), the violating configuration obtains in (ii-b), with object extraction from an embedded OVS, but *not* in (ii-a), where the object is extracted from an embedded VOS. I argue that the schematic representations in (ii) are incorrect, however. Specifically, I posit that the correct representations must be these:

(iii) a.   O.EMB S V [CP that [TP _ V _ S _]]
      b.   O.EMB S V [CP that [TP _ V _ S _]]

As should be clear now, the situation is in fact the opposite to that conjectured by Željko Bošković (p.c.) and Steven Franks (p.c.): object extraction from OVS is not ungrammatical because it is really object extraction from VOS, but rather object extraction from VOS across a filled complementizer is ungrammatical because it includes the step of object moving through the Spec,TP position, thus, for all intents and purposes, becoming identical to the violating configuration in OVS in (11-b).

(cf. Stepanov & Georgopoulos 1997; see also Szczegielniak 1999). It has long been known in the literature on the *that*-trace effect that it is ameliorated by adverb intervention (due to Bresnan 1977; see esp. Pesetsky 2017 for a detailed overview), such that placing an adverbial expression immediately after the complementizer noticeably improves the ungrammaticality of the *that*-trace effect (12):

(12) a. Robin met the man who Leslie said that (for all intents and purposes) ＿ was the mayor of the city.
      b. I asked what Leslie said that (in her opinion) ＿ had made Robin give a book to Lee.

(10′) a. ?[Kakaja-to devuška] [každyj student]   xočet, čtoby [**poskoree/nakonets**
          some   girl.NOM every student.NOM wants that   more.quickly/finally
          pročitala [ego stat'ju]].
          read   his article.ACC
          'Every student wants some girl to finally/more quickly read his article.'

                                                    (✓**S extraction from [*that* SVO]**)

(11′) b [Kakuju-to stat'ju]   [každyj student]   xočet, čtoby [**poskoree/nakonets**
          some   article.ACC every student.NOM wants that   more.quickly/finally
          pročitala [ego devuška]].
          read   his girlfriend.NOM
          'Every student wants his girlfriend to finally read his article.'

                                                    (✓**O extraction from [*that* OVS]**)

The fact that the purported *that*-trace effect exhibits the same characteristic properties as does its better-studied English counterpart certainly suggests that we are dealing with a genuine *that*-trace effect phenomenon.[15] The emerging situation is an interesting one. The schematization in (iii) in *ft.* 14 suggests that the derivation of Russian OVS may involve highly local movement steps, with the object passing through all available intermediate A-positions.[16] I argue that we can use the *that*-trace effect paradigm as a diagnostic in order to tease apart competing analyses of potentially problematic data. The problematic case of a new binding relation established in an OSV sentence (ex. (14), see also ft.5), left without an explanation, indeed weakens the binding evidence in (3), repeated here as (13-a)-(13-b). The problem with (14) is that since the reciprocal is contained within the subject, presumably located in Spec,TP in OSV, we cannot have a simple explanation of this binding relation, e.g., in terms of reconstruction. The object being the binder and the subject the one that contains the bound reciprocal, object reconstruction would not work, as the reciprocal would end up being unbound at LF, yielding ungrammaticality.

(13) a. *[Pis'ma   **drug drugu**$_i$]   podderživali **podrug**$_i$.
          letters.NOM **each other**.DAT supported   friends.ACC.PL

          'Letters to each other supported the friends.'   ***SVO**
      b. **Podrug**$_i$ podderživali [pis'ma   **drug drugu**$_i$].
          friends.ACC.PL supported   letters.NOM **each other**.DAT

          'The friends were supported by each other's letters.'   **OVS**

(14) Podrug$_i$ [pis'ma   drug drugu$_i$] podderživali.
      friends.ACC letters.NOM each other.DAT supported

      'The friends were supported by each other's letters.'   **OSV**

One possibility that comes to mind that could account for the unexpected binding in (14) is due to the fact that the subject position in Russian seems to allow for multiple Specifiers (Williams,

---

[15] As pointed out by Steven Franks (p.c.), the amelioration effect suggests that what we are dealing with is a phonological phenomenon. I leave the development of the analysis of *that*-trace effects to another occasion for now, but assume a syntactic account of the data is possible.

[16] This conclusion receives further support from the Quantifier Float test where the object in OVS is able to float its associate Quantifier in numerous positions between its thematic position inside the VP and its final landing site, which I now take to be established as Spec,TP.

2006). If this is correct, then the object could raise into the outer Spec,TP (thus obtaining the ability to bind into the reciprocal inside the subject) and either remain there or move further into a higher A-Bar position. In a scenario like this, then, the possibility of binding in (14) does not weaken the evidence from (3-b)/(14) for object raising into the Spec,TP position in OVS, though it does raise the question of how we can tell apart the OSV and the OVS constructions. If this hypothesis about (14) is correct, one prediction is that we may find two distinct prosodic contours, one associated with the A-Bar structure, OSV, another with A-movement sentences that look like OSV due to multiple specifiers of TP being filled. The *that*-trace effect paradigm provides a better way of figuring out exactly what's going on in (14) though. The prediction made by the *that*-trace effect generalization is that object extraction from (3-b)/(13-b), an OVS structure, will yield a clear violation. The example in (14), if it is a case of an object being in an outer specifier of TP, should yield a violation as well. If, on the other hand, the object in (14) is situated in some higher A-Bar position, then no such violation should be found with example (14′).

(13′) *Podrug$_i$ on xočet, ___ čtoby [___ podderživali [pis'ma   drug drugu$_i$]].
       friends.ACC he wants   that   supported   letters.NOM each other.DAT
       'The friends he wanted to be supported by each other's letters.'   **OVS**

(14′) Podrug$_i$ on xočet, ___ čtoby ___ [[pis'ma   drug drugu$_i$] podderživali].
       friends.ACC he wants   that   letters.NOM each other.DAT supported
       'The friends is who he wants to be supported by each other's letters.'   **OSV**

What we observe in (13′) is that object extraction across a filled complementizer yields an ungrammaticality, suggesting extraction is taking place from Spec,TP. On the other hand, (14′) is perfectly grammatical. What this means is that the position the object in (14′) is extracted from is not Spec,TP. The analysis of (14) I would like to propose, then, is that before the object in OSV ends up in an A-Bar position, the object undergoes the same type of local A-movement that we have observed earlier, with the object raising all the way into the outer Spec,TP position before undergoing A-Bar movement. Arguably, it is raising into this outer Spec,TP that allows the object to bind the reciprocal within the subject. Once this binding relation is established, the object undergoes further movement into an A-Bar position, a position it is perfectly extractable from.

3.2 THE QUANTIFIER FLOAT TEST

Consider the distribution of the Quantifier float data in (15) and (16). Examples (15-a)-(15-d) show all of the possibilities as far as the position in which an object-associated quantifier can be floated in an SOVPP structure, which will serve as a control for us in examining the corresponding OVPPS sentences in (16-a)-(16-e):

(15)   Maks   [**vse** korobki s   domašnej utvar'ju] složil   v mašinu.
       Max.NOM all boxes.ACC with home   furnishings put.PST.MSC in car
       'Max put all of the boxes of home furnishings in the car.'   **OVPP**
       a.   Maks [korobki s domašnej utvar'ju] složil v mašinu **vse**.
       b.   Maks [korobki s domašnej utvar'ju] složil **vse** v mašinu.
       c.   Maks [korobki s domašnej utvar'ju] **vse** složil v mašinu.
       d.   Maks [korobki **vse** s domašnej utvar'ju] složil v mašinu.

(16)   [**Vse** korobki   s   domašnej utvar'ju]   složil   v mašinu Maks.
        all boxes.ACC with home   furnishings put.PST.MSC in car   Max.NOM
       'MAX put all of the boxes of home furnishings in the car.'   **OVPPS**
       a.   [Korobki s domašnej utvar'ju] složil v mašinu Maks ***vse**.
       b.   [Korobki s domašnej utvar'ju] složil v mašinu **vse** Maks.
       c.   [Korobki s domašnej utvar'ju] složil **vse** v mašinu Maks.
       d.   [Korobki s domašnej utvar'ju] **vse** složil v mašinu Maks.
       e.   [Korobki **vse** s domašnej utvar'ju] složil v mašinu Maks.

My interpretation of the Q-float data above crucially relies on the insights derived from the analysis of Q-float proposed in (Bošković, 2004), according to which quantifiers cannot be floated in theta positions.[17] Assuming (Bošković, 2004), the lowest acceptable occurrence of a floated Q in (15-a) must already be a raised position rather than the object's theta position. This, in turn, given its linear order following V+PP, suggests that the lowest position the Q is floated in is still vP-internal, but crucially below the subject's merge position.[18] A natural initial assumption is that it is this very occurrence of Q that is banned from the lowest (starred) Q position to the right of the subject in (16-a).[19] I take the contrast between (15-a) and (16-a) with respect to the grammaticality of Q-float in this sentence-position to be significant and in need of a principled explanation. Thus, while one might be tempted to explain away the ungrammaticality of the lowest/post-subject Q-stranding in (16-a) on the grounds that the subject in OV(PP)S must be final, I argue that this fact must be *derived*, that is, S-finality in OVS/OVPPS sentences must be made to follow from the account rather than stipulated. Interestingly, one type of account in fact *can* derive the obligatory S-finality of the construction quite easily. Specifically, this empirical fact is derived trivially on any subject extraposition account (such as Willand 2013; Bailyn 2018 ; Pereltsvaig, this volume). It is not so easily derived in accounts where the subject is taken to have undergone leftward movement or to remain vP-internal, as neither of these, *as is*, precludes other VP-internal material from being stranded below the subject's base position. In the absence of other solutions to the S-finality problem at the moment, the data in (16-a) can thus be taken to provide support for the subject extraposition accounts.

While the discussion here must be kept to a minimum due to space limitations, I will point out another relevant insight afforded by the data. Specifically, the grammatical instances of Q-Float suggest that this movement is highly local, with the object moving through each available intermediate position. Interestingly, in his account of Q-Float, Bošković (2004) cites (Maling, 1976) observation that there is a correlation between the ability of an element to undergo passivization and its ability to float a Q, which suggests A-movement is a prerequisite for Q-float. The relevance of this observation for us should be clear: if the correlation holds, then the ability of the object in OVS to float a Q as in (16) provides another piece of evidence for object's (highly local) A-movement and raising into Spec,TP.[20]

4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND SOME THEORETICAL CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this paper we have seen a number of tests converge on the conclusion that the object in OVS occupies the canonical subject position, Spec,TP, which simultaneously limits the analytical search space within which the subject can reasonably be expected to occur, ruling out a number of existing accounts. While placing the object in Spec, TP not only accounts for its QP scope, binding

---

[17]Bošković (2004) argues that the ban on floating quantifiers in theta positions is a theorem, e.g., it is derivable from independent principles. Specifically, the ban can be traced back to Sportiche (1988)/Benmamoun's (1999) claim that FQs are adjoined to an NP they modify and Chomsky's (1986) ban on adjunction to arguments, according to which adjunction to arguments would interfere with theta role assignment. Finally, Lebeaux's (1988) claim that adjuncts can enter the structure acyclically can account for the fact that quantifiers can be floated in non-theta positions, once the noun phrase that the Q modifies moves away from its theta position.

[18]Steven Franks (p.c.) notes that acceptability of a Floated Q in (15-a) indicates that there is a non-theta position within the VP in Russian into which the object can raise and this still be an SVO structure. I believe this is exactly the right conclusion; there is independent evidence that such a position exists in ditransitives, and it is responsible for the VP-internal permutation of internal arguments of ditransitive verbs in Russian and Ukrainian (see Antonyuk 2015; Bailyn 1995, 2012; and Antonyuk & Mykhaylyk, forthcoming, for the relevant discussion on Russian and Ukrainian). I will remain agnostic for now as to whether it is the same position, but it appears to be very likely it is indeed.

[19]It is important to point out that there is a possibility to have a sentence identical to (16-a) with the Q-Float in sentence-final position being grammatical. Such a structure will have the same word order, but different prosody and different interpretation, one where the only element in focus is the floated Q (carrying the pitch accent), with the subject being part of the given material, together with the rest of the sentence. In this respect 'OVS' can be viewed as an umbrella term, subsuming seemingly identical sentences that nevertheless have different syntactic structures, derivations and a different mapping to prosody and Information Structure. For our purposes, the only relevant type of OVS is the one where the subject is in narrow focus.

[20]In my related work, I argue that the movement the object in OVS and other object-prominent structures undergoes in Russian is Object Shift, drawing on the analysis of Object Shift in a closely related Ukrainian (see Mykhaylyk 2011; Antonyuk-Yudina & Mykhaylyk 2013; Antonyuk & Mykhaylyk forthcoming).

and extraction properties, it is also in line with the IS profile of the construction, since the object in OVS must represent given information and be interpreted as specific/presupposed material as well. The subject of OVS, on the other hand, must represent new information and serve as (narrow) focus.

Given the evidence we have seen, one analytical possibility is represented by recent accounts which posit object raising into Spec,TP with subject extraposition to the right (Bailyn 2018; Pereltsvaig, this volume). These accounts straightforwardly derive the subject's sentence final-ity in OVS without depending on the verb and other VP-internal material vacating the vP (citing lack of verb raising outside the vP in Russian). As we have seen, the data from the Quantifier Float test (section 3) make clear several points: first, the data provide further insights into the way in which the object undergoes raising into its surface position. Specifically, the Q-Float test implicates the extremely local A-movement of the object, echoing our earlier conclusions, which are thus strengthened. The Q-Float data also indicate that the S-finality is not simply a preference in OVS constructions, but a strict requirement, given the evidence that an object-associated quantifier cannot be stranded below the subject's merge position in OVS despite there clearly being a suitable position for it. If so, such strict S-finality must receive a principled explanation in any account of OVS and extraposition accounts derive this requirement for free.

Another possibility, which, to the best of my knowledge, hasn't been proposed so far, places the object in Spec,TP and keeps the subject in its base position. Let us consider this possibility a bit more closely. Being postverbal and sentence-final, the subject remaining inside the vP straightforwardly accounts both for the subject's IS profile as well as for its association with the nuclear stress accent (assuming, of course, all more deeply embedded material has vacated the vP, thus making the subject the only suitable element to receive the nuclear stress accent). One could argue, then, that the subject *does* remain vP-internal in OVS (accounting for its focal interpretation and association with the nuclear stress), but that it must obligatorily raise, *covertly*, to a higher position in the clausal spine in order to avoid existential closure and to receive presuppositional interpretation, thus also deriving the subject's vP-external semantics, as well as scope and binding properties. This account, of course, crucially depends on the verb raising to a position higher than the subject's base position in Spec,vP, which, while treated as problematic in many accounts, is in fact entirely possible on the assumption that the verb must obligatorily raise and adjoin to Asp head for the morphosyntactic unification of the verbal complex with aspectual morphology (Gribanova, 2017), a conclusion which may well be the right one irrespective of the correct analysis of OVS. Thus, assuming obligatory verb raising into AspP, the linearization problem for the VS portion of the construction is resolved rather trivially. Notice though that despite the IS import of OVS, the crucial principles which enable its derivation are (1) the fact that Agree is divorced from Move (Chomsky 2008; Lavine & Freidin 2002), allowing the subject to remain in situ while agreeing with T, and (2) the EPP requirement of T (unlike in English) can be satisfied by a variety of syntactic material in Russian (Bailyn, 2004), both purely syntactic principles. Thus, when the subject fails to raise overtly and fill the Spec,TP position, the object, which independently needs to raise outside the vP/AspP due to being given, presupposed material, will raise to Spec,TP to satisfy the EPP requirement of T.[21] This account thus seems to me to represent the simplest hypothesis at the moment, since it derives the empirical profile of the construction without postulating anything that is not already assumed to be independently needed, while also avoiding the extraposition step (Kayne, 1994).[22]

---

[21] There is the interesting and important question of what ensures that the subject does not raise to T as usual. I suggest that the reason the subject in OVS does not raise is the same reason the object *does*, namely its status wrt givenness. Since I propose the subject then raises covertly anyway, this suggests that givenness can only be marked overtly, which seems to be the correct conclusion. This line of reasoning of course immediately raises the question of why the subject of SVO does raise, despite being associated with new information in some, and with old/given information in other cases. My tentative suggestion is that this has to do with the status of other material in SVO vs OVS: suppose given material in OVS must vacate the vP first, which somehow blocks the non-given material from doing the same. While the details of this idea are yet to be worked out, some initial supporting evidence comes from SO(adv)V sentences, where the object is given and thus vacates the vP. As far as I can tell, in such sentences the subject must also be given. I will leave unpacking the complexity of these fascinating issues for another occasion.

[22] Apart from theoretical considerations, while extraposition derives subject's S-finality for free, it also allows for any other vP-internal material to remain *in situ*. But if any XP does remain inside the vP, it should then receive the nuclear stress, by virtue of being the most deeply embedded material (with the subject assumed to be attached at vP level or

To conclude, it is worth pointing out why OVS and similar derived structures are so interesting. Positing, e.g., subject raising into Spec,TP in OVS and subsequent (IS-driven) movements fronting the object and the remnant VP into a higher A-Bar domain vs positing subject being in Spec,vP, with the rest of the material moving leftwards and the object occupying the canonical subject position and satisfying the EPP requirement of Tense is not only about the technicalities of the derivation of the construction; these analyses speak of the kind of syntax-IS relation we believe to be implicated here. Thus, the former account clearly implies that all narrow syntax operations are carried out first and are then followed by (post-syntactic) IS-motivated movements. The latter suggest a very different picture: this type of accounts suggests that IS-related considerations can drive syntactic operations (in a narrowly syntactic sense). If this is correct, figuring out how much of Information Structure is encoded in core grammar seems to be the question to ask, and the Russian OVS data we have discussed suggest that of all IS notions, that of *givenness* is the one that needs to be encoded grammatically, as has been argued especially in Kučerová (2007, 2012) on the basis of related Slavic data. If so, OVS, one of the constructions in Russian and Slavic more generally which seems entirely motivated by discourse considerations, can nevertheless still be derived by purely syntactic means.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTACT

Svitlana Antonyuk
svitlana.antonyuk@uni-graz.at

REFERENCES

Aksënova, Alëna. 2016. OVS in Russian: it's not a bug, it's a feature! Ms, Stony Brook University.

Antonyuk, Svitlana. 2015. *Quantifier scope and scope freezing in Russian*. Stony Brook, NY: Stony Brook University dissertation.

Antonyuk, Svitlana. 2019. Quantifier Scope in Russian. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4(1).

Antonyuk, Svitlana. 2020. The puzzle of Russian ditransitives. In Anna Pineda & Jaume Mateu (eds.), *Dative constructions in Romance and beyond*, 43–74. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Antonyuk, Svitlana & Roksolana Mykhaylyk. forthcoming. Scope Freezing and Object Shift in Ukrainian: does Superiority Matter? Remark. *Syntax* .

Antonyuk-Yudina, Svitlana. 2009. Long-distance scrambling, VP ellipsis, and scope economy in Russian. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 15(1). 2.

---

higher). Thus, the extraposition accounts also crucially depend on the vP being vacated, a point that does not appear to be appreciated in subject extraposition accounts of OVS. Furthermore, if the subject is extraposed, even if all material does vacate the vP and the verb itself is adjoined to little v head, the stress assignment will arguably still not work out, since the verb complex will then be the most deeply embedded material and will thus be assigned the nuclear stress, contrary to fact. Extraposition also seems to make the wrong predictions wrt the linearization of phonologically overt material: the extraposed subject, attached at vP level (or higher) will c-command vP-internal material, if there remains any, including the verb (unless the verb is raised into Asp head), thus predicting that the extraposed subject will be linearized to the left of any vP-internal material. Positing a vP-internal subject which undergoes covert raising to some higher position in the clausal spine avoids all these issues with stress assignment and linearization and is thus to be preferred.

Antonyuk-Yudina, Svitlana & Roksolana Mykhaylyk. 2013. Prosodic effects in word order: Evidence from Ukrainian. In Seda Kan, Claire Moore-Cantwell & Robert Staubs (eds.), *Proceedings of 40th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 31–45. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.

Bailyn, John F. 2012. *The Syntax of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailyn, John Frederick. 1995. *A configurational approach to Russian "free" world order*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University dissertation.

Bailyn, John Frederick. 2004. Generalized inversion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22(1). 1–50.

Bailyn, John Frederick. 2018. Russian Word Order and the fate of Syntactic Theory. Keynote address given at the 8th Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters, Moscow State University, Oct. 22, 2018. Moscow.

Belletti, Adriana & Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and θ-theory. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 291–352.

Benmamoun, Elabbas. 1999. The syntax of quantifiers and quantifier float. *Linguistic inquiry* 30(4). 621–642.

Bošković, Željko. 2004. Be careful where you float your quantifiers. *Natural language & linguistic theory* 22(4). 681–742.

Bresnan, Joan. 1977. Variables in the theory of transformations. In Peter W Culicover, Thomas Wasow & Adrian Akmajian (eds.), *Formal Syntax: Proceedings of the 1976 MSSB-UC Mathematical Social Science Board*, 157–196. New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. Conditions on Rules of Grammar. In Noam Chomsky (ed.), *Essays on Form and Interpretation*, 163–210. New York: North-Holland.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Kenneth L. Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Erechko, Anna. 2003. On subject verb inversion in Russian. In Marjo van Koppen, Joanna Sio & Mark de Vos (eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE X*, 1–14. Leiden: SOLE.

Gribanova, Vera. 2017. Head movement and ellipsis in the expression of Russian polarity focus. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 35(4). 1079–1121.

Ionin, Tania. 2003. The one girl who was kissed by every boy: Scope, scrambling and discourse function in Russian. In Marjo van Koppen, Joanna Sio & Mark de Vos (eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE X*, 65–80. Leiden: SOLE.

Ionin, Tania & Tatiana Luchkina. 2018. Focus on Russian scope: An experimental investigation of the relationship between quantifier scope, prosody, and information structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49(4). 741–779.

Kallestinova, Elena & Roumyana Slabakova. 2008. Does the verb move in Russian? In Andrei Antonenko, John F. Bailyn & Christina Bethin (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16. The Stony Brook meeting*, 199–214. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Koenemann, Olaf & Hedde Zeijlstra. 2014. The Rich Agreement Hypothesis rehabilitated. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(4). 571–615.

Kučerová, Ivona. 2007. *The syntax of givenness*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

Kučerová, Ivona. 2012. Grammatical marking of givenness. *Natural language semantics* 20(1). 1–30.

Lasnik, Howard & Tim Stowell. 1991. Weakest crossover. *Linguistic inquiry* 22(4). 687–720.

Lavine, James E & Robert Freidin. 2002. The subject of defective T (ense) in Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10. 253–289.

Lebeaux, David. 1988. *Language Acquisition and the Form of the Grammar*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts dissertation.

Maling, Joan M. 1976. Notes on quantifier-postposing. *Linguistic inquiry* ?volume?(?number?). 708–718.

Mykhaylyk, Roksolana. 2011. Middle object scrambling. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 19(2). 231–272.

Pereltsvaig, Asya M. 2021. OVS order in Russian: Where are the O and the V? *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 29(FASL extra issue). Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 28; Andrei Antonenko and John F. Bailyn (eds.).

Pesetsky, David. 1982. Complementizer-trace phenomena and the nominative island condition. *The linguistic review* 1(3). 297–344.

Pesetsky, David. 2017. Complementizer-Trace Effects. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Second Edition*, 1–34. ?address?: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ruys, Eddy G. 2000. Weak crossover as a scope phenomenon. *Linguistic inquiry* 31(3). 513–539.

Slioussar, Natalia. 2011. Russian and the EPP requirement in the Tense domain. *Lingua* 121(14). 2048–2068.

Sportiche, Dominique. 1988. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. *Linguistic inquiry* 19(3). 425–449.

Stepanov, Arthur & Carol Georgopoulos. 1997. Structure building and the conceptual interface: An analysis of Russian long-distance wh-questions. In Martina Lindseth (ed.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Indiana Meeting 1996*, 275–294. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 2003. A word order paradox resolved by copy deletion at PF. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 3(1). 139–177.

Szczegielniak, Adam. 1999. 'That-trace effects' cross-linguistically and successive cyclic movement. In K Arregi, B Bruening, C Krause & V Lin (eds.), *Papers on Morphology and Syntax, Cycle One. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Linguistics.

Titov, Elena. 2013. Scrambling and interfaces. *Information structure: Empirical perspectives on theory* 33–55.

Willand, Bartosz. 2013. Paths in remnant movement: A single solution to three problems in the Polish OVS syntax. In Seda Kan, Claire Moore-Cantwell & Robert Staubs (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 40)*, 253–264. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.

Williams, Edwin. 2006. Subjects of different heights. In James Lavine, Steven Franks, Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva & Hana Filip (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14. The Princeton meeting*, 409–423. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Zanon, Ksenia. 2015. *On hybrid coordination and quantifier raising in Russian*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University dissertation.