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CHAPTER 2
THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE RUSSIAN VP

2.1 What is the ultimate position of the verb in Russian?

One of the parameters on which languages are claimed to vary is the position of a finite verb in the main clause. In V2 languages, e.g. German or Dutch, a finite verb is argued to reside in the CP domain. V→-I movement languages, e.g. French, are assumed to have the verb moved into the IP domain. Finally, some languages are argued to have the verb residing inside the verb phase, e.g. English. With the introduction of Pollock’s (1989) Split IP-Hypothesis, verb movement possibilities were considerably expanded. As a result, languages traditionally assumed to lack verb movement out of VP were reanalyzed as undergoing such a movement albeit to a lower part of the inflectional domain (Johnson 1991).

2.1.1 Adverb placement

Russian is often argued to pattern with languages like English in that the verb does not leave the VP, or rather vP, in SVO sentences (Bailyn 1995b, Erechko 2002, Kallestinova 2007, Slioussar 2007). This conclusion is drawn on the basis of adverb placement, a traditional test for determining V-movement possibilities.

For a long time, adverbs have been considered to demarcate phrasal boundaries. There are two ways to analyze adverb placement: a syntactic cartographic approach (Cinque 1999) and a semantic approach (Ernst 2002). According to the former, adverbs are argued to occur in a strict order with respect to each other and to other elements in the clause. Under semantic analysis, adverbs are freely merged into positions in which their semantics does not clash with the semantics of the adjoined phrases. In spite of the technical differences between the two accounts, both admit that adverbs are restricted to particular domains in the clause. To appreciate the idea, consider the hierarchy of adverbs proposed by Ernst (2002), given in (1), and Cinque (1999), represented in (2).

(1)  | Comp | Tense | Neg | Modal | Asp | Voice | Pred | V |
    |      |       |    |       |     |       |      |   |
    |      | frequency / duration / aspectual | manner / event-internal |
    | evidential | subject-oriented | modal | evaluative |
    | speech-act |

(2)  Speech act > Evaluative > Evidential > Modal > Time > Aspectual > Voice-related (well) > Manner > Aspectual (event-internal)

As we can see from (1) and (2), there is an obvious similarity between the two types of analyses with respect to position of adverbs relative to other elements. For instance, on both analyses manner adverbs are considered to occupy one of the lowest positions in the hierarchy, and thus in the tree structure.
If we assume, following Ernst and Cinque, that manner adverbs delimit the VP, the easiest way to test the V-movement possibilities in Russian is to consider the position of a verb relative to a manner adverb. The data showing this are given in (3).

(3) a. Oni gromko peli (??/*gromko) pesnju.
    they.NOM loudly sing.PST.PL song.ACC
    ‘He loudly sang the song.’

b. My vnimatel’no pročitali (??/*vnimatel’no) pravila.
    we.NOM carefully read.PST.PL rules.ACC
    ‘We carefully read the rules.’

As illustrated in (3) and discussed briefly in section 1.1.1, a manner adverb usually precedes the verb in Russian. The reverse ordering is at best marginal\(^5\).

Slioussar (2007) provides a corpus study on the relative order of verbs and manner adverbs (horošo ‘well’, medlenno ‘slowly’, and polnost’ju ‘completely’), which shows that the order ADV > V is attested in almost 100% of all the cases. This can be taken as a very strong evidence for the lack of V-movement past these adverbs. If the adverbs delimit the VP (or vP), these findings indicate the V(v)P-internal surface position of the verb in Russian.

The data in (3) cannot be explained by some adjacency condition on case dependency between the verb and its internal argument. First, as shown by (4), an adverb cannot follow a verb even if the argument is a PP, which is not case-dependent on the verb. And secondly, as will be shown shortly, the adjacency between a verb and an internal argument can be disrupted under certain conditions.

(4) On bešeno kričit (??/*bešeno) na ženu.
    he.NOM madly shout.PRS.3SG on wife.ACC
    ‘He shouts madly at his wife.’

As a matter of fact, it is not completely true that a verb cannot precede a low adverb in Russian. One context in which the reverse, i.e. V>ADV, order is preferred is under narrow focusing on the adverb. In this case the adverb occurs clause-finally.

(5) Arina delaet (??/*bystro) uroki hustro.
    Arina.NOM do.PRS.3SG homework.ACC quickly
    ‘Arina does her homework QUICKLY.’

A verb can also cross a low adverb under polarity Focus. As is well-known, polarity Focus in Russian is encoded by accenting the verb. This is indicated by bold face in the examples below. As shown in (6), V > ADV order becomes preferable under negation. In this case an adverb can even intervene between the

\(^5\) In the majority of works on Russian, sentences with an adverb intervening between the verb and the object are judged to be strongly ungrammatical. However, some of my informants grade them as deviant rather than completely unacceptable.
verb and its internal argument, which contrasts with the examples in (3). Similar results are obtained under positive polarity focus (7).

(6) Ty (??/*vnimatel’no) ne pročitala vnimatel’no pravila you.NOM NEG read.PST.FEM carefully rules.ACC
igry, i poetomu proigrala.
game.GEN and that.is.why lose.PST.FEM
‘You have not carefully read the rules of the game and that is why you lost.’

(7) My (?? vnimatel’n) oznakomilis’ vnimatel’n s vašimi
we.NOM acquaint.PST.PL attentively with your
dokumentami.
documents.ACC
‘We DID consider your documents carefully.’

Thus on the basis of the adverb placement test, the verb in Russian does not seem to leave the VP. In neutral contexts ADV > V is the only legitimate order. The verb is allowed to cross a low adverb only in some well-defined contexts: either the adverb is narrowly focused and is thus postposed, or under polarity Focus.

In the next section we are going to look at another set of data which appear to be problematic if the assumption concerning the immobility of V in Russian is established as a truism.

V-movement is usually motivated by the necessity to check features associated with verbal morphology, i.e. [Tense], [Aspect], etc. Since Russian exhibits overt Tense, Aspect, and Agreement marking, it is possible to entertain the idea that the verb should be able to raise to check these features. This line of reasoning is sometimes taken in the analyses of clause structure of other Slavic languages (Progovac 2005).

In the following section it will be shown that some recent analyses of Aspect in Russian imply that V must undergo movement out of the vP. This will force us to reconsider the constraint on relative adverb/verb placement.

2.1.2 The syntax of Russian Aspect

In section 1.1.3 of the introductory chapter I already presented some facts concerning the aspectual system of Russian. At this point we are interested in the analysis of Russian aspectual prefixes, which are considered to be the main locus of perfectivity.

As mentioned previously, aspectual prefixes in Russian do not form a homogeneous class. They are subdivided into two large groups: lexical (LP) and superlexical (SLP) (Babko-Malaya 1999, Romanova 2004, 2007, Ramchand

6 There exist also, so-called, purely perfectivizing prefixes (PPP) (Babko-Malaya 1999). They differ from the two discussed groups in that they neither add idiosyncratic meaning to the verb, like LP, nor specific adverbial meaning, like SLP. They simply make the verb perfective. Due to a certain similarity in the behavior of PPP and SLP, Ramchand (2004) treats PPP as a subclass of SLP.
LPs differ from SLPs with respect to the following properties:

- LPs have spatial or idiosyncratic meaning. They often trigger idiomatic interpretation of the resulting predicate (7). SLPs change the meaning of the resulting verb in a predictable way. They are akin to quantifying adverbials (e.g. for a while, a lot of) or aspectual verbs (e.g. to start) (8).

(7) a. dumat’ za-dumat’ b. krutit’ za-krutit’
think.IMPF LP-think.PRF turn.IMPF LP-turn.PRF
‘to think’ ‘to plan’ ‘to turn’ ‘to screw in’

(8) pere- distributing ‘to do smth. one by one’
po- delimitative ‘to do smth. for a while’
za- inceptive ‘to start doing smth.’
na- cumulative ‘to do smth. a lot’

- LPs have the ability to change the argument structure of a verb, e.g. by adding an obligatory argument (9). SLPs do not affect the argument structure (10).

(9) a. bit’ (*gvozd’) b. v-bit’ *(gvozd’)
bit.IMPF nail.ACC LP-bit.PRF nail.ACC
‘bit (*nail)’ ‘tap in a nail’

(10) a. pet’ (pesnju) b. po-pet’ (pesnju)
sing.IMPF song.ACC SLP_DEL-sing.PRF song.ACC
‘sing (a song)’ ‘sing (a song) for a while’

- Only LPs allow for backwards aspectual transformation – secondary imperfective, described in 1.1.3 (11 vs. 12)

(11) a. za-dumat’ b. za-dum-yva-t’
LP-think.PRF LP-think-2IMPF-INF
‘to have planned’ ‘to plan’

(12) a. na-sobirat’ b. * na-sobir-yva-t’
SLP_COM-gather SLP_COM-gather-2IMPF-INF
‘to have gathered a lot of smth.’ ‘to gather a lot of smth.’
• There can be more than one SLP on a verb (13b), while no such stacking is possible with LPs (13a).

(13) a. bežat’ v-bežat’ za-bežat’ * v-za-bežat’
   run.IMPF LP-run.PRF LP-run.PRF LP-LP-run.PRF
   ‘to run’ ‘to run in(to)’ ‘to run in(to)’
   or to run behind’

b. bit’ na-bit’ po-na-bit’
   break.IMPF SLP\textsubscript{CUM}-break.PRF SLP\textsubscript{DIST}-SLP\textsubscript{CUM}-break.PRF
   ‘to break’ ‘to break a lot of smth.’ ‘to break a lot of smth. one by one.’

The syntactic and semantic differences illustrated above are captured by the analyses wherein the two types of prefixes are assumed to be generated in different syntactic positions. It is a fairly standard assumption by now that LPs originate inside and SLPs outside the verb phrase (vP) (Ramchand 2004a, Svenonius 2004, Romanova 2007). The argumentation goes as follows. Because SLPs have stable meanings resembling those of quantificational adverbs, while LPs have idiosyncratic meaning and change the argument structure, the latter should be introduced within the domain relevant for argument structure and idiomaticity, while the former should be introduced within the domain relevant for quantification over the event. In structural terms, the argument structure and idiomatic domain corresponds (roughly) to the vP, and the quantificational domain to some higher clausal area.

For the present purposes, I am going to follow Svenonius’ (2004) analysis, who argues that LPs are structurally similar to Germanic particles and as such start out inside the prepositional small clause (SC). In the course of the derivation an LP undergoes phrasal movement to SpecAspP dominating the vP. Superlexical prefixes are argued to merge directly into SpecAspP. AspP is assumed to be the locus of perfectivity, i.e. prefixes create perfective meanings due to their being moved/generated in AspP. Provided the stacking possibilities of SLP (13b), the head of AspP can be optionally realized by the secondary imperfective suffix -ixa. This explains the morphological nature of SLP/LP versus secondary imperfective: the former are prefixes, while the latter is a suffix. A sample derivation for the verb ponavbivat’ ‘to tap in a lot of smth. one by one’, which comprises two SLPs (po- and na-), an LP (v-), and the secondary imperfective suffix –ixa, is shown in (14).
RP in (14) stands for the Result Phrase, originally proposed for the analysis of Russian LPs by Ramchand (2004a). Svenonius (2004) includes RP into his analysis, but the role of this projection in his work is limited to introducing resultative meaning rather than being the merging site for LPs, as suggested in Ramchand (2004a).

The derivation in (14) captures several facts. First, it produces the desired linear order of the affixes. Second, it reflects the semantics of the resulting predicate, namely the scope relations between the affixes, which are SLP > Secondary Imperfective > LP.

Svenonius does not discuss the issue of V-movement. However, this analysis quite obviously implies that in order to enter into checking relation with the aspectual operator and to form a morphological word with the affixes, the verb must undergo movement to Asp', which I indicate in (14) by arrows.

The prediction of the analysis of Aspect outlined above and the results of the adverb test discussed in the previous section stand in contradiction to each other. Interestingly, the order ADV > V is preserved for verbs with LPs as well as for verbs with SLPs, and secondary imperfective, as shown in (15).

(15) On bystro na-vy-dum-yva-l (??/*bystro) vsjakih tales.GEN
    he.NOM quickly SLP.CUM-LP-think-2IMPF-PST.MASC various nebylic.

‘He quickly thought out (a lot of) various tales.’

On the assumption that manner adverbs are attached somewhere inside the vP area, the ADV-V order in (15) is quite unexpected, if the analysis of Russian prefixes is on the right track. Note that assuming affix lowering rather than head movement of the verb would not improve the situation. In the latter case, an adverb is expected to intervene between an affix and a verbal stem. It seems we are forced to assume that the verb moves overtly to AspP. But this leads to a problem with respect to adverb placement.
2.1.3 Reconciling the two facts

We face a puzzle: aspectual properties of Russian verbs presuppose V-to-Asp movement, while the position of manner adverbs relative to verbs forces us to reject V-movement out of vP. In the present section I would like to propose a way out of the dilemma by assuming more flexibility in adverb placement.

Essentially, the idea concerning flexible syntax of adverbs has already been introduced in Ernst (2002). In the present work I am following Svenonius (2002a) in its exact instantiation. Svenonius puts the phrase-delineating ability of adverbs into question. His proposal is based on the assumption that adverbs are merged into the structure on semantic grounds. But it is further assumed that the nodes not contributing to the interpretation of an adverb are ignored by it. This means that an adverb cannot attach lower than the domain it is supposed to scope over, but it is, in principle, unproblematic for it to attach higher than the minimally needed domain, under the condition that the semantics of the higher node does not conflict with that of an adverb.

I propose that the fixed ADV-V ordering in Russian points not to the immobility of verbs but rather to higher attachment of manner adverbs. Namely, I assume that the latter are allowed to attach to AspP. In what follows, I prove that such a “high” attachment of a manner adverb does not cause semantic problems.

First, we have to understand what type of meaning is rendered by these modifiers. Semantically manner adverbs are assumed to be predicates over events (Parsons 1990). The semantics of verbs received the same treatment. In particular, Davidson (1967) proposed that verbs denote predicates over eventualities and that the argument structure of a verb, apart from the participants, includes an eventuality argument \( e \), often referred to as Davidsonian. On the basis of these descriptions, a sentence like (16a) has a semantic representation as in (16b).

\[
\text{(16) a. Sue ate fast.} \\
\text{b. } \exists e \ [ \text{ate}(e, \text{Sue}) \land \text{fast}(e) ]
\]

If manner adverbs take events as their arguments, the event has to be constructed first. This is motivated by the following fact. It has been proposed that not all verbs contain an event argument in their argument structure (Kratzer 1989, Felser 1998, Katz 2003, among others). For instance, Katz (2003) argues that stative verbs are devoid of \( e \). Interestingly, they make infelicitous arguments for manner adverbs. The restriction of manner adverbs to eventive predicates also holds in Russian, as shown in (17).

\[
\text{(17) Saša *gromko/*vnezapno/*bystro ljubit Veru.} \\
\text{Sasha.NOM loudly suddenly quickly love.PRS.3SG Vera.ACC} \\
\text{‘Sasha loves Vera *loudly/*suddenly/*quickly.’}
\]

The difference between states and events is assumed to be represented syntactically. Namely, according to Felser (1998), \( e \) is generated in the SpecAspP. Thus states are argued to lack AspP altogether, which predetermines their lacking
of e. A similar conclusion is drawn by Katz (2003), who provides the following representations for the verbs kiss and like (18).

(18) a. \([TP Sandy]\_i_ [\_t_\_PAST \_L_\_\_ PERFECTIVE \_v_\_\_t_ \_k_\_\_iss \_Kim \_]]\[
   b. \([TP Sandy]\_i_ [\_t_\_\_PAST \_v_\_\_t_ \_l_\_\_ike \_K\_i\_m \_]]\[

Based on the abovementioned analyses, a direct relation between Aspect and argument structure emerges. This idea is explicitly defended in various event-based approaches to argument projection such as Tenny (1994), Arad (1996), and Borer (2003), among others. For instance, Arad argues that arguments are directly generated in aspectual projections and the presence of an argument correlates with aspectual interpretation of the predicate as being either telic or atelic: predicates containing a measuring argument (or Theme) are telic and those lacking it are atelic. Thus, according to event-based accounts, argument projection is predetermined by aspectual properties of the verb.

Recent approaches to Russian Aspect divert from the event-based approaches mentioned above in that they take arguments to be generated inside the vP and to be assigned thematic roles by the verb (Ramchand 2004a, Romanova 2007). However, the influence of the higher aspectual head on the selectional properties of a verb is well recognized (Romanova 2007). For instance, SLPs na-(CUM) and pere-(DIST) both induce the verb to take a mass or plural object. Besides na- requires a genitive, or partitive, argument (19a), and pere- a strongly-quantified argument (19b).

(19) a. D e t i n a - r v a l i c v e t - o v / * - y d l j a
   children.NOM SLP\_CUM\_pick.PST.PL flowers-GEN/-ACC for many.
   mother.GEN
   ‘Children picked (a lot of) flowers for their mother.’

   b. D e t i p e r e - l o m a l i ?? (vse) i g r u š k i .
   children.NOM SLP\_DIST\_break.PST.PL all.ACC toys.ACC
   ‘Children broke all the toys (one by one).’

The example in (20) provides another illustration: under the progressive interpretation of the verb in the sentence is only compatible with the specific interpretation of the argument (a), while habitual verb semantics forces a non-specific reading of the argument (b).

(20) J a p e r e v o ž u s t a t ’ j u .
   I.NOM translate.PRS.IMPF.1SG article.ACC

   a. ‘I am translating a certain article (now).’
   b. ‘I am translating an article (every day).’

Thus, what we observe is a close relation between Aspect and argument structure, one the one hand (19-20), and the interaction of argument structure with manner
modification, on the other, (17). Aspect behaves as a mediator between the two
types of relations. Note that ungrammatical (17) can be improved if the verb is
turned into an eventive predicate, which is achieved by adding an LP, as in (21).

(21) a. Saša vnezapno/bystro po-ljubil Veru.
    Sasha.NOM suddenly quickly LP-love.PST.MASC Vera.ACC
    ‘Sasha suddenly/quickly fell in love with Vera.’

    b. Saša vnezapno/bystro raz-ljubil Veru.
    Sasha.NOM suddenly quickly LP-love.PST.MASC  Vera.ACC
    ‘Sasha suddenly/quickly fell out of love with Vera.’

The contrast between (17) and (21) strongly supports Katz’ assumption concerning
the influence of Aspect on licensing manner adverbs.

I conclude that manner adverbs must be generated outside of vP, presumably
on top of AspP. This assumption allows us to account for the fixed ADV >V order
in Russian, as well as for the aspectual properties of Russian verbs.

One can ask whether V-movement in Russian terminates in AspP or whether
the verb moves even higher. I am not going to elaborate on this issue in the present
work. What is important for my purposes is that the verb leaves the thematic
domain for a position inside the inflection field.

2.2 Base positions of arguments

In the present section we will consider the position of verbal arguments in
discourse neutral contexts, i.e. prior to application of scrambling. The discussion
will be centered on the position and mutual ordering of internal arguments of
ditransitive verbs. As to the subject, I follow the nowadays standard position that it
is introduced by a separate functional head \( v \) (Marantz 1984, Bowers 1993,
Chomsky 1995, Kratzer 1996, to name just a few).

There are two types of ditransitives in Russian: those that take two DP
arguments (22), and those that select for a DP and a PP (23).

(22) Nastja pokazala Sergeju svoi pokupki.
    Nastya.NOM show.PST.FEM Sergey.DAT REFL purchases.ACC
    ‘Nastya showed Sergey her purchases.’

(23) Mama postavila moloko v holodil’nik.
    mother.NOM put.PST.FEM milk.ACC into fridge.LOC
    ‘Mother put milk into the fridge.’

\(^7\) Note that this analysis is also compatible with Cinque (1999). In his view, adverbs are
specifiers of dedicated aspectual projection. Extending this to Russian would mean that
the AspP hosting prefixes can have a manner adverb in its outer specifier. Recall that I
take prefixes to originate in/move to SpecAspP (Svenonius 2004).
The pattern shown in (22) is known as the Double Object Construction (DOC). Note that Russian DOCs do not enter the alternation shown in (24) for English, whereby a dative argument is replaced by a PP, even though Russian has a preposition (к ‘to’) that assigns Dative. This is illustrated in (25).

(24)  
a. Nastya showed Sergey her purchases.  
b. Nastya showed her purchases to Sergey.

(25)  
* Nastja pokazala svoi pokupki k Nastya.NOM show.PST.FEM REFL purchases.ACC to Sergey.DAT  
   ‘Nastya showed her purchases to Sergey.’

A PP argument in the unmarked case follows the DO (cf. section 1.1.1). This is quite a common assumption (Bailyn 1995b, Chvany 1975). However, the relative order of arguments in DOC is debated.

The most detailed syntactic study on Russian DOC I am aware of is Bailyn (1995b). The author argues that the base structure of Russian DOC must be represented as in (26), i.e. the IO, carrying Dative, is asymmetrically c-commanded by the DO, marked Accusative.

(26)  
[\text{Bailyn 1995b: 9}]

Some alternative opinions about the architecture of Russian DOCs have been expressed, namely, that the arguments are projected in the opposite order, i.e. the DO merges with the verb first and the IO is generated higher up (Chvany 1975, Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Soschen 2005, Slioussar 2007, Pereltsvaig forthcoming).

In this work, I am following the idea about the structurally higher position of IOs. The structure I am advocating is given in (27).

(27)  

As shown in the representation, the verb phrase is decomposed into a number of projections, or shells (Larson 1988). The upper shells, vP and VP\_APPL, are functional in nature and serve to introduce the arguments “external” to the core
predicate: vP introduces agentive subjects, and VP_{APPL} hosts IO in its Spec. vP and VP_{APPL} also participate in case checking: the former checks ACC on DO, and the latter checks DAT on IO that it introduces. The lexical core of the phrase is represented by VP, which consists of a verb, a DO and other possible complements to V, such as PPs and clausal complements.

In what follows, I motivate the structure in (27) and challenge the arguments in favor of the structure given in (26).

2.2.1 Bailyn’s (1995) analysis and the challenges it faces

The arguments presented by Bailyn (1995b) in favor of the structure in (26) come from the following DO-IO asymmetries.

First, only DO can undergo certain case alternations, namely the GenNeg and the distributive po shift. The former is illustrated in (28).

(28)  

a. Ja ne daju detjam konfet-y/-Ø.  
I.NOM NEG give.PRS.1SG kids.DAT sweets-ACC/-GEN  
‘I don’t give (any) sweets to kids.’

b. Ja ne daju det-jam/*-ej konfety.  
I.NOM NEG give.PRS.1SG kids-DAT/-GEN sweets.ACC  
‘I don’t give sweets to (any) kids.’

As discussed in section 1.1.4 and shown in the examples above, in the presence of the sentential negation a DO in Russian can surface either in Accusative or in Genitive. Such a case variation is precluded with IO, which preserves its Dative case.

Similarly, only DO is subject to the distributive po alternation. The use of a po-phrase is a way to express distributivity in Russian. As evidenced by the contrast in (29), DO, but not IO, can be substituted by a po-phrase.

(29)  

a. Vospitatel’ razdaval detjam po konfete.  
kindergarten.teacherNOM give.PST.MASC children.DAT DIST sweets.DAT  
‘The kindergarten teacher gave the children a sweet each.’

8 In my summary of Bailyn’s (1995b) analysis, I omit the asymmetry related to scope ambiguities. Quantifier scope is a debatable issue in Russian. For instance, while Bailyn argues that DO always takes wide scope over IO, Ionin (2001) provides quite different judgements. She presents data showing that scope relations depend on the form of the quantifier (odin ‘one’ vs. po krajej mere Odin ‘at least one’) as well as on the IS of the sentence. I personally tend to agree with Ionin in her treatment of scope in Russian.
b. *Vospitatel’ razdal po rebenku
goodergarten.teacherNOM give.PST.MASC DIST child.DAT
konfety.
sweets.ACC
‘The kindergarten teacher gave each of the children sweets.’

Bailyn accounts for the data presented above by suggesting that the described case alternations are structurally restricted to the SpecVP position hosting DO.

But do these case alternations really tell us anything about the hierarchical relations between DO and IO? In what follows I present facts that speak against this assumption.

GenNeg and distributive po-phrases are often used as unaccusativity tests in Russian linguistics (Pesetsky 1982, Schoorlemmer 2004). This means that agentive subjects cannot undergo these case transformations either, which is shown in (30).

child-GEN never NEG see.PST.MASC cat.ACC
Intended meaning: ‘No child ever saw a cat.’

b. *Po rebenku eli jabloki.
DIST child.DAT eat.PST.PL apples.ACC
Intended meaning: ‘Each child ate an apple.’

The data in (30) replicate those in (28b, 29b) and show that S patterns with IO in that both are banned from entering either the GenNeg or the distributive po alternation. It is beyond any doubt that S is higher than and thus c-commands all the other arguments both before and after its movement to SpecTP. Importantly, the data provided above point to the similarity between S and IO. In section 2.2.2 I will show that the similarity between the two goes much further.

The other two asymmetries considered by Bailyn seem more telling since they are more directly related to hierarchical relations. The first one is from Binding. The author shows that DO can bind a non-subject-oriented anaphor within IO, while the reverse does not hold. This is shown in (31).

(31) a. Maria predstavljaet [svoih drugi
introduce.PRS.3SG REFL friends.ACC each
drugu, other.DAT

b. Maria predstavljaet drug drugi [svoih
introduce.PRS.3SG each other.DAT REFL
friends.ACC
druzej].
c. ? Maria predstavljает [svoim druz’jam], drug Maria.NOM introduce.PRS.3SG REFL friends.DAT each druga, other.ACC
d. *Maria predstavljает drug druga, [svoim Maria.NOM introduce.PRS.3SG each other.ACC REFL drug’jam]...
friends.DAT

‘Maria introduced her friends to each other.’

In (31a) the anaphor and its antecedent are in their respective base positions with the latter c-commanding the former. (31b), according to Bailyn, illustrates the case of A’-scrambling of the DO with reconstruction to its base position, which allows for binding in spite of the anaphor preceding its antecedent on the surface. The author grades (31c) as deviant and proposes that the speakers who allow it, permit A-movement of IO, which accounts for the marginal acceptability. Finally, (31d) is the base order with the anaphor preceding the antecedent, which yields ungrammaticality.

First of all, it should be mentioned that the data in (31) are not uncontroversial: the marginality of (31c) and full acceptability of (31b) are debatable. On the basis of my own judgements and the judgements of my informants, the acceptability of binding relations in Russian depends heavily on the linear order. This means that irrespective of case and grammatical relations, a sentence in which an antecedent precedes an anaphor always outranks the one in which the order is inverted, i.e. (31a) and (31c) are acceptable, while (31b) and (31d) are marginal or unacceptable.9 This might be taken as an indication that the so-called VP-internal scrambling in Russian is of A-type, which changes binding relations (Bailyn 1995a).10 Moreover, in some cases, the order Antecedent_DAT –

9 The contrast between Antecedent-Anaphor and Anaphor-Antecedent orders becomes much sharper with verbs that are not inherently reciprocal, e.g. show in (i):
(i) a. Svaha pokazala partneram, drug druga, matchmaker.NOM show.PST.FEM partners.DAT each other.ACC
b. Svaha pokazala drug druga, partneram, matchmaker.NOM show.PST.FEM drug druga, partneram, ...

   a’. ??/* Svaha pokazala drug druga, partneram, matchmaker.NOM show.PST.FEM each other.ACC partners.DAT
   b’. ??/* Svaha pokazala drug druga, partneram, matchmaker.NOM show.PST.FEM each other.ACC partners.DAT

   ‘The matchmaker showed partners to each other.’

10 Note that in order to account for the acceptability of (31c), Bailyn has to assume that IO undergoes movement to an A-position, while the possibility of (31b) is explained by reconstruction typical of A’-movement. In the absence of any further evidence showing
Anaphor_{ACC} is notably preferred over the opposite order (32), undermining Bailyn’s analysis.

(32) a. Čistaja slučajnost’ podarila nam drug druga.
    mere chance. NOM present. PST. Fem us. DAT each other. ACC

    ‘A mere chance gave us as a gift to each other.’

The data on variable binding further substantiate the claim concerning the linearity of binding relations in Russian.

    I. NOM give. PST. Fem every student. DAT his work. ACC

    ‘I gave every student his work back.’

b. * Ja otdala ego rabotu [každomu studentu].
    I. NOM give. PST. Fem his article. ACC every student. DAT

c. Ja otdala [každuju rabotu], ee avtoru.
    I. NOM give. PST. Fem every work. ACC its author. DAT

    ‘I gave every work to its author.’

d. * Ja otdala ee avtoru [každuju rabotu].
    I. NOM give. PST. Fem its author. DAT every work. ACC

    ‘I gave every work to its author.’

As shown in (33a) and (33c), binding relations between a quantifier and a pronominal variable are possible if the quantifier precedes the variable, otherwise they are ruled out (33b and 33d). Case properties and grammatical relations do not influence the grammaticality.

The conclusion to draw from the data discussed above is, whichever operation is responsible for re-ordering of IO and DO, this operation affects binding relations. If so, it precludes Binding as a reliable diagnostics for determining basic order of constituents in Russian.\(^{11}\)

The last argument provided by Bailyn in favor of DO > IO base order is related to Control. He notes that an accusative DP makes a licit controller for the PRO subject of an instrumental depictive Small Clause (SC), while a dative DP does not.

that the IO in (31b) occupies a different position in comparison to (31c) this seems to be a stipulation.

\(^{11}\) In fact, in his more recent works Bailyn (2003, 2004) argues extensively for A-nature of clause internal scrambling in Russian.
Polina introduced her girl friend to her father drunk.

(34) shows that S is equally acceptable as a PRO controller. The author explains the control property by assuming that the depictive SC in (34) is adjoined to V’, as in representation (35).

(35) IP
   NOM_i
     VP
       ACC_k
         V’
           SC
             V’
               V
                 DAT_m
                   PRO_{i,k=*m}

Given the c-command theory of Control assumed by Bailyn, the ungrammaticality of the m-coindexing in (34–35) follows from the failure of IO to c-command PRO.

The representation in (35) triggers the following predictions: (i) control into adjunct clauses from the IO position is generally impossible in Russian, and (ii) on the basis of the c-command theory of Control, we expect control possibilities to vary with different word orders. Neither of the predictions is borne out.

First, as evidenced by (36), Control as such is not a problem for IO. It can easily control into purpose infinitival SCs.

(36) Ona prinesla mne raboty PRO_i proverit’.
    she.NOM bring.PST.FEM I.DAT papers.ACC check.INF
    ‘She brought me some papers to check/grade.’

Note that the PRO-subject in (36) cannot have an arbitrary reference. The sentence cannot be paraphrased as She brought me some papers for someone to grade them. (36) cannot even be an example of partial Control because interpreting the sentence as She brought me some papers for her and me to grade together is not possible either. Thus in (36) we are dealing with the same type of Control, namely obligatory, as in (34).

Syntactically, the infinitival SC in (36) as well as the instrumental depictive SC (34) is an adjunct. If adjunction happens at the V’ level, as depicted in (35), the difference in control possibilities between (34) and (36) is quite puzzling.

Furthermore, if c-command is all that matters for Control, the IO in (34) should become a possible controller once it is moved across the DO, because in this
case c-command relations change accordingly. However, no new control possibilities arise (37). This is rather unexpected on the analysis given in (35).

(37) Polina, predstavila otcu svoju podrugun
Poly.NOM introduce.PST.FEM father.DAT REFL girl.friend.ACC
pyan-oj /-INST.FEM */-INST.MASC
‘Poly introduced her girl friend to her father drunk.’

Finally, if only depictives are taken into consideration, the ban on Control by IO is not absolute. Depictive secondary predicates in Russian come in two types: agreeing and instrumental. An instrumental depictive was shown above (34, 37). (38) is an example of an agreeing depictive secondary predicate.

(38) Ona rasskazala nam etu novost’ i bez togo
she.NOM tell.PST.FEM we.DAT this news.ACC and without that
rasstroennym i /-INST.MASC
upset.DAT.PL
‘She told us this news while we were already upset enough.’

The data in (36-38) clearly indicate that the behavior of IO in Control environments cannot be accounted for in purely configurational terms. C-command seems an insufficient condition for Control, on general basis. A proper account of subject (39b) versus object (39a) Control is still missing.

(39) a. Lina asked her boyfriendi [PROi/*k to buy some wine].
   b. Lina promised her boyfriendi [PRO*i/k to buy some wine].

In both examples in (39) the subject as well as the object seem to c-command the infinitival SC but control possibilities clearly differ. 12 A proper analysis of the Control facts presented above is well beyond the objectives of the present study. 13 What I aimed to show is that an attempt to use Control as indicating hierarchical relations leads to a number of questions. Unless a...

12 I thank Željko Bošković for bringing this fact to my attention.
13 My intuition is that the difference in Control is linked to the case properties of the controller: S and DO carry structural case, while IO is marked with inherent Dative. There might be some sort of a clash between the case of the controller and the case carried by the PRO-subject. A partial support for the idea comes from data like (36). If the PRO subject of an infinitival SC in Russian is marked Dative (Perlmutter and Moore 2002) than the ability of IO to control into infinitival SCs can be argued to follow from the lack of case clash. Of course, we still have to find an explanation for the examples with instrumental SCs, since there PRO can be argued to be marked Instrumental, which does not preclude control by a DP marked Nominative or Accusative. However, if Instrumental turns out to be a structural case, the explanation in terms of case clash might hold.
satisfactory answer to these questions is found using Control for the designated purposes is incorrect.

To summarize, in the present section I revised the arguments suggested by Bailyn (1995b) in favour of the structure wherein IO is asymmetrically c-commanded by DO. It was shown that the observed asymmetries are easily challenged.

In the following section, I provide some additional facts that present a problem for Bailyn’s analysis but can be naturally explained within the analysis defended in the present thesis.

2.2.2 Motivating IO > DO configuration
In the previous section, we reviewed the arguments put forth by Bailyn (1995b) in favor of his analysis of the Russian DOC. It was shown that they do not provide a solid ground to conclude that the base order of arguments corresponds to DO > IO.

In this section, I present some more facts aimed at clarifying the issue. The data to be discussed go against Bailyn’s analysis and speak in favor of the hypothesis that the structural hierarchy of arguments in Russian DOCs is rather IO > DO.

The first piece of evidence comes from consideration of focus structure in Russian DOCs. This fact has been pointed out previously (Janko 1991, Junghanns and Zybatow 1997).

A notorious property of Russian is its free word order, which is constrained by discourse factors. As a rule, a clause-final constituent carries the main sentential stress and constitutes the focus or a part thereof (under wide Focus). Apart from the correlation between stress and focus, there is also a correlation between stress and the depth of embedding (Cinque 1993; Neeleman and Reinhart 1998). In particular, in accordance with the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR) (Cinque 1993) the main sentential stress falls on the most deeply embedded constituent. NSR can be obviated by applying additional operations, such as distressing and/or stress strengthening. However, if any of the stress-shifting operations applies focus projection is blocked (Neeleman and Reinhart 1998).

With this in mind, consider the sentences in (40) and their possible contexts given below each of the examples. The bold face indicates the position of the sentential stress.

(40) a. On kupil kakomu-to niščemu obed.
    he.NOM buy.PST.MASC some beggar.DAT lunch.ACC
    ‘He bought some beggar a lunch.’

    What’s up with Sergey? He looks so happy.
    What did Sergey buy for some beggar on the street?

b. On kupil obed kakomu-to niščemu.
    he.NOM buy.PST.MASC lunch.ACC some beggar.DAT
    ‘He bought a lunch for some beggar.’

    Who did Sergey buy a lunch for?
    * What’s up with Sergey? He looks so happy.
Only (40a) is a felicitous answer to questions targeting wide (VP or sentential) focus. (40b), with the inverted order of arguments, can only encode narrow focus on the IO. If focus projection is a reliable diagnostics for determining the unmarked order, (40a) must be the base structure and (40b) derived from it, not vice versa.14

Another test for establishing the base order of arguments in DOC was suggested by Zimmerling (2007). Some nouns, especially loan words, do not exhibit overt case morphology. Because of this case homophony, the arguments are ambiguous with respect to their grammatical roles. Zimmerling notes that the most natural way to interpret sentences like (41) is by assigning the function of DO to the rightmost DP and that of IO to the next higher argument. In other words, (41) gets an interpretation similar to the English DOC and not to the to-dative, as shown in the translation of (41). This finding speaks in favor of the order IO > DO being the unmarked variant.

(41) Vasya podaril Marlo P’erlo.

‘Vasya gave (a work by) Pierlo to Marlo.’

(42) a. [Čitat’ detjam skazki] i roditeli očen’ ljubijat t.

‘Parents like to read tales to their kids very much.’

Apart from the abovementioned facts already noted in studies on the Russian DOC, there are some further indications of the structure I am arguing for, i.e. IO > DO.

Consider the sentences in (42) illustrating VP-topicalization. Topicalization is often used to identify constituency. It is beyond any doubt that a Head forms a constituent with its Complement but not with its Specifier. The structure proposed by Bailyn (26, 35) predicts that it should be easier to topicalize a verb together with its IO rather than with its DO. But as we can see in (42), this prediction is not borne out.

14 Note that the sentences in (40) must be considered with the prosody indicated in the text, i.e. a single accent on the final word. In principle, a sentence with the order DO-IO can be uttered as an answer to a what’s up? question, but in this case the main accent will fall on the non-final DO, and IO can get a secondary stress. This will not contradict NSR once we dissociate scrambling from focus, and allow even focused constituents to scramble for some independent reasons.
As shown in (42a), Topicalization can apply to the entire V-IO-DO sequence. The movement can also target the verb and its DO, as in (42b). Extracting the verb with an IO in the presence of a DO produces an unacceptable sentence (42c). I attribute the ungrammaticality of (42c) to the fact that the verb does not form a constituent with IO to the exclusion of DO at the level where Topicalization applies.\footnote{The data in (42) are quite puzzling. Given that Russian is a scrambling language, we expect it to be possible to derive sequences like (42c) by scrambling the DO out and then fronting the remnant VP. An explanation of the data awaits further study.}

Marantz (1984) discusses the influence of syntactic structure on the formation of lexical units. In particular, he shows that the syntactic position of verb arguments affects their ability to participate in idiom formation. Roughly speaking, the closer an argument is to the lexical verb in the syntactic representation, the easier it is to include it into an idiom. If IO is a complement of V, it should be unproblematic to find idioms consisting of V plus IO, excluding DO. However, the most common templates for idioms in Russian are V-DO, V-DO-PP, and V-PP (43).

\begin{itemize}
\item[(43)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. bit’ bakluši [V-DO]
\begin{itemize}
\item beat.INF dawdles.ACC.
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item ‘to be lazy’
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item b. sest’ v galošu [V-PP]
\begin{itemize}
\item sit.down.INF into rubber.shoe.ACC
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item ‘to fail’
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item c. metat’ biser pered svin’jami [V-DO-PP]
\begin{itemize}
\item cast.INF beads.ACC before swines.INST
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item ‘to cast pearls before swines’
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

My survey of 600 idioms (Shansky et. al. 1975) revealed no cases where IO would be idiomatized together with V to the exclusion of other arguments, especially DO. It is not the case that dative IOs are incompatible with idioms. Idioms can be used within DOC as long as IO is outside the idiomatic unit (44) (the idiom is underlined).

\begin{itemize}
\item[(44)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item On večno vstavljaet nam palki v kolesa.
\begin{itemize}
\item he.NOM always put.PRS.3SG we.DAT sticks.ACC into wheels.ACC
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item ‘He always impedes us.’
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

If idiom-formation is syntactically restricted to the lexical VP (Marantz 1984), the evasive behaviour of IO in such contexts implies that it is located outside the core lexical VP. Note that in this respect IO patterns with the external argument\footnote{Russian has a handful of idioms with a fixed subject (kondraška shvatila ‘to be frightened to death’, sovest’ zaela ‘feel guilty’), but these are analyzed on a par with object experiencer verbs (bespokoit’ ‘worry’, radovat’ ‘please’) (Chtareva 2004).}. 

\begin{itemize}
\item[15] The data in (42) are quite puzzling. Given that Russian is a scrambling language, we expect it to be possible to derive sequences like (42c) by scrambling the DO out and then fronting the remnant VP. An explanation of the data awaits further study.
\item[16] Russian has a handful of idioms with a fixed subject (kondraška shvatila ‘to be frightened to death’, sovest’ zaela ‘feel guilty’), but these are analyzed on a par with object experiencer verbs (bespokoit’ ‘worry’, radovat’ ‘please’) (Chtareva 2004).
\end{itemize}
The “external” nature of IO with respect to the lexical VP is further supported by its lack of interaction with Aspect. Here we are only interested in perfectivization with the help of LPs. As described above (section 2.1.2), their distinguishing property is the ability to change the argument structure of a verb, e.g. by adding an obligatory argument to an otherwise intransitive or an optionally transitive verb. In (45) the optionally transitive verb čítat’ ‘read’ turns into the obligatory transitive when the LP do- is added to it.

(45) a. Mama čítala *(skazku).
   mother.NOM read.PST.FEM tale.ACC
   ‘The mother was reading (the/a tale).’

b. Mama do-čítala *(skazku).
   mother.NOM LP-read.PST.FEM tale.ACC
   ‘The mother read *(the tale) up to the end.’

Recall that the effect LPs have on selectional properties of the verb is accounted for by assuming that an LP is introduced inside the lexical domain, i.e. inside the VP.

Importantly for our discussion, only DOs are involved in this valence-changing process. There is no LP in Russian which governs the presence or absence of IO. Thus in (45) an IO, e.g. detjam ‘children.DAT’, can be freely added to both (a) and (b) examples. The argument structure of a verb is argued to be conditioned by its syntactic environment (Marantz 1993, Pylkkänen 2002). In this context, the inertness of IO with respect to selectional restrictions of verbs (and LPs) points to its “external” nature relative to the domain where these selectional restrictions are satisfied. In this, IO approximates the behaviour of S.

And finally, IO is similar to S with respect to extraction. It is a well-known fact that it is much easier to extract from the Complement rather than from the Specifier. If IO is a Complement of V and DO is introduced as its Specifier, it should be easier to extract from the former than from the latter.

Russian does not allow long wh-movement out of indicative embedded clauses, but extraction is possible out of subjunctive clauses. Moreover, Russian is not subject to the Left Branch Condition, as shown in (46).

(46) Kakie mama prislala tebe fotografii?
   which.ACC mother.NOM send.PST.FEM you.DAT pictures.ACC
   ‘Which pictures did your mother send you?’

Wh-movement out of subjunctive complements shows the Subject/Object asymmetry: (47) is bad because the extraction targets S, while (48), where it applies to DO, is acceptable.
Interestingly, the restrictions on extraction out of subjunctive clauses are the same for IO (49) as for S (47).

If extraction is sensitive to the Complement/Specifier distinction, the similarity between S and IO with regard to extraction suggests that the two must occur in a similar structural position, namely the Specifier.

The data in this section show that IO shares a fair amount of properties with S. This fact is difficult to explain under an analysis which treats IO as the argument structurally closest to the lexical verb. In the following section, I argue for an alternative analysis of the Russian DOC. I claim that IO is generated outside the lexical VP. The facts presented in this section follow naturally from the present proposal.

2.2.3 Applicative Head approach to Russian DOC

It has been emphasized in the preceding section that the behavior of IO resembles that of S. I would like to interpret this similarity as indicating that the two share some structural property which distinguishes them from DO. Following Marantz (1993) and Pylkkänen (2002), I assume that this common structural characteristic is that IO, similarly to S, is a ‘non-core’ argument of the verb. Both IO and S are introduced in the course of the derivation by a dedicated functional head. DO, on the other hand, is an essential component of the verbal meaning and is introduced by the lexical verb.

Building on numerous proposals in the literature (Jackendoff 1990, Johnson 1991, Bowers 1993, Marantz 1993; Pylkkänen 2002; McIntyre 2006) I assume that IO is introduced by a light verb, which contributes the possession component to the meaning of the predicate. In the spirit of the previous work mentioned above, I label the node encoded by this light verb Applicative ($V_{APPL}$).

By applying the Applicative Head approach to DOC I eschew the transformational account to the construction (Larson 1988, Den Dikken 1995).
According to the latter, DOC is derived from a PP ditransitive construction, i.e. (50a) is a transformed version of (50b). The transformation is related to the fact that the null preposition in (50a), as opposed to overt to in (50b), cannot license case on the complement DP (Den Dikken 1995).

(50)  

a. I gave [Ø her] PP flowers.

b. I gave flowers [to her] PP.

The arguments for rejecting the transformational account to Russian DOC have been provided previously (e.g. Babyonyshev 1999, Pereltsvaig forthcoming). Here I just present some of them.

It was shown earlier in this chapter that Russian totally lacks the to-dative construction and possesses only DOC. This is quite surprising in light of the fact that Russian does have a dative-assigning preposition – k ‘to’. But as shown above, it cannot be used to express the corresponding meaning. The relevant data are repeated below.

(51)  

a. Nastja pokazala Sergeju svoi pokupki.

   Nastya.NOM show.PST.FEM Sergey.DAT REFL purchases.ACC

   ‘Nastya showed Sergey her purchases.’

b. * Nastja pokazala svoi pokupki k

   Nastya.NOM show.PST.FEM REFL purchases.ACC to

   Sergey.DAT

   ‘Nastya showed her purchases to Sergey.’

K is a purely locative preposition. Therefore there are no morphosyntactic cues in the language to derive DOC from a prepositional construction.

Moreover, as argued by Babyonyshev (1999) there is no abstract (in)to-preposition in the inventory of Russian (i.e. preposition of ‘terminal coincidence’(Hale and Keyser 1993)). The lack of the abstract preposition correlates with the fact that Russian does not contain any location verbs (to shelve, to bottle, etc.), as evidenced by (52). The latter are assumed to be formed by incorporation of the preposition of terminal coincidence into the corresponding noun (Hale and Keyser 1993).

(52)  

a. * butylit’ ‘to bottle’

b. * polkat’ ‘to shelve’

The meanings denoted by the English verbs in (52) can only be expressed by using a relevant verb with a PP argument, as in (53).
Based on the arguments presented above, I will proceed by analyzing ditransitives with dative IOs as being derivationally unrelated to those with PP arguments.

As stated earlier in this section, I take dative IOs to be introduced by $V_{\text{APPL}}$, which takes a lexical VP as its complement. Since Pylkkänen’s (2002) study on applicatives the latter are subdivided into two types: High Applicatives which introduce Benefactors/Malefactors and thus relate an individual to an event, and Low Applicatives which bring in a Possess or/Source participant into the argument structure of the verb, i.e. relate two individuals. The representations for High and Low $V_{\text{APPL}}$ are given in (54a) and (54b) respectively.

(54) a. $vP$
    \[ V^o \rightarrow V'_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow V_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow v_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow IO \rightarrow v_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow V'_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow V_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow v_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow v' \rightarrow vP \]
    b. $vP$
    \[ V^o \rightarrow V_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow v_{\text{APPL}} \rightarrow v' \rightarrow vP \]

Soschen (2005) assumes, without much discussion though, that Russian $V_{\text{APPL}}$ is low, i.e. it projects the structure shown in (54b). I would like to propose that the structure of Russian DOCs is of the type (54a) rather than (54b). The reasons for that are the following.

First of all, although dative IOs are often Possessors (e.g. with verbs like $\text{dat’} ‘\text{give’}, \text{poslat’ ‘send’}$), they also occur with verbs that do not imply possession between its objects. These include verbs like $\text{citat’ ‘read’}, \text{pet’ ‘sing’}, \text{gotovit’ ‘cook’}$ etc. We have already seen examples with $\text{citat’ ‘read’}$ in (42) above. (55) provides some more examples of this type.

(55) a. Arina nam pela i tancevala.
    Arina.NOM we.DAT sing.PST.FEM and dance.PST.FEM
    ‘Arina danced and sang for us.’
b. Borina žena ne gotovit i ne stiraeť emu.
Boris.NOM wife.NOM NEG cook.PRS.3SG and NEG launder.PRS.3SG he.DAT
‘Boris’ wife does not cook or launder for him.’

Pylkkänen argues that only High $V_{APPL}$ is compatible with agentive intransitive verbs, and these are exactly the type of predicates we have in (55). This means that there is no strong correlation in Russian between transitivity of the verb and its ability to take an IO – a hallmark of languages which possess High $V_{APPL}$.

Secondly, the structure in (54a), rather than that in (54b), provides a more natural account for some DO/IO asymmetries discussed in the previous section. In particular, the VP-Topicalization fact (42) was argued to indicate that, at a certain level, DO forms a syntactic constituent with V excluding IO. This type of constituency is difficult to obtain in (54b). Furthermore, under (54b) DO is introduced as an argument of $V_{APPL}$. But as we saw earlier some perfective verbs (namely those with an LP) have their arguments introduced by the prefix lower down in the structure. I do not see a way to maintain the assumed analysis of LPs and to obtain the desired constituency for Topicalization under the structure in (54b).

And, finally, McGinnis (2001) argues that only languages with High $V_{APPL}$ allow for the so-called, long passives, i.e. constructions where the lowest of the two internal arguments undergo passivization. As shown in (56), English does not have long passives, since passivization can only apply to the object that is structurally higher.

(56) a. Maria was sent a box of chocolate.

b. *A box of chocolate was sent Maria.

Russian counterparts of (56) show the opposite acceptability. As evidenced by (57b), IO, although structurally higher, cannot be passivized at all in Russian. DO passivizes easily and triggers agreement on the predicate (57c).

(57) a. On otpravil sestre ctevy.
he.NOM send.PST.MASC sister.DAT flowers.ACC
‘He sent his sister some flowers.’

17 I should note that not all agentive verbs can take an IO. For instance, verbs like plakat ‘cry’ or begat ‘run’ cannot take a Benefactor/Malefactor argument in standard adult Russian. However, Soschen (2005), reports that it is possible in child Russian (i), which suggests that speakers must have access to High $V_{APPL}$.

(i) Ja ne tebe plaču, ja mame plaču.
I.NOM NEG you.DAT cry.PRS.1SG I.NOM mum.DAT cry.PRS.1SG
‘I’m not crying for you, I’m crying for my Mum.’

[Soschen 2005: 2 (footnote)]
Thus we see that Russian contrasts with English in what concerns passivization of arguments in DOC. The ungrammaticality of English examples like (56b) is accounted for by Relativized Minimality. IO is assumed to be an intervener for agreement of DO with T°. In Russian, on the other hand, no minimality effects are attested.

McGinnis (2001) proposes that passivization of the lower argument depends on whether or not it can move to the edge of the VP_APPL. This movement makes both arguments equidistant from T° and the initially higher IO is no longer an intervener. The author argues that only High V_APPL can provide an escape hatch for DO under passivization.

Based on the facts provided above, I conclude that the Russian DOC involves High V_APPL, i.e. it has the structure shown (54a).

2.2.4 Case checking

The representation in (54a), repeated below for convenience, reflects the order in which the arguments of DOC in Russian enter the derivation.

(58)

Now, we should make sure that this configuration can also ensure the appropriate case checking by the arguments. A DO in Russian is marked Accusative. An IO surfaces as Dative. I am aware of two types of approaches to case checking within DOC. In both of them it is assumed that the sources for objective cases in DOC are v° and V°_APPL.

Collins (1997) and McGinnis (1998) argue that DO gets its case checked by V°_APPL and IO receives its case from v°. Such a direction of checking allows for a maximally local relation.

In the previous section I repeatedly emphasized the similarity between IO and S in Russian. One can be tempted to extend the similarity further and conclude that the case features are checked in a similar way as well, namely by entering into Agree with a higher functional head: T° in case of S, and v° in case of IO. This would imply, though, that an IO within DOCs in Russian has a structural case
(because $v^o$ is a structural-case checker). This would mean that an IO must exhibit properties which a DO displays in simple transitive constructions. However, this is a false expectation. IO in Russian does not carry a structural case. A hallmark property of the structural case is that it can change under various structural transformations. For instance, Accusative can turn into Nominative under passivization. In Russian, it can also become Genitive under negation (section 1.1.4). Dative IOs are not subject to any of these case alternations, as was shown above.

The proposal recently made by a number of researchers is that inherently marked IOs check their case against $V^o_{APPL}$ rather than $v^o$ (Anagnostopoulou 2001, Lee-Schoenfeld 2006, McFadden 2006, McIntyre 2006). Thus $T^o$ and $v^o$ are preserved as purely structural-case checking heads. Woolford (2006) defines inherent case as that which is checked by a non-lexical verb and which is checked by the same head that also assigns a $\theta$-role to the corresponding argument. By these criteria, $V^o_{APPL}$ is the only possible licensor of case on IO: it is a functional head that introduces this argument.

How does DO check its case? I assume that Accusative on a DO is checked against $v^o$ in simple transitive as well as in ditransitive constructions. This triggers a question – why does IO not block Agree between $v^o$ and DO? The answer to this question is rather obvious. If IO always gets its case feature checked against $V^o_{APPL}$, by the time $v^o$ enters the derivation IO turns inactive for the purposes of any further case checking. Therefore it does not count as an intervener. A more interesting question is why the case feature on $V^o_{APPL}$ does not enter into checking with the DO which is already available in the derivation when $V^o_{APPL}$ is introduced. If that happens IO would remain caseless given our assumptions about inherent case checking. To prevent $V^o_{APPL}$ from exhausting its case-checking potential too early, I assume that it is simply not capable of checking a structural case at all. This particular property of $V^o_{APPL}$, I propose, reflects its selectional restrictions.

Caha (2006, 2007) argues that a DP, when it enters the derivation, is dominated by a number of case projections (KPs) ordered according to the universal hierarchy shown in (59).

\begin{equation}
\text{Instrumental} \rightarrow \text{Dative} \rightarrow \text{Prepositional} \rightarrow \text{Genitive} \rightarrow \text{Accusative} \rightarrow \text{Nominative}.
\end{equation}

The higher in the hierarchy is the case the more structurally complex is a DP. Caha assumes that every DP is introduced with all its KPs and case checking is achieved by peeling-off the higher layers and spelling out the remaining part. For instance, a Nominative subject, on this account, results from stranding all the KPs in SpecvP, where the subject is introduced and moving just the KP_NOM to SpecTP. I would like to follow Caha in what concerns the structural make-up of DPs (i.e. inclusion of KPs) and the correlation between the case and structural complexity/deficiency of a DP. However, I assume that a DP enters the derivation with just as much superstructure as necessary. For example, a dative DP would have KP_DAT as its topmost layer, and an accusative nominal would be crowned with just KP_ACC, lacking all the other case specifications, as shown in (60).
A DO in the Russian DOC, I assume, has the internal structure as in (60b), which is considerably impoverished in comparison to the make-up of an IO (60a). Following Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) in this work, I take feature checking to be matching of similar features. Suppose that \( V^o_{\text{APPL}} \) in Russian carries the \([\text{D} \text{DAT}]\) feature. This means that only an argument with the structure as in (60a) would match the feature of the functional head. A DO, although present in the derivation and ready for feature matching, will be ignored by \( V^o_{\text{APPL}} \) because this functional head cannot agree with anything smaller than \( \text{KP}_{\text{DAT}} \). On this basis I argue that the case checking in Russian DOC proceeds as shown in (61)\(^{18}\).

(61) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[vP } v^o \text{ [VP,on, IO} \text{ [V}^o_{\text{APPL}} \text{ [VP DO [V}^o \text{ ]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

Case on both objects is checked in situ. For DO it implies long-distance Agree with the dedicated functional head. I think there are good reasons to believe that case-checking does not require movement in Russian. This has been proposed for Nominative checking on the basis of, the so-called, inversion constructions, illustrated in (62), wherein the argument marked Nominative, which also triggers agreement on the verb, remains low in the structure.

(62) a. Na nebe 
    sgustilis’
    tuči.

    on sky.LOC 
    thicken.PST.PL 
    clouds.NOM

    ‘There were a lot of clouds in the sky.’

b. Mne 
    ne 
    nравится
    tvoe 
    otnošenie.

    I.DAT 
    NEG 
    please.PRS.3SG 
    your attitude.NOM

    ‘I do not like your attitude.’

Long-distance agreement was also proposed for checking Accusative by Lavine and Freidin (2002), who state explicitly that Russian is not an object shift language and that “ACC Case on the direct internal argument is valued ‘long distance’ via Agree with \( \varphi \)-complete \( v \)” (2002: 260). I take this to be a correct assumption and propose the following motivation for it.

First of all, the neutral order of objects is IO > DO. Provided that IO is case-licensed inside \( \text{VP}_{\text{APPL}} \), where it is introduced, the most natural way to account

\(^{18}\) Another view is that Accusative is intimately linked to Aspect and thus is checked against \( \text{Asp}^o \) (Kiparsky 1998, Svenonius 2002b, Kratzer 2004). I leave this possibility open. There are suggestions that \( \text{Asp}^o \) does not participate in checking Accusative in Russian (McDonald 2006).
for the unmarked order of the arguments is to assume that DO does not leave its first-merge position for case reasons.

Another piece of evidence comes from the so-called predicate cleft construction, exemplified in (63).

(63) Napisat’ stat’ju(-to) ja napisala.
write.INF article.ACC-(TO) I.NOM write.PST.FEM
‘As to writing the article, I DID write it.’

Predicate clefts are used in Russian to express contrastive topicalization of the event. We will discuss this construction in some detail later on in this thesis. For now, let us assume that it is derived by IS-driven vP movement (Abels 2001, Aboh and Dyakonova 2009). The most important thing for us here is the position of DO relative to the verb: it must precede the lower copy, if stranded (64a) but follow the higher one under fronting (64b vs. 63).

(64) a. Napisat’(-to) ja stat’ju napisala (?? stat’ju).
write.INF-(TO) I.NOM article.ACC write.PST.FEM
‘As to writing the article, I DID write it.’

b. *Sta’ju napisatj(-to) ja napisala.
article.ACC write.INF-(TO) I.NOM write.PST.FEM.SG

The object is always case-marked inside the fronted vP. This means that the object does not need to move overtly to get case-marked. Otherwise, we would expect sequences like (64b) to be acceptable.

To sum up, I assume that case checking in Russian does not require overt movement, but is done via long-distance Agree. This implies that overt movement, when it is attested, is initiated by some other factors.

2.3 Summary

In the present chapter, I considered the question of what the launching positions of IS-driven movements are in Russian.

First, I argued that, contrary to what is often assumed, the position of the verb in a neutral Russian sentence is best analyzed as being derived by movement to an aspectual projection dominating vP. This conclusion was drawn on the basis of the existing analyses of Russian aspecual prefixes. It was shown that the position of a verb relative to a low adverb, which is ADV > V, can be accounted for by allowing manner adverbs to attach to AspP hosting the verb.

Then we looked at the base positions of arguments. I argued that the order in which they are merged into the structure corresponds to S > IO > DO. S is introduced by v*, which dominates V"APPL introducing IO, which, in turn, dominates lexical VP containing DO. This analysis was shown to be superior to the one previously proposed by Bailyn (1995b).