In the present chapter we will raise some questions that are often discussed with respect to discourse configurational languages. They arise due to the necessity to formalize the mechanisms standing behind various surface orders.

It is widely assumed in Russian linguistics that the observed word order permutations result from real syntactic movement (King 1995, Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Bailyn 1995a, 2003, Sekerina 1997, Slioussar 2007)\(^\text{23}\). However, it is less clear what sort of movement operations bring about this structural diversity. In the previous chapter I have shown that the driving force for overt movement in Russian is pragmatics, namely the intricate interplay between D-linking and IS. This means that, if the movement operations are carried out in narrow syntax, they are triggered by discourse features, or Edge-type features, in Chomsky’s (2005b) terms. However, in previous studies it has been proposed that purely Edge-type features are insufficient to account for the word order variation in Russian (Lavine and Freidin 2002, Bailyn 2003, Slioussar 2007). Instead a subset of word orders is argued to be derived by purely formal, e.g. Agree-type, features. Thus the first question I would like to raise is:

Q1 What is the role of Agree-type and Edge-type features in the derivation of non-canonical word orders in Russian?

Whatever the answer to the first question is, pragmatics cannot be eliminated from the picture. Dedicated [Topic] and [Focus] features and the corresponding functional heads, Top\(^\text{b}\) and Foc\(^\text{b}\), were proposed for a number of languages displaying a strong IS-structure correlation (Bródy 1990, Kiss 1995, Svolaccia, Mereu and Puglielli 1995, Vilkuna 1995, Rizzi 1997, Puskas 1997, Benincà and Poletto 2004, Aboh 2004, Schwarz 2003, among others). Given that in Russian the structural effects of IS are quite obvious, it seems logical to assume that the displaced constituents target some dedicated IS-related projections in Russian as well. Therefore the next question is:

Q2 Are there dedicated positions for IS-driven movements in Russian?

The question is not trivial. At present, the majority of linguists working on Russian word order refute the existence of TopP and FocP (Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Sekerina 1997, Junghanns 2001, Pereltsvaig 2004, Slioussar 2007). Instead, the underlying assumption is that IS is largely a linear phenomenon, i.e. a moved constituent can occupy any syntactic position (mostly adjoining to other phrases) as long as the correct linear ordering of topic and focus is achieved in the end. I will review some of the existing analyses of this kind in this chapter.

\(^\text{23}\) A notable exception is Van Gelderen (2003), who argues for base generation of various word orders in Russian.
As shown in chapter three, apart from the IS ordering rule, the Scrambling Rule, sensitive to the referential properties, operates in the language. In case of topic and DNM, the IS Ordering Rule and the Scrambling Rule work in tandem. However, the two ordering principles work in different directions when it comes to Focus: the IS rule forces the focus to stay clause-finally, while the Scrambling Rule opens the possibility for it to occur in the pre-verbal field. Given this, another question that arises is:

Q3 To what extent is syntax involved in the observed interpretive nuances? In other words, are there various dedicated focus positions each with its specific properties (e.g. Contrastive/Exhaustive versus New Information)?

Any account of word order variation in Russian has to consider the systematicity of word order alternations, i.e. focus is clause-final, topic is sentence-initial, as well as the deviations from this systematic pattern, i.e. preposing of focus for D-linking.

In the present chapter we are going to see which progress has been made in understanding the phenomenon of word order variation in Russian and which answers, if any, have been suggested for the questions raised above.

4.1 What are the limits to IS, as the driving force of movement in Russian?

In this section we are going to deal with the first question raised above (Q1). Some of the main problems with IS-driven movement are its apparent optionality and the debatable status of Topic and Focus as grammatical features. Given that scrambling is problematic for Minimalism, which prohibits any optional operations, there are numerous attempts to substitute this operation by some well-established and better understood movement types. For instance, Miyagawa (1997) argues that one of the transformations in Japanese previously known as scrambling is, in fact, an alternative way to check case on the object. Similar attempts have been recently made for Russian.

4.1.1 Scrambling as EPP satisfaction

Bailyn (2003, 2004) proposes that a subset of word order permutations in Russian, previously described as IS-driven scrambling, is actually licensed by factors independent of IS. The author argues that OVS constructions are derived by movement of the object (or some other XP) to the canonical subject position, i.e. SpecTP. The movement is claimed to be triggered by a purely formal syntactic feature - [EPP].

EPP, or Extended Projection Principle, was originally formulated as a requirement that sentences have subjects (Chomsky 1982). More recently it was reconsidered and assumed to be a feature of a functional head (Chomsky 2001) or a special property of some formal feature of a functional head (Pesetsky and Torrego 2001) that is responsible for movement in narrow syntax. This means that [EPP] is not restricted to To anymore.

Bailyn (2003) assumes that the EPP is instantiated by a strong [D] feature on I^*. Due to its strength it has to be checked in a local Spec-Head configuration with an element bearing the matching feature. He adopts the idea that [D] on I^* can
be checked by any [D]-bearing constituent irrespective of its thematic role, i.e. not only by an external argument. On this basis Bailyn argues that OVS (1) and some other constructions with postposed grammatical subjects (2-3) are cases of [D] on \( \text{I}^o \) being checked by a “non-subject” XP. The author coins this type of [EPP], or [D], satisfaction, Inversion.

(1) Mašu obidel Oleg.
    Masha.ACC offend.PST.MASC Oleg.NOM
    ‘Oleg offended Maša.’

(2) U moi roditelej dom v Jalte.
    at my.GEN parents.GEN house.NOM in Yalta.LOC
    ‘My parents have a house in Yalta.’

(3) V komnatu vbežala devočka.
    to room.ACC run.PST.FEM girl.NOM
    ‘A girl ran into the room.’

The constructions in (1-3) are assumed to be derived in the following manner. First, [D] on \( \text{I}^o \) is dissociated from Case and Agreement. Therefore it can be checked not only by an element with which \( \text{I}^o \) enters into \( \phi \)-feature matching but by any XP that includes [D] into its feature complex. This is exactly what motivates XP movement in (1-3).

Following Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), the author assumes a dependency between Nominative case and Tense, whereby Nominative is the instantiation of uninterpretable [T] feature on DP. Since [T] is also a feature of \( \text{I}^o \) that requires checking, a nominative DP is a potential goal for this purpose. This means that in a canonical SVO sentence the subject does two things simultaneously: (i) checks [D] on \( \text{I}^o \), and (ii) checks [T] on \( \text{I}^o \). Under Inversion, the latter checking procedure fails since [T] on \( \text{I}^o \), according to Bailyn, is also strong in Russian. In order to save the derivation, V\(^{-}\)-to-I\(^{o}\) movement takes place, since the verb is another potential goal for [T] checking.

In this way the three properties of Inversion illustrated in (1-3) are derived, namely: (i) some XP is overtly fronted; (ii) V\(^{-}\)-to-I\(^{o}\) movement\(^{24}\) takes place; (iii) the subject remains in situ.

The author cannot dispense with IS-motivated movement altogether and still recognizes that the other type of movement to the clause-initial position is IS-driven. He labels this type of movement Dislocation, which is illustrated in (4).

(4) Mašu Oleg obidel.
    Masha.ACC Oleg.NOM offend.PST.MASC
    ‘Oleg offended Maša.’

\(^{24}\) According to Bailyn (1995b), the verb in Russian never leaves vP, except in Inversion constructions.
The latter is given considerably less attention and is discussed only in comparison to Inversion. However, as can be concluded from (4), Dislocation does not involve either non-canonical EPP satisfaction or V-movement. As a matter of fact, Dislocation is another name for what is usually referred to as Topicalization.

The derivation of Inversion versus Dislocation and their respective syntactic properties are summarized in (5).

\[(5)\]
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. Inversion} & \text{b. Dislocation} \\
\text{IP} & \text{IP} \\
\text{XP}_1 & \text{XP}_1 \\
\text{V^{o_1+v^{o_2}+I^{o}}_1} & \text{vP} \\
\text{S…t_v…t_i} & \text{S…V…t_i} \\
\end{array}\]

- accompanied by V-to-I movement  
- subject is in situ  
- changes Binding relations  
- no WCO effects

- no V-movement  
- subject is in SpecIP  
- no affect on Binding  
- induce WCO

Bailyn’s analysis was preceded by a similar analysis of Lavine and Freidin (2002). The authors also claim that [EPP] on I^o can be checked by a non-subject XP in Russian. Although they only discuss adversity impersonal constructions (6), their analysis can be naturally extended to OVS.  

\[(6)\] Urožaj pobilo gradom.

crop.ACC hit.PST.NEUT hail.INST

‘The crops got damaged by the hail.’

The arguments they provide in support of their account include the following: (i) the fronted XP can bind an anaphor within the argument left in situ; (ii) whichever of the two arguments is fronted does not affect IS of the sentence; (iii) no WCO is observed.

To sum up, in order to reconcile scrambling, at least partially, with the Minimalism, it is suggested that a subset of scrambling cases can find a purely formal syntactic motivation, such as EPP satisfaction.

4.1.2 Against Inversion in Russian

Analyses like those discussed above are bluntly criticized by Slioussar (2007). On a par with the previous authors, she treats EPP as a purely formal requirement, i.e. [EPP] is an Agree-type feature. However, she extensively argues that [EPP] on T^o in Russian can only be checked off by an external argument, or rather by the external argument.

Note that Lavine and Friedin (2002) do not analyse OVS as a case of non-canonical [EPP] checking. For them it is a genuine case of object scrambling to some higher, though A-type, position.
highest DP argument of the verb. This means that an external argument can never remain in situ. On this account, what looks like a postverbal subject is, in fact, a subject in its canonical SpecTP position crossed over by a remnant-moved chunk of the structure.

The motivation for her analysis comes from the following facts. First, Slioussar shows that no V-to-I movement that Bailyn (2003, 2004) proposes takes place in OVS. This is evidenced by the adverb placement test: if the verb always moves to T\textsuperscript{0} under Inversion, we expect it to be able to precede a manner adverb, which is definitely not the case, as shown in (7) (see also chapter two).

\begin{equation}
\text{(7) } \text{Ivana} \text{ sil'no udaril (?? sil'no) Nikolaj. }
\end{equation}

\begin{center}
Ivan.ACC strongly hit.PST.MASC Nickolaj.NOM
\end{center}

`Nickolaj strongly hit Ivan.'

Furthermore, on the basis of experimental data she casts some doubt on the putative difference in binding possibilities between Inversion and Dislocation. In particular, it is shown that Inversion and Dislocation are often indistinguishable in terms of reconstruction for binding. This significantly undermines Bailyn’s claim about the structural difference between the two operations.

The sample derivation proposed by Slioussar for an OAvdVS sentence is given in (8).

\begin{equation}
\text{(8) } \text{CP} \quad \text{[Slioussar 2007: 153]}
\end{equation}

As shown in (8), the whole chunk of structure below TP, in this case AdvP, is fronted to the outer SpecTP. From there, the object, which is in the outer SpecvP, undergoes movement to SpecCP. As a result the desired order is produced. All the movements, except for the subject movement, are IS-induced. Note that Slioussar
rejects Criterial Freezing. Therefore for her no problem arises with extraction of the object out of SpecTP position in (8).

The details of Slioussar’s analysis of scrambling will be discussed below. What is important for us at this point is that, according to the author, movement to SpecTP in Russian is argued to be obligatory and independent of any IS requirements.

4.1.3 How much of pragmatics, how much of syntax?
In the previous sections I outlined two analyses which, although in different ways, come to the same conclusion - movement to SpecTP in Russian is obligatory, triggered by the strong [EPP] feature on T0.

These analyses are of interest to us for the following reason. On the descriptive level, one of the operations altering the word order was referred to as S-postposing (chapter 3). According to the above-described analyses, structurally this operation can be either true postposing (à la Bailyn) or only apparent postposing (à la Slioussar).

There are two auxiliary questions that can help us to choose between the options discussed so far.

Bailyn’s approach is based on the idea that the fronted XP is in the canonical subject position. To adopt this view it is necessary to test the subjecthood properties of the fronted constituent. The exact position of the postposed subject is not crucial for his account, although the author assumes it is in situ.

Slioussar, on the other hand, builds her analysis on the hypothesis that the grammatical subject always moves to its canonical position in Russian. Thus in order to accept or reject her view it is necessary to find some evidence that the subject in OVS is not in its first-merge position. The exact landing site of the fronted object is of less importance for her.

In the following subsections I will consider these two questions in turn.

4.1.3.1 Are there oblique subjects in Russian?
The structures I am concerned with here are not only those with fronted objects and post-posed external arguments, such as (9a), but also those which are often argued to have oblique subjects (9b-d).

(9)

a. Košku prinesli deti.
cat.ACC bring.PST.PL kids.NOM
‘Children brought the cat.’

b. Mne nravjatsja koški.
I.DAT like.PRS.3PL cats.NOM
‘I like cats.’

c. Menja besjat alkogoliki.
I.ACC irritate.PRS.3PL alcoholics.NOM
‘Alcoholics irritate me.’
First, I would like to review Bailyn’s arguments in favor of the subjecthood of the fronted XP and then apply a couple of other subjecthood tests to strengthen the point.

One of the properties of Inversion pointed out by Bailyn is the lack of WCO effects. This is illustrated in (10).

(10) Každogo i rebenka ljubjat ego i roditeli.
    every child.ACC love.PRS.3PL his parents.NOM
    ‘His parents love every child.’

However, as has been noted on various occasions (King 1995, Ionin 2001), Russian does not exhibit WCO even in contexts of obvious A’-movements, e.g. wh-questions. According to my informants (as well as my native intuitions), (11) is grammatical on the variable reading of the pronoun.

(11) Kogo i nikogda ne bili ego i roditeli?
    who.ACC never NEG bit.PST.PL his parents.NOM
    ‘Who never got bitten by his parents?’

Since WCO effects in Russian do not show sharp contrast between A and A’-movement, using it as an argument for the subject status of the preposed constituents in (9) is misleading.

One of the assets of proponents of the non-canonical [EPP] checking approach is pragmatic neutrality of the orders in (9 b-d). While this is really so, it can be alternatively taken to show the base ordering of the arguments involved. As stated in chapter two, it is a common practice to use focus projection possibilities for this purpose. In other words, the constituent which is assumed to satisfy EPP in (9) is projected higher than the one carrying Nominative case. Note also that applying a what’s new?-test to sentences like (9b-d) is not possible. They all contain individual level predicates, and sentences with this predicate type cannot be used as thetics (Ladusaw 1994, Jäger 1997). Therefore, the sentences in (9b-d) exhibit the most common Topic-Comment articulation.

As to OVS (9a), the argument concerning pragmatic neutrality simply does not hold. This was shown in chapter three, where we discussed IS of various word orders, and is repeated again below. As shown in (12), SVO and OVS sentences cannot be used interchangeably.

(12) (Context: What happened?)
    a. Vladik razbil okno.
       Vladik.NOM break.PST.MASC window.ACC
b. # Okno razbil Vladik.
    window.ACC break.PST.MASC Vladik.NOM

‘Vladik broke the window.’

Another often employed argument for the SpecTP position of XPs in (9) is their ability to bind anaphors. It is a well-known fact about Russian that only grammatical subjects can bind a reflexive. As shown in (13), the accusative DP, as in (9c), seems to be a legitimate antecedent for a nominative reflexive.

(13) Antona ne interesujut svoi kollegi.
    Anton.ACC NEG interest.PRS.3PL REFL collegues.NOM

‘His collegues do not interest Anton.’

However, data like (13) should be considered carefully. As noted on several occasions in the literature (e.g. Rappaport 1986, Slioussar 2007), the reflexive svoj in Russian can have an arbitrary reference, when it means ‘one’s own/private’. Many of the examples drawn to illustrate binding possibilities of the fronted constituent can be interpreted in exactly this way. This is indicated by the fact that inverting the arguments in (13) does not rule the sentences out (contra Bailyn 2003, 2004), as one would expect if svoj were a commonplace anaphor.

(14) Svoi kollegi vovse ne interesujut Anton.
    REFL collegues.NOM totally NEG interest.PRS.3PL Anton.ACC

‘His collegues do not interest Anton at all.’

Where the arbitrary interpretation is more difficult to obtain the sentence is ungrammatical irrespective of the order of arguments, as in (15).

    REFL mother.NOM scold.PST.FEM Max.ACC

    Max.ACC scold.PST.FEM REFL mother.NOM

‘His mother scolded Max.’

Furthermore, if an adjunct containing a reflexive is added to the sentence, only the postposed nominative DP and not the fronted argument can be an antecedent.

---

26 For more discussion on binding possibilities of the fronted constituents in the considered constructions see Slioussar (2007: 162-179).
(16) Mne i ponravilas’ eta devuška iz-za svoej neposredstvennosti.
*I liked this girl because of her/*my spontaneity.*

(17) Olgu i uvolil načalnik iz-za svoej nastiness.
*Her boss sacked Olga because of his/*her nastiness.*

What we observed so far is the lack of strong evidence for the hypothesis about the surface subjecthood of the fronted XPs in XPVS constructions. If we apply other standard subjecthood tests (Zaenen, Mailing and Thráinsson 1985) to the relevant Russian data we get further evidence for the non-subject status of the fronted XP. I am going to illustrate the point using Control and Raising. The tests will be applied only to some of the constructions illustrated in (9). However, the same result can be obtained for all of them.

One of the properties associated with subjects is that they have a null counterpart, PRO, occurring in embedded infinitival clauses. This is illustrated for Russian in (18), where the missing argument of the predicate stat’ strojnee ‘become slimmer’ functions as the subject in the clause.

(18) Ivan i načal begat’, čtoby PRO i stat’ strojnee.
*Ivan started jogging in order to become slimmer.*

As shown by the following examples, the putative oblique subjects cannot be substituted by PRO within the infinitival. In (19) the Experiencer argument of the infinitive like cannot be a PRO. Similarly, in (20) the OVS construction cannot occur within the infinitival clause with PRO corresponding to the object.

(19) * Ivan, ne p’et vina, daby PRO, ne ponravit’ja alkogol’.
*Ivan does not drink wine not to start liking alcohol.*
Note that a nominative argument of experiencer verbs (e.g. *like*) which is usually postposed does show the discussed subject characteristics, as evidenced by (21). Here PRO stands for the nominative argument. In this respect (21) contrasts with (19).

(21) Olga i ponravilas’ Vladimiru prežde čem Olga.NOM like.PST.FEM Vladimir.DAT before PRO i ponravit’ja vsen ostal’nym. like.INF all.DAT rest.DAT
    ‘Vladimir got to like Olga, before everybody else got to like her.’

Another property associated with the grammatical subject is the ability to undergo Raising. Raising predicates are instantiated mostly by aspectual verbs in Russian, such as *načinat’* (begin), *prodolžat’* (continue), *zakančivat’* (finish), etc. An example is given in (22), where Raising is reflected in agreement between the raised subject and the matrix predicate.

(22) a. Varvara načala razgovarivat’. Varvara.NOM begin.PST.FEM talk.INF
    ‘Varvara began to talk.’

In the constructions under consideration, the preposed oblique argument is banned from undergoing Raising. As shown in the examples below, the matrix predicate agrees with the postposed nominative DP and not with the putative oblique subject.

(23) a. Ee načal*-a/-i razdražat’ moj she.ACC begin.PST-FEM/PL irritate.INF my.NOM repliki. comments.NOM
    ‘My comments began to irritate her.’

b. Bol’nogo načal*-o/-li naveščat’ rodstvenniki. patient.ACC begin.PST-MASC/PL visit.INF relatives.NOM
    ‘His relatives started to visit the patient.’

To sum up, testing the subject properties of the fronted constituents in XPVS constructions reveals that these fronted XPs fail to exhibit the typical subject behavior. At the same time, the postposed DP does pass all the subjecthood tests. On this basis, I conclude, in the spirit of Moore and Perlmutter (2000) and Slioussar (2007), that the one and the only subject in the constructions under consideration is the postverbal nominative DP. This implies that if SpecTP is a position dedicated
for subjects, it cannot host any other XP and that the fronted constituent in sentences discussed in this section necessarily occupies some other landing site.

One last remark is in order. In many analyses that treat OVS and the like as involving oblique subjects, the illustrated non-subject like behavior of the fronted XP is argued to follow from its case properties. Namely, only the argument which enters into φ-matching with T₀ is assumed to be able to exhibit all the required properties. However, as shown for Russian by Moore and Perlmutter (2000), the correlation between Case/Agreement and subjecthood does not hold. Russian does have a construction with a dative subject, wherein the dative argument exhibits all the subject characteristics.²⁷ These are infinitival clauses with overt subjects illustrated in (24).

(24) Emu ne polučt’ etu dolžnost’.
    he.DAT NEG get.INF this position.ACC
    ‘It is not possible for him to get this position.’

Thus the problem with the the discussed XPVS constructions is not the Agreement/Case properties of the fronted argument but rather its non-subject status. I therefore conclude that the trigger for movement of the non-subject constituent to the sentence-initial position in the constructions discussed in this section is not some formal feature of T₀.

4.1.3.2 What is the position of the clause-final subject?

Now that we have established that SpecTP in constructions with the postposed grammatical subject is not taken by the fronted constituent, there is a possibility that it hosts the subject itself, as proposed by Sliousar (2007).

To remind the reader, according to the author, [EPP] on T₀ in Russian is checked in exactly the same way as in English, i.e. either by moving the grammatical subject or by merging an expletive. Because there are no overt expletives in Russian, it is assumed to be null. Slioussar claims that an external argument, which is always Nominative in Russian, obligatorily moves to the SpecTP driven by [EPP]. The nominative argument of an unaccusative predicate is assumed to optionally raise to SpecTP, depending on topicality: only topical ones undergo the movement. If the argument is non-topical and remains in situ, an expletive is merged in SpecTP. The latter, i.e. the expletive strategy, is proposed to also hold for experiencer verbs (25) and adversity-impersonal constructions (26).

(25) Antonu nравитсja физика.
    Anton.DAT like.PRS.3SG Physics.NOM
    ‘Anton likes Physics.’

²⁷ The reader is referred to the original text (Moore and Perlmutter 2000) for the supporting evidence.
With respect to (25-26), Slioussar assumes that an expletive always satisfies [EPP] on T° in such constructions, and that argument raising is related to some independent reasons unclear to the author.

The detailed discussion of postverbal subjects is postponed till chapter five. Here I would like to raise some issues casting doubt on the described analysis.

First, it remains unclear to me why, given that [EPP] is a formal syntactic feature in Slioussar’s analysis, movement to SpecTP is sensitive to topicality of the argument in case of unaccusatives. Although the author draws a direct parallel between Russian and English Expl-V-S\textit{NOM} constructions, claiming that in both languages it is only attested with unaccusative verbs, I cannot agree with it. As stated in chapter three, S-postposing is not restricted to non-agentive subjects. Examples of postverbal subjects of unergatives were given earlier and I provide some more data below.

(27) (Context: Ivan was going along the corridor. He stopped in front of one door and opened it.)

a. V komnate spali deti.
   in room.LOC sleep.PST.PL children.NOM

b. # V komnate deti spali.
   in room.LOC children.NOM sleep.PST.PL

‘*There slept some children in the room.’

(28) (Context: It was a nice winter night. The silence was deafening.)

a. I vdrug zalajali sobaki.
   and suddenly bark.PST.PL dogs.NOM

b. # I vdrug sobaki zalajali.
   and suddenly dogs.NOM bark.PST.PL

‘*And suddenly there started barking dogs.’

The sentences in (27) and (28) are thetics, as shown by the preceding contexts. Both contain unergative predicates. And in both cases S-postposing produces the only possible felicitous output. The (b) variants are excluded in such contexts. Note that the English counterparts in the translations are ungrammatical. I conclude from this that agentivity of the subject does not presuppose raising to SpecTP in Russian.

Of course it is possible to suggest that the same derivation as suggested by Slioussar for O-Adv-V-S constructions shown in (8) and repeated in (29) is involved in the derivation of (27-28).
However, in this case it should be proven that (XP)VS sentences with unaccusative predicates are derived differently, i.e. with the help of a null expletive. There are no structural cues for such a derivation as the order of the elements in sentences with either unaccusative or unergative predicate is exactly the same. Compare (27-28) with (30).

(30)  V gorod prišla vesna.
     into city.ACC come.PST.FEM spring.NOM
     ‘There came spring into the city.’

Note furthermore that the requirements on VS structures in Russian are exactly the same for all types of predicates (i.e. unaccusative and unergative). Recall from chapter three that the subject can remain post-verbal only if (i) the subject is the only non-verbal constituent in the clause, or (ii) another constituent, if present, is fronted to the pre-verbal position. Transitive predicates always include another argument besides the subject. Since Russian lacks transitive expletive constructions an object is obligatorily fronted producing OVS. With intransitive predicates there is a possibility to get pure VS in the absence of any adverbial material. If there is an adjunct it necessarily precedes the verb. Thus the patterns we have are the following:

(31)   a. O V S
       b. * V O S
       c. (Adjunct) V S
       d. * V Adjunct S

A comment is necessary with respect to the pattern (31c). The acceptability of adjunct-less VS varies in Russian. However variability is not due to the type of the predicate (unaccusative/unergative), but rather due to the semantics of the verb. An unergative verb, e.g. *zvonit’ ‘phone’, can be used in VS without any problems (32). At the same time, verbs like spat’ ‘sleep’ or sidet’ ‘sit’ are not so easily used in VS constructions (33).

(32)  Zvonila kakaja-to devočka / Marina.
     phone.PST.FEM some girl.NOM Marina.NOM
     ‘Some girl / Marina phoned.’

(33)  ?? Sideli koški.
     sit.PST.PL cats.NOM
     ‘Cats were sitting.’

The same contrast can be observed with unaccusative verbs. The verb padat’ ‘fall’ sounds worse in the sentence-initial position than the verb priehat’ ‘arrive’. Compare (34) with (35).
On Slioussar’s model the contrast between (32) versus (33), and (34) versus (35) is unexpected. The ungrammaticality of (31b) and (31d) also remains unexplained. Why should the object/adjunct always front when the subject turns out in the clause-final position? Since (31a) and (31c), according to the author, are derived by IS-driven movement of the object/adjunct, it is not clear why it is obligatory in exactly these circumstances, while, generally, IS-driven scrambling is assumed to be optional.

The contrasts like those in (32 vs. 33) and (34 vs. 35) are attested crosslinguistically. The following examples are reported in Brunetti (2003).

(36) a. ?? Ha dormito il bambino.   b. Ha telefonato Gianni.
    has slept the child      has phoned Gianni
    ‘The child has slept.’       ‘Gianni has phoned.’

As in Russian, VS constructions are permitted in Italian. We see in (36) that, as in Russian, there is a contrast in acceptability within the same predicate type.

Brunetti (2003) attributes this difference to the fact that the semantics of the verb phone, as opposed to sleep, permits the event to be interpreted as spatio-temporally anchored even in the absence of an overt adverbial. In other words, Russian (32a) and Italian (36b) have the interpretation “somebody phoned you/me/our place, etc.” Thus V-initial sentences are licensed by a covert spatio-temporal argument. The more difficult it is to interpret the sentence as describing the situation related to a particular place or time, the less acceptable it is. This is exactly what happens in (33), (34), and (36a). The predicate in these sentences does not inherently imply location/time of an action. Therefore the spatio-temporal information must be overtly expressed.

I take this to be the right characterization and, following Brunetti (2003), I assume that the acceptability of VS in Russian does not depend on the type of the predicate. The ungrammaticality of (31d) follows naturally: if the covert spatio-temporal argument occupies the sentence-initial position in VS, its overt counterpart has to occur in the same position. Of course something else has to be said about (31b), because the presence of an overt adverbial does not improve the grammaticality, i.e. Adjunct-V-O-S is still not good.

The above discussion leads to the conclusion that post-posed subjects, both agentive and non-agentive, can occur in one and the same position. If the view that [EPP] on T° requires obligatory raising in Russian is to be maintained, we are forced to assume that all nominative arguments always move to SpecTP. ²⁸

This leads to another more general typological question. If it is true that grammatical subjects always raise in Russian, as they do in e.g. English, why is it the case that the same type of derivation as proposed for Russian cannot be

---

²⁸ The expletive strategy can be postulated for sentences without any nominative arguments, e.g. various impersonal constructions (e.g. (26) in the text).
employed by other languages. For instance, why does English not exhibit OVS constructions? In other words, how can we explain the fact that not all languages allow for postverbal subjects.

In this respect it is interesting to consider the following fact from Gungbe, which possesses a very finely structured left periphery shown in (37).

(37) \[
\text{[ForceP \text{[Force do [TopP [Top \text{yà [FocP [Foc wè ]]}]]]]]}
\]

Gungbe shows the Subject/object asymmetry with respect to focus encoding (Aboh 2007b). An object \textit{wh}-question triggers an answer in which the focused object either remains in situ (38a) or moves to the left periphery where it is followed by the focus marker \textit{wè} (38b). Subject questions, on the other hand, do not allow for an answer without the focus particle (39a), which means that the focused subject is always in the CP domain.

(38) (Context: What did Kofi eat?)
   Kofi eat rice   rice FOC Kofi eat
   ‘Kofi ate RICE.’   ‘Kofi ate RICE.’

(39) (Context: Who ate rice?)
   Kofi eat rice   Kofi FOC eat rice
   ‘KOFI ate rice.’   ‘KOFI ate rice.’

[Aboh 2007b: 97]

The asymmetry observed in (38-39) is explained by Aboh (2007b) as indicating that the subject has an IS-independent reason to front, namely checking [EPP] on \(T^0\), which is strong in Gungbe. The object can stay low under focusing, satisfying [Foc] in some other way, since [EPP] on \(T^0\) can only be checked by the subject in this language.

It follows from this description that the [EPP] in Gungbe is checked in the same way as in Russian, i.e. only the subject can do the job. However, the fact that the focused subject in Gungbe is not in SpecTP indicates that the EPP requirement can be obviated if necessary. Aboh proposes that the obviation is achieved in Gungbe by merging a null \textit{pro} expletive. Recall that Slioussar also assumes the existence of null expletives in Russian. This leads to a question – Why focused subjects in Russian can stay in SpecTP, even though the [EPP] on \(T^0\) can be checked by an expletive, while a focused Gungbe subject cannot and must obligatorily resort to the expletive strategy?

I propose that the difference between Russian and Gungbe does not stem from the ability of a focused subject to stay in SpecTP. I assume that in both languages the EPP is checked by a null expletive under subject focusing. The difference is in the position of the focused subject: in Gungbe it moves to the left-periphery while in Russian it does not. In chapter five I argue that Russian contains a low FocP where a focused constituent must move to check its [Focus] feature. That is why a focused subject ends up post-verbally in Russian. Once moved to
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SpecFocP, it freezes in place, due to Criterial Freezing (Rizzi 2001a). As a result the [EPP] is checked by a null expletive. As shown in chapter two, case- and φ- feature checking can take place at a distance in Russian. Therefore, leaving the subject low does not harm Agreement with the verb and Nominative checking. In Gungbe this cannot happen. The reason for this is not so much unavailability of low FocP in Gungbe, but rather the way agreement and case checking works in the language. Aboh (2007b) argues that due to the impoverished Case and Agreement system of Gungbe, the expletive in SpecTP must be controlled by the subject in SpecFocP. I take this to mean that Gungbe, unlike Russian, does not freely allow long-distance Agree. In fact, in his earlier work Aboh (2004) shows that most features are checked via movement, in the Spec-Head configuration, in Gungbe. Therefore, I ascribe the difference between languages with and without VS inversion to the way Agree-type features are checked. Criterial, or Edge-features, are assumed to be checked in the same way across languages. Those languages where Agree-feature checking does not require a local configuration of the probe and the goal are expected to allow for VS inversion. On the other hand, those languages where long-distance Agree is very restricted or impossible are assumed to lack VS.

4.2 How and where do things scramble?

In the preceding section we have established that IS-driven scrambling cannot be dispensed with. Apart from movements driven by formal-feature checking, e.g. [EPP], there are constructions resulting from IS-driven operations. In the present section we are going to consider how these various IS-motivated transformations have been analyzed in literature. In other words, we will take up questions 2 and 3 from the introduction to this chapter.

In the majority of existing analyses of Russian free word order the idea of dedicated IS projections is explicitly rejected (Bailyn 1995a, Kondrashova 1996, Sekerina 1997, Junghanns 2001, Pereltsvaig 2004, Slioussar 2007). By and large, in analyses of this type various orderings are assumed to be freely generated by adjunction or movement to outer specifiers of various functional projections. I will refer to these approaches as “non-cartographic”. Within the non-cartographic branch, there are two types of analyses: those that view IS as a separate module of grammar and those that take it to be parasitic on PF. There is only one analysis in which a “dedicated position” view is taken (King 1995). I will refer to this analysis as “cartographic-like”. Let us discuss the different analyses in turn.

4.2.1 Cartographic-like approach: King (1995)

King (1995) is the closest to the cartographic way of dealing with the syntax-IS interface (Rizzi 1997). According to the author, Topic and Focus are syntactically represented in the form of dedicated positions. King, however, differs from the classical cartography in that she does not make use of FocP or TopP. She claims that certain positions in the tree are used first and foremost to encode IS rather than some formal properties. The structure she advocates is represented in (40).
Discourse neutral elements

King recognizes a tripartite structuring of a sentence into Topic, Focus, and DNM. DNM is argued to usually include the verb and other non-focal postverbal elements. Two types of Topic and two types of Focus are established on the basis of their interpretation and syntactic position: External (TOP_{Ext}) versus Internal (TOP_{Int}) Topic, and New Information (NIF) versus Contrastive (CF) Focus.

As shown in (40), movement out of the VP results in a specific IS interpretation of the element depending on its landing site. In-situ constituents are usually interpreted as discourse-neutral. Note, however, that an IS-motivation for movement is proposed only for arguments or adjuncts. The predicate is assumed to always undergo V"'-to-I' movement independently of its interpretation.

TOP_{Ext} is argued not to involve any movement. It is base generated in E, a special projection used solely for introducing TOP_{Ext}.29

The other two dedicated IS positions are derived by movement: SpecIP and adjunction to IP. TOP_{Int} is argued to be adjoined to IP. Due to the adjunction configuration, multiple TOP_{Int} are allowed. Note that what King treats as multiple TOP_{Int} are treated as DNM in this thesis, since on my account only one Topic per clause is allowed. The position of TOP_{Int} is decided on the basis of the following distributional facts: (i) TOP_{Int} is always pre-verbal; (ii) TOP_{Int} always follows a wh-word moved to SpecCP; (iii) TOP_{Int} always precedes CF.

29 An example of TOP_{Ext} is given in (i).

(i) Lena, ona takaja zanuda.
    Lena.NOM she.NOM such bore.NOM
    ‘Lena, she is such a bore.’

The resumption of the dislocated constituent clause-internally is quite common but not strictly necessary. TOP_{Ext} is a matrix-clause phenomenon. Besides it is always phonologically set off from the rest of the sentence and is subject to the uniqueness requirement, i.e. it is limited to one per sentence. These properties made King conclude that TOP_{Ext} is introduced by “an anomalous projection”, which does not conform to the X'-schema, in that it does not contain either the Head or the Specifier.
Similar distributional facts are provided in favor of the idea that CF is located in SpecIP: (i) it is usually immediately pre-verbal; (ii) it always follows $\text{TOP}_{\text{int}}$.

The only IS constituent that does not have a dedicated place, according to King, is NIF. NIF is not restricted to any specific position. She does not associate it directly with the VP-domain since VP is argued to host DNM. The author proposes that NIF can be assigned to any constituent in situ; by associating it with $[+F]$ feature demarcating the scope of NIF on the left and the final falling tone delimiting its scope on the right. In other words, NIF results from the combination of syntactic ($[+F]$ assignment) and intonational means. There is only one exception: when NIF follows DNM assumed to be inside the VP. In such cases NIF is argued to be right-adjoined to VP. This type of derivation takes place, for instance, “when the subject is the only focus and must appear in final position after the verb and the object; this right-adjunction may extend to other arguments” (King 1995: 133). An example of such a sentence is given in (41).

(41) (Context: Who bought a dress?)
Kupil' a plat’e Inna.
buy.PST.FEM dress.ACC Inna.NOM
‘It was Inna who bought a dress.’

To sum up, despite the fact that there are no TopP and FocP postulated, King’s analysis is very close to the recent cartographic approaches in that each position is associated with a well-defined IS interpretation: SpecIP is restricted to CF, adjunction to IP is limited to $\text{TOP}_{\text{int}}$, EP to $\text{TOP}_{\text{ext}}$, and right adjunction to VP encodes NIF (in some special cases).

4.2.2 IS-interface oriented non-cartographic approaches

Non-cartographic approaches, in general, reject the idea of dedicated IS-related positions. The main premise of this type of analyses is that Topic and Focus are linear, or edge-oriented, rather than position-oriented phenomena.

Most of the existing analyses of Russian scrambling are of the IS-interface oriented type. Interestingly, their proponents recognize the existence of syntactic [Focus] and [Topic] features which are freely assigned to syntactic constituents (Bailyn 1995a, Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Kondrashova 1996, Junghanns 2001). But importantly, these features are not checked in the usual way. They rather require some licensing, in a loose sense of the word, and expression, e.g. via stress. The distinguishing feature of this approach is that narrow syntax is argued to produce structures which accidentally reflect IS organization of the sentence. One analysis that stands out among the IS-oriented ones is Slioussar (2007). Not only does she reject the existence of [Focus] and [Topic] features, she further claims that the notions relevant for the analysis of Russian word order are not Topic and Focus, but rather relative accessibility and salience. I will discuss her approach in some detail in the following subsection.

The underlying assumption of all the authors working within this approach is that scrambling ensures a closer match between syntax and the interpretive module at which sentences are subject to IS partition (Functional Form in Bailyn’s
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terms, IS according to Kondrashova). This module orders the information according to a Topic > Focus template. In order to account for focus preposing various proposals have been made.

Bailyn (1995a) assumes that focus does not have any dedicated position at all. Rightmost placement is just one of the ways to encode it, but it can also be encoded purely phonologically, by means of heavy stress. He refutes the idea about the obligatorily contrastive nature of preposed foci, as I do in this work.

Junghanns and Zybatow (1997) postulate a special feature [CF], which is assigned to contrastively focused constituents which can be either in situ or in some derived position. They further assume that moved foci are obligatorily narrow and contrastive. Note that no motivation for the movement of the focused element is proposed either by Bailyn or by Junghanns and Zybatow.

Kondrashova (1996) argues that focus movement, as well as movement of topical elements, occurs in order to stop Focus projection. Her argumentation is the following: scrambling is adjunction, and adjunction blocks projection to higher levels. Thus according to Kondrashova the feature that drives focus movement can be defined as [+ Narrow].

To recap, IS-oriented non-cartographic analyses are based on the idea that IS can be visible to syntax through corresponding features [Topic]/[Focus]/[CF]. These are freely assigned in course of the derivation and syntactic movement-plus-adjunction takes place to organize the constituents in such a way that Topic-Focus ordering of information is obtained.

In the next section, I am discussing in some more detail the most recent analysis of this type (Slioussar 2007). It deserves some special attention because certain assumptions are very close to those proposed earlier in this work.

4.2.2.1 Slioussar (2007): from Topic/Focus to accessibility

Slioussar (2007) deviates from the traditional conception that scrambling is motivated by Focus structure. It is extensively argued that Topic and Focus are not grammatical notions at all. Rather, they are taken to be relegated completely to the general conceptual system. What grammar encodes, according to the author, are relational notions Accessibility and Salience, which according to her, are IS phenomena.

Accessibility and Salience are rather tentatively defined within the activation network framework. More accessible entities are those which possess the higher amount of activation on them before the sentence is produced. Saliency reflects the difference in the amount of activation each entity possesses before and after the sentence is produced. As noted by the author, “in most cases there is a negative correlation between Accessibility and Salience: the least accessible (‘new’) units acquire more activation than the ones that were already active above the resting level (‘given’). I will assume that A cannot be both more accessible and more salient than B” (Slioussar 2007:10).

30 Junghanns (2001) explicitly rejects the existence of a separate IS module and states that “focus and background are encoded by means of sentence grammar” (Junghanns 2001: 330).
As already mentioned, the author argues that grammar encodes the relation between elements with respect to Accessibility and Salience, i.e. more or less accessible/salient. Both distinctions are encoded in narrow syntax on the basis of the following interface rule:

\[(42) \text{If } X \text{ is (re)merged above } Y, \text{ the discourse entity corresponding to } X \text{ is at least as accessible and at most as salient as the one corresponding to } Y. \text{ If there are no independent reasons to remerge } X \text{ above } Y, \text{ the discourse entity corresponding to } X \text{ is more accessible and less salient than the one corresponding to } Y.\]

[Slioussar 2007: 31]

Importantly, Salience and Accessibility are assumed to be only indirectly related to the conceptual notions Topic and Focus. To put it simply, Accessibility and Salience are encoded within Topic and Focus as well. Slioussar illustrates this with the following example.

\[(43) \text{(Context: What are you doing?)} \]
\[\text{pišu pis’mo mame.} \]
\[\text{write.PRS.1SG letter.ACC mother.DAT} \]
\[\text{‘I am writing a letter to my mother.’} \]

In (43) the entire sentence corresponds to Focus. The basic word order for a sentence with a ditransitive verb is V > IO > DO. This is the order we expect in (43). However this is not what we find in (43). Slioussar assumes that the order of internal arguments in (43) is derived by scrambling the DO over the IO. This happens because DO “appears to be more ‘predictable’, i.e. it is more accessible out of the two entities (apparently, the concept of writing ‘preactivates’ the concept ‘letter’ through semantic connection)” (Slioussar 2007: 14).

From the theoretical point of view, scrambling is viewed as a free IS-motivated \[31\] Internal Merge, i.e. movement. She builds on the latest ideas of Chomsky (2005b) outlined in section 1.3.1. In particular, Slioussar assumes that Edge-motivated Internal Merge is entirely position-free. It can target an outer specifier \[32\] of any functional projection if it is necessary to derive a certain word order.

To account for the variety of permutations, the author resorts to massive pied-piping. Contrary to some previous approaches, Slioussar’s analysis is based on the antisymmetry hypothesis (Kayne 1994), i.e. all movements are strictly leftward.

Slioussar recognizes the relation between scrambling and prosody. IS-driven movement has some prosodic effects. However, prosody is considered to be independent of syntax and is assumed to be directly read off the syntactic configuration. Therefore, it is not the interface with PF but the interface with IS that triggers scrambling. Stress is assumed to be assigned on the basis of the Nuclear

\[31\] Notice that IS here is meant to denote the relative Accessibility/Salience, not Topic/Focus.

\[32\] Following Chomsky, Slioussar assumes multiple-specifier structures.
Stress Rule (NSR), after all the Agree- and IS-motivated movements are carried out. Prosody, according to Sloussar, helps to differentiate IS-motivated from Agree-motivated Internal Merge: when an element undergoes IS-driven movement sentential stress is calculated on the basis of its landing site, while under Agree-motivated movement stress is inherited from the launching position.

4.2.3 PF-oriented approaches

The underlying assumption of this type of analyses is that Topic and Focus are PF-related notions in that they are directly derived from prosody, e.g. stress = Focus. There are two analyses of this type, and each applies this assumption in quite a different way.

Sekerina (1997), following Reinhart (1995), proposes that scrambling in Russian is motivated by stress. The latter is assumed to reflect the Focus structure. To be more precise, it is argued that constituents move (in narrow syntax) due to a [-S(entential) S(tress)] feature they carry. [-SS] is a strong feature, i.e. it requires overt movement. It can be assigned to any number of elements and forces an element to leave its base position not to be included into the Focus domain. The moved phrases adjoin to IP or VP. The adjunction is assumed to be bidirectional. Sekerina follows Junghanns and Zybatow (1997) and Bailyn (1995a) and treats postverbal focal subjects as being right-adjointed to VP. The most deeply embedded element inside the Focus domain, i.e. inside VP, is assigned [+SS] which is instantiated by the main sentential stress at PF. On the basis of this feature, the Focus of the sentence is assigned and can percolate up. The percolation line is broken by adjoined phrases, which means that movement always precludes Focus projection.

Apart from [-SS] and [+SS], Sekerina introduces another independent PF feature [Constituent Stress]. The latter is independent of scrambling and can be assigned to any element in situ or after [-SS] triggered movement. As the name suggests, it is assigned to narrowly focused constituents, contrastive and non-contrastive alike. It has only a prosodic correlate, namely heavy stress: no syntax is involved.

Another PF-based account is worked out by Van Gelderen (2003). This account differs drastically from what has been proposed for Russian scrambling to date. What unifies her account with Sekerina’s is that she also derives IS effects directly from PF. However, unlike the previous author, she largely rejects the role of syntax in the derivation of various non-canonical orders. Van Gelderen’s analysis is based on the idea that structure-building is purely an LF requirement. PF can easily handle unstructured chunks of elements and linearize them in accordance with its own rules. Because IS is derived directly from stress, or generally accentuation, it is included in the inventory of these PF rules. Whether the linearization is carried out on the basis of a hierarchical structure or on the basis of IS depends on the timing of Spell-Out, the point in the derivation when the syntactic object is sent to PF.

Assuming Derivation by Phase (Chomsky 2001), the author argues that Spell-Out proceeds exclusively by phase. Two such phases are recognized by the author: CP and DP. If Spell-Out happens at DP, i.e. Early Spell-Out, what reaches PF is an unordered set of objects. If it occurs at CP, Late Spell-Out, PF gets a
hierarchically ordered structure. Consequently, under Early Spell-Out, linearization is based on IS language specific rules. Under Late Spell-Out, linearization proceeds in a universal fashion, i.e. on the basis of asymmetric c-command (Kayne 1994). The parameter that allows for Early Spell-Out is tentatively assumed to be Case, namely the ability of a noun to check case DP-internally.

With respect to Russian scrambling, Van Gelderen proposes that it is, by and large, a result of Early Spell Out. In particular, she argues that the orders OSV, OVS, VOS, and VSO are always conditioned by Early Spell-Out. As a consequence, Focus projection is not allowed in these constructions, since projection requires structure. SVO, SOV, and O,SV are produced either by Early or Late Spell-Out.34 Thus only three orders, namely SVO, SOV, and O,SV, are derived via syntactic movement. The rest of the orderings are base generated at PF.

The rules, which according to Van Gelderen, govern the order of constituents under Early Spell-Out, are given in (44) and (45) below.

(44) **IS Informational Focus Algorithm**

a) Assign informational focus pitch to element bearing [+F] feature (prosodic step)

b) Compose in such a way that the informational focus element appears in the rightmost position (linear (re)-ordering step)

[Van Gelderen 2003: 59]

(45) **IS Contrastive Focus Algorithm**

Assign contrastive focus pitch to element bearing [+CF] feature (prosodic step)

[Van Gelderen 2003: 60]

The consequence of (44) and (45) is that NIF is always a rightmost constituent in a sentence, and CF has no designated position.

As noted above, three orders (SVO, SOV, O,SV) are assumed to result from syntactic processes. The syntactic movement responsible for SOV and O,SV is assumed to be a phonologically driven syntactic movement of the type proposed in Sekerina (1997), which means it happens in syntax but is motivated by the correct stress assignment.

To recap, PF-oriented approaches argue that scrambling in Russian is motivated by PF rules, such as stress assignment. Syntax is assumed to be directly manipulated by PF producing various word orders. Or else, transformations are argued to take place at PF.

---

33 The difference between OSV and O,SV is assumed to be prosodic. O,SV has a pause after the preposed object, which is indicated by the comma. From the IS point of view, in O,SV the object is assumed to be a contrastive topic, and in OSV it is an ordinary non-contrastive topic.

34 See the original work for the argumentation.
As we have seen above, in none of the existing analyses IS-related functional heads, Top⁰ or Foc⁰, are recognized. Therefore the answer to the question about the existence of dedicated IS-related positions in narrow syntax (Q2) has received a negative answer. Although various IS-related features are recognized, e.g. [+CF], [+F], [+Narrow], etc., those are treated largely as PF features regulating stress assignment. Thus the answer to the question about the relevancy of focus typology (Q3) has a partially positive answer. In particular, different foci are argued to possess distinct features and involve distinct derivational mechanisms. But these features and mechanisms are assumed to be of post-syntactic nature.

Although the reviewed approaches do not recognized narrow syntax as the locus of IS encoding, very few motivations for rejecting Top⁰ or Foc⁰ are presented, apart from assuming that in this way structural complexity is reduced. The only exception is Pereltsvaig (2004), who provides some arguments in favor of the linear approach to IS encoding in Russian.

The author argues on the basis of the data given in (46) that a topic can occur in different structural positions in Russian. The sentences in (46), according to Pereltsvaig, illustrate Topicalization of a nominal predicate. Nominal predicates in Russian can either agree with the subject, i.e. occur in the Nominative case, or they can be marked Instrumental. As shown in (46a), Topicalization of the nominative predicate marginalizes anaphor binding by the subject, while (46b) indicates that binding relations between the subject and the anaphor within the preposed instrumental predicate remain unchanged.

(46) a. ? Zlejšie vragi [drug druga], byli evil.SUPER.NOM enemies.NOM each other.GEN COP.PST.PL [Ol’ga i Irina], Olga.NOM and Irina.NOM

b. Zlejšimi vragami [drug druga], byli evil.SUPER.INST enemies.INST each other.GEN COP.PST.PL [Ol’ga i Irina], Olga.NOM and Irina.NOM

‘The worst enemies of each other were Olga and Irina.’

Based on the variability in binding (46), Pereltsvaig concludes that the nominative predicate topic in (46a) is in an A-position, while the instrumental topic in (46b) is in an A’-position. Therefore, the author concludes that a topic does not always occupy the same syntactic slot in Russian, which undermines the existence of a dedicated TopP.

Pereltsvaig’s explanation perhaps might hold if it really was the case that the inverted predicates in (46) undergo Topicalization. However, as shown by Den

---

35 Pereltsvaig (2004) gives a star to examples like (46a). According to my judgments and the judgments of my informants it is slightly deviant rather than strongly ungrammatical.
Dikken (2006), predicate inversions of the type given in (46) might have another IS-independent motivation. He analyzes predicate inversion in copular constructions as A-movement of the predicate around its subject. His analysis is based on the following facts: (i) the inverted predicate can undergo Raising under passivization and in Raising constructions, and (ii) extraction of/from the subject of the inverted predicate is banned. The latter property is explained by Strong Cross Over: the trace of an extracted subject in an inverted construction is bound by the coindexed element in an A-position, which is the predicate.

Interestingly, in neither of the examples in (46) subject extraction is allowed under predicate inversion. This is shown in (47).

\begin{align*}
\text{(47) a. } & \text{Kto}_0 \text{ ty hoče če \acute{s} toby zle\v{s}ie} \\
& \text{who.NOM you.NOM want.PRS.3SG that.SUBJ evil.SUPER.NOM} \\
& \text{vragi drug druga byli t?} \\
& \text{enemies.NOM each other.GEN COP.PST.PL} \\

\text{b. } & \text{Kto}_0 \text{ ty hoče če \acute{s} toby zle\v{s}imi} \\
& \text{who.NOM you.NOM want.PRS.3SG that.SUBJ evil.SUPER.INST} \\
& \text{vragami drug druga byli t?} \\
& \text{enemies.INST each other.GEN COP.PST.PL} \\

\text{\* Who do you want the worst enemies of each other to be?'}
\end{align*}

If we consider Raising, e.g. under passivization, it is only applicable to sentences with instrumental predicates both in inverted (48) and non-inverted contexts (49).

\begin{align*}
\text{(48) a. } & \text{Zle\v{s}ie vragi byli} \\
& \text{evil.SUPER.NOM enemies.NOM COP.PST.PL} \\
& \text{ob\textsuperscript{\textacutes}javleny Ol'ga i Irina.} \\
& \text{proclaimed.PST.PART Olga.NOM and Irina.NOM} \\

\text{b. } & \text{Zle\v{s}imi vragimi byli} \\
& \text{evil.SUPER.INST enemies.INST COP.PST.PL} \\
& \text{ob\textsuperscript{\textacutes}javleny Ol'ga i Irina.} \\
& \text{proclaimed.PST.PART Olga.NOM and Irina.NOM} \\

\text{\* The worst enemies were proclaimed to be Olga and Irina.} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(49) a. } & \text{Ol'ga i Irina byli ob\textsuperscript{\textacutes}javleny} \\
& \text{Olga.NOM and Irina.NOM COP.PST.PL proclaimed.PST.PART} \\
& \text{zle\v{s}ie vragi.} \\
& \text{evil.SUPER.NOM enemies.NOM}
\end{align*}
Olga.NOM and Irina.NOM COP.PST.PL proclaimed.PST.PART zlešśi mi vragi mi.

‘Olga and Irina were proclaimed the worst enemies.’

In (48a) the inverted nominative predicate is shown not to be able to raise under passivization. But (49a) shows that the subject in sentences without inversion cannot do this either. The contrast between (48a) versus (48b), and (49a) versus (49b) is evidence of the fundamental difference between the derivation of a copular construction with a nominative predicate and the derivation of that with an instrumental predicate.

The data provided in (47-49) show that the contrast (note - a mild contrast!) in (46) might have nothing to do with the landing site of the inverted predicate, namely A in (46a) versus A’ in (46b). I am not entirely sure that the movement we observe is Topicalization at all. If it is not, (46) does not represent an argument against the existence of TopP in Russian.

Note that binding, which is often used in order to determine A- versus A’-positions, does not always provide a clear picture in Russian. This will be discussed in some detail below (see also Sloussar 2007: chapter 4).

The arguments against the existence of FocP are even less convincing. The only argument provided repeatedly is the freedom of contrastive focus placement. The fact that new information focus is consistently clause-final is disregarded as a solid ground for recognizing FocP. Instead, the position is often explained by right adjunction (King 1995, Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Bailyn 1995a, Sekerina 1997). An immediate prediction of such an analysis is that Focus projection should be impossible, for adjunction should cut the projection line. However, as we saw in chapter three, focused subjects occurring post-verbally do not preclude wide Focus reading. An example is repeated in (50).

(50) (What happened to the picture collection?)
Odnu kartinu [priobrel častnyj kolekcioner] Focus.

‘One of the pictures a private collector has bought.’

The fact that a postverbal focused subject can form part of a wide Focus, just as a postverbal focused object, favors an analysis which would analyze both cases in a uniform way. However, in the analyses discussed above object and subject foci are treated differently.

Another problem for these analyses is that focus preposing is assumed to be some kind of disambiguating strategy to ensure narrow Focus reading (Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Kondrashova 1996, Sekerina 1997). I showed in chapter three that a preposed focus does not block projection. Therefore explanations in terms of [-Sentential Stress] feature (Sekerina 1997) or unmerged structures (Van Gelderen 2003) cannot be maintained.
For some analyses that assume an ‘anywhere’ condition for focus (at least for CF), such as Bailyn (1995a) and Junghanns and Zybatow (1997), it remains a mystery what drives scrambling of the corresponding element after all. If [+CF] can be assigned it situ there should be some independent reason for movement.

Note that IS features in one form or another (e.g. [F], [CF]) are nevertheless postulated. Furthermore transformations are argued to take place in syntax. At the same time, movement and the postulated features are not directly related, i.e. the movement is not a response to feature-checking. Bailyn (1995a), Kondrashova (1996), and Sekerina (1997) argue that [+F] or [+CF] are not syntactic features at all, but are rather assigned after Spell-Out at some special IS interface level. This creates a problem: how can these features be visible in syntax, such that syntax ‘knows’ where to move the corresponding elements? Besides treating IS features as post-syntactic clearly violates Inclusiveness. IS has both LF and PF reflexes. If [Focus] and [Topic] are assigned at IS/LF it is not clear how PF can interpret them, and they are PF-interpretable.

To avoid this problem, Junghanns and Zybatow (1997) and Junghanns (2001) consider [Focus] and [Topic] to be syntactic features. However, it remains a mystery how syntax is dealing with them. They are assumed not to be checked, or enter any sort of Spec-Head relation with a dedicated head, because no dedicated heads are recognized.

Considering scrambling to be PF-motivated is similarly problematic. First of all, as argued extensively in Chomsky (2001) phonological operations are semantically vacuous, i.e. they should not have an interpretive effect. However, the proposed phonological features [-Sentential Stress]/[+Sentential Stress]/[Constituent Stress] (Sekerina 1997) or [F]/[CF] (Van Gelderen 2003) do exactly what they are not supposed to do - affect the interpretation. On a more conceptual level, features like [F], [CF], and the like are arguably not PF features at all. As argued in Slioussar (2007), it might be essentially wrong to assimilate Focus to stress. Topic and Focus are notions which are crucial for interpretation, i.e. they feed the Conceptual-Intentional system. Stress, on the other hand, is a matter of the Sensory-Motor system. If Focus is derived directly from stress it means that the Conceptual-Intentional system has direct access to sound strings and related information. But if that were the case “grammar as a form-meaning pairing device would not be necessary” (Slioussar 2007: 78).

4.2.4.1 Slioussar’s (2007) model as compared to the present proposal

The ideas presented in Slioussar’s (2007) work are similar to a certain extent to those defended in this thesis. Therefore, I would like to assess her work separately in order to show where our views diverge.

I consider Slioussar’s analysis the most attractive one of those discussed above for the following reasons. First of all, her model respects the general principles of the theory. Namely, she does not resort to any cross-interface mapping rules that would allow a direct PF ↔ LF access. PF and LF effects of scrambling are directly read off the syntactic representation. Second, what makes her approach quite different from all the others and compatible with the present work is the fact that she changes the perspective on the trigger of scrambling and underlines the role of accessibility in accounting for various word order permutations. This is a
desirable move, because we have seen in chapter three that some of the movement operations are related not to IS encoding but to encoding of the referential givenness.

Although I agree with the author that accessibility is important to account for scrambling in Russian, I consider substitution of Topic/Focus with Accessibility/Salience, respectively, to be incorrect. I argued above that givenness/newness (Slioussar’s Accessibility/Salience) are not IS notions at all. They are phenomena of a different level. An element can be inherently given, e.g. a pronoun. However, accessibility does not presuppose the IS status, i.e. a pronoun can be a topic as well as a focus.

As to saliency, it is quite a confusing notion to include it into the grammatical inventory. Something can be salient but still accessible, as generally is the case with contrastive Topic/Focus. For instance, in (51) the fronted IOs can be said to be accessible via the set relation to the entity figuring in the question (your department), but salient as compared to the subject referent (your boss/Sergey Sergeevich).

(51) (Context: How did your boss reward your department for the good performance?)

\[
\text{Načal’niku otdela} \quad \text{Sergej Sergeevič}
\]

\[
\text{head.DAT} \quad \text{department.GEN} \quad \text{Sergey Sergeevich.NOM}
\]

\[
\text{podpisal} \quad \text{povyšenie, a} \quad \text{ostal’nym} \quad \text{on}
\]

\[
\text{sign.PST.MASC} \quad \text{promotion.ACC} \quad \text{and rest.DAT.PL} \quad \text{he.NOM}
\]

\[
\text{naznacil} \quad \text{premi} \quad \text{award.PST.MASC} \quad \text{bonuses.ACC}
\]

‘Sergey Sergeevich signed the promotion for the Department Head and gave bonuses to the rest.’

In fact, sentences like (51) present a problem for Slioussar’s principle of free Edge-motivated Internal Merge, repeated below.

(52) If X is (re)merged above Y, the discourse entity corresponding to X is at least as accessible and at most as salient as the one corresponding to Y. If there are no independent reasons to remerge X above Y, the discourse entity corresponding to X is more accessible and less salient than the one corresponding to Y.

According to (52) the rightmost and the leftmost constituents in a sentence with IS-motivated Internal Merge are interpreted as the most salient and the most accessible respectively. Now let us consider (51) again. Movement of the IOs to the clause-initial position is, what Slioussar calls, free Internal Merge, because it is not triggered by any Agree-type feature. According to the rule in (52), the IOs, \text{načal’niku otdela} ‘Department Head’ and \text{ostal’ny} ‘the rest’, must be more accessible and less salient than \text{S}, Sergey Sergeević. However, the context does not support such a conclusion. Using the author’s definition of accessibility and salience, the amount of activation on the unit referring to the boss is certainly greater than on the units referring to the colleagues, e.g. \text{načal’niku otdela} ‘Department Head’. Therefore the constituent encoding this discourse referent,
namely Sergey Sergeevič, is expected to be more accessible than the rest of the constituents and, as predicted by (52), to occur more to the left. The rule in (52) has a difficulty to deal with what can be called contrastive Topics. The latter are always the leftmost elements in the sentence. The tendency for contrastive, or shifted, topics to precede the material already present in the discourse, or continuous topics, is attested cross-linguistically (Benincà and Poletto 2004, Svenonius 2002a).

To sum up, Slioussar’s model is close to mine in that accessibility is regarded as a possible trigger for scrambling. But it differs from mine since in her model accessibility replaces the more familiar notions Topic and Focus. In the present approach, accessibility complements Topic/Focus. I proposed the Scrambling Rule, based on accessibility, or D-linking, to account for cases where IS requirements seem to be violated, e.g. focus is fronted or elements within the focus domain are rearranged. Slioussar largely ignores sentences with preposed foci. She briefly notes that clause-initial focus can be a special construction where the focused element undergoes an IS-independent Agree-type movement to CP. However, it is hard to imagine what sort of agreement this could be. Constructions with clause-initial focus differ from those with canonical focus in emotional coloration but not in grammaticality. As to the middle-field focus, the author tentatively assumes that either CR is undergoing a shift from VO to OV, or it is developing a ‘tail’ strategy. However, she mentions in passing that a focus in the middle field is perceived as being more foregrounded than a postverbal one, which comes close to the characterization assumed in the present work.

4.3 Focus preposing: does it exist?

In this section I would like to go back to the question concerning the relevancy of focus typology for the derivation (Q3). In most of the analyses described in this chapter different foci (contrastive/narrow, i.e. preposed, versus informational/wide, i.e. clause-final) are treated differently. However, as described in chapter three, a preposed focus behaves similarly to the canonical focus in certain respects (e.g. with respect to Focus projection). Therefore, it might seem preferable to give both a uniform analysis, namely that the focus, whether preposed or not, is always in the same syntactic position and that its linear position is derived by some other means. Such an attempt has recently been made in the two independent analyses described below.

4.3.1 Against focus movement: Junghanns (2001), Pereltsvaig (2004).

In their recent works Junghanns (2001) and Pereltsvaig (2004) propose that preposing in sentences with non-final focus is only apparent. What seems to be a sentence-initial or a middle-field focus is, in fact, an ordinary clause-final focus followed by right dislocated constituents. I will coin these analyses R(right) D(islocation) approach. The authors differ slightly in implementation of this idea, but the main point is the same. In technical terms, Junghanns assumes focus position to be associated with the right edge of the clause, i.e. CP. Pereltsvaig argues that it occupies the right edge of IP.
Let us consider the analysis of Junghanns first. The sentences in (53) have focus in a non-canonical position, indicated by bold face (adopted from Junghanns 2001).

(53)  
a. Neznakomec ubil staruhu.  
stranger.NOM kill.PST.MASC old.woman.ACC  
b. Staruhu neznakomec ubil.  
old.woman.ACC stranger.NOM kill.PST.MASC  

‘It was the stranger who killed the old woman.’

Assuming the Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1995), Junghanns proposes that structures like those in (53) are derived by copy and remerge of the entire CP to the right of the source CP. After that, complementary deletion takes place in the two CPs: in the source CP, the material following the focused constituent is deleted, while in the copied CP, the material that precedes the focus and the focus itself are deleted. The difference between (53a) and (53b) reflects the fact that in (53b) Topicalization of the object takes place prior to copying, while in (53a) it does not. Thus (53a) is an example of a pure RD, and (53b) is a combination of Topicalization and RD. The derivations for (53a) and (53b) are given in (54a) and (54b), respectively. Deletion is indicated by strikethrough.

(54)  
a.  
\[
\text{CP} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{CP} (\text{source}) \quad \text{CP} (\text{copy}) 
\]
Neznakomec ubil staruhu \quad Neznakomec ubil staruhu  

b.  
\[
\text{CP} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{CP} (\text{source}) \quad \text{CP} (\text{copy}) 
\]
Staruhu, neznakomec ubil t₁ \quad Staruhu, neznakomec ubil t₁  

After deletion applies, the focus exponent turns out to be the rightmost constituent in its own, i.e. the source, CP.

Pereltsvaig’s analysis technically differs from the one outlined above in that, since for her focus is restricted to the right edge of IP, the extraposed constituents undergo nested movements and right adjoin to IP.

Both authors build their respective analyses on phonological properties of sentences with a non-canonical focus. They provide an acoustic analysis which shows that the part of the sentence that follows focus is pronounced with a flat intonation typical of extraposed constituents.
Pereltsvaig provides some additional arguments. She discusses data on resyllabification, which usually happens in Russian between a coda of the preceding and a vowel of the following word. Thus in (55a), under neutral intonation, the codas of the subject and the verb are resyllabified with the vowel of the following verb and DO, accordingly. However, if either the verb (55b) or the subject (55c) is focused, resyllabification is precluded.

(55) a. Ivanov otkryl okno.
Ivanov.NOM open.PST.MASC.SG window.ACC
‘Ivanov opened the window’.

b. [Ivanov]_[focus] otkryl okno.

According to Pereltsvaig, this phonological process is syntactically restricted to IP in Russian. In other words, only elements within the same IP can be resyllabified. The lack of resyllabification in (55b) and (55c) is taken by the author to indicate that the focus and the constituents following it are not in the same IP. In particular, the DO in (55b) and the V and DO in (55c) are assumed to be right-dislocated and adjoined to the IP.

4.3.2 What moves after all?
In the present section I will show that the RD analyses described above cannot be on the right track.

First of all, RD, or ‘tail’ strategy, is not a productive rule of Russian (see also Slioussar 2007). According to the described analyses, sentences like (56) should be perfectly acceptable in Russian, on the analysis that the IO in (56a) and the DO and the PP in (56b) are right-dislocated. But, in fact, they are at best marginal. We will return to this point in chapter five.

(56) a. ?? Andrej ne pokazal svoju knigu Marii.
Andrey.NOM NEG show.PST.MASC REFL book.ACC Maria.DAT
‘Andrej didn’t show HIS BOOK to Maria.’

b. ?? Nikita zaberet zavtra vešči u Very.
Nikita.NOM take.FUT.3SG tomorrow things.ACC from Very
‘Nikita will take his things from Vera TOMORROW.’

Furthermore, if RD analyses are right it should be impossible to have a preposed focused NPI followed by negation, as in (57).
(57) (Context: Who saw our new colleague?)

Nikto ego ne videl.

nobody.NOM he.ACC NEG see.PST.MASC

‘NOBODY has seen him.’

On an RD analysis, the focused NPI in (57) indicates that the following constituents are dislocated. This should preclude NPI licensing, assuming that NPIs are strictly clause-bound in Russian (Brown 1999).

Furthermore, focus in a non-canonical position is predicted to never have scope over the material that follows it. Actually, both authors argue for the background status of RD elements. This is not correct, as was shown in chapter three: a preposed focus does not narrow down the Focus domain. Even more challenging are sentences with a discontinuous Focus like (58). They are simply undervisible under RD analyses.

(58) (Context: What’s this noise? Did our dog break the fence?)

Da neta! Sosedskyu košku vash Amur

PTCL no neighbor cat.ACC your Amour.NOM

zagryz.

bite.to.death.PST.MASC

‘Oh no! Your Amour [killed the neighbor’s cat] Focus.’

Another prediction of any RD analysis is that a considerable freedom of word order is expected within the dislocated part. This is one of the tests often used to reveal RD (Vallduví 1992, Samek-Lodovici 2005). This expectation is not borne out. As shown, in (59) free reordering of post-focal constituents is not possible.

(59) ?? Mašinu žene podaril Sergej.

car.ACC wife.DAT give.PST.MASC Sergey.NOM

‘It’s a car that Sergey gave to his wife (as a present).’

Similarly, it should in principle be possible to extrapose any of the sentence constituents. However this is not true either, as evidenced by (60), where the PP and the IO following the focused subject are extraposed on the RD analysis.

(60) * Fotografii pokazal otec za užinom

photos.ACC show.PST.MASC father.NOM at dinner.INST

deti. detjam.

children.DAT

‘It’s the father who showed children the pictures during dinner.’

Irrespective of how exactly the subject gets focused (by moving everything across it or by right adjunction to VP), there are no obvious reasons why RD cannot apply in (60). But as revealed by a corpus study carried out by Slioussar (2007), nothing can follow the focused subject in VS sentences in Russian. This is a problem not only for RD analyses of postfocal material, but for all the analyses (of which there are many) where clause-final subject focus is derived by right adjunction to VP: if
focus adjoins to VP nothing should preclude adjoining background material to CP or IP.

The prosodic motivation for the RD analysis of preposed foci is not very persuasive either. The fact that focus is phonologically set off as well as the lack of resyllabification with the post-focal element(s) can be explained without resort to RD. All the examples provided by the authors have narrow focus. The prosodic property of this type of focus in Russian is that the focused constituent forms a separate phonological phrase (Alter, Mleinek, and Richter 2001). This means that there is a phrasal boundary not only between the focus and the material that follows but also between the focus and the material that precedes it. As shown by Alter (1997), narrow focus on the object in an SVO sentence (61b) precludes regressive voice assimilation between the coda of the verb and the onset of the focused object, which usually happens in neutral contexts (61a).

(61) a. Zavhoz zavez zakaz.
    factor.NOM deliver.PST.MASC order.ACC
    ‘The factor delivered the order.’

    [zavhoz] [zavez# zak‘az]

    [zavhoz] [zavez# zak‘az]

The data in (61) echo the resyllabification facts discussed by Pereltsvaig (2003), depicted in (55). In (55b), for example, resyllabification fails not only with the post-focal DO but also with the subject preceding it as well. Therefore, following the logic of the author, we would be forced to conclude that either the focused constituent itself is dislocated or the material preceding it is not in the same clause with it. However, this is not what the authors aim to show. In the face of the prosodic properties of narrow focus (Alter 1997, Alter, Mleinek, and Richter 2001), the arguments put forth by Junghanns (2001) and Pereltsvaig (2004) lose their strength.

To sum up, provided the challenges faced by RD analyses of preposed focus I eschew this approach and maintain the preposing hypothesis, i.e. what moves in CR sentences with medial and left-peripheral focus is the focus exponent itself.

4.4 Scrambling and binding

Before we proceed to the analysis of word order freedom in Russian, I would like to clarify one issue. As we have seen above, the possible landing sites of scrambled elements are often identified as A or A’ on the basis of binding possibilities from these new positions. In this section I review Binding as a diagnostics. I argue that it should not be considered a decisive factor in determining movement/position types. Note that all the sentences to be discussed here must be considered under neutral downgrading intonation.
Let us start with anaphor binding. As argued by Bailyn (1995b) on the basis of the example in (62), short scrambling in Russian can marginally give rise to new binding possibilities, but only if an antecedent IO scrambles over an anaphoric DO. Recall that for Bailyn the underlying order of arguments corresponds to DO > IO.

(62)  
a. *Mama predstavila drug druga Petrovymi  
mother.NOM introduce.PST.FEM each other.ACC Petrovs.DAT  
b. ? Mama predstavila Petrovymi drug druga tiO.  
mother.NOM introduce.PST.FEM Petrovs.DAT each other.ACC  
‘The mother introduced the Petrovs to each other.’  
[Bailyn 1995b: 23]  

In case an anaphoric IO scrambles over an antecedent DO no new binding possibilities are argued to arise.

(63)  
a. Mama predstavila Petrovyh drug drugu  
mother.NOM introduce.PST.FEM Petrovs.ACC each other.DAT  
b. Mama predstavila drug drugu Petrovyh tiO.  
mother.NOM introduce.PST.FEM each other.DAT Petrovs.ACC  
‘The mother introduced Petrovs to each other.’  
[Bailyn 1995b: 22]  

Therefore, according to Bailyn (1995b), short scrambling in Russian is compatible with either A- (62) or A’-movement (63).

Sekerina (1997), who assumes the opposite base order, i.e. IO > DO, mostly agrees with Bailyn’s judgments, but grades (62b) as unacceptable. Therefore, on Sekerina’s view, (63) is equated with (62), for in neither of them binding relations are changed.

In chapter two, I presented some data showing that binding relations between a DO and an IO depend on the surface position of the antecedent. The data is repeated below.

(64)  
a. Svaha pokazala partneram drug druga  
matchmaker.NOM show.PST.FEM partners.DAT each other.ACC  
b. Svaha pokazala partnerovy drug drugu  
matchmaker.NOM show.PST.FEM partners.ACC each other.DAT  
a’. ??/* Svaha pokazala drug druga partneram.  
matchmaker.NOM show.PST.FEM each other.ACC partners.DAT
The same behavior (i.e. lack of reconstruction) was shown to hold with respect to variable binding. The relevant data are given in (65).

\begin{align*}
(65) & a. \text{Ja otdala } [\text{každomu studentu}], \text{ ego, rabotu.} \\
& \text{I.NOM give.PST.FEM every student.DAT his work.ACC}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(65) & b. \text{* Ja otdala ego, rabotu } [\text{každomu studentu}], \\
& \text{I.NOM give.PST.FEM his work.ACC every student.DAT}
\end{align*}

‘I gave every student his work back.’

\begin{align*}
(65) & c. \text{Ja otdala } [\text{každuju rabotu}], \text{ ee, avtoru.} \\
& \text{I.NOM give.PST.FEM every work.ACC its author.DAT}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(65) & d. \text{* Ja otdala ee, avtoru } [\text{každuju rabotu}], \\
& \text{I.NOM give.PST.FEM her author.DAT every work.ACC}
\end{align*}

‘I gave every work to its author.’

On the basis of (64-65) short scrambling seems to exhibit clear A-movement properties. The situation remains the same if we move an element to the sentence-initial position. This is shown in (66) for variable binding and in (67) for anaphor.

\begin{align*}
(66) & a. \text{* Ja otvela ego, roditeljam } [\text{každogo rebenka}], \\
& \text{I.NOM bring.PST.FEM his parents.DAT every child.ACC}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(66) & b. \text{[Každogo rebenka], ja otvela ego, roditeljam } [\text{každogo rebenka}], \\
& \text{every child.ACC I.NOM bring.PST.FEM his parents.DAT}
\end{align*}

‘I took every child to his parents.’

\begin{align*}
(67) & a. \text{* Vospitatel’ nedavno predstavil drug} \\
& \text{kindergarten.teacher.NOM recently introduce.PST.MASC each}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(67) & b. \text{drug drugu, rebiat,} \\
& \text{other.DAT children.ACC}
\end{align*}
b. Rebjati, vospitatel’ nedavno
children.ACC kindergarten.teacher.NOM recently
predstavil drug drugu, tDO.
introduce.PST.MASC each other.DAT

‘The kindergarten teacher recently introduced children to each other.’

To sum up, anaphoric binding relations between two internal arguments can be changed if one of them scrambles over the other. However, if we consider binding between an external and an internal argument we get somewhat different results.

As shown in (68) and (69) for anaphor binding and in (70) for variable binding, when an internal argument scrambles over an external argument no changes in binding are attested.\(^{36}\)

(68) a. * Svoja, mama porugala Maksima,
REFL mother.NOM scold.PST.FEM Max.ACC

b. * Maksima, svoja, mama porugala tDO.
Max.ACC REFL mother.NOM scold.PST.FEM

‘His mother scolded Maxi.’

(69) a. Maksim, očen’ ljubit svoju, mamu.
Max.NOM much love.PRS.3SG REFL mother.ACC

b. [Svojui mamu] Maksim, očen’ ljubit tDO.
REFL mother.ACC Max.NOM much love.PRS.3SG

‘Maxi loves his mother a lot.’

(70) a. Každyj, čelovek očen’ dorožit svoej, žizn’ju.
Every person.NOM much value.PRS.3SG REFL life.INST

b. [Svoej, žizn’ju] každyj, čelovek očen’ dorožit tDO.
REFL life.INST every person.NOM much value.PRS.3SG

‘Every person values his life a lot.’

In (68) an anaphor within the subject remains ungrammatical whether or not the potential antecedent precedes it (68b). On the other hand, if the subject functions as an antecedent, binding is undisturbed even if the anaphor scrambles over it (69b).

\(^{36}\) There is a complementary distribution between personal pronouns and reflexives in Russian: subjects can only bind reflexives, with both possessive and arbitrary reading, objects are incompatible with reflexives in either meaning, and require a pronominal bindee.
Similarly in (70b) the fronted object remains properly bound by the quantified subject.

Interestingly, this internal/external argument asymmetry with respect to reconstruction is exhibited only with anaphor and variable binding. If we consider reconstruction for Condition C (R-expression), we find no difference between external and internal arguments. Consider the situation for internal arguments first.

(71) a. My otdali Arinei ee rabotu.
    we.NOM give.PST.PL Arina.DAT her work.ACC

b. * My otdali ee rabotu Arinei tPO-
    we.NOM give.PST.PL her work.ACC Arina.DAT

c. * My ee rabotu otdali Arinei tPO-
    we.NOM her work.ACC give.PST.PL Arina.DAT

d. * Ee rabotu my otdali Arinei tPO-
    her work.ACC we.NOM give.PST.PL Arina.DAT

‘We gave Arina her work back.’

(72) a. * Ja predstavila ee sestre Ol’gu.
    I.NOM introduce.PST.FEM her sister.DAT Olga.ACC

b. Ja predstavila Ol’gu ee sestre tPO-
    I.NOM introduce.PST.FEM Olga.ACC her sister.DAT

c. Ja Ol’gu predstavila ee sestre tPO-
    I.NOM Olga.ACC introduce.PST.FEM her sister.DAT

d. Ol’gu ja predstavila ee sestre tPO-
    Olga.ACC I.NOM introduce.PST.FEM her sister.DAT

‘I introduced Olga to her sister.’

(71a) is grammatical since an R-expression is not c-commanded by a pronoun. The sentences (71b-d), where the phrase containing a pronoun scrambles over an R-expression, are ruled out as Condition C violations. In (72) scrambling, on the opposite, remedies the violation.

The same effects of scrambling (i.e. lack of reconstruction) are attested for subject-object relations, as shown in (73-74).
Thus we have the following two-way split with respect to reconstruction effects exhibited by scrambling in Russian. First, there is a distinction between reconstruction for anaphor and variable binding, on the one hand, and reconstruction for Condition C, on the other. With respect to the latter no reconstruction is attested altogether. Scrambling either incurs or improves violations of Condition C. Second, as to anaphor and variable binding, we observed internal/external argument asymmetry. There is no reconstruction when one internal argument scrambles over the other. However, the scrambled XP displays reconstruction effects when the corresponding relations between an internal and an external argument are evaluated.

Based on the data given above it is quite challenging to characterize clause-internal scrambling as either A or A’-movement. This led some researchers to classify it as a mixed type (Sekerina 1997).

The notion of reconstructions has been losing its importance with the Minimalist Program. With emergence of the Copy Theory of movement it became possible to give a derivational account for phenomena exhibiting reconstruction effects, e.g. to Binding (Saito 2003, Bailyn in press). In essence, a derivational theory postulates that various interpretive requirements, e.g. those of Binding, can be satisfied as the derivation evolves. If this is so, identification of a landing site as A or A’ based on binding possibilities becomes impossible. For instance, as shown by Bailyn (in press), A’- on a par with A-movement can create new anaphoric relations. Bailyn illustrates this point with the English example (75) and a Russian example of long scrambling (76).

(75) a. *John, knows that Mary showed [a new picture of himselfi] to Susan.

b. John, wonders [which picture of himselfi] Mary showed to Susan.
It should be noted that Russian examples like (76b) under $j$ co-indexing are not unanimously accepted by native speakers and the degree of grammaticality ranges as well. For instance, Bailyn, who takes the example from Antonenko (2006), grades it as deviant. Glushan (2006) considers such examples to be fully acceptable. In my idiolect they are worse than just marginal. However, there is evidence to believe that $wh$-movement, which is a clear A'-specie, can also create new binding configurations in Russian. This is shown in (77).

(77) a. Ivan $i$ hoćet čtoby Olga $i$ nakazala
Ivan.NOM want.PRS.3SG that.SUBJ Olga.NOM punish.PST.FEM svoego $i$ syna.
REFL son.ACC

‘Ivan wants that Olga punishes her/his son.’

b. Kogo iz svoih $i$ detej Ivan $i$ hoćet čtoby
which of REFL kids.ACC Ivan.NOM want.PRS.3SG that.SUBJ
Olga $i$ nakazala?
Olga.NOM punish.PST.FEM

‘Which of her/his children Ivan wants that Olga punishes?’

In (77a) the reflexive within the DO can only be bound by the embedded-clause subject. If, however, the DO is $wh$-moved into the matrix clause, co-indexing with the matrix clause subject is rendered possible. Assuming that on its way to the matrix clause the $wh$-phrase passes through the edge of the embedded CP, it becomes accessible to the higher antecedent.

Adopting the derivational approach to Binding, I assume that binding relations can be fixed at any point in the derivation. Therefore, no recourse to position/movement type is necessary or important in this respect. What we see from the data discussed above is that in Russian Binding tends to be determined on the basis of the final position of an element, although sometimes the initial or an intermediate site is taken for evaluation.

The main conclusion to draw from this section is that using binding as a way to argue for A or A’ status of scrambling in Russian does not provide satisfactory results. This might very well apply universally. It has been argued by different researchers that many interpretational distinctions, including binding, are
sensitive to IS (Ionin 2001, Lahousse 2007, Erteschik-Shir 2007). Since IS is encoded via word order in Russian, it is not surprising that Binding can be read off the surface structure.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I raised some questions concerning the role of syntax in encoding IS in Russian. First, I considered the issue of the role of Edge features versus the role of Agree features in the derivation of various orderings (Q1). The working hypothesis I entertain is that overt movement in Russian is, by and large, IS motivated. I tested this hypothesis against the analyses that argue for IS-unrelated nature of certain movement operations, namely [EPP]-driven movements. The conclusion I came to was that there are no obvious reasons why these cases should not be considered on a par with other cases of scrambling. First, it was shown that the phenomenon of oblique subjecthood is not attested to the extent claimed previously. Second, I addressed the issue of whether a grammatical subject always undergoes EPP-driven movement to SpecTP and came to the conclusion that it does, unless it is assigned either [Topic] or [Focus] feature in which case it has to undergo Criterial checking and the SpecTP is filled by a null expletive.

Next, I reviewed several existing studies on the syntax-IS interaction in Russian in order to find out whether any purely syntactic requirements are assumed to be involved in IS encoding (Q2 and Q3). It was shown that previous analyses of Russian preclude the possibility that IS-motivated movements are triggered by the same factors and proceed in the same way as other syntactic operations, i.e. by feature matching. IS features, if recognized at all, are assumed to be “special” in that, although they trigger movement in narrow syntax, they become visible only later, at the IS or PF level. These analyses were argued to face some serious challenges. In particular, none of the existing approaches can account for the similarities between the canonical and the preposed focus, on the one hand, and the differences between the middle-field and the left-peripheral focus, on the other. In many analyses, theoretically questionable rightward movement is involved to derive the required order of constituents.

The skepticism concerning the existence of dedicated Topic/Focus positions is based on the fact that the landing sites of scrambled constituents do not exhibit uniform properties in all cases. For example, the widely-used Binding diagnostics show that the constituents of various categories can display various binding behavior under scrambling, which is often taken as an argument against TopP/FocP. However, in the last section of this chapter I discarded this argument and showed that Binding is orthogonal to position identification.