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1 Introduction

Many languages exhibit movement to the Tense domain, which is standardly captured by the EPP requirement on the T or Agr head (henceforth the EPP in T). In the majority of cases, this head shares features with the moved element (a Nominative DP or a finite verb), so most EPP theories rely on agreement. However, a number of apparent exceptions have been identified in various languages (e.g. Collins, 1997; Holmberg, 2000; Ura, 2000; Miyagawa 2001; Nevins and Anand, 2003). In particular, several authors claim that the EPP requirement is regularly satisfied by non-agreeing XPs in Russian (e.g. Babyonyshev, 1996; Bailyn, 2003a, 2003b, 2004; Lavine, 1998; Lavine and Freidin, 2002).

These cases are interesting from a typological perspective and also play a principal role in a more general debate: what is the relation between two basic grammatical operations, Agree and Move (or internal Merge)? For example, in (Chomsky, 1995) Move is parasitic on Agree, while Chomsky (2008) suggests dissociating them and mentions Lavine and Freidin’s Russian EPP model as an important argument. Therefore, every potential exception calls for a careful analysis. In this paper, I focus on Russian data, concluding that they have been misanalyzed: only Nominative DPs can satisfy the EPP in T in Russian. Subsection 1.1 provides some background on the EPP in T; subsection 1.2 presents the Russian examples in question and their previous analyses, and then sketches my proposal and the structure of the paper.

1.1 Background

Historically, the EPP was an extension of the Projection Principle (hence the term) stating that clauses must have subjects. In (Chomsky, 1995), this requirement was related to the categorial D feature with the EPP property present on T. This feature could be checked either by moving an XP (a subject) or by merging an XP (an expletive). Later, the feature responsible for these operations was assumed to sit on Agr, while in many recent works, it is again ascribed to T. The nature of this feature is also debated: for example, Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) claim that it is a T(ense) feature.

Languages that allow for low subjects without an overt expletive, such as Italian, Spanish, Greek etc., were always problematic for the EPP theory. Many authors introduced covert expletives for such languages (e.g. Chomsky, 1982, 1995; Holmberg, 2005; Rizzi, 1982, 1986; Rizzi and Shlonsky, 2007). Another solution was proposed by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) and developed in subsequent work (e.g. Manzini and Savoia, 2002; Platzack, 2004): crosslinguistically, the EPP requirement can be satisfied either by an XP (a Nominative subject or an expletive) or by an X0 (a raised verb).1

This is used to explain why, for example, in Greek, the finite verb obligatorily moves up, while the position of the subject depends on other, IS (Information Structure) related factors. Greek subjects raise if they are topical and remain in situ if they are not. Consider (1a-b) from (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1998: 497, 1

1 In this case, rich verbal agreement morphology is claimed to have the requisite nominal feature, as was suggested in (Taraldsen 1978). Importantly, the authors who opt for a silent expletive also assume that verbal agreement morphology plays a role in licensing it.
n. 9a, ia):

(1) a. An ehi idhi diavasi kala o Petros to mathima.
   if has already read well Peter the lesson
   ‘If Peter has already read the lesson well.’

b. An diavaze sinithos kala o Petros to mathima.
   if read usually well Peter the lesson
   ‘If Peter usually read the lesson well.’

The finite form — the auxiliary or the main verb — raises to [Spec; TP] (or [Spec; AgrS], depending on the model) and therefore surfaces before aspectual adverbs. The subject remains in situ, in [Spec; vP], and is therefore below the light manner adverb. Other constituents that do not move out of the vP, like the object in (1a-b), follow such subjects, as expected. The participle in (1a) precedes the light manner adverb and, according to Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, is in Asp.

Let us compare this pattern to English. In English the main verb normally remains inside vP, surfacing below most adverbs, and auxiliaries are interspersed with adverbs, presumably in the order of merger. External Nominative arguments, generated in [Spec; vP], raise to [Spec; TP] to satisfy the EPP, and thus precede all verb forms and at least low adverbs. Internal Nominative arguments can remain in situ, in the complement of VP, following most adverbs and all verb forms. In this case, an overt expletive is used, as in (2).

(2) There always appeared two bright lines in the spectrum in the place of the two dark lines D.

Apparent exceptions to Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou's generalization have been found in various languages, but the analysis of these cases remains controversial. Since they are often used to dissociate the EPP in T and even movement in general from agreement, every such case deserves close scrutiny. This paper focuses on Russian data.

1.2 Russian data: previous analyses and the present proposal

Several authors claim that the EPP in T can be satisfied by non-Nominative XPs in Russian (e.g. Babyonyshev, 1996; Bailyn, 2003a, 2003b, 2004; Lavine, 1998; Lavine and Freidin, 2002), but the cases they discuss do not always overlap. The constructions suggested by Babyonyshev, Lavine and Freidin can be analyzed together because

---

2 English Locative Inversion (LI), as in (ia), is the most widely discussed case (e.g. Coopmans, 1989; Levine, Culicover, 2001; den Dikken, 2006). The locative PP is often assumed to occupy [Spec; TP]. Some authors use this as an argument against agreement-based EPP theories, while others try to incorporate LI in them — for example, Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) suggest that the PP bears an uninterpretable T feature. In any case, putting this PP in [Spec; TP] is controversial — it is unclear why V-to-C movement and embedding in (ib-c) are impossible.

(i) a. Down the hill was rolling the ball.

   b. *Was down the hill rolling the ball?

   c. *Did he say that down the hill was rolling the ball?
they share an important property: all arguments in them are internal.³ Consider the examples in (3)-(6). In my translations, I have tried to reflect their Information Structure.

(3) a. Sinjak pojavsja na kolene.
   bruise.NOM appeared on knee
   ‘The bruise appeared on the knee (rather than somewhere else on the leg).’

   b. Na kolene pojavsja sinjak.
      on knee appeared bruise.NOM
      ‘On the knee, a bruise appeared.’

   c. Na kolene sinjak pojavsja.
      on knee bruise.NOM appeared
      ‘On the knee, a bruise appeared (while on the elbow, there was none).’

(4) a. Deti nравятся Maše.
   children.NOM appeal Masha.DAT
   ‘Children are liked by Masha.’

   b. Maše nравятся дети.
      Masha.DAT appeal children.NOM
      ‘Masha likes children.’

   c. Maše дети nравятся.
      Masha.DAT children.NOM appeal
      ‘As for Masha, children are liked by her.’

(5) a. Mašu ubilo pulej.
    Masha.ACC killed.IMPER bullet.INSTR
    ‘Masha was killed by a bullet.’

   b. Pulej ubilo Mašu.
      bullet.INSTR killed.IMPER Masha.ACC
      ‘The bullet killed Masha.’

(6) Uši založilo.
    ears.ACC clogged.IMPER
    ‘(My) ears got clogged.’

Babyonyshev, Lavine and Freidin argue that non-Nominative XPs satisfy the EPP in cases like (3b), (4b), (5a-b) and (6). Bailyn extends this analysis to ‘OV S’ sentences like (7b), postulating two-step Generalized Inversion (GI) in them. First, a non-Nominative XP A-moves to [Spec, IP] and satisfies the EPP. Second, the verb raises to I over the subject, while in (7a) it moves no further than v. The subject in (7b) remains in situ. (7c) has the same derivation as (7a), only the object undergoes discourse-driven Dislocation to an unspecified A’ position. Babyonyshev and Lavine and Freidin make no claims about such cases.

(7) a. Maša s’ela kašu.
    Masha.NOM ate porridge.ACC
    ‘Masha ate the porridge.’

³ Many problems concerning Russian argument structure are still unresolved, but there is little disagreement on how to divide arguments into internal and external. I will not need to go into details in this paper and therefore can rely on this general consensus.
b. Kašu s'ela Maša.
porridge.ACC ate Masha.NOM
‘The porridge was eaten by Masha.’

c. Kašu Maša s'ela.
porridge.ACC Masha.NOM ate
‘As for the porridge, Masha ate it.’

In subsequent sections, I examine the positions of various elements to formulate a novel view of the Russian EPP requirement in general, and on these constructions in particular. Section 2 presents adverb placement facts indicating that the verb does not normally raise further than $v$ in Russian. Section 3 focuses on the positions of Nominative DPs following the verb. Internal Nominative arguments, as in (3b) or (4b), can be shown to be in situ. But external arguments, as in (7b), do not pattern with in situ subjects in other languages.

For example, in Greek, all Nominative DPs remain in situ when they are not topical, and in this case they can be followed by other $v$P-internal material, as in (1a-b). In Russian, external arguments surface after the verb only when they are in narrow focus (or contrasted inside a wide focus), and in this case no other material follows them. I argue that external subjects always raise to [Spec; TP], but if they are in narrow focus, subsequent IS-related movement occurs. This can be described either as right-dislocating the subject or as moving the constituent below the subject (including the verb, adverbs etc.) around it. Choosing between these approaches is outside the scope of this paper. I merely show that such subjects either are in or reconstruct to [Spec; TP] for the purposes of scope and binding.

Thus, despite notorious differences in word order, Russian turns out to be similar to English with respect to the EPP in T: external Nominative arguments always raise to satisfy it, while internal ones can remain in situ. This conclusion is incompatible with Bailyn’s analysis of ‘O V S’ sentences. What about cases like (3b), (4b), (5a-b) and (6) where internal Nominative arguments are absent or do not raise — can the EPP be satisfied by non-Nominative XPs in such cases?

First, if this were true, non-Nominative XPs would exhibit A-properties associated with movement to [Spec; TP] in these sentences and A’-properties in ‘XP S V’ cases like (3c) and (4c). Contrary to the claims previously made in the literature, section 5 demonstrates that this is not borne out: both groups of cases share the same properties. Second, if non-Nominative XPs could satisfy the EPP, one of them would be expected to surface in [Spec; TP] in the absence of external

---

4 Cases with V-to-C movement are exceptions to this: some yes-no questions (the others differ from affirmative sentences only in intonation), conditionals with inversion, like in English, etc.

5 In this paper, the term subject is applied only to Nominative DPs, external arguments are Nominative DPs generated in [Spec; $v$P], and all other arguments merged in lower positions (both Nominative and non-Nominative) are called internal.

6 Exceptions include V-to-C movement constructions and marginal cases with paired foci.

7 In face of the crosslinguistic evidence that subjects become immovable having reached [Spec; TP] (e.g. Rizzi and Shlonsky 2007), the second approach appears more attractive.

8 All grammatical examples exhibit A’-properties, but sometimes both groups of sentences are bad, as if we were dealing with A-movement. Since no A-position is available to XPs in ‘XP S V’ constructions, I conclude that the ungrammaticality is caused by independent factors.
arguments. But, as section 4 shows, a single internal argument, Nominative or not, is free to remain in situ, as in (8) or (9). Moreover, examples like (10) are also possible.

(8) Založilo uši.
   clogged.IMPERS ears.ACC
   ‘(My) ears got clogged.’

(9) Pojavilis’ pervye cvety.
   appeared [first flowers].NOM
   ‘There appeared first flowers.’

(10) Temneet.
    [gets darker].IMPERS
    ‘It is getting darker.’

Williams (2006) suggests a solution for the problem with A- vs. A’-properties. He argues that raised XPs occupy the specifier of LP, or Logical Phrase, in Russian. LP is above TP and, roughly speaking, hosts topic-like elements. The EPP requirement is associated with LP, but not with TP in Russian, while English has the opposite pattern. Relying on Representation Theory (Williams, 2003), he abandons the division into A and A’ positions, claiming that some projections, including LP, have intermediate properties. Williams notes that this can explain the mixture of A- and A’-properties of raised non-Nominative XPs, but does not go into details. However, this approach still cannot account for sentences like (8)-(10). Moreover, obligatory external subject raising becomes mysterious. In section 3, I will present various tests showing that these subjects are in or pass through [Spec; TP] in ‘O V S’, ‘PP V S’ and similar constructions. If Russian had an EPP requirement higher than T (in Williams’ L, or in the broadly conceived C domain) that could be satisfied by various XPs, then objects or PPs would be enough to satisfy it in these cases.

Thus, obligatory raising of external Nominative arguments clearly indicates that the EPP in T is operative in Russian. How is it satisfied in (8)-(10), as well as in (3b), (4b), (5a-b) and (6), if we conclude that non-Nominative XPs do not pass through [Spec; TP] in such sentences? The assumption that Russian has covert expletives in these cases, where English has overt ones, appears to be the most parsimonious option. Many authors view the EPP as an overtness requirement (e.g. as in (Lasnik 2001)) and therefore avoid silent expletives. So section 6 presents some evidence for their existence. Section 7 summarizes what can be concluded from these results.

Finally, let me make a remark on the materials used in the paper. Rather than constructing examples, I drew them from corpora wherever possible. I used the National Corpus of Russian Language (all information can be found at www.ruscorpora.ru) and the corpus Bokrjonok created at the Department of Computational Linguistics at St. Petersburg State University. It contains over 21 million words and includes texts written between 1985 and 2004, mainly from magazines and newspapers. The source is indicated when it is relevant (e.g. when frequencies of various constructions are estimated). I have also used data from other papers and constructed examples for binding and scope tests. Binding judgments are subject to variation in Russian. To obtain a more comprehensive picture, I included a

---

9 In the sentences with two internal arguments, like (4)-(5), one of the arguments has to move out, but, as I demonstrate in section 4, not for EPP reasons.
large number of sentences in a questionnaire presented to 20 speakers. All details are
given in the Appendix. Several examples were introduced at later stages, so I
collected judgments informally, consulting about ten speakers from Moscow and
St. Petersburg.

2 Verb movement

In this section, I discuss adverb placement tests for verb movement. According to
major Russian corpus studies (Sirotinina, 1965; Koltunova, 1976; Shvedova, ed., 1980
etc.), Russian adverbs are normally preverbal. As (11a-b) show, this is true both for
‘S V O’ and for ‘O V S’ orders. The main exceptions are focused adverbs at the end of
the sentence, as in (11c), and rare cases of focus fronting, as in (11d). Manner adverbs
are considered to be the lowest (e.g. Cinque, 1999). If the verb consistently surfaces
below them, it does not move out of the vP.

(11) a. Zlodei xorošo znali povadki životnyx.
    malefactors.NOM well knew [animals’ habits].ACC
    ‘The malefactors knew animals’ habits well.’

b. Ėto v’juščeesja rastenie xorošo znali drevnie rimljane.
    [this creeping plant].ACC well knew [ancient Romans].NOM
    ‘This creeping plant was well known to ancient Romans.’

c. Neftegazovye oligarxi živut očen’ xorošo.
    [oil and gas oligarchs].NOM live very well
    ‘Oil and gas oligarchs live very well.’

d. Xorošo vremja proletelo – i veselo, i nezametno!
    well time.NOM flew away and merrily and imperceptibly
    ‘How nicely the time has passed - imperceptibly and with fun!’

Certain Russian constructions involve V-to-C movement: e.g. root and embedded
yes-no questions with the particle li, as in (12a), conditionals like (12b) etc. My
conclusions do not extend to these special cases.

(12) a. Ne uveren, znali li oni xorošo etot jazyk.
    not sure knew PART they well language.ACC
    ‘I am not sure whether they knew this language well.’

b. Slušali by deti vnimatel’no svoix roditelj...
    listen.COND children.NOM attentively [self’s parents].ACC
    ‘If (only) children listened attentively to their parents…’

Like in English, auxiliaries and modals are interspersed with adverbs in Russian.
Russian has only one auxiliary byt’ (‘to be’), used in imperfective Future forms, as in
(13a), and in Passive. There is also only one modal verb moč (‘can’), shown in (13b)
constructed on the basis of (13a). Otherwise modal predicative adjectives are used.

(13) a. Sintetika vposledstvii vsegda budet bystro temnet’.
    synthetics.NOM later always will quickly darken.INF.IMPERF
    ‘Afterwards, synthetic oil will always quickly darken.’

---

10 Almost nothing can precede the verb in such cases. Topics are impossible. As for adverbs,
togda is possible, but with the meaning ‘in this case’, not the temporal meaning ‘then’.
b. Sintetika v posledstvii vsegda možet bystro potemnet'.
synthetics.NOM later always can quickly darken.INF.PERF
‘Afterwards, synthetic oil can always quickly darken.’

To investigate adverb placement facts in more detail, I analyzed samples with three very low adverbs: xoroso ‘well’, medlenno ‘slowly’ and polnost’ju ‘completely’ from the corpus Bokrjonok.11 I worked with two students, Tatiana Maljavko and Ekaterina Ershova, from the Department of Computational Linguistics at St. Petersburg State University. The results of the study presented in Table 1 show that Russian verbs consistently follow even the lowest adverbs, and hence do not move out of vP.

In most ‘V Adv’ cases (19 out of 30), adverbs are followed by an object, as in (14a). There are also several sentences with argument PPs, as in (14b), and with temporal and locative PP modifiers.

(14) a. (Esli vy polnost’ju doverjaete rebenu)
    i znaete xoroso ego druzhej, sverstnikov i staršíx,
    and know.2PL well [his friends].ACC [of-the-same-age and older].ACC
    (ne lišnim budet proverit’…)
    ‘(If you trust your child) and know his friends, both of the same age and older, well enough (it will not hurt to check…)’

b. (Vstupaja v nee,)
    čelovek otrekalsja polnost’ju ot sveogo prošloga
    man.NOM renounced completely from his past
    (i daže menjal imja).
    ‘(Entering it) a man renounced his past completely (and even changed his name).’

These rare examples involve IS-related movement rather than verb raising. The adverb receives a secondary stress in these cases and is perceived as emphasized or contrasted. However, such stress can also be assigned without any reorderings, with the adverb in its canonical position (‘S Adv V O’ and ‘O Adv V S’).12 My view is supported by the fact that in (15), a future tense version of (14a), the adverb can follow the infinitive, which does not raise. (Self-identifying reference) discusses such cases in more detail.

(15) …i budete znat’ xorosho ego druzey, sverstnikov i staršíx.
    and will.2PL know.INF well [his friends].ACC [of-the-same-age and older].ACC

We came across only two cases, given in (16a-b), where a postverbal adverb is followed by the subject. The other 267 sentences with postverbal subjects found in our corpus sample had the ‘XP Adv V S’ word order, as in (11b).

(16) a. No ego faktičeski perepisali polnost’ju brat’ja Strugackie,
    but it.ACC practically rewrote completely [brothers Strugatsky].NOM

---

11 We analyzed only the sentences where these three adverbs modify one-word finite verb forms (rather than adjectives, infinitives etc.). We did not include cases where adverbs bear narrow focus, like in (11c), or are fronted, like in (11d). Such constructions cannot be taken into account in verb movement tests because they contain additional IS-related reorderings.

12 The situation with the main stress is the same in Russian: for example, in a sentence containing a subject, an object and a verb, a focused subject can end up in the most embedded position, where the default main stress falls (‘O V S’), or the stress can be shifted to it without any reorderings (‘S V O’).
sdelav _______ perevod.

having made ______ translation.ACC

‘But it was practically completely rewritten by the Strugatsky brothers when they translated it.’

b. Ne za sčet proizvodstva živet xorošo zapadnyj mir!

not due to production ______ lives well ______ [western world].NOM

‘The western world lives well not due to production (of material values)’

To conclude, no verb movement caused by the EPP in T or by other requirements (V2, clustering etc.) can be found in Russian, and so it is similar to English in this respect. These results show that OVS sentences cannot have a structure in which the verb moves over the in situ subject (as argued in Bailyn (2003a, 2003b, 2004)).

3 Positions of postverbal subjects

In this section, I analyze the positions of Nominative arguments in sentences where they follow the verb. I show that in Russian, only internal Nominative arguments can remain in situ. External subjects always raise to [Spec; TP], although eventually they can surface sentence-finally as a result of IS-related movement. Subsection 3.1 shows that Russian postverbal external arguments do not pattern with in situ subjects in other languages. For example, in Greek, all Nominative DPs move up when they are topical and remain in situ when they are not. In the latter case, they can be followed by other vP-internal material, as (17) shows.

(17) An dhiavaze sinithos telios kapios to vivlio...

if ______ read ______ usually completely somebody the book

‘If somebody usually completely read the book.’

This is true only for Russian internal Nominative arguments. External subjects almost always precede the verb: not only when they are topical, but also when they are part of a wide focus. They surface after the verb only if they are in narrow focus (or highlighted inside a wide focus), and in this case no other constituents can follow them. I conclude that these subjects also raise to [Spec; TP] and end up sentence-final as a result of IS-related movement. Scope and binding tests in subsection 3.2 confirm their high position, while postverbal internal subjects are shown to be in situ. Thus, another similarity between Russian and English is revealed: in both languages, only external Nominative arguments undergo obligatory EPP-driven movement.

3.1 Constructions with postverbal subjects, their frequency and IS properties

How often are subjects postverbal in Russian? Sirotinina (1965) estimated their frequency in various belles-lettres and scientific texts, finding that Tolstoy’s War and Peace has postverbal subjects in 16-30% of sentences (depending on the chapter), a monograph on immunity has them in 16-22% of sentences etc. Colloquial Russian corpus estimates are much lower: 7% of sentences on average. Sirotinina’s massive corpus data indicate that almost all postverbal subjects are focused. Exceptions to this are provided by the V-to-C cases mentioned above (li questions, conditionals without conjunction etc.).

In my second corpus study, carried out in collaboration with the same students, Tatiana Maljavko and Ekaterina Ershova, I analyzed constructions with
postverbal subjects. We wanted to see what type of predicates are found in such constructions, what type of constituents follow postverbal subjects and how often. When compiling a corpus sample, one has to deal with the fact that the Nominative and Accusative forms of many Russian inanimate nouns coincide. In the Bokrjonok corpus, as well as in other reasonably big Russian corpora, grammatical tagging was done automatically, and the disambiguation of such cases is still in progress. Since postverbal Accusatives are much more frequent than postverbal Nominatives, we decided to limit the sample to unambiguous cases from the very start. Analyzing only animate nouns could bias the results in an unpredictable way, so we restricted ourselves to Singular forms of the 1st declension (like čaška ‘cup’), where there is no ambiguity. This declension is highly frequent and contains most Feminine gender nouns, with no bias towards animate or inanimate ones. We analyzed 500 randomly selected sentences with postverbal subjects. The results are presented in Table 2.

The results indicate that when the subject is postverbal in Russian, it immediately follows the verb and is sentence-final in the absolute majority of cases (in 92% of cases in our sample). Now let us turn to 20 ‘(XP) V S XP’ sentences. 8 examples are V-to-C structures. For example, verb-initial constructions, like (18), are characteristic of Russian fairy tales (and their imitations). I briefly come back to them in the Conclusions.

(18) Maxnula ptička pravym krylom… waved bird.NOM with right wing
     ‘The bird waved with its right wing’ and the old woman became a young beauty.

In 12 other sentences, postverbal subjects are internal Nominative arguments, as in (19). Out of 78 ‘V S’ cases, 8 are V-to-C constructions, while in the other 70 the Nominative argument is also internal, as in (20).

(19) Inogda razvivaetsja polnaja gluxota v tečenie neskol'kich dnej sometimes develops [complete deafness].NOM in several days
     ili daže časov. or even hours
     ‘Sometimes there develops a complete deafness in several days or even hours.’

(20) Voznikaet neestestvennaja situacija.
     arises [unnatural situation].NOM
     ‘An unnatural situation arises.’

I will analyze the ‘(XP) V XP S’ cases after discussing the IS properties of postverbal subjects. In Greek, Spanish and similar languages, subjects are preverbal when they are topical and postverbal when they are part of the focus or backgrounded (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1998; Costa, 2000, a.o.). In Russian, this is true only for internal Nominative arguments. This can be illustrated by (21b-c): in the ‘S V XP’ clause, the subject is topical, while in the ‘V S XP’ one, it is part of the focus.

(21) a. Jajcekletka ... soxranjaet sposobnost’ k oplodotvoreniju v srednem v tečenie 5-6 časov.
     ‘An ovum maintains its ability to be fertilized for 5-6 hours on average.’

13 Most frequent V-to-C constructions, like li questions, were filtered out beforehand. The fact that (18) involves V-to-C can be proved by adverb placement: e.g. slučajno ‘unintentionally’ would follow the verb and the subject.
b. Process oplodovorenija happens in the outer third of the oviduct.

‘The process of fertilization takes place in the outer third of the oviduct…’

c. Where a new cell is formed as a result of merger between an ovum and a sperm cell.

‘…where a new cell (a zygote) is formed as a result of merger between an ovum and a sperm cell.’

External Nominative arguments exhibit a different pattern. Postverbal subjects are necessarily in narrow focus, as in (22a), or are highlighted (contrasted or emphasized) inside a wide focus, as in (22b). In (22b), the fact that a man was bitten by a rabid fox, rather than by an ordinary dog, is the most salient part of the new information. Cases like this are analyzed in detail in (self-identifying reference).

(22) a. This small parcel was noticed by a very skinny young woman.

‘This small parcel was noticed by a very skinny young woman.’

b. A man was bitten by a rabid fox.

‘(A rare case in the province): a man was bitten by a rabid fox.’

All other subjects, even if they are new and part of a wide focus, are preverbal. For example, in (23) the preverbal subject is non-specific, which excludes topicality.

(23) A very serious foreign tourist always lodges a complaint with the local court.

‘A very serious foreign tourist always lodges a complaint with the local court’…

As is well known, Russian allows for massive IS-related movement: topics and discourse-linked material surface at the beginning of the sentence, while foci become sentence-final. Relying on this generalization and on the data presented above, I hypothesized that external Nominative arguments always raise to [Spec; TP] in Russian. However, when they are in narrow focus, subsequent IS-related movement occurs. This can be described either as right-dislocating the subject or as moving the constituent below the subject (including adverbs, the verb etc.) around it. Choosing between these two options is not directly relevant to the topic of this paper and would require an extensive analysis of IS phenomena, so let me refer the reader to (self-identifying reference). But it is essential to show that sentence-final external subjects indeed either occupy [Spec; TP] or pass through this position. Scope and binding arguments are given in the next subsection.

Finally, let me come back to the ‘(XP) V XP S’ sentences from Table 2. All of them have external Nominative subjects in narrow focus. Since Russian allows for multiple topics, all other elements usually end up in the left periphery in such cases, so the ‘XP V S’ order is predominant. ‘(XP) V XP S’ structures arise when one of the arguments is not a suitable topic: mostly when it is an anaphor, as in (24a), or forms a set expression with the verb, as in (24b). As we saw in section 2, sentences like (16a-b) are possible as well, but these did not occur in the corpus sample.
3.2 Scope and binding arguments

Let us start with the sentences in (26a-b). (25) provides a context for them.

(25) Na škol'nom predstavlenii šest' devoček i tri mal’čika ispolnjali narodnye tancy. V pervom nomere učastvovali vse devočki i tol’ko odin mal’čik. Posle etogo na scene ostalis’ odni devočki, kotorye vyxodili tancevat’ to po-otdel’nosti, to vse vmeste. ‘At a school show, six girls and three boys were performing folk dances. All the girls and only one boy took part in the first number. Then only the girls remained on the stage and came out to dance, sometimes together, sometimes separately.’

(26) a. A potom dva raza pojavil’sja každyj mal’čik. two > every and then two times appeared [every boy].NOM

b. A potom dva raza stancival každyj mal’čik. two > every, every > two and then two times danced [every boy].NOM

We can conclude that the internal Nominative argument in (26a) remains in situ: it never comes to c-command dva raza ‘two times’, so the ‘Q > Num’ reading is impossible. However, this reading becomes possible in (26b) with the external subject. This indicates that the subject has raised, but then ends up sentence-final for IS reasons (as a contrastively focused entity).

Let us turn to (27)-(28). These sentences were included in my binding questionnaire (see Appendix).


b. Svoix, učitelej ljubjat otličniki. [self’s teachers].ACC like A-students.NOM

c. Svoix, učitelej otličniki ljubjat. [self’s teachers].ACC A-students.NOM like


b. Svoim, učiteljam nravjatsja otličniki. [self’s teachers].DAT appeal A-students.NOM

c. Svoim, učiteljam otličniki nravjatsja. [self’s teachers].DAT A-students.NOM appeal

Ljubit’ ‘to love’ has an external Nominative argument and an internal Accusative one. Nravîť’sja ‘to appeal’ takes two internal arguments, a higher Dative and a lower
Nominative. According to my analysis, the Nominative DP is in or has passed through [Spec; TP] in (27b) and remains in situ in (28b). Consequently, only (28b) is expected to be ungrammatical. This is true for my Russian idiolect. The judgments of my informants are given in the Appendix. Despite some variation, there is a clear tendency to judge (28b) as the worst.

Two more examples are given in (30a-b). Checking whether the subject is able to bind the Locative phrase, we can conclude that the subject is in [Spec; TP] or has passed through this position in (30a), but not in (30b).

(29) V sočel’nik deti xodili po domam i peli pesni. Každaja devočka postaralas’ poradovat’ roditelej i objazatel’no vystupit’ pered nimi.
‘On Christmas Eve, children went from house to house singing songs. Every girl tried to please her parents and to make sure that she performs in front of them.’

   no in self’s house sang [every boy].NOM

   no in self’s house appeared [every boy].NOM

To conclude, in this section I have demonstrated that external Nominative DPs always raise to [Spec; TP] in Russian, but can subsequently appear in the sentence-final position when they are in narrow focus. Internal Nominative arguments raise when they are topical and otherwise remain in situ. Thus, Russian is similar to English, in which only external subjects obligatorily move to satisfy the EPP. This is incompatible with an analysis in which OVS sentences have in situ subjects (as in Bailyn (2003a, 2003b, 2004)).

4 Sentences with no overt material to satisfy the EPP

What satisfies the EPP in the sentences where internal Nominative arguments remain in situ or where the verb takes no Nominative arguments? In English, expletives are used in these constructions. Russian has no overt expletives. Does a non-Nominative XP occupy [Spec; TP] in these cases? In this section, I show that the EPP does not trigger obligatory raising of such XPs, and many sentences have no overt material in the left periphery. Section 5 demonstrates that even if there is an XP there, as in

---

14 Examples in this section also show that internal Nominative arguments, unlike external ones, cannot move to [Spec; TP] and then end up sentence-final as a result of subsequent IS-related movement. An anonymous reviewer asked why they cannot do so and receive a narrow focus reading. This can be easily explained if a configurational IS model is adopted (e.g. Neeleman and Reinhart, 1998; Neeleman and van de Koot, 2008; Reinhart, 2006; Szendrői, 2001; self-identifying reference). In these models, there are no dedicated IS features like Top or F and no fixed syntactic positions targeted by topics and foci. Rather, an element should be in a particular configuration to receive a particular interpretation.

The models mentioned above differ in various aspects, so I will take (Reinhart, 2006) as an example. In this model the focused constituent must contain the main stress. The main stress is assigned by default in the most embedded position, so either a focused constituent ends up there or the stress is relocated to it. If a required configuration is available without additional movements or stress shifts, they are ruled out by the Economy Principle. This is why Russian internal Nominative arguments must remain in situ if they are focused, and do not get into the sentence-final position as a result of additional movements.
'XP V S' constructions with *in situ* subjects, it does not pass through [Spec; TP].

First of all, Russian has impersonal sentences like (31) with no overt material except the verb.\(^{15}\)

(31) Temneet.

[gets darker], IMPERS

'It is getting darker.'

Now let us look at verbs with two internal arguments. (32a-d), taken from Williams (2006: 416, n. 34a-b), demonstrate an important generalization: one of the arguments obligatorily moves out.

(32) a. Saše ne nravitsja Boris.

Sasha.DAT NEG appeals Boris.NOM

‘Sasha does not like Boris.’ Answer to: Do you foresee any problems with our group trip?

b. Boris ne nravitsja Saše.

Boris.NOM NEG appeals Sasha.DAT

‘Sasha does not like Boris.’ Not an answer to: Do you foresee any problems with our group trip? Answer to: Who likes Boris?

c. Nravitsja Saše Boris.

d. Nravitsja Boris Saše.

The verb *nravit'sja* takes two arguments, a higher Dative and a lower Nominative. The higher argument raises ‘by default’, i.e. without any IS effects: (32a) is felicitous in the all-new context. The lower argument can also raise — when it is topical. The same pattern can be observed in Locative Inversion (LI) cases, like (33a-b) below (Babyonyshev, 1996, p. 52, n. 37a-b), where the ‘PP\(_{LOC}\) V DP\(_{NOM}\)’ is also the canonical word order. The verb-initial orders in (32c-d) are extremely infrequent and can be used when the verb is anaphorically given or focus-fronted and in ‘folksy’ contexts, as in example (18) in section 3. All these uses are associated with specific intonational properties. It is commonly assumed that such constructions involve additional verb movement after internal argument raising (e.g. Lavine and Freidin, 2002, p. 272).

(33) a. V klasse pojavilsja noven'kij.

in class appeared new.NOM

‘A new boy entered the class.’

b. Noven'kij pojavilsja v klasse.

new.NOM appeared in class

Lavine and Freidin explain the obligatory argument raising in cases like (32a-d) or (34a-b) below (2002: 282, n. 44a-b) by appealing to the EPP requirement.

(34) a. Soldata ranilo pulej.

soldier.ACC wounded.IMPERS bullet.INSTR

‘A soldier was wounded by a bullet.’

\(^{15}\) For such cases, a solution has been proposed, although it might not be optimal and is not available at all if the EPP requirement is associated with T. Lavine and Freidin (2002), who associate the EPP requirement with Agrs, claim that verbs like *temnet’* do not project an AgrsP. Hence, there is no EPP requirement in such sentences.
b. Pulej ranilo soldata.
   bullet.INSTR wounded.IMPERS soldier.ACC

However, this explanation is undermined by three facts. First, XPs occupying [Spec; TP] are expected to bind possessive anaphors, as happens with quirky subjects in Icelandic (Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson, 1985). (35)-(36) show that this is not the case in Russian. In section 5, specifically dedicated to binding and coreference, this will also be demonstrated for cases like (32a) and for Locative Inversion (LI) constructions.

(35) a. Soldata ranilo ego / *svoej pulej.
   soldier.ACC wounded.IMPERS his self’s bullet.INSTR
   ‘A/the soldier was wounded by his bullet.’

b. Každago soldata ranilo ego / *svoej pulej.
   every soldier.ACC wounded.IMPERS his self’s bullet.INSTR
   ‘Every soldier was wounded by his bullet.’

(36) Upavšimi kirpičami zavalilo ix / *svoego xozjaina.
   [fallen bricks].INSTR blocked.IMPERS their self’s owner.ACC
   ‘Fallen bricks blocked their owner.’

Second, the presence of other XPs in the left periphery, as in (37a-b), does not change the pattern. If Locative PPs can satisfy the EPP, raising of internal arguments becomes unnecessary. Nevertheless, one of them still obligatorily moves up.

(37) a. Na peredovoj soldata ranilo pulej.
   on the front line soldier.ACC wounded.IMPERS bullet.INSTR
   ‘On the front line, a soldier was wounded by a bullet.’

b. Na peredovoj pulej ranilo soldata.
   on the front line bullet.INSTR wounded.IMPERS soldier.ACC

Third, as (38) and (39b) show, there is no obligatory raising in the sentences with one internal argument. Examples (39a-b) are provided with their corpus contexts, as I will need them later. This forces the conclusion that the movement in (32)-(34) has some independent causes, which have still to be identified.

(38) Pojavilis’ pervye cvety.
   appeared [first flowers].NOM
   ‘There appeared the first flowers.’

---

16 One can argue that this should be possible only in LI constructions. Various restrictions on LI are still unclear even in English, in which it has been studied extensively (e.g. see footnote 2), but it appears to matter what type of predicate is used. So I can only note that ranilo ‘wounded.IMPERS’ and similar verbs can be used without their Instrumental argument in cases like (ii), which look like LI. Thus, my observation might still be interesting even if this objection is correct.

(ii) Na peredovoj ranilo soldata.
    on the front line wounded.IMPERS soldier.ACC
    Canonical order: ‘On the front line a soldier was wounded’.

17 Non-EPP-driven movement out of vP is discussed by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2001), but their analysis applies only to the examples where two arguments bear structural Case (i.e. to the sentences with a subject and a direct object).
(39) a. (I vdrug... Bac!!! Takoj oglušitel’nyj zvuk!)
   Uši založilo, čestnoe slovo!
   ears.ACC clogged.IMPERS word of honor
   ‘(And all of a sudden... Bang!!! Such a deafening sound!) My ears got clogged, honestly!’

b. (Baraxtalas’, bojalas’ vdoxnut’ i vydoxnut’).
   Založilo uši.
   clogged.IMPERS ears.ACC
   ‘(I floundered, I was afraid to breathe in and out). My ears got clogged.’

In section 3, we have already seen that ‘V S’ sentences like (38) are commonplace in Russian. Now let me discuss (39a-b) in more detail. Bailyn analyzes (39a), although without any context (2003b: 159, n. 6). Following Babyonyshev (1996), he claims that such sentences exhibit obligatory EPP-driven object raising.

However, if this were the case, sentences like (39b) would be ill-formed, while in fact they are grammatical and frequently used. To illustrate this claim, I searched for (39a) and (39b) in the National Corpus of Russian Language (www.ruscorpora.ru), looking at pure ‘O V’ and ‘V O’ sentences, as well as ‘(XP) O V (XP)’ and ‘(XP) V O (XP)’ constructions. I also added examples with the verb zakladyvalo, the Imperfective counterpart of založilo. The distribution of word orders is presented in Table 3. Obviously, this small data sample can only be used as an illustration. But it clearly indicates that VO orders are by no means marginal — in this case, they were even predominant. Moreover, as the contexts I provided in (39a-b) show, both ‘O V’ and ‘V O’ constructions can have wide focus.

To conclude, (38) and (39b) do not have the specific intonational and interpretative properties found in constructions like (32c-d) where the verb moves to the left periphery. Therefore, there is no overt material in these sentences that could even potentially satisfy the EPP in T. I come back to this problem in section 6, while the next section answers a different question: if the left periphery does contain a non-Nominative XP, can it satisfy the EPP at least in some cases?

5 Positions of raised non-Nominative XPs

This section examines whether non-Nominative XPs can satisfy the EPP in ‘XP V S’ cases with in situ subjects. If they could, they would have A-properties, as opposed to

---

18 This group of verbs is known as Adversity Impersonals, but, as examples (55a-b) in section 6 show, this term is misleading: they do not always denote something adverse.

19 What is the difference between (39a) and (39b)? In the Russian linguistic tradition, Koptunova (1976) suggested that OV orders are emphatic, but eventually most authors agreed that while written Russian uses VO orders, OV orders are characteristic of colloquial Russian, and there are no clear interpretative differences between them (e.g. Sirotinina, 1965; Kodzasov, 1989, 1996). This problem is discussed in more detail in (self-identifying reference). Importantly, the tendency to use OV in colloquial Russian has nothing to do with the EPP requirement because it equally affects ‘S O V’ vs. ‘S V O’ etc. As (iii) shows, the position occupied by preverbal objects is rather low, but its exact nature still has to be identified.

(iii) (Nenavižu samolety), mne vsegda uši zakladyvaet.
   me.DAT always ears.ACC clogs.IMPERS
   ‘I hate planes, my ears always get clogged.’
the A‘-properties found in ‘XP S V’ constructions. This question has been most thoroughly studied by Bailyn (2003a, 2003b, 2004), who looked at various cases with internal Nominative DPs, including constructions analyzed in (Babylonyshev, 1996; Lavine and Freidin, 2002), as well as the ‘V S’ vs. ‘O S V’ sentences. I will therefore go over his examples as a starting point. The sentences for which my native speaker intuitions did not coincide with the ones reported by Bailyn were included in a questionnaire and presented to 20 informants (see Appendix).

First, cases with personal and possessive pronominals, such as the homophonous ego ‘him’ and ego ‘his’, will be considered. A‘-movement reconstructs, while A-movement is expected to change binding and coreference possibilities with respect to the canonical word order. Subsection 5.1 shows that ‘XP V S’ and ‘XP S V’ receive the same ratings in the absolute majority of cases, although, surprisingly, these ratings can sometimes vary from ‘grammatical’ to ‘?’ among speakers. All grammatical examples show A‘-properties, but sometimes both cases are judged bad, as if we were dealing with A-movement. Since no A-position is available to XPs in ‘XP S V’ constructions, I conclude that the ungrammaticality is caused by independent factors.

Second, I will analyze sentences with the possessive anaphor svoj ‘self’s’, to see whether XPs can bind it in ‘XP V S’ cases, as opposed to ‘XP S V’ ones, because binders of such anaphors are standardly assumed to occupy [Spec; TP]. Importantly, it has been known at least since (Rappaport, 1986) that svoj does not always function as an anaphor. The relation between anaphoric and non-anaphoric svoj (their status in the lexicon, their distribution etc.) is far from clear. One way to distinguish between them is to check whether svoj can be replaced with sobstvennyj ‘own’ and to look for additional shades of meaning associated with the non-anaphoric reading: ‘private’, ‘closely related’. For example, the expression svoi ljudi ‘self’s people’ refers to the people one has some special relations with, often to one’s fellow criminals. In subsection 5.2, I show that once this factor is controlled for, there is no evidence that the XPs in the ‘XP V S’ cases have subject properties.

5.1 Examples with pronominals

Let us first look at the examples with possessive pronominals. Consider (40a-b) (Bailyn 2003b: 161, n. 14a-b), given here without their grammaticality evaluations.

(40) a. Staršij brat, pojavilsja v ego, dome.  
   [older brother].NOM appeared in his house  
   Intended meaning: ‘The older brother, appeared in his house.’

(40) b. V ego, dome pojavilsja staršij brat.  
   in his house appeared [older brother].NOM

According to Bailyn, (40a) deserves a ‘?’ and (40b) with Locative Inversion a ‘?’’. He assumes that (40a) involves a Principle B violation, which is remedied in (40b), because A-movement does not reconstruct. However, I find both sentences highly degraded. Almost all my informants shared my judgments, but often rated (40a) as slightly better than (40b). Apart from that, two participants found (40a) grammatical and gave (40b) a ‘?’, and one gave them a ‘?’ and a ‘*’ respectively. All answers are given in the Appendix.20 Thus, for the absolute majority of speakers, whether they

20 An anonymous reviewer suggests converting the ratings (ok, ?, ??, ???, *) into a numerical
accept or reject (40a), movement in (40b) does not change binding and coreference possibilities.

If we turn to the Dative experiencer constructions in (41a-c), there is more variation between my informants. Bailyn’s (41a-b) (2003b: 161, n. 14a-b) are supplemented by (41c) showing their ‘XP S V’ counterpart. As with (40a-b), Bailyn gives (41a) a ‘*’ and (41b) a ‘?’. Most participants evaluated (41a) as the best. (41b) and (41c) were usually equal (from ‘grammatical’ to ‘*’). For me, (41a-c) are all bad.

(41) a. Deti_novajtsja ix_roditeljam.
   children.NOM appeal [their parents].DAT
   Intended meaning: ‘Children, please their parents.’

b. Ix_roditeljam novajtsja deti._
   [their parents].DAT appeal children.NOM

c. Ix_roditeljam deti_novajtsja.
   [their parents].DAT children.NOM appeal

For the sake of completeness, let us also consider (42a-c), which have external subjects (Bailyn, 2003b: 168, n. 31a-c). Bailyn rates (42a-c) as ‘*’, ‘grammatical’ and ‘??’. Most of my informants gave all three sentences ‘???’ or ‘*’ (as I do). (42b-c) were never found better than ‘??’ and almost always received the same ratings, while (42a) received three ‘??’ ratings and was even accepted by one speaker.

(42) a. Ivan_ljubit ego_druzej.
   Ivan.NOM loves [his friends].ACC
   Intended meaning: ‘Ivan, loves his friends.’

b. Ego_druzej ljubit Ivan._
   [his friends].ACC loves Ivan.NOM

c. Ego_druzej Ivan_ljubit.
   [his friends].ACC Ivan.NOM loves

Before I draw any conclusions, let us turn to the cases involving personal pronominals in (43a-b) and (44a-b) (Bailyn, 2003b: 163, n. 20a-b, 21a-b). I have added (43c) and (44c) to these examples. Bailyn claims that (43a) and (44a) are grammatical, while (43b) and (44b) deserve a ‘*’, and explains this as a Principle C violation. Most of my informants agree with his evaluations, as I do. But both ‘XP S V’ cases receive the same low ratings.

(43) a. Znakomye Ivana_ byli u nego_doma.
   [friends of Ivan].NOM were at him at home
   ‘Friends of Ivan were at his house.’

b. U nego_doma byli znakomye Ivana._
   at him at home were [friends of Ivan].NOM

c. U nego_doma znakomye Ivana_byli.
   at him at home [friends of Ivan].NOM were

(44) a. Znakomye Ivana_ novajtsja emu._
   [friends of Ivan].NOM appeal to him

scale (0-4). This way, averages can be computed and it is easy to appreciate whether sentences received roughly the same ratings or not, and how big the difference is.
‘Friends of Ivan please him.’

b. Emu.nravjatsja znakomye Ivana.
   to him appeal [friends of Ivan].NOM

c. Emu. znakomye Ivana nravjatsja.
   to him [friends of Ivan].NOM appeal

(43)-(44) are evaluated as if we had A-movement not only in ‘XP V S’, but also in ‘XP S V’ constructions, which is very strange. However, when we look at all the sentences presented in this subsection, the following tendency emerges. Most speakers tend to reject all examples with backward anaphora — both ‘XP V S’ and ‘XP S V’ cases, both when the canonical order is judged as grammatical and when it is not. Thus, some independent factor must be at work here.

Finally, Bailyn presents examples where alleged WCO violations are remedied in ‘XP V S’ cases. I did not include them in my questionnaire, so I rely on informally collected judgments. First consider (45a-b) (Bailyn 2004: 28, n. 49a-b).

(45) a. Ee. uborščica vošla v každuju komnatu.  
   [its cleaning lady].NOM entered into every room  
   ‘Its cleaning lady entered into every room.’

b. V každuju komnatu vošla ee. uborščica.  
   into every room entered [its cleaning lady].NOM

Bailyn gives (45a) a ‘*’ and rates (45b) as grammatical. All speakers I asked rejected both sentences and their ‘XP S V’ counterparts. Independent factors might be involved, because uborščica (etoj komnaty) ‘(this) room’s cleaning lady’ also sounds bad in Russian. So I tested different examples in (46a-c).

(46) a. Ee. xozjain prišel v každuju kvartiru.  
   [its owner].NOM arrived in every apartment  
   ‘Its owner came to every apartment.’

b. V každuju kvartiru prišel ee. xozjain.  
   in every apartment arrived [its owner].NOM

c. V každuju kvartiru ee. xozjain prišel (pervym).  
   in every apartment [its owner].NOM arrived first

(46a) is rejected by all speakers. Many people also do not like (46b-c). Those who accept these sentences find (46b) better — as predicted by Bailyn. However, this preference disappears once some constituent is inserted at the end of (46c). Apparently, the problem has nothing to do with WCO — people do not like the verb-final order because it presupposes narrow focus on the verb prišel ‘arrived’. It is difficult to imagine what this predicate could be contrasted with.

No such problems are expected with the predicate nravit’sja ‘to like’. So let us compare Bailyn’s (47a-b) (2004: 28, n. 51a-b) with (47c). Bailyn rates (47a-b) as ‘??’ and grammatical respectively. While many people I asked tend to reject (47a) altogether and not all of them accept (47b-c), those who do judge them as equal.

(47) a. Ee. sobaka nravitsja každoj devočke.  
   [her dog].NOM appeals [every girl].DAT  
   ‘Every girl likes her dog.’
b. Každoj devočke řavitsja ee sobaka.
   [every girl].DAT appeals [her dog].NOM

c. Každoj devočke ee sobaka řavitsja.
   [every girl].DAT [her dog].NOM appeals

What factors are responsible for the pattern in (46)-(47)? First of all, they are not limited to WCO because (46a) and (47a) remain degraded without kazhdyj ‘every’. Apparently, these sentences suffer from the same backward coreference problem as the ‘XP V S’ and ‘XP S V’ examples at the beginning of this subsection. In (47b), no WCO effects could arise in any case, because the Dative argument is merged higher than the Nominative argument and therefore never crosses it. In fact, it is unclear whether Russian has WCO effects at all — at least, it is one of the languages in which local wh-movement does not induce WCO violations. Finally, so far it is unclear why some speakers accept (46b-c) and (47b-c), while the others do not. In any case, let me stress that there is no difference between ‘XP V S’ and ‘XP S V’ cases.

5.2 Examples with anaphors

Let us turn to examples with the possessive anaphor svoj, starting with (48a-b) (Bailyn, 2003b: 160-161, n. 12a-b). I have added (48c) to this comparison.

(48) a. ??? Svoj. dom byl u Petrovyx.
   [self’s house].NOM was at Petrovs
   ‘The Petrovs had their own house.’

b. U Petrovyx byl svoj. dom.
   at Petrovs was [self’s house].NOM

c. U Petrovyx svoj. dom byl.
   at Petrovs [self’s house].NOM was

Bailyn argues that in (48b), the PP occupies [Spec; IP], satisfies the EPP and binds svoj, while otherwise it is impossible, as (48a) shows. However, my (48c) is also grammatical, although the PP is definitely higher than [Spec; IP]. There was very little disagreement in the informally collected judgments, so I did not include (48a-c) in my questionnaire.

I believe that svoj is non-anaphoric in these examples (meaning ‘own’, ‘private’, which, incidentally, is stressed in Bailyn’s translation). (48a) might be judged as somewhat degraded out of the blue, because the neutral word order in this possessive construction is ‘PP V DPNOM’. Once (48a) appears in a proper context (e.g after the question U kogo byl sobstvennyj dom? ‘Who owned a house?’), it becomes acceptable.

Although possessive constructions like (48a-c) are analyzed alongside Locative Inversion (e.g. Babyonyshev, 1996, p. 34), let us also look at (49a-c) with Locative PPs. Unlike in (48a-c), svoj cannot be replaced with sobstvennyj ‘own’ in these examples, so the possibility of a non-anaphoric reading does not influence the judgements. All speakers I asked unanimously rejected (49a-c). Thus, when independent factors are controlled for, raised PPs show no subject properties either in ‘XP V S’ or in ‘XP S V’ constructions.

21 All translations of Bailyn’s original examples are taken from his work.
Let us move to Bailyn’s (50a-b) (2003b: 161, n. 13a-b) and to my (50c). Bailyn marks (50a) as ‘???’ and (50b) as grammatical. Most of my informants judged (50a) as the worst and (50b) and (50c) as equally good or bad (from ‘grammatical’ to ‘*’). For some, (50b) was slightly better than (50c) or vice versa. I would give both ‘??’.

This diversity in ratings can be partly explained by two possible readings of svoj. Notably, if svoj is replaced with sobstvennyj ‘own’, (50a) still looks worse than (50b-c) out of context. In any case, there is no tendency to prefer the ‘XP V S’ case over the ‘XP S V’ one. Let me add that (49b-c) and (50b-c) are grammatical with possessive pronouns, although (49c) requires some context to justify the narrow focus on vošel ‘entered’. Although this rule is not without exceptions, usually pronouns are allowed only when anaphors are ruled out. As for (48a-c), this construction already has a possessive meaning, so possessive pronouns become superfluous.

Explaining the extensive variation among speakers calls for further research. Nevertheless, the distinction between ‘XP V S’ and ‘XP S V’ cases clearly was not supported. It is also notable that (49b-c), where the non-anaphoric reading definitely does not interfere, were unanimously rejected. This indicates that raised XPs do not occupy [Spec; TP] either in ‘XP V S’ or in ‘XP S V’ constructions.

6  Covert expletives

The data presented in sections 4 and 5 lead to the following conclusion: only Nominative DPs can occupy [Spec; TP] in Russian, so in the sentences without a Nominative argument or with in situ subjects, there is no overt material to satisfy the EPP requirement. At the same time, the obligatory raising of external Nominative arguments proves that it is certainly operative in Russian. Therefore, introducing covert expletives in these cases, analogous to English Nominative expletive it and Caseless expletive there, is the most parsimonious option.22

As I mentioned in subsection 1.1, initially it was assumed that covert expletives are used in all those sentences in various languages where the subject is

22 Let me note that Russian impersonal verbs have the same endings as the verbs with 3 SG NEUTR overt subjects, e.g. like sostojanie ‘state’ or ono ‘it’.
absent or does not move to [Spec; TP]. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) and their followers challenged this assumption, arguing that the EPP in T is satisfied by the raised finite verb in some languages and covert expletives should not be introduced in them. The debate is still open: Holmberg (2005), Neeleman and Szendrői (2007), Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007) and other authors provided numerous arguments for covert expletives in various languages.

In any case, even if languages like Italian or Greek lack covert expletives, it does not mean that they are absent in other languages, where the finite verb does not always raise to T. A Dutch example with an optionally covert expletive and a German sentence with an obligatorily covert one are given in (51) (Perlmutter and Moore, 2002: 645, n. 102a-b) and (52) (Reuland, 1983: 5, n. 8b). Haeberli (1999) examines Germanic languages in great detail and argues for covert expletives in German, Yiddish, Dutch, Frisian and Icelandic.

(51) Gisteren kwam (er) door de achterdeur iemand binnen.
    yesterday came EXPL through the back door someone inside
    ‘Yesterday someone came in through the back door.’

(52) Er sagte, daß (*es) angenommen wurde daß jeder sofort
    he said that EXPL was assumed that everyone at once
    weggehen würde.
    would leave.
    ‘He said that it was assumed that everyone would leave immediately.’

As I showed in section 2, Russian also belongs to the group of languages where the EPP in T cannot be satisfied by the raised verb because the finite verb normally does not move further than v. Perlmutter and Moore (2002) present some EPP-independent evidence for the existence of covert expletives in Russian impersonal constructions. As (53)-(54) show (Perlmutter and Moore, 2002: 621, n. 5a-b, 9a-b), impersonal constructions cannot be infinitival, although all other types of predicates are used in infinitival sentences.

(53) a. … čtoby my uexali na vokzal.
    in order we.NOM [go out].SUBJUNCT to railway station
    ‘in order that we go out to the railway station’

b. … čtoby nam uexat’ na vokzal.
    in order we.DAT [go out].INF to railway station
    ‘in order for us to go out to the railway station’

(54) a. Čtoby morozilo na Gavajax, (nado, čtoby zemlja perevernulas’).
    in order freeze.SUBJUNCT in Hawaii
    ‘In order that it freeze in Hawaii, (the world would have to turn upside down).’

b. *Čtoby morozit’ na Gavajax, (nado, čtoby zemlja perevernulas’).
    in order freeze.INF in Hawaii
    Intended meaning: ‘In order for it to freeze in Hawaii, (the world would have to turn upside down).’

The impersonal verb in (54a-b) has no overt arguments. (55a-b) illustrate that the same generalization holds for impersonal verbs taking overt arguments.

(55) a. Čtoby Mašu oosenilo, (ej nado pomeditirovat’).
    in order Masha.ACC dawn-on.SUBJUNCT
‘In order that Masha get an insight, (she needs to meditate).’

b.  *Čtoby Mašu / Maše oseníť, (ej nado pomeditirovat’).
   in order  Masha.ACC  Masha.DAT  dawn-on.INF
   Intended meaning: ‘In order for Masha to get an insight, (she needs to meditate).’

Perlmutter and Moore propose the following explanation: “impersonal clauses have a silent expletive subject whose Nominative case clashes with a language-particular requirement that the subject of infinitival clauses be Dative” (Perlmutter and Moore 2002: 620). Importantly, it is not the case that infinitival clauses must always have overt subjects, as (56) shows (ibid.: 634, n. ii).

(56) Čto delat’?
   what do.INF
   ‘What is one to do?’

Perlmutter and Moore emphasize that introducing covert expletives in Russian does not mean that they should be postulated in analogous constructions in other languages. They note that silent expletives might be absent in Irish or Greek, because these languages exhibit certain systematic contrasts with Russian. For example, they have no Case-related restrictions on the distribution of impersonals, which can be used in ECM constructions in Irish and in Genitivus Absolutus constructions in Greek.

7 Conclusions

This paper discusses the EPP in T in Russian. Section 2 demonstrates that it does not trigger verb movement. Using scope, binding and other tests, section 3 shows that external Nominative arguments obligatorily raise to satisfy the EPP, while internal ones can remain in situ, as in English. Unlike English, Russian is rich in IS-related movement, so external subjects in narrow focus nevertheless end up in the sentence-final position.

Contrary to several recent models (e.g. Babyonyshev, 1996; Bailyn, 2003a, 2003b, 2004; Lavine, 1998; Lavine and Freidin, 2002), sections 4 and 5 show that only Nominative DPs can satisfy the EPP in Russian. Other raised XPs do not exhibit subject properties and hence do not pass through [Spec; TP], while some sentences have no overt material in the left periphery at all. External subject raising proves that the EPP requirement is operative in Russian, so introducing covert expletives in these cases, where English has overt ones, appears to be the most parsimonious option. Since many authors view the EPP as an overtness requirement and therefore try to avoid silent expletives, section 6 provides some independent evidence for their existence in Russian.

The fact that Russian patterns with English with respect to the EPP in T is interesting from a typological perspective. As a result, Russian ‘free word order’ systematically differs from the one in Spanish or Greek where IS-related movement is also abundant, but is superimposed on different EPP-driven processes (verb raising). The question of whether the EPP in T can be satisfied by non-agreeing XPs is also important for a more general debate on the relation between two basic grammatical operations, Agree and Move (or internal Merge). For example, Chomsky (2008) suggests dissociating them and mentions Lavine and Freidin’s Russian EPP model as an important argument. Potential exceptions to agreement-
based EPP models have been found in various languages (e.g. Collins, 1997; Holmberg, 2000; Ura, 2000; Miyagawa 2001; Nevins and Anand, 2003), so removing one of them certainly does not solve the problem. Rather, it shows that every such case deserves close scrutiny.

Finally, let me make a brief remark on the place of Russian in the EPP typology. Contrasting EPP-driven subject raising and verb raising, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) note that the latter option is taken in languages with rich verbal morphology and stress the importance of agreement in person. Prima facie Russian is known for its complex verbal morphology. However, Russian Past tense forms are former participles that agree only in number and gender (in the Singular). In Old Russian, these participles were used with to be auxiliaries, which were subsequently lost (as in Farsi).

The question of whether the EPP requirement in Old Russian worked like the EPP in Spanish and Greek and then changed is difficult to answer. Most early texts, especially syntactically complex narratives, were written in Church Slavonic, while Old Russian was a spoken language. I can only note that Church Slavonic texts indeed have many (XP) V S XP constructions, and such examples are also numerous in Russian folk epics and fairy tales. For example, (57) is the first sentence in the classic fairy tale about a gigantic turnip. A similar case was presented in (18). Further research is needed to determine what the structure of such sentences was in Old Russian, and whether they were subsequently reanalyzed (as I noted in section 2, modern Russian constructions with verb raising involve V-to-C movement).

(57) Posadil ded repku.
    planted [old man]. NOM turnip.ACC
‘An old man planted a turnip.’
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Tables

Table 1
Positions of different adverbs with respect to the verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Adv V</th>
<th>V Adv</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xorošo (‘well’)</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>99,8%</td>
<td>1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medlenno (‘slowly’)</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>99,5%</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polnost’ju (‘completely’)</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>97,1%</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Types of constructions with postverbal subjects and their frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>N of cases</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XP V S</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>76,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V S</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP V XP S</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V XP S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP V S XP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V S XP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(XP) V XP S XP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Word order distribution for a sample OV/VO case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>N of cases</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>založilo ‘clogged.PERF.IMPERSON’ + uši ‘ears.ACC’</td>
<td>(XP) O V (XP) (out of them pure ‘O V’)</td>
<td>22 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zakladývalo ‘clogged.IMPERSON’ + uši ‘ears.ACC’</td>
<td>(XP) O V (XP) (out of them pure ‘O V’)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix. Binding and coreference questionnaire

20 adult native speakers of Russian from St. Petersburg and Moscow took part in this questionnaire. Below, they are coded by numbers 1-20. All participants received a printed form with sentences and instructions. The instructions asked them to judge sentences using five symbols: ‘ok’ (normal), ‘?’ (slightly odd), ‘??’ (rather odd, but possible), ‘???’ (almost impossible, but not ungrammatical) and ‘*’ (impossible). Indices were used to indicate coreference. Their meaning was explained in the beginning of experiment and demonstrated on two sample sentences. In addition to that, periphrastic descriptions of int were included in the questionnaire. Two sets of sentences were added to the questionnaire later, so only 11 speakers judged them.

An anonymous reviewer suggested converting the ratings (ok, ?, ??, ???, *) into a numerical scale (0-4, 4 being worst) so that averages could be computed. This way it is much easier to appreciate whether the sentences received roughly the same ratings or not, and how big the difference is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40a</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40b</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41b</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41c</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42a</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42b</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42c</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43a</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43b</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43c</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44b</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44c</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50b</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50c</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>