

The OVS order in Russian: Where are the O and the V?¹

Alya M Pereltsvaig (Independent Scholar)

Abstract. The non-canonical OVS order in Russian is reconsidered and argued to be derived not by a head-final *v*P- or VP-fronting (as, for example, in Kalin’s 2014 analysis of Hixkaryana), nor by fronting the O into a left-peripheral position. Rather, it is argued that Russian OVS is derived by A-movement of the object into Spec-TP. Furthermore, the Fronted VP Scope Freezing diagnostic is used to show that there is no (remnant) verb phrase fronting in the derivation of the Russian OVS. It is also argued that the verb does not raise via Head Movement. It thus follows that the post-verbal position of the S is derived by a rightward movement of the subject to a low adjoined position.

1. Introduction

Russian is well-known for its “freedom” of word order, and in particular for the possibility of OVS order, for which several analyses have already been proposed in the literature (Erechko 2003, Bailyn 2004, 2012, Slioussar 2011, Wiland 2013, Titov 2013, 2018, Ionin and Luchkina 2018, *inter alia*). In this paper, the issue of the proper analysis for the Russian OVS order is reconsidered.²

In this paper, I argue that the OVS order in Russian is derived neither by fronting the O into a left-peripheral position such as Spec-CP, nor by fronting a VP or a *v*P, as has been proposed in some of the earlier literature. Instead, it is argued that the OVS in Russian is derived very differently. First, the O is argued to move to Spec-TP. Second, it is argued that there is no remnant verb phrase movement in Russian OVS sentences; instead, the V and other VP-internal material stays *in situ*. The only tenable alternative is deriving the postverbal position of the subject by moving it to a right-adjoined position. It is suggested in the final section of this paper that such a right-adjoined position cannot be a high one, but must be relatively low, albeit outside the *v*P. Note that Antonyuk (this volume) reaches a similar, albeit not an identical conclusion; nor are her arguments the same as those presented here. While Antonyuk’s focus is largely about deriving the position of the S in OVS, the present paper focuses on buttressing the argument for the position of the O in Spec-TP and for the verb staying in an unmoved *v*P. Thus, our two papers complement each other.

For the purposes of this paper, I assume a basic clausal structure, with CP, TP, and *v*P being the only functional projections. Note that in this minimal clause structure, TP is the only derived A-position. Moreover, I take the basic/canonical/default order in Russian to be SVO, derived by the S moving to Spec-TP, the V staying in *v*P (i.e. Short Verb Movement only, no V-to-T raising), and the O staying *in situ*. In addition, I assume that the OSV order is derived from SVO by Topicalization (i.e. A'-movement) of the O into the left periphery of the clause. These assumptions are shared with much research on Russian syntax (see Bailyn 2012 for an overview).

Another important assumption made here is that the same surface word order may correspond to different syntactic structures depending on the information structural status of various elements. For example, a surface OVS order may correspond to different syntactic structures

¹ This work has been greatly inspired by Bailyn (2018) and conversations with John F. Bailyn in Moscow and Saint Petersburg. I am also grateful to Svitlana Antonuyk, Hadas Kotek, Ekaterina Lyutikova, Olga Mitrenina, Sergei Tatevosov, Yakov Testelet, Susi Wurmbbrand, and the audience at FASL 29 at Stony Brook University, as well as anonymous reviewers, for insightful discussions. Moreover, I am indebted to the 125 native Russian speakers whose patience in answering my endless queries and surveys has made this research possible.

² Curiously, the OVS in Russian is “the most frequent non-canonical word order” (Ionin and Luchkina 2018: 742), occurring in 11% of all 3-member sentences (Bivon 1971); cf. also Sirotinina (1965), Bailyn (1995), Kallestinova (2007), *inter alia*.

depending on which element is focused (following Brunetti 2004, I do not distinguish New Information Focus and Contrastive Focus). To compare apples to apples, only OVS sentences with a focused S, as in (1a), are considered in this paper and OVS sentences with a focused O are set aside, as in (1b).

- (1) a. A: Who wrote *Anna Karenina*?
 B: “Annu Kareninu” napisal [Lev Tolstoj]_{FOC}.
 [Anna Karenina].ACC wrote [Leo Tolstoj].NOM
 ‘As for *Anna Karenina*, Leo Tolstoj wrote it.’
- b. [Annu KARENINU]_{FOC} napisal Tolstoj, a ne roman “Idiot”.
 [Anna Karenina].ACC wrote [Tolstoj].NOM and not novel *Idiot*
 ‘It’s *Anna Karenina* that Tolstoj wrote, and not *Idiot*.’

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I consider novel evidence from binding and adverb placement and argue that the O is in a derived A-position (i.e., Spec-TP). In section 3, I turn to the question of how the VS chunk of the OVS sentence is derived. I claim that the verb (and any other VP-internal material) does not move to the left of the S, either by Head Movement or by remnant *v*P/VP movement. Instead, I argue that the V (and other VP-internal material) stays *in situ* while the S extraposes to a *v*P-adjoined position. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Is the O in Spec-TP or in CP?

Existing analyses of the Russian OVS can be divided into two camps: those that take the O to be in Spec-TP or some similar A-position (see King 1995, Bailyn 2003, 2004, and Titov 2012, 2013, 2018) and those that take the S to be in Spec-TP and the O to be somewhere in the left periphery, either in Spec-CP or inside the fronted *v*P located in Spec-CP (see Erechko 2003, Slioussar 2007, 2011, Wiland 2013, Ionin and Luchkina 2018). In what follows, I reconsider the arguments proposed by the latter camp and decide in favor of the former position, buttressing the analysis in Bailyn (2004) that takes the O to be located in Spec-TP.

One of the arguments brought forward by both Erechko (2003) and Wiland (2013) to argue that the O in OVS is in the left periphery is as follows: the S in OVS, they claim, can take scope over sentential negation, and is therefore in Spec-TP. (To be more precise, Wiland claims that in Polish OVS the S can take both wide and narrow scope with respect to negation, whereas Erechko claims that in Russian OVS the S can only scope over negation.) As it turns out, the S in Russian OVS can take both wide and narrow scope with respect to sentential negation (as claimed by Wiland); in particular, sentences such as (2) are ambiguous, with the context determining the more salient reading.³ For example, in the context of a cooking competition where for any chef to be promoted to the next round, his dish needs to be tasted by at least 10 children, the reading with negation taking scope over the S comes to the fore. Conversely, in a context of a kindergarten where parents of the kids who have not tried semolina porridge would be called to the principal’s office, the reading with the S taking scope over negation is more salient.

- (2) Mannuju kašu eščě ne poprobovali desjat’ detej.
 [semolina porridge].ACC yet not tasted [ten children].NOM
 ‘As for semolina porridge, ten children haven’t tasted it yet.’
 ambiguous: 10 \neg or \neg 10

³ Unless otherwise indicated, judgments reported in this paper come from my panel of native speakers. A total of 125 people participated in various parts of this empirical research. Variation among speakers is reported wherever relevant.

However, although the S in OVS can take scope over negation, this fact says nothing about the position of the S because the same sort of scope ambiguity occurs when the quantifier is part of the O in an SVO sentence: for example, the sentence in (3) is just as ambiguous as (2). Yet, it is hardly true that the O in SVO is in Spec-TP position. Therefore, the possibility of taking scope over sentential negation cannot be taken as a good diagnostic for Spec-TP.

- (3) Maša eščě ne poprobovala desjat' pirožnyx.
 Masha.NOM yet not tasted [ten pastries].ACC
 'Masha hasn't tasted ten pastries yet.'
 ambiguous: $10 \neg$ or $\neg 10$

Another argument that is often brought up to support the analysis with the S rather than the O in OVS being in Spec-TP concerns binding. It is often claimed (e.g. Slioussar 2011, Ionin and Luchkina 2018) that the O in OVS cannot bind reflexives *sebja* 'self' or *svoj* 'self's' contained within the S, which would be expected if the O were in an A-position.⁴ In what follows, I argue that neither of the two reflexives, *sebja* 'self' or *svoj* 'self's', is a reliable diagnostic for an A-position of its antecedent, with *sebja* 'self' resulting (for independent reasons) in both false negatives and false positives and *svoj* 'self's' resulting in false positives. Instead, I propose that the A-nature of the O's position in OVS can be shown via binding of the reciprocal *drug druga* 'each other' and a previously unnoticed anaphoric element *on sam* 'he himself'.

Let's start with the reflexive *sebja* 'self'. First of all, it should be noted that this anaphor does not have a nominative form; consequently, examples where it appears as the S in OVS to be bound by the O are impossible to construct. But we can consider instead examples where the reflexive is embedded inside the S in OVS, particularly where the S is either an event nominal or a picture nominal since in other types of nominals a reflexive possessive *svoj* 'self's' must be used (we return to the possessive reflexive below).

- (4) a. Ot gibeli v bolote Mjunxgauzena; spaslo [vytjagivanie sebja; za volosy].
 from death in swamp Munchhausen.ACC saved [drawing self on hair].NOM
 'Munchhausen was saved from a death in a swamp by drawing himself on his hair.'
- b. Direktora; rasstroili [sluxi o sebe].
 director.ACC upset rumors.NOM about self.LOC
 'The director was upset by the rumors about himself.'
- c. Direktora; ubili [sluxi o sebe].
 director.ACC killed rumors.NOM about self.LOC
 'The director was really upset by the rumors about himself.'

At the first glance, such examples contradict the claims in the existing literature that the O in OVS cannot bind into the S; however, a closer look reveals additional complications. For example, the O in (4a) appears to bind into the S, but the S—an event nominal—presumably contains a PRO in its subject position, and that PRO is the antecedent for *sebja* 'self'. This, of course, raises the question of whether the PRO here is an arbitrary one (and receives the correct interpretation through some pragmatic principles) or is controlled by the O *Mjunxgauzena*; if the latter is the case, it would still provide evidence for the A-nature of the O's position in OVS because only if the O is in Spec-TP can it be a controller of PRO. As for the example in (4b), whether or not a non-overt pronominal subject is postulated inside the picture-nominal, it is clear from the meaning of this

⁴ Kondrashova (1996: 170) further claims that the S can bind the O in OVS.

sentence that that *pro* is not the antecedent of *sebjja* ‘self’. However, an added complexity is introduced here by the fact that the verbs in such examples are typically psych-verbs, and even verbs that are not normally psych-verbs receive psych-interpretation, as shown in (4c). Unfortunately, the argument structure and the syntax of psych-verbs in Russian are yet not well-understood. To recap, the grammaticality of *sebjja* ‘self’ in examples of (4) is hardly conclusive evidence for the possibility of the O binding into the S in OVS.⁵

Now let’s turn to the reflexive possessive *svoj* ‘self’s’: examples where this anaphor is inside the S in OVS and the O is its antecedent are grammatical (example in (5a) is from Antonyuk 2015).

- (5) a. *Direktora_i obyčno otvlekajut tol’ko svoi_i podčinnnye.*
 director.ACC usually distract only [self’s subordinates].NOM
 ‘The director is usually distracted only by his [self’s] subordinates.’
- b. *Každogo pacienta_i osmotrel svoji_i vrač.*
 [every patient].ACC examined [self’s doctor].NOM
 ‘Every patient was examined by his doctor.’
- c. *Ètu bolezn’_i lečit svoji_i vrač.*
 [this illness].ACC treats [self’s doctor].NOM
 ‘This illness is treated by an appropriate doctor.’

However, Padučeva (1983) has shown that there are several types of *svoj* ‘self’s’ in Russian, including *svoj* ‘self’s’ meaning ‘in familial, friendly or some other close and constant relationship’ (Padučeva’s *svoj₆*); *svoj* ‘self’s’ denoting a distributive share bound by *každogo* ‘every’ (Padučeva’s *svoj₃*); and *svoj* ‘self’s’ meaning ‘appropriate, proper’ (Padučeva’s *svoj₅*). Furthermore, Padučeva also shows that these (and several other) types of *svoj* ‘self’s’ are not anaphors that are subject to Principle A (i.e. requiring an appropriate antecedent in a local c-commanding A-position); see also Rappaport (1986), Testelefs (2015), and Zubkov (2018).⁶ It is my claim that these non-anaphoric types of *svoj* ‘self’s’ are used in examples in (5): the familial *svoj₆* in (5a), the distributive share *svoj₃* in (5b), and the ‘appropriate’ *svoj₅* in (5c).⁷ Thus, these examples are false positives, and as such, they tell us nothing about whether the O in OVS can bind into the S.

Since neither *sebjja* ‘self’ nor *svoj* ‘self’s’ can be used as a reliable diagnostic for the position of the O in OVS, we must turn to other anaphors, such as the reciprocal *drug druga* ‘each other’. Like

⁵ As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the grammaticality of binding by the O of a reflexive inside the S in OVS structures contrasts with the fact that such binding fails in OVS sentences of Germanic Verb Second languages. This is true even in English, where Negative Inversion involves V2: **Only the Republican candidates did each other’s slurs damage* is ungrammatical. In this example (provided by the reviewer), *the Republican candidates* cannot bind subject-contained *each other*. This confirms that Russian OVS is not like the OVS patterns found in Germanic V2-languages, typically analyzed in terms of A'-movement to SpecCP, which does not feed binding.

⁶ Zubkov (2018: 62) also points out that in OVS clauses *svoj* ‘self’s’ is (marginally) possible, but not as a possessive “as it cannot satisfy a thematic relation specified by the nominal”. The same is true not only with psych-verbs, as in Zubkov’s example, but with non-psych verbs, e.g. *pocelovala* ‘kissed’, as well.

(i) ?? *Každogo razdražacet svoja žena.*
 everybody.ACC irritates.3SG self’s wife.NOM
 #‘Everybody_i is irritated by his_i wife.’
 ?‘Everybody is irritated by a married woman of his own.’

⁷ The *svoj* in (5b) can also be understood as the familial *svoj₆*; this does not affect the point made in this paper.

sebja ‘self’, the reciprocal does not have a nominative form.⁸ Thus, as with *sebja* ‘self’, we cannot check whether the reciprocal can be the S in OVS, bound by the O; instead, the reciprocal must be embedded inside S. It is also worth noting that unlike *sebja* ‘self’, the reciprocal is not-subject oriented, and thus the O can bind a reciprocal in another argument or adjunct position even in the SVO order, as in (6a). Yet, in the SVO order, the O cannot bind the reciprocal inside the S because of the obvious lack of c-command.

- (6) a. Vanja predstavil dokladčikov; drug; drugu.
 Vanya.NOM presented speakers.ACC [each other].DAT
 ‘Vanya presented the speakers to each other.’
- b. *Vystrely drug; druga ubili duèljantov;
 shots.NOM each other killed duelists.ACC
 intended: ‘The duelists were killed by each other’s shots.’ (cf. Titov 2012: 94; similar examples discussed in Lavine & Freidin 2002)

However, in the OVS order, the O can bind the reciprocal inside the S, as shown in (7a-b); since a new binding configuration is created by the fronting of the O, that fronting must be, by definition, an instance of A-movement.⁹ While these data do not show directly that the O in OVS is in Spec-TP, under the minimal clause structure assumed in this paper, Spec-TP is the only derived A-position, and thus the only position where the binder of the reciprocal might be. Note also that in the OSV order (derived by A'-movement), the O cannot bind the reciprocal inside the S, as in (7c).

- (7) a. Duèljantov; ubili vystrely drug; druga. **OVS**
 duelists.ACC killed shots.NOM each other
 ‘The duelists were killed by each other’s shots.’ (cf. Titov 2012: 95; 2018: 2)
- b. Duèljantov; ubili sekundanty drug; druga. **OVS**
 duelists.ACC killed helpers.NOM each other
 ‘The duelists were killed by each other’s helpers.’
- c. *Duèljantov; {vystrely / sekundanty} drug; druga ubili. **OSV**
 duelists.ACC shots.NOM / helpers.NOM each other killed
 intended: ‘The duelists were killed by each other’s {shots/helpers}.’

In addition to the reciprocal *drug druga* ‘each other’, there is another anaphor in Russian, thus far unnoticed in the literature, which too exhibits the same pattern: the O cannot bind it if the anaphor is in the S position in the SVO order but can if it is in the S position in OVS order. That anaphor is *on sam* ‘he himself’. Despite consisting of a personal pronoun and an intensifier *sam, on*

⁸ The present claim that the reciprocal does not have a nominative form may seem strange, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, particularly in light of the fact that the first word looks like the nominative form of the noun *drug* ‘friend, companion’ (and the second word looks like its accusative forms). Although more needs to be said about the internal structure of *drug druga* ‘each other’, note, however, that the first word is definitely not the head of this construction. In particular, when the reciprocal is found in a non-accusative case position, it is the form of the second word—and not of the first—that changes: e.g. INSTR *drug drugom* or DAT *drug drugu* etc.

⁹ Titov (2012: 93–95, 2018: 2) claims that embedding of the reciprocal *drug druga* ‘each other’ inside an animate S is ungrammatical. However, my survey of 40 native speakers shows that about half of them are indifferent to the animacy of the noun phrase containing *drug druga* ‘each other’ (39% consider them equally good and 13% – equally bad). Only 18% of the speakers in my survey exhibit Titov’s pattern: they consider otherwise identical sentences with *mašiny drug druga* ‘cars of each other’ more acceptable than those with *žëny drug druga* ‘wives of each other’. Yet, 15% exhibit the opposite pattern: they consider the animate noun phrase containing *drug druga* ‘each other’ more acceptable than the inanimate one.

sam ‘he himself’ does not behave like a pronoun. Like its English counterpart *he himself* (cf. Bickerton 1987: 347), the Russian *on sam* ‘he himself’ is an anaphor in that it is subject to Principle A: it must be bound by a c-commanding antecedent (but unlike its English counterpart, *on sam* ‘he himself’ does not have to be nominative). As can be seen from the following example, a pronoun such as *on* ‘he’ can be coindexed/coreferential with an R-expression so long as that R-expression does not c-command it in a local domain (Principle B). In this example, *politik* is too deeply embedded to c-command the subject of the embedded clause; hence, the pronoun *on* ‘he’ is possible in that position, but note that *on sam* ‘he himself’ is not possible.

- (8) [Context: What did the journalist say to the politicians’s supporters?]
 Žurnalistka_j skazala storonnikam politika_p, čto {on_{*j/p} / on sam_{*j/*p}} prijdet na miting.
 journalist(F) said to.supporters politician that {he_{*s/n} / he himself_{*s/*n}} will.come to protest
 ‘The (female) journalist said to the politician’s supporters that {he_n / *he himself_n} will come to the protest.’

As noted in Lyutikova (1998), there are several other, potentially confounding, non-anaphoric meanings/uses of post-pronominal *sam*: (a) adverbial *sam*, meaning ‘without anyone else’s participation or involvement’, which is typically stressed and can be non-adjacent to the pronoun, as in (9a); (b) additive *sam*, meaning ‘he too’, in which case *sam* is unstressed and the verb is contrastively focused (i.e., verum focus), as in (9b); (c) contrastive *sam*, meaning ‘he alone, only he’, used with a contrastive stress on *sam*, as in (9c).¹⁰

- (9) a. Žurnalistka skazala storonnikam politika_p, čto on prijdet na miting SAM_p.
 journalist(F) said to.supporters politician that he will.come to protest himself
 ‘The (female) journalist said to the politician’s supporters that he will come to the protest on his own.’ (w/o team)
- b. Žurnalistka skazala storonnikam politika_p, čto on sam_p PRIJDET na miting...
 journalist(F) said to.supporters politician that he himself will.come to protest
 ‘The (female) journalist said to the politician’s supporters that he will also come to the protest.’ (and so should they)
- c. Žurnalistka skazala storonnikam politika_p, čto on SAM_p prijdet na miting...
 journalist(F) said to.supporters politician that he himself will.come to protest
 ‘The (female) journalist said to the politician’s supporters that HE will come to the protest.’ (and they needn’t bother)

Now that we know how to distinguish anaphoric and non-anaphoric pronoun+*sam* in Russian, we can return to the OVS problem. First, note that in the canonical SVO order, the S cannot be the anaphoric *on sam* ‘he himself’ bound by the O, because the O does not c-command the S. However, in the OVS order, the O can bind the anaphoric *on sam* ‘he himself’ in the S position.

- (10) a. On (sam)_{*i/k} priglasil Petju. **SVO**
 [he himself].NOM invited Petya.ACC
 intended: ‘Petya invited {Petya/himself}.’

¹⁰ As mentioned in Lyutikova’s work, *sam* can also be prenominal, in which case it is the following noun that is stressed, and *sam* has the “unexpected” reading (‘of all X’). This use of *sam* with pronouns is rather restricted, for information-structural reasons. Generally, *sam* tends to follow pronouns, as in Serbo-Croatian, cf. Progovac (1998).

- b. Každuju kvartiru; otremonirovala eë; xozjajka. **OVS**
 [every apartment].ACC renovated [its owner].NOM
 ‘Every apartment was renovated by its owner.’ (Titov 2012: 16, 91; 2013: 36)
- c. Každaja kvartira; byla otremonirovana eë; xozjajkoj. **passive**
 [every apartment].NOM was renovated.PASS [its owner].INS
 ‘Every apartment was renovated by its owner.’
- d. *Každuju kvartiru; eë; xozjajka otremonirovala. **OSV**
 [every apartment].ACC [its owner].NOM renovated
 ‘Every apartment was renovated by its owner.’

The same parallelism between the O in OVS and the derived S in passives—but not with the O in OSV—is also evident from the data involving subject-oriented adverbs such as ‘willingly’, ‘unwillingly’, ‘cleverly’ and the like (better termed Agent-oriented, but I shall stick to the usual terminology). In the canonical SVO order, as in (14a), subject-oriented adverbs are placed between the S and the V. (If an auxiliary is present, the subject-oriented adverb can appear either immediately before or immediately after the auxiliary, with a slight preference for the latter position.) As shown in (14b), in OVS, the same adverb is placed between the O and the V—making the O in OVS similar to the S in SVO. (Again, if an auxiliary is present, the adverb can appear either immediately before or immediately after the auxiliary.) The same is observed in passives, as in (14c): the adverb is placed between the derived subject of the passive and the V—making the O in OVS similar to the derived subject of the passive. Finally, in the OSV order, the adverb is not placed immediately after the O (as in OVS) but after the S.

- (14) a. (*Oxotno) Vanja (oxotno) budet (oxotno) jest’ (*oxotno) kašu.
 (*willingly) Vanya (willingly) will (willingly) to.eat (*willingly) porridge
 ‘Vanya will willingly eat porridge.’
- b. Kašu (oxotno) budet (oxotno) jest’ (*oxotno) Vanja (*oxotno).
 porridge (willingly) will (willingly) to.eat (*willingly) Vanya (*willingly)
 ‘As for porridge, Vanya will willingly eat it.’
- c. Kaša (oxotno) byla (oxotno) s’edena (*oxotno) Vanej.
 porridge (willingly) was (willingly) eaten (*willingly) Vanya.INS
 ‘The oatmeal was willingly eaten by Vanya.’
- d. Kašu (*oxotno) Vanja (oxotno) budet (oxotno) jest’ (*oxotno).
 porridge (*willingly) Vanya (willingly) will (willingly) to.eat (*willingly)
 ‘As for porridge, Vanya will willingly eat it.’

To recap, we can conclude two things about the fronting of the O in OVS. First, since this movement creates new binding configurations, as we have seen above with the binding of the reciprocal *drug druga* ‘each other’ and of the anaphoric *on sam* ‘he himself’, this movement cannot be analyzed as post-syntactic (contra Kallestinova 2007). Second, data involving binding, Weak Cross-Over effects, and the placement of subject-oriented adverbs all shows that the O in OVS patterns with the S in SVO and the derived subject in passive and not with the O in OSV; hence, we must conclude that the O in OVS is—like the S in SVO and the derived subject in passive—in Spec-TP

(or in the very least in an A-position) and not in the left periphery (or an A'-position).¹² In the next section, we turn to the question of how the VS portion of the OVS order is derived.

3. If the O is in Spec-TP, how does the V get to be before the S?

In the previous section, it has been established that the O in OVS is in an A-position (i.e. in Spec-TP); now let's turn to the question of where the V and the S are. In principle, there are two ways in which the V can end up preceding the S, if we assume an underlying SV order: either the V moves to the left of the S or the S moves to the right of the V. In what follows, I show that the V does not move to the left of the S, either by head movement or by (remnant) verb phrase movement. This leaves us with the inescapable conclusion that the S either moves to the right of the V or, as suggested by an anonymous reviewer, is base-generated in a position at the right edge (linked to a null proform in the subject's theta-position). While the exact derivation of the subject's postverbal position is outside the scope of this work, it is my hope that future research will address this question in more detail.

3.1. Against V-to-T raising in Russian OVS

The first way in which the V could end up preceding the S is the V moving to the left of S by head movement, in which case the S would be left *in situ*. (This derivation has been proposed by Kiss 1998 for information focus and by Brunetti 2004 for focus in Italian.) However, four arguments emerge to show that the VS portion of the Russian OVS order is not derived by V-to-T raising. First, let's consider the diagnostic proposed in Pollock (1989): contrary to the claim in Bailyn (2004), the verb in OVS follows rather than precedes VP-boundary adverbs, such as frequency and manner adverbs (see Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Erechko 2003, Slioussar 2007, 2011, Kallestinova 2007: 72–90, 115–121, Titov 2012: 175–176, 2013: 39, Ionin and Luchkina 2018, and Bailyn 2018; cf. Veselovská 1995: 56–63, Kučerová 2007 on Czech).

- (15) Xorošie detektivy často pišut ženščiny.
 [good mystery.novels].ACC often write women.NOM
 'As for good mystery novels, it's often women who write them.'

The second argument against V-to-T raising in Russian OVS sentences is as follows: if the O in OVS is in Spec-TP and the V were to raise to T, the O and the V would be in Spec-Head relationship and no other element could come between them. Yet, as we have seen with subject-oriented adverbs in (14b) above, this is not the case. Besides subject-oriented adverbs, pronominal

¹² Another potential (albeit weak) argument for placing the O in OVS in Spec-TP concerns the embeddability of the OVS:

- (i) I začem vam znat', čto "Annu Kareninu" napisal Tolstoj.
 and for.what you.DAT know that [Anna Karenina].ACC wrote Tolstoy.NOM
 'And why do you need to know that as for *Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy wrote it.'

A potential way to explain the embeddability of OVS is CP-recursion. However, CP-recursion has been shown to be not the right solution for embeddability of other phenomena otherwise related to CP, such as embedded V2 in Yiddish (see Heycock and Santorini 1993) or embeddable VSO in Irish (see McCloskey 1996). So CP-recursion may not be the right way to explain the embeddability of OVS either. However, OSV can be embedded too; presumably, the S is in Spec-TP and the O is adjoined to TP (Bailyn 1995: 188–189). Thus, it could be said that in OVS the O is likewise adjoined to TP, which is why I do not consider this a strong argument.

- (ii) Bytuet mnenie, čto "Annu Kareninu" Tolstoj napisal iz čuvstva nenavisti k žene.
 exists opinion that [Anna Karenina].ACC Tolstoy.NOM wrote from feeling hatred.GEN towards wife
 'There's an opinion that as for *Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy wrote it out of hatred for his wife.'

indirect objects can also appear between the O and the V in OVS (cf. Bailyn 1995: 58–62 on Pronoun Fronting).

- (16) Ètu knigu mne prislalo izdatel'stvo.
 [this book].ACC me.DAT sent publisher.NOM
 'As for this book, it was the publisher who sent it to me.'

The third argument (suggested by an anonymous reviewer) is based on constructions involving verbal periphrasis, that is an auxiliary verb followed by a lexical verb. The most obvious of such constructions involves composite future tense. As pointed out by the reviewer, in Germanic V2 languages, where OVS is derived via head movement, this results in the OAuxSV order, as in the German example in (17a). However, the same is not true for Russian where the resulting order is OAuxVS, as in (17b):

- (17) a. Diesen Roman habe ich schon letztes Jahr gelesen. **German**
 this novel have I already last year read
 'This novel, I have already read last year.'
- b. Xorošie detektivy budut pisat' ženščiny. **Russian**
 [good mystery.novels].ACC will write women.NOM
 'As for good mystery novels, it's women who will write them.'

The fourth argument against V-to-T raising, or indeed against any head movement of the V around the S, comes from the fact that other VP-internal material (e.g. indirect objects, PPs, manner adverbs) appears to the left of the S as well (Erechko 2003, Slioussar 2011).¹³

- (18) **O** **V** **XP** **S**
 "Ščelkuncika" ispolnjajet na roždestvo počti každaja baletnaja truppa v SŠA.
Nutcracker.ACC performs on Christmas almost [every ballet troupe].NOM in USA
 'As for *The Nutcracker*, almost every ballet troupe in the USA performs it at Christmas.'

The position of other VP-internal material to the left of the S suggests that the V—if it moves to the left of the S at all—moves by (remnant) verb phrase movement. This possibility is explored in the next subsection.

3.2. Against remnant verb phrase movement in Russian OVS

In the previous subsection, I have shown that in OVS the V does not move to the left of the S by head movement; could it be that the V moves to the left of the S by remnant verb phrase movement, as suggested by the word order in (18)? In what follows, I argue that this is not the case, based on comparing the OVS structures with the Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect observed in cases of overt verb phrase fronting. The phenomenon that I refer to as the Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect is not to be confused with Scope Freezing between two DPs without overt VP fronting, the latter being discussed in the works of Antonyuk (2015, 2019) and Ionin and Luchkina

¹³ Note that under the proposed analysis OV(XP)S clauses are maximally similar in their structure to VO(XP)S clauses, as in (i), except for the additional movement of the O to Spec-TP in OVS. Both types of clauses are also similar in their information structure (e.g. the S is the new information focus), again the only difference being that in OVS the O is the Topic, whereas in VOS the entire (remnant) #P is backgrounded.

(i) Gotovit kašu xorošo mama.
 prepares porridge.ACC well Mother.NOM
 'It is Mother who makes porridge well.' (Bailyn 1995: 84)

(2018). The Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect is described for a number of languages, including English, German, Spanish, and Hungarian (see Sauerland 1998, Sauerland and Elbourne 2002, Wurmbrand 2006, Vicente 2007, 2009, *inter alia*). The effect is as follows: a quantifier inside the moved verb phrase cannot take wide scope with respect to the quantifier around which the verb phrase moved. For example, (19a) below is ambiguous between a reading where every bank is such that some policeman or another stood in front of it and a reading where there is a certain policeman who stood in front of all the banks. Yet, with a verb phrase fronting in (19b), it has been claimed that the former reading disappears; this sentence means only that a certain policeman went from one bank to another.

- (19) a. A policeman stood in front of every bank that day. $\exists\forall, \forall\exists$
 b. ...and [**VP** stand in front of every bank] a policeman did that day. $\exists\forall, *\forall\exists$

In order to establish that the same effect is operative in Russian, we need to find some *bona fide* verb phrase fronting. There are a number of constructions in Russian where verb phrase fronting appears to take place—and in fact does, as we shall see below. These constructions include VP-Doubling, either with a direct object in the fronted verb phrase, as in (20a), or with a PP in the fronted verb phrase, as in (20b).¹⁴

- (20) a. [**VP Kupit' piva**]-to Ivan kupit, no pit' ne budet. **V+O fronting**
 to.buy beer -TOP Ivan will.buy but to.drink not will
 'As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer, but won't drink it.'
 b. [**VP Vystupit' na FASLe**]-to Vanja vystupil, no statju ne napisal. **V+XP fronting**
 to.present at FASL -TOP Vanya presented but article not wrote
 'As for presenting at FASL, Vanya did present, but he didn't write an article.'

Since Antonenko (2018) claimed that VP-doubling in Russian, as in (20), involves base-generation rather than movement, it is imperative to first check whether structures in (20) are indeed derived by movement. To this end, I tested them for strong and weak islands. Predictably, judgments for weak islands such as *wh*-island and factive island are more varied, but with respect to strong islands, my panel was unanimous: all 33 speakers judged these sentences as ungrammatical. Thus, I conclude, contra Antonenko (2018) and following earlier proposals by Abels (2001), Ibnbari (2008 a, b), and Scott (2012), that VP-doubling involves movement rather than base-generation.

- (21) a. * Kupit' piva-to ja znaju človeka, kotoryj kupil. **complex NP island**
 to.buy beer (-TOP) I know person who bought
 intended: 'As for buying beer, I know a person who did.'
 b. * Vypit' piva-to ja ušël, potomy čto Maša vypila. **adjunct island**
 to.drink beer (-TOP) I left because Masha drank
 intended: 'As for drinking beer, I left because Masha did.'

The same can be said of other constructions involving verb phrase fronting, in particular those where the non-moved part includes a modal, an auxiliary, or an aspectual verb, as in (22a-c);

¹⁴ Some speakers only accept Verb-Doubling, not VP-Doubling, whereby the fronted portion includes only the verb itself thus stranding the object; some other speakers only accept Verb-Doubling with intransitive verbs, thus avoiding the issue of where the object must be altogether. Moreover, some speakers who accept VP-Doubling, accept it only with oblique arguments or adjuncts in the fronted part, as in (20b), but not with a direct object in the fronted part, as in (20a). Speakers also vary as to their acceptance of these structures with the particle *-to*, the particle *-taki*, or without any particle whatsoever.

combining these structures with strong islands also shows that they involve verb phrase movement rather than base-generation (see examples in d-f):

- (22) a. [VP Kupit' piva]-to Ivan smog... **VP-Fronting with modals**
 to.buy beer-TOP Ivan could/managed
 'As for buying beer, Ivan was able to buy beer...'
- b. [VP Pokupat' pivo]-to Ivan budet... **VP-Fronting with future Aux**
 to.buy beer-TOP Ivan will
 'As for buying beer, Ivan will buy beer.'
- c. [VP Pokupat' pivo]-to Ivan načal ešče v škole... **VP-Fronting with aspectual verbs**
 to.buy beer-TOP Ivan began already in school
 'As for buying beer, Ivan began to buy beer already in school...'
- d. * [VP Kupit' piva]-to ja ušël, potomy čto Maša smožet...
 to.buy beer-TOP I left because Masha could/managed
 'As for buying beer, I left because Masha could buy beer...'
- e. * [VP Pokupat' pivo]-to ja ušël, potomy čto Maša budet...
 to.buy beer-TOP I left because Masha will
 'As for buying beer, I left because Masha will buy beer.'
- f. * [VP Pokupat' pivo]-to ja ušël, potomy čto Maša načala ešče v škole...
 to.buy beer-TOP I left because Masha began already in school
 'As for buying beer, I left because Masha began to buy beer already in school...'

Thus, there are at least five structures in Russian involving VP (or *vP*) movement; the next question is whether they exhibit the Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect of the type illustrated above for English. According to the judgments provided by my panel of speakers, the answer is yes. For example, of the 32 speakers who judged (23), 13 speakers treat *kakoj-to* 'some' as scope-rigid, that is allow only wide scope interpretation for *kakoj-to* 'some' regardless of which argument it is or what the word order is. Of the remaining 19 speakers, 17 exhibit the Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect and 2 do not. Additional examples that were tested, with the judgment by the majority of the speakers, are given in (24). (Only responses from speakers who accept VP-Doubling in the first place were counted here.)

- (23) Vljubit'sja v kakuju-to devočku (-taki) rovno dva mal'čika vljubilis'.
 fall.in.love in some girl (-TOP) exactly two boys fell.in.love
 'As for falling in love with some girl, exactly two boys did.' 23, *32
- (24) a. Otvetit' na každyj vopros(-to) bol'se poloviny studentov otvetili.
 to.respond to each question(-TOP) more.than half students responded
 'As for responding to each question, more than half the students did.'
 $\frac{1}{2} \forall, * \forall \frac{1}{2}$
- b. Zanimat'sja na každom trenažere (-to) minimum pjat' posetitelej zanimalis'.
 to.train on each machine (-TOP) minimum five clients trained
 'As for training on each machine, at least five clients did.'
 $5 \forall, * \forall 5$

- c. Učastvovat' v každoj demonstracii (-to) okolo tysjači aktivistov učastvovali.
 to.participate in each demonstration(-TOP) about 1000 activists participated
 'As for participating in each demonstration, about 1000 activists did.'
 $1000\forall, *\forall 1000$

To recap, I have shown that verb phrase movement in Russian—like in English, German, Spanish, and Hungarian—induces the Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect such that a quantifier inside the moved verb phrase cannot take wide scope with respect to a quantifier outside the verb phrase, particularly in the S. This offers us a diagnostic to test whether the VS portion of the OVS order is derived by verb phrase movement (particularly, by the V and any other VP-internal XPs undergoing remnant *v*P movement), a movement that is partially obscured by the fronting of the O: if that is the case, we expect to see the same Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect as in examples in (23) and (24). However, it turns out that relevant OVS examples exhibit no Fronted VP Scope Freezing. For example, to test whether there is Fronted VP Scope Freezing in (25), I asked speakers to watch several short videos of parodies of Little Swan Dance from Tchaikovsky's *Swan Lake*. These videos were selected in such a way as to make it clear to the viewers that the four performers in each video are different: men in one video, children in another, female ballerinas in the third, Japanese arm-dancers in the fourth, and so on. Then, the speakers were asked to judge whether in the context of the videos they had watched, the sentence in (25) was true or false. Note that this sentence is true only under the interpretation where 'every video' takes wide scope with respect to 'exactly four people' (i.e. in each video there were exactly four people, but not necessarily the same ones). Under the only interpretation compatible with the Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect, namely where 'exactly four people' takes wide scope with respect to 'every video', the sentence is false in this situation since there was not a single individual that appeared in each and every video (let alone four such individuals). And yet, all the speakers were unanimous in judging this sentence as true, meaning that there is no Fronted VP Scope Freezing here.

- (25) Tanec malen'kix lebedej ispolnili v každom video rovno četyre človeka.
 [dance little swans].ACC performed in every video [exactly four people].NOM
 'As for Little Swan Dance, exactly four people performed it in each video.'
 $4\forall = F, \forall 4 = T$ in the context of videos with different dancers

Additional examples that were judged by my panel are given in (26). For each of these examples, I first checked the speakers treated both quantifiers as scope-flexible and could get both surface and inverse scope in simple SVO and OVS sentences; then, speakers were presented with two distinct contexts for each example, such that in one context the example sentence was true on one interpretation and false on the other, and vice versa for the other context. The judgments in (26) represent the overwhelming majority of the respondents.

- (26) a. Special'nye upražnenija delali na každom trejažere minimum pjat' posetitelej.
 [special exercises].ACC did on each machine minimum five clients
 'As for special exercises, at least five clients did them on each machine.'
 $5\forall, \forall 5$
- b. Učastije prinjali v každoj demonstracii okolo tysjači aktivistov.
 participation.ACC took in each demonstration about 1000 activists
 'As for participating in each demonstration, about 1000 activists did.'
 $1000\forall, \forall 1000$

- c. Kursovuju rabotu napisali o kakom-to romane rovno dva studenta.
 [course work].ACC wrote about some novel exactly two students
 ‘As for term papers, exactly two students wrote it about some novel.’
 2Э, Э2

These data show that there is no Fronted VP Scope Freezing in Russian OVS sentences, unlike in sentences that involve *bona fide* verb phrase fronting. Note also that sentences in the OVS block were paired with sentences in the VP-Fronting block (for example, (26a) and (24b) were paired, as were (26b) and (24c)), so that the sentences contain the same quantifiers and the same lexical material in order to control for these as potential interfering factors. To recap, I have shown that OVS sentences in Russian exhibit no Fronted VP Scope Freezing effect, characteristic of VP-fronting in Russian; hence, I conclude that there is no VP/*v*P movement in deriving the OVS order (contra Erechko 2003, Slioussar 2011, Wiland 2013).

4. Conclusions and questions for future research

Following Sherlock Holmes’ dictum, “once you eliminate the impossible, whatever remains, no matter how improbable, must be the truth”, we have eliminated some imaginable but impossible analyses of the Russian OVS order. If the V does not move to the left of the S by either head movement, nor by remnant phrasal movement (see the [previous two subsections](#)), we are left with the only viable conclusion that the VS portion of the OVS order is derived not by moving the V to the left of the S but by moving the S to the right of the V(P). If so, where does the S move to? Here, I must, alas, remain tentative and propose that the S right-adjoins to *v*P, as in Bailyn (1995: 217–222, 327; 2018); similar proposals are also found in King (1995) and Junghanns and Zybatow (1997). In the minimal clausal structure assumed in this paper, there are two positions in which the S in OVS might occur: adjoined to TP or adjoined to *v*P. However, following Pereltsvaig (2004), I assume that the S in OVS cannot move to a position right-adjoined to TP because the latter position is reserved for right-dislocated material that follows Contrastive Focus, as in the following example. Here, the O is contrastively focused and the S follows it. The S in such an example is pronounced after a pause (comma intonation) and with a special “flat” prosody that characterizes Right Dislocation.

- (27) [[Napisal [ANNU KARENINU]_{FOC}] TP Tolstoj]_{TP}, a ne roman “Idiot”.
 wrote [Anna Karenina].ACC Tolstoy.NOM and not novel *Idiot*
 ‘It is *Anna Karenina* that Tolstoy wrote, and not *Idiot*.’

It is also possible for the S to be contrastively focused with some other material, here a temporal PP, to follow it in a Right Dislocation structure:

- (28) [Annu Kareninu napisal [TOLSTOJ]_{FOC}] TP v 1870-x godax]_{TP}, a ne Dostojevskij.
 [Anna Karenina].ACC wrote Tolstoy.NOM in 1870s years and not Dostoyevsky
 ‘It is Tolstoy who wrote *Anna Karenina* in 1870s, and not Dostoyevsky.’

Thus, if the position right-adjoined to TP is reserved for Right Dislocated material, and the focused S in OVS precedes it, the S cannot be adjoined to TP but must be adjoined lower. The implications of this analysis with respect to anti-locality are to be explored further in future research. Moreover, the reader is referred to Antonuyk (this volume) for an interesting take on an extraposition account for the S in OVS.

References:

- Abels, Klaus. (2001) “The predicate cleft construction in Russian”. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 9: 1–18.

- Antonenko, Andrei. (2018) “Predicate doubling in Russian: One process or two?”. Paper presented at FASL 27, Stanford.
- Antonyuk, Svitlana (2015) *Quantifier Scope and Scope Freezing in Russian*. PhD dissertation, Stony Brook University.
- Antonyuk, Svitlana (2019) Quantifier Scope in Russian. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 4(1): 54.
- Antonyuk, Svitlana (this volume) Russian OVS: Evidence from Quantifier Scope, the that-trace effect Paradigm and the Quantifier Float Test. *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 29*, the Stony Brook University meeting.
- Bailyn, John F. (1995) *A configurational approach to Russian “free” word order*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell.
- Bailyn, John F. (2003) “Does Russian scrambling exist?”. Simin Karimi, ed. *Word Order and Scrambling*. Oxford: Blackwell, 156–176.
- Bailyn, John F. (2004) “Generalized Inversion”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22(1): 1–50.
- Bailyn, John F. (2012) *The syntax of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailyn, John F. (2018) “Russian word order and the fate of syntactic theory”. Paper presented at the Conference on Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters, Moscow, October 2018.
- Bickerton, Derek. (1987) “He himself: Anaphor, pronoun or..?” *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(2): 345–348.
- Bivon, Roy. (1971) *Element order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brunetti, Lisa. (2004) *A unification of focus*. Padova: Unipress.
- Erechko, Anna. (2003) “On subject-verb inversion in Russian”. Marion van Koppen, *et al.*, eds. *Proceedings of ConSOLE XI*: 34–47.
- Heycock, Caroline and Beatrice Santorini (1993) “Head movement and the licensing of non-thematic positions”. Jonathan Mead, ed. *Proceedings of WCCFL 11*: 262–276.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. (2013) “Proto-Indo-European verb-finality: Reconstruction, typology, validation”. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3(1): 49–76.
- Ibnbari, Lena. (2008a) *Aspects of predicate cleft constructions in Russian*. MA thesis, Ben-Gurion U.
- Ibnbari, Lena. (2008b) “Asymmetries in Russian predicate clefts”. *Proceedings of Israeli Association for Theoretical Linguistics* 24: 1–24.
- Ionin, Tania and Tatiana Luchkina. (2018) “Focus on Russian scope: An experimental investigation of the relationship between quantifier scope, prosody and information structure”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49: 741–779.
- Junghanns, Uwe and Gerhild Zybatow. (1997) “Syntax and Information Structure of Russian clauses”. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 5: 289–319.
- Kalin, Laura. (2014) “The syntax of OVS word order in Hixkaryana”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32(4): 1089–1104.
- Kallestinova, Elena. (2007) *Aspects of word order in Russian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa.
- King, Tracy Holloway. (1995) *Configuring topic and focus in Russian*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. (1998) “Identificational focus versus information focus”. *Language* 74(2): 45–273.
- Kondrashova, Natalia. (1996) *The syntax of existential quantification*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Kučerová, Ivonna. (2007) *The syntax of givenness*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Lavine, James E. and Robert Freidin. (2002) The Subject of Defective T(ense) in Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10(1-2): 253-289.
- Lyutikova, Ekaterina. (1998) *Intensifikatory i tipologija reflektivna*. Ph.D. dissertation, Moscow State University.
- McCloskey, James. (1996) “On the scope of verb movement in Irish”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 47–104.
- Padučeva, E. V. (1983) “Vozvratnoje mestoimenie s kosvennym antecedentom i semantika reflektivnosti”. *Semiotika i informatika*. Volume 23. Moscow. Pp. 3-32.

- Pereltsvaig, Asya. (2004) “Topic and focus as linear notions: evidence from Italian and Russian”. *Lingua* 114: 325–344.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. (1989) “Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365–424.
- Progovac, Liljana. (1998) “Determiner phrase in a language without determiners”. *Journal of Linguistics* 34: 165–79.
- Rappaport, Gilbert. (1986) “On anaphor binding in Russian”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4(1): 97–120.
- Sauerland, Uli. (1998) “Scope reconstruction without reconstruction”. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 17.
- Sauerland, Uli and Paul Elbourne. (2002) “Total reconstruction, PF movement, and derivational order”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33(2): 283–319.
- Scott, Tanya. (2012) *Whoever doesn't HOP must be superior*. Ph.D. dissertation, Stony Brook University.
- Sirotnina, O. B. (1065) *Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke*. Saratov State University.
- Slioussar, Natalia. (2007) *Grammar and Information Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation, LOT.
- Slioussar, Natalia. (2011) “Russian and the EPP requirement in the tense domain”. *Lingua* 121: 2048–2068.
- Testelefs, Yakov G. (2015) “Svoj i čuzoj: “poluanaphoričeskie” element v russkom jazyke”. Presented at the Institute for contemporary linguistic research MPGU. Moscow, 2015.
- Titov, Elena. (2012) *Information Structure of argument order alternations*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCL.
- Titov, Elena. (2013) “Scrambling and interfaces”. Lena Karvovskaya, *et al.*, eds. *Information Structure: Empirical perspectives on theory*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam, 33–54.
- Titov, Elena. (2018) The OVS construction. Ms., UCL.
- Veselovská, Ludmila. (1995) *Phrasal movement and X⁰-morphology. Word order parallels in Czech and English nominal and verbal projections*. Ph.D. dissertation, Palack University, Olomouc.
- Vicente, Luis. (2007) *The syntax of heads and phrases*. Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden.
- Vicente, Luis. (2009) “An alternative to remnant movement for partial predicate fronting”. *Syntax* 12(2): 158–191.
- Wiland, Bartosz. (2013) “Paths in remnant movement: A single solution to three problems in the Polish OVS syntax”. S. Kan, *et al.*, eds. *Proceedings of NELS* 40: 253–264.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. (2006) “Licensing case”. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 18(3): 175–236.
- Zubkov, Peter. (2018) *The grammar of binding. A study with reference to Russian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht.