Chapter 2: Subjecthood and Nonagreement

2.0 Introduction

This chapter examines the subject properties of sentences that lack (selected) subjects. The central question that I will be concerned with is whether there is evidence in Slavic nonagreeing predicates for an obligatory clausal subject position independent of the lexical semantics of the main predicate. That is, can we tease apart the subject selected as a lexical property of a particular predicate (i.e., the thematic subject) from the notion of subject as an independent formal property of clauses? When a predicate fails to select an external argument, or to promote an internal one by means of voice-altering affixation, is the clause, as a result, also subjectless?

These questions will be examined on the basis of finite impersonal predicates in (Contemporary Standard) Russian and non-finite impersonal passives in (Modern) Ukrainian. Note that these constructions, exemplified in (1-2) below, share the following basic properties: (i) they lack a thematic external argument; (ii) they select at least one internal argument; and (iii) the direct internal argument is marked ACC.

(1) Russian (“Adversity Impersonals” (Babby 1994a))
   a. Rabočego ubilo oskolkom plity.
      worker:ACC killed:[-AGR] splinter:INST of-concrete-slab
      ‘A worker was killed by a splinter of concrete slab.’
      [Moskovskij komsomolec 9-10-99]

   b. Ženščinu zadavilo “kovrom-samoletom“ v parke Gor'kogo.
      woman:ACC crushed:[-AGR] carpet airplane:INST in park of-Gorky
      ‘A woman was crushed by the flying carpet [attraction] in Gorky Park.’
      [Moskovskij komsomolec 9-13-99]

   c. Nos založilo ot pyli.
      nose:ACC clogged:[-AGR] from dust:GEN
      ‘My nose got stuffed up from the dust.’
(2) Ukrainian: Impersonal Passive (−no/-to)¹

a. Inozemčja bulo posadženo do vjaznyci.
   foreigner:ACC was placed:[-AGR] to prison
   ‘A foreigner was put in prison.’

b. Nemolvja bulo znajdeno u košyku.
   baby:ACC was found:[-AGR] in basket
   ‘A baby was found in a basket.’

c. Parljamentariv Ukrajiny traktovano jak rivnopravnyx
   members-of-parliament:ACC of-Ukraine treated:[-AGR] as equal
   partneriv.
   partners:ACC
   ‘Ukrainian members of parliament are treated as equal partners.’
   [Wieczorek 1994:17]

The predicates in (1-2) may be referred to as “accusative unaccusatives.”² They are straightforwardly unaccusative in the basic lexico-semantic sense discussed above: they select at least one internal argument and no external one. They also exhibit a form of NP-movement to subject position, along the lines (at least superficially) of more standard instances of unaccusatives, as evidenced by the NP-initial word order (which is argued to be discourse-neutral in section 2.3). Note that the ACC marking on the direct internal argument does not prevent or “block” this movement; rather, it merely rules out case-checking as its trigger (ACC is not checked in the Tense system).³

In the Russian examples in (1), the VP compositionally (in the sense of Marantz 1984) fails to select an external argument. These predicates exceptionally mark events without external agents or causers, a criterial property of unaccusativity (Harley 1995).⁴ In other

---

¹ The Ukrainian -no/-to construction is discussed in considerable detail in chapter 3. I will put off a more thorough discussion of the properties of this construction until then.
² Babby, forthcoming, refers to such predicate-types as “un-Burzio” verbs, since they are obvious counterexamples to Burzio’s Generalization (Burzio 1986), which states, informally, that only those verbs that have a fully-thematic external theta role can assign ACC to their direct object.
³ Unaccusativity is discussed in more detail in chapter 3 (section 3.2.1).
⁴ It should be borne in mind that the indirect internal argument is not a by-phrase of some sort; I will assume, following Babby 1994a, that this argument receives case in conjunction with theta-role assignment, that is, Chomsky’s (1981) “inherent case” (Babbi’s (1994b) “semantic case”). In the present
words, these events lack an external “initiator.” In the case of the Ukrainian impersonal passives in (2), the external argument is dethematized by voice-altering affixation. Note that the passive morphology exceptionally fails to “absorb” the verb’s ACC case feature, with the result that there can be no “raising” in the traditional sense to a NOM case-marked subject position. The result in both (1-2) is that after the thematic saturation of the main predicate’s (internal) arguments, the subsequent predication of VP, now itself a one-place predicate in the sense of Williams 1994, apparently fails to be instantiated.⁵ If predication is a more general instance of theta role assignment, it is reasonable to consider what happens in those instances in which the VP does not have a theta role to assign.

At first blush, (1-2) appear to be in violation of Rothstein’s Predication Condition, given in (3):

(3) Predication Condition (Rothstein 1983:9, 1984, 1995)
Every syntactic predicate must be syntactically saturated.

The Predication Condition is the clausal correlate of the Projection Principle, which states that all the arguments of a lexical predicate must be thematically saturated at every syntactic level. That is, a non-referential maximal projection, such as VP, is unsaturated if it is not provided with a subject of which it can be predicated, just like a lexical head, such as V, is unsaturated if it fails to assign an obligatory theta role (cf. Chomsky 1986:116). The Predication Condition expresses semantically (i.e., in the

---

⁵ Williams (1994:37-39) holds that the VP is a one-place predicate by virtue of “inheriting” the index of V’s external theta role and assigning it to the external argument. This is (main-clause) predication, thematically defined.
Fregean sense of the “saturation” of functions) that which the more general Extended Projection Principle states in basic structural terms, as in (4):

(4) **The Extended Projection Principle (EPP)**
The Clausal subject position is projected syntactically and must be filled.

In their strongest sense, the Predication Condition and the EPP are meant to hold even if the clausal subject position is non-thematic, and, thus, is of no semantic relevance. Either (3) or (4) may be invoked, for example, to account for the appearance of semantically-vacuous expletive elements such as English *it* and *there*, French *il*, Dutch *er*, and German *es*. Pleonastic subjects appear in constructions that lack an external theta role and do not force raising to subject position. Since case is assigned to the direct object VP-internally in both (1-2), these data provide an appropriate testing ground to tease apart traditional, case-driven NP-movement from movement whose sole motivation is to provide a formal argument for the **syntactic** saturation of the VP.

The primary goal of this chapter is to argue that (1-2) are well-formed with respect to both the Predication Condition (the monadic VP is syntactically saturated) and the EPP (the clausal subject position is filled). In section 2.1, I will sketch a history of the EPP and show that in its most recent incarnation (Chomsky 1998), the EPP expresses the basic idea of the Predication Condition. The question of whether null expletives are implicated in the well-formedness of (1-2) is taken up in section 2.2. Under the standard hypothesis that the properties of empty categories should not differ from their phonologically-realized counterparts (Chomsky 1981, 1982), a set of empirical diagnostics will be formulated on the basis of evidence from **overt**-expletive languages to determine whether

---

6 Note that expletives involved in existential quantification, such as English *there*, cannot be considered truly “semantically-vacuous.” What is meant here is merely that such expletives bear no semantic (or thematic) relation to a predicate’s argument structure (i.e., expletives are not assigned theta roles).
the Russian and Ukrainian impersonal predicates discussed above can be shown to involve a null form of expletive-insertion. Data regarding the Definiteness Effect (Milsark 1977, Safir 1985) and existential closure (Diesing 1992) will show that (1-2) fail to pattern with similar constructions in languages that uncontroversially have expletive-insertion as a syntactic resource. In section 2.3, I will show that the requirement for a filled clausal subject position may be satisfied by simple XP-movement, divorced from both case and agreement, as well as from discourse interpretation. This conclusion will be supported by the results of section 2.2, as well as by additional evidence from binding, word order, and focus projection.

In this way, the EPP is teased apart from those features that tend to cluster with it, resulting in a “purer” instantiation of this checking requirement. The case of accusative unaccusatives in Slavic should play a crucial role in determining the set of primitive syntactic operations crosslinguistically.

2.1 A History of the E(xtended) P(rojection) P(rinciple)

Any work on the formal syntax of nonagreement and impersonal predicates in Slavic must contain an explicit characterization of the EPP in order to distinguish non-discourse-motivated, feature-driven movement from more general instances of scrambling. While it is widely held that Slavic is among those “free word order” languages that read Information Structure off of the surface string (see, e.g., Bailyn 1995), it is nonetheless possible, under neutral discourse, to determine whether this surface order is affected in some way by purely syntactic (i.e., feature-driven) movement. Thus, if we factor out discourse effects on word order by examining replies to discourse initial, out-of-the-blue
questions like *what happened*, an underlying, “discourse-free” word order can be established. For example, in the case of basic transitive verbs under neutral discourse, only the SVO order is felicitous. Here, the EPP, as formulated in (4), is satisfied trivially. This is illustrated on the basis of the question-answer paradigm from Russian in (5):

(5) **Russian**

Q. Čto slučilos’ segodnia v škole?
   what:NOM happened today in school
   ‘What happened in school today?’

A. (a) Mal’čik poceloval devočku.
   boy:NOM kissed:MASC.SG girl:ACC

(b) #Poceloval mal’čik devočku.\(^7\)
   ‘A boy kissed a girl.’

Note, however, that an immediate question for the EPP is raised by the discourse-neutral word order for predicates consisting exclusively of internal arguments. Consider, for example, the Russian Adversity Impersonal in (1b) as a response to the discourse-initial question in (6):

(6) **Russian: Adversity Impersonal**\(^8\)

Q. Čto slučilos’?
   ‘What happened?’

A. (a) #Zadavilo ženščinu “kovrom-samoletom“.
   crushed:[-AGR] woman:ACC carpet airplane:INST

(b) Ženščinu zadavilo “kovrom-samoletom“.
   ‘A woman was crushed by a flying carpet.’

If we take non-movement, as in (5a), to indicate the basic, discourse-neutral word order, then the V-initial structure in (6a) is incorrectly predicted to be a felicitous response. That

---

\(^7\) The ‘#’ symbol indicates a grammatically well-formed structure that is inappropriate to a given discourse.

\(^8\) See Kovtunova (1980:354) on the discourse values associated with word-order differences for such impersonals.
is, if SVO is the discourse-neutral word order, why, in the absence of S, should VO(O) not be equally felicitous? Problems such as these are discussed in more detail in section 2.3.1. For now, let us note only that a clausal subject constraint appears to be relevant for such structures. Without the EPP, we would be forced to consider (6b) an instance of scrambling; this would be an unnatural result in light of the fact that this particular instance of scrambling would have to be stipulated ad hoc as a process that establishes discourse-neutral word order. We will note, however, that the EPP can be invoked in such cases only under its more recent formulations, namely, those that abstract away from the necessity of a canonical NOM or expletive subject, and may target, instead, non-NOM NPs (and, in some cases, PPs).

2.1.1 The EPP and the Null-Subject Parameter

The notion of a subject condition was first discussed in the generative literature in Perlmutter 1971. Perlmutter’s exact formulation is given in (7). All languages were assumed to be one of two types: those for which (7) held (Type A) and those for which it did not (Type B):

(7) Perlmutter’s Subject Condition
Any sentence other than an imperative in which there is an S that does not contain a subject in surface structure is ungrammatical.

The parametric choice of (7) was designed to capture an apparent typological division among languages based on whether or not a particular language pronounced non-emphatic subject pronouns. Perlmutter (1971:99-105) observed that the null-subject (pro-drop) status of Type-B languages implied (i) the lack of overt expletives and (ii) the lack of that-trace phenomena. The circumvention of ECP (that-trace) effects was later taken up by Rizzi (1982) and attributed to “free inversion,” the process by which an embedded
subject can be *wh*-extracted from a postverbal VP-adjoined position, in which it is properly governed, and thus, not in violation of the ECP. The following example from Italian (the prototypical free-inversion language) illustrates the licit extraction of an embedded subject over an overt complementizer:

(8) Italian Free-Inversion

\[ \text{Chi} \quad \text{hai detto che ha [scritto questo libro] tì?} \]

‘Who did you say wrote this book?’ [Roberts 1997:207]

The fact that *wh*-extraction of subjects in Russian and Ukrainian is degraded with respect to similar instances of object extraction shows that these are not free-inversion languages (that is, the postverbal (VP-adjoined) position is not a legitimate site for subject extraction):\(^9\)\(^10\)

(9) Russian

a. Subject Extraction

\[ \text{*Ktoi, ty xočeš’, čtoby tì napisal ètu knigu?} \]

‘Who do you want to write this book?’ (Lit.: ‘..., that will write this book?’)

b. Object Extraction

\[ \text{Čtoi, ty xočeš’, čtoby Ivan napisal tì?} \]

‘What do you want Ivan to write?’ (Lit.: ‘..., that Ivan will write?’)

To be sure, as reported in Franks (1995:291), examples such as (9a) are acceptable in the colloquial language of some speakers. That Russian does not allow subject extraction

---

\(^9\) Slavic permits *wh*-extraction from subjunctive subordinate clauses only. The examples in (9) accordingly test the extractability over the subjunctive complementizer *čtoby* (see Bailyn 1995:249 and Sekerina 1997:36)

\(^10\) The same facts reported in (9-10) for Russian hold for Ukrainian, as well; the corresponding Ukrainian examples are therefore omitted.
from a postverbal position is illustrated by the sharper subject/object asymmetry with respect to long-distance extraction, as in the scrambled structures in (10).\textsuperscript{11}

(10) Russian

a. Long-Distance Extraction of Subject

*Vy Vanja, slyšali, kogda t, uvozil musor?

you:NOM.2PL Vanja:NOM.3SG heard:2PL when took-away:3SG garbage:ACC

‘Did you hear when Vanja removed the garbage?’

b. Long-Distance Extraction of Object

Vy musor, slyšali, kogda uvozili t,?

you:NOM.2PL garbage:ACC heard:2PL when they-took-away

‘Did you hear when they removed the garbage?’ [Zemskaja 1973:399-400]

In addition to the lack of free inversion, the fact that neither Russian nor Ukrainian is a null-subject (pro-drop) language firmly places these languages in Perlmutter’s Type-A class, which, it will be recalled, is subject to the EPP-like condition in (7).

Note, however, that the main thrust, for our purposes, of Perlmutter’s typology is the claim that it makes with respect to expletives; that is, whether expletives will appear in a given language overtly or in a phonologically-null form. Perlmutter observed that null-subject status and free inversion patterned only with \textit{covert} expletives (by now, a widely accepted typological fact). Thus, to review, in Perlmutter 1971 (and in much subsequent work on the Null-Subject Parameter, including Chomsky 1981 and Rizzi 1982) the following properties were believed to cluster together in null-subject languages (such as Italian and Spanish):

(11) Characteristic Properties of Null-Subject Languages (Type B)

a. phonologically-null referential subject
b. free inversion (circumvention of \textit{that}-trace effects)
c. \textit{covert} expletive pronouns

\textsuperscript{11}Note that the licit long-distance extraction of subjects is an additional property noted by Rizzi (1982:49-57) and Chomsky (1981:240-255) to correlate with null subjects and free inversion. In the case of Rizzi, for
It follows that non-null-subject languages (such as English, French, and German) were believed to exhibit the opposite value for (11a-c), namely those given in (12):

(12) Characteristic Properties of Non-Null-Subject Languages (Type A)
   a. non-emphatic referential subject obligatorily pronounced
   b. that-trace effects
   c. overt expletive pronouns

Thus, in the case of predicates that fail to select an external argument, Perlmutter’s (1971) two-way typological division is meant to capture the lack of an overt subject in Italian-style languages (Type B) versus their obligatory presence in English-style languages (Type A). Compare, for example, the null-subject structure in (13) and its non-null-subject counterpart in the English gloss:

(13) Italian Existential Unaccusative
    [e] all’improvviso è entrato un uomo dalla finestra.
    suddenly AUX entered a man from-the window
    *(There) suddenly entered a man through the window.’ [Belletti 1988:9]

Returning to the Russian and Ukrainian examples in (1-2), the question is whether Perlmutter’s typology, and in fact, the Null-Subject Parameter in general, has any real explanatory force for Slavic. As uncontroversial non-null-subject languages, Russian and Ukrainian would be predicted to pattern with other Type-A languages, whose relevant properties are given in (12). Note, however, that while (12a-b) do indeed hold, (12c) does not: Russian and Ukrainian are falsely predicted by the Null-Subject Parameter to have example, as in (9), long-distance movement specifically refers to the free violation of the wh-Island Constraint.

12 Apparent instances of pro-drop in Russian and Ukrainian are best treated as discourse ellipsis since items readily recoverable from recent discourse are regularly omitted, regardless of the syntactic position (see Franks 1995:307-308).

13 Existential predicates are believed to consist of a Theme (the entity whose existence is being asserted) and an (optional) Locative argument. Thus, they contain internal arguments only and, for this reason, are generally considered unaccusative (see Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 148-154). Note, for our purposes, that it is precisely unaccusative verbs that allow the insertion of existential there (or its null counterpart).

14 Null expletives will be indicated by bracketed bold “e”.

---

---
overt expletives in (1-2),\(^{15}\) patterning with the English gloss in (13). Instead, as we will see, the “free word order” resource of Russian and Ukrainian prevents infelicitous V-initial sentences in a way to be made more precise as we proceed. It will be argued in subsequent sections that the preverbal elements in Russian and Ukrainian (1-2) occupy the same position as \([e]\) in Italian (13). The fact that this position cannot be characterized in a unified way in Perlmutter’s (1971) framework points to a weakness in its explanatory scope. Furthermore, as noted above, the fact that overt expletives are not available in (1-2) for otherwise Type-A languages points to a weakness in the empirical scope of work on the Null-Subject hypothesis, more generally. That is, on the basis of Russian and Ukrainian impersonal predicates, we have seen that there can be no obligatory implicational universal between null subjects and covert expletives, on the one hand, and non-pro-drop and overt expletives, on the other.

It is reasonable to consider whether Russian and Ukrainian constitute a third language-type, not anticipated by the assignment of a simple +/- value for the subject condition in (7). This would be a language-type in which non-pro-drop patterns with \textit{covert} expletives, rather than their expected overt counterpart. Whether the structures in (1-2) contain a covert form of \textit{there}-insertion is considered in detail in section 2.2. In what follows in sections 2.1.2-3, it will be shown that the null-expletive hypothesis, at the very least, is not forced by the EPP on theory-internal grounds. In section 2.2, we will see that the null-expletive hypothesis cannot be maintained on purely empirical grounds.

\textit{2.1.2 The EPP and “Syntactic Saturation”}

In the discussion of a subject condition in Chomsky 1981, it is assumed that the

\(^{15}\)The question of overt expletive \textit{vono} in Ukrainian is discussed in more detail in chapter 3 (sections
[NP, Infl] position is generated universally, rather than being subject to parametric variation. Languages differ merely as to whether non-theta-related (pleonastic) subjects are pronounced. It is thus assumed that the Italian existential in (13) satisfies the EPP in essentially the same way as its English gloss: by projecting [NP, Infl] (see Chomsky 1981:25-28). This assumption has been corroborated by much subsequent work that shows that such null expletives exhibit the same semantic and syntactic properties as their phonologically-realized counterparts (see, e.g., the discussion of the Definiteness Effect (DE) in Safir 1985 and Belletti 1988, where the DE is shown to hold equally of both overt and null existential expletives).\(^{16}\)

To be sure, however, the idea that the EPP applies universally in all instances in which a canonical subject is missing has led to a whole null-expletive industry; in many cases, the expletive is merely stipulated as a GB requirement (see, e.g., Sobin 1985 and Franks 1995, both with respect to Slavic data), rather than being detected in some way indirectly, following the otherwise standard GB practice of invoking empty categories. The result is that Slavic is made to conform superficially to the Romance pro-drop languages on the basis of theory-internal considerations alone, with no empirical gain with respect to our understanding of Slavic impersonals, and how their syntax is affected by a universal subject condition. At this point the Slavic data require either a finer-grained approach to

---

3.1.2.1 and 3.5) (see also Billings 1993).

\(^{16}\) The Definiteness Effect is a restriction on the interpretation of postverbal subjects, namely, that they are obligatorily indefinite. In section 2.2, the DE will be discussed as a diagnostic for detecting existential expletives in languages (such as Slavic) in which they do not appear overtly. The DE may be illustrated on the basis of a null-expletive language such as Italian by considering the definite-NP counterpart to (13). This example, given in (i), is reported by Belletti (1988:9) as ungrammatical, thus exhibiting the DE in the same way as its English gloss, with the overt existential expletive *there*:

(i) Italian

\[* [e] all'improvviso è entrato l' uomo dalla finestra.\]

suddenly AUX entered the man from-the window

‘There suddenly entered the man from the window.’
the Null-Subject Parameter (to show that Russian, for example, really is Italian, in this respect, and, thus, null expletives would be expected) or a finer-grained approach to the EPP itself, which would allow the subject positional constraint to be satisfied in a way that distinguishes Slavic from typologically-distinct pro-drop Romance. Here, and (mainly) in subsequent sections, the latter approach will be pursued.

The term “Extended Projection Principle” first appears in Chomsky 1982 (10). The subject positional constraint constitutes the second clause of the EPP, while the first clause simply states the (non-extended) Projection Principle (i.e., that a predicate must satisfy its theta requirements at each syntactic level). The independent stipulation that clauses have subjects was made in order to account for the following facts that the Projection Principle did not capture: (i) non-selected elements (expletives) can occupy the subject position, and, in fact, in some languages (such as English) are required to do so in case the subject position is non-thematic; (ii) even when thematic, the selected subject need not be projected (in contrast to a predicate’s complements) as in the case of passives and nominalizations. It is precisely for these reasons that predicates were believed to subcategorize for their complements only. A verb’s subject, as mentioned earlier, was held to be a selectional property of the entire VP. Since these subject facts were not subsumed by the Projection Principle, the “extended” clause of the EPP was merely added to the Projection Principle as a special condition. By virtue of this second clause of the Projection Principle, the phrase structure rule, $S \rightarrow \text{NP Infl VP}$, could now be replaced by the independent principles of X-bar theory and the EPP (the latter, to be sure, still a stipulation).\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} Discussion of the EPP in this subsection will, thus, henceforth refer to its second clause.
The next major conceptual shift in the formulation of the EPP is due to Rothstein 1983, 1984. Based on the notion of “function” from set theory and the Fregean concept of “saturation,” Rothstein sought to derive the EPP from the basic requirement that all open functions must be saturated. Saturation, in this sense, can be thought of as completing an incomplete meaning, where unsaturated meanings are open functions that are closed by virtue of discharging arguments.18 The two clauses of the EPP are linked by the general requirement that all functions must be saturated. The difference between the two clauses of the EPP reduces to the fact that the Projection Principle expresses a lexical function that must be satisfied by means of theta-assignment, while the subject condition of the EPP is a syntactically-defined function: it requires a single formal argument that may, but need not, be thematically related to the predicate. It is precisely in this sense that the VP is viewed as a monadic predicate, whereas lexical V is of “variable polyadicity” (Rothstein 1984:268-270). While the number and type of arguments selected by lexical heads is a purely idiosyncratic property related to the predicate’s meaning, the requirement that the VP be predicated of some subject (cf. the Predication Condition in (3)) is a formal syntactic requirement of the clause. Rothstein’s reformulation of (both clauses of) the EPP is given in (14)

(14) EPP (Rothstein 1983:69)
For a sentence to be well-formed, both syntactic and lexical functions must be appropriately saturated.

It will be recalled that when a thematic subject is not selected or dethematized (cf. (1-2), respectively), it is generally the case that the VP is predicated either of an initially internally-merged argument, as in passives, basic unaccusatives, and raising verbs, or of

---

18 For discussion, see Heim & Kratzer (1998:2-3, 14-15).
a semantically-vacuous pleonastic (expletive) element. Assuming, for the moment, that Russian and Ukrainian do not have covert expletives as a lexical resource, it appears that the VP in (1-2) is syntactically-saturated by means of syntactic movement of an internal argument. That is, in the absence of the VP having a theta role to discharge, an internal argument unexceptionally serves this purpose. This relationship between an “available” internal argument and a non-thematic subject position lies at the heart of Burzio’s Generalization, in any of its formulations. Russian and Ukrainian impersonals, however, remove case as a possible trigger for this movement (since the internal argument already receives structural ACC),\(^{19}\) with the result of isolating the EPP.

Consider (1a) and (2a), repeated below as (15-16):

(15) Russian: Adversity Impersonal
Rabočego ubilo oskolkom plity.
worker:ACC killed:[-AGR] splinter:INST of-concrete-slab
‘A worker was killed by a splinter of concrete slab.’

(16) Ukrainian: Impersonal Passive
Inozemca bulo posadżono do v’jaznyci.
foreigner:ACC was placed:[-AGR] to prison
‘A foreigner was put in prison.’

The crucial difference between the impersonals in (15-16) and other more standard instances of unaccusatives is that in the former the Theme role has an internal case-

\(^{19}\) That the direct object is assigned **structural** ACC in Ukrainian impersonal passives, rather than quirky ACC, as in some instances of Icelandic psych verbs (Sigurðsson 1992), is discussed in chapter 3, section 3.3.2. The genitive of negation, which applies to structurally-marked object only, shows the same for the object of Russian Adversity Impersonals (this is tested on (1b) rather than (1a/15) since the ACC and GEN forms of MASC.SG.ANIM NPs are not distinguished morphologically):

(i) Russian Adversity Impersonal: Affirmative
Ženščinu zadavilo “kovrom-samoletom”.
woman:ACC crushed:[-AGR] carpet airplane:INST

(ii) Russian Adversity Impersonal: Negated
Ni odnoj ženščiny ne zadavilo “kovrom-samoletom”.
NEG one woman:GEN NEG crushed:[-AGR] carpet airplane:INST
‘Not a single woman was crushed by the flying carpet.’
marked position to which it can be assigned. I have assumed up to this point that the
displacement of the direct internal argument is an instance of syntactic NP-movement.
Let us test this assumption against the theory developed in Williams 1994, in which
syntactic NP-movement under passivization (and “Unaccusative Advancement,” more
broadly) is subsumed under theta-role assignment. According to Williams, under normal
instances of passivization, the internal object position is caseless and, thus, by Visibility
(Chomsky 1986:93-95), cannot satisfy theta roles. The direct internal theta role is
satisfied instead by “vertical binding,” according to which its index is percolated up to
VP. That is, where no external argument is available, the VP inherits the index of its
complement, as a “relativized head.” Predication of monadic VP then reduces to an
instance of theta-role assignment (i.e., predication on the Theme argument applied to the
subject) (Williams 1994:113-119), with no NP-movement. This is illustrated in (17):

(17) Vertical Binding (Williams 1994:119)

```
IP
   NP
      VP
          V [NP]
               <Ag>, Th
```

In the abbreviated tree in (18) the index of the Theme is assigned externally, saturating
the one-place VP-predicate with no syntactic movement:

(18) Predication (Williams 1994:119)

```
IP
   NP
       VP
           V [NP]
                <Ag>, Th
```

---

20 Angle brackets (< >) indicate dethematization; square brackets indicate a caseless NP position.
The Theme argument in (18) thus surfaces externally purely by virtue of theta role assignment (vertical binding) and the subsequent predication of VP; NP-movement is not involved.

The question, then, is whether the impersonal predicates in (15-16) can work the same way. That is, assuming, for the moment, that the direct internal argument in (15-16) satisfies the EPP, just as the same argument does in the canonical passive in (18), is it then the case that NP-movement is not involved in (15-16) either? Note that the crucial difference between the Russian and Ukrainian examples in (15-16) and the canonical passive in (18) is the availability of a case-marked, visible object position in the former, versus its absence in the latter. The result is that the direct internal argument in the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals receives its theta role in situ, at Merge. Since the index of the direct internal argument in (15-16), as a result, does not percolate to VP (i.e., since there is no vertical binding), the VP itself, still a monadic predicate, has no thematic material of which it can be predicated. It is precisely in such cases that an expletive element is generally assumed to be introduced as a purely “formal subject” to saturate this one-place predicate. This is indeed the case in the widely-studied examples of impersonal passives in French, Dutch, and German, given in (19):

(19) Impersonal Passives (+ Expletive)\(^{21}\)
   a. French
      Il a été tué un homme.
      ‘There has been killed a man.’

   b. Dutch
      Hij zei, dat er mijn oom een boek gegeven zal worden.
      ‘He said that there will be given a book to my uncle.’

\(^{21}\) Note that the English glosses in (19) with expletive *there* are marginally acceptable. Why such examples are not fully grammatical remains a mysterious property of English.
c. German
   Es wurde ein alter Hund gesehen.
   there was an old dog:NOM seen
   ‘There was seen an old dog.’

[Safir 1985:98-109]

If we continue to assume that a phonologically-null version of the expletives in (19) is not available as a lexical resource in Russian and Ukrainian, and that vertical binding (as in (18)) does not take place when the direct internal position is capable of bearing case, then the obligatory saturation of the one-place VP-predicate in (15-16) (i.e., EPP-satisfaction) must be instantiated in a third way, namely, syntactic NP-movement of a case-marked internal argument. Note that this instance of NP-movement (raising) involves a structurally case-marked object, undermining the original case-theoretic motivation for Burzio’s Generalization, as mentioned earlier, but providing in its place an EPP-motivated source for the “Burzio pattern” of movement (in predicates with non-thematic subjects) as suggested by Rothstein 1983 and Marantz 1991.22

2.1.3 The EPP and D-Feature Checking

To review, the GB notion of the EPP in the 1980s held that the subject positional constraint was satisfied either by movement of an internal, caseless NP to a NOM-marked subject position, or the insertion of an expletive, either null (as in pro-drop languages such as Italian) or overt (as in non-pro-drop English, French, Dutch, and German). The fact that the syntactic saturation of VP may involve internal, case-marked arguments indicated the need for a principled reformulation of the EPP that would admit such well-

22 In fact, Rothstein (1983:63) briefly mentions the Russian Adversity Impersonal (my (1) and (15)) in her discussion of Burzio’s Generalization. Her proposal that the word order of such structures is a result of the “predicate linking rule” (i.e., the EPP) (63-69) is supported in this chapter by a finer-grained examination of the focus-structural and semantic-interpretive facts of this construction.
formed structures, without overgenerating the range of legitimate VP-predications. More specifically, the next major conceptual shift in the formulation of the EPP involved the decoupling of case (together with agreement) from the subject positional constraint.

It had long been held that grammatical functions such as “subject” were not primitives in the theory. Under the checking theory developed by Chomsky (1993, 1994), it was proposed that case, agreement, and the subject positional constraint were all related to distinct, uninterpretable features that, by hypothesis, could be checked independently in the course of a derivation. The EPP itself was reduced to a D(P)-feature in T(ense).

Under Chomsky’s theory, uninterpretable morpholexical features are not visible at the PF interface (that is, they cannot be pronounced) and, thus, have to be eliminated (by virtue of being checked) before Spell-Out. The ungrammaticality caused by the presence of an uninterpretable feature at one of the interfaces (PF or LF) is believed to be the result of a Full Interpretation violation, or the presence of superfluous symbols in a representation. Given Full Interpretation, the presence of [-Interpretable] features in a derivation, such as the D-feature in T, accounts for the displacement property of language. Other [-Interpretable] features include the (structural) case features of T (NOM) and NPs, and the phi- (AGR) features of T. The checking of formal features, imposed on the derivation by the need to eliminate those features that are [-Interpretable] at one of the interfaces, is generally held to take place in either a head-head or spec-head relationship, that latter for maximal projections. The EPP, then, reduces to the requirement that an XP bearing a D-feature enter into a licit checking configuration (spec-head) with Tense by overt syntactic
movement.\textsuperscript{23,24} Note that in the case of the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals in (1-2) (and (15-16)), the numeration (or array of lexical items to be concatenated in the course of the derivation) lacks both NOM case and agreement morphology. As a result, the feature composition of T is “impoverished:” it contains the D-feature alone (see Lavine 1998a).

The dissociation of case and the EPP was initially motivated by Chomsky (1994) on the basis of successive-cyclic raising structures, as in (20) below, and there-insertions structures, as in (21):

\begin{equation}
\text{(20) Successive-Cyclic Raising (Chomsky 1995a:283)}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation*}
\text{We are likely [}t_1 \text{ to be asked [}t_2 \text{ to [}t_1 \text{ build airplanes}]]].
\end{equation*}

Here, overt raising of we from the most embedded clause through the two infinitival IPs can only be motivated by I’s (= Tense’s) D-feature, since case (and agreement) are not available in the nonfinite $t_2$ and $t_3$ positions. Case and the EPP are similarly divorced in the expletive-Merge construction in (21):

\begin{equation}
\text{(21) Expletive-Merge (Chomsky 1995a:344-348)}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation*}
\text{There seems [}t \text{ to be [someone in the room]]].
\end{equation*}

That the EPP-feature of the embedded infinitival is checked by the expletive (where there is no simultaneous case checking since nonfinite T lacks a case feature) is established by comparing (21) with the ungrammatical competing derivation given in (22):

\begin{equation}
\text{(22) *There seems [someone to be [}t \text{ in the room}]]}.
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{23} Here, we assume “generalized pied-piping” of the lexical material associated with the raised D-feature in order to satisfy interface conditions at PF: the D-feature itself cannot be pronounced and, thus, at PF is uninterpretable (Chomsky 1995a:282).
\textsuperscript{24} Note also that the XP need not obligatorily be an NP/DP. In the case of Locative Inversion, as we will see shortly, a PP (containing an NP) is pied-piped to [Spec, TP] for EPP-checking (Babyonyshev 1996, Collins 1997).
The common point in the derivation of (21) and (22), given in (23), is where the lower VP merges with nonfinite T:

(23) \[ TP \text{ to } [vp \text{ be someone in the room}] \]

At this point in the derivation, the specifier of T must be filled in order to eliminate the latter’s uninterpretable D-feature (= EPP-checking). Here, there are two possibilities: either someone can move into this position, with the expletive inserted directly into the specifier of the matrix clause, or the expletive can be merged into this position and then subsequently raise to satisfy the matrix EPP. Only the latter option yields the correct form in (21).

Note that Chomsky (1995a:344-345) takes examples such as these to indicate that overt movement is more costly (due to Procrastinate) than lexical insertion (i.e., expletive-Merge) (see also Chomsky 1995b, 1998). Assuming this to be correct universally, the prediction is that in Russian and Ukrainian impersonals, the EPP will be checked by expletive-Merge, rather than movement, as long as an expletive (null or overt) is part of the derivation. Under this approach, overt syntactic movement to an EPP position will be taken to suggest that the less-costly expletives are not a lexical resource in these languages (see section 2.2 and below).

The necessary machinery is now in place to account for other instances of “pure” EPP-checking; that is, where the EPP is checked independently from case and agreement. Perhaps the best known instance of such EPP-checking is the case of oblique subjects in Icelandic impersonal passives and middles. Note the alternation in (24) between overt

25 Note that while the D-feature of T is [-Interpretable], the corresponding categorial feature of the NP/DP is [+Interpretable] and, thus, able to enter into multiple checking relations. For discussion, see Chomsky 1995a:279-286.
movement of a quirky-case-marked internal argument to the EPP-position and simple expletive-Merge in the following paradigm from Sigurðsson (1992:14):

\[(24) \text{ Icelandic: Quirky-Case-Assigning Passive} \]
\[\text{a. Stólunum hafði verið stolið á uppboðinu.} \]
\[\text{the-chairs:DAT had:\[-AGR\] been stolen at the-auction} \]
\[\text{b. Pað hafði verið stolið fjórum stólum á uppboðinu.} \]
\[\text{there had:\[-AGR\] been stolen four chairs:DAT at the-auction} \]
\[\text{c. *Hafði verið stolið fjórum stólum á uppboðinu.} \]

That the EPP is checked in (24a) independently of case and agreement is uncontroversial. Note, however, that Icelandic is an overt-expletive language. In (24b) the expletive is introduced in order to allow for the right-alignment of indefinite focused material without inducing an EPP-violation. The deviant example in (24c) shows that insertion of the expletive in (24b) is a formal requirement of the clause.

Note that instances of EPP-satisfaction by means of a non-NOM constituent is well known in Slavic as well. This is illustrated by the Locative Inversion and Psych Predicates from Russian given in (25):

\[(25) \text{ Russian Non-Canonical EPP-Satisfaction} \]
\[\text{a. Locative Inversion (Babyonyshchev 1996:52)}^{27} \]
\[\text{V klasse pojavilsja noven’kij.} \]
\[\text{in class appeared:MASC.SG new-one:MASC.SG} \]
\[\text{‘There appeared a new boy in our class.’} \]
\[\text{b. Psych Verbs (Lavine, Harves & Billings, to appear)} \]
\[\text{Dedu vspomnilas’ èta učitel’nica.} \]
\[\text{grandfather:DAT recalled:F.SG this teacher:NOM.F.SG} \]
\[\text{‘Grandpa recalled this teacher.’} \]

---

26 Icelandic is also a null-subject language. From the point of view of the Null-Subject Parameter, discussed in section 2.1, the fact that Icelandic has overt expletives is unexpected (see (11-12)).

27 Collins (1997) suggests that in the case of Locative Inversion, the EPP is satisfied by the D-feature of the NP/DP that the PP contains. The whole PP is pied-piped to the EPP-position for well-formedness at PF.
Like the Icelandic example in (24a), the EPP is satisfied in both examples in (25) by an oblique, definite NP.  

In principle, there is no reason why structurally-marked, indefinite NPs should not also be able to satisfy T’s uninterpretable D-feature. In fact, we know that such constituents regularly satisfy the EPP in instances of maximally-focused basic transitives, as in (5a), repeated in (26):

(26) Russian Transitive: Maximal Focus

Malččik poceloval devočku.

boy:NOM kissed:MASC.SG girl:ACC

‘A boy kissed a girl.’

Indeed, the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals in (1-2) and (15-16) have already shown that internal structurally-marked, indefinite NPs also satisfy the EPP. (15-16) are repeated below in (27-28), together with the V-initial structures, which are degraded under neutral discourse:

(27) Russian: Adversity Impersonal

a. Rabočego ubilo oskolkom plity.

worker:ACC killed:[-AGR] splinter:INST of-concrete-slab

‘A worker was killed by a splinter of concrete slab.’

b. ??Ubilo rabočego oskolkom plity.

(28) Ukrainian: Impersonal Passive

a. Inozemca bulo posadženo do v’jaznyci.

foreigner:ACC was placed:[-AGR] to prison

‘A foreigner was put in prison.’

b. ??Bulo posadženo inozemca do v’jaznyci.

The (a) examples in (27-28), under their optional indefinite reading, illustrate that the EPP can be divorced not only from case and agreement, but also from discourse interpretation. That is, the preverbal position in these structures is ambiguous between non-topicalized [Spec, TP] and a dedicated left-edge discourse-related topic position.

Assuming, trivially, that the PP is an oblique form of its NP constituent.
(such as [Spec, CP]). These examples contrast sharply with Icelandic (24b-c), where it is shown that indefinite objects in Icelandic structures with non-thematic subjects pattern obligatorily with an expletive subject.

To summarize, an immediate effect of reformulating the EPP as a D-feature checking requirement was to admit a wider range of “EPP-satisfiers,” with the result that this well-formedness condition, though still essentially stipulative in nature, now gained a wider empirical scope. In particular, it made possible an analysis of Slavic impersonals that did not rely on null expletives. Whether or not the non-null-expletive approach is the correct one will be taken up in more detail in sections 2.2 and 2.3.

2.1.4 Chomsky 1998: The EPP and Selection

Under the framework of Merge and Agree in Chomsky 1998, feature checking by movement is amended in several significant ways. First, the EPP is now viewed as a selectional property of those “Core Functional Projections” (CP, TP, vP) whose specifiers are not determined by the Projection Principle. Although all functional heads are now considered to have EPP-features, it appears to be the case, as Chomsky notes, that only the EPP-feature of T is universal; the specifiers of CP and vP are filled optionally, due to the optional application of overt wh-movement and Object Shift, respectively. Furthermore, while T’s sectional feature can only be satisfied by overt movement, Agree, which replaces covert feature-movement and the stipulation of feature strength, has the effect of checking and deleting uninterpretable (structural) case and agreement features by virtue of “long-distance agreement” (presumably, under the right locality
Thus, Chomsky 1998 provides further argumentation (largely conceptual) for the separation of T’s EPP-feature from the licensing of case and agreement (only the former obligatorily requires movement).

Let us note, for our purposes, that if the EPP is a selectional feature of T, its satisfaction can be likened to the obligatory saturation of a lexical head’s arguments. That is, returning to the terms discussed in section 2.1.2, T without a filled specifier is an open function and, as such, is an ill-formed syntactic object. The EPP, which has long had the feel of a mere stipulation, is now treated on par with the theta criterion as a particular instance of the more general requirement that all selectional properties be satisfied. This is the essence of the EPP as formulated by Rothstein (1983), given in (14) and repeated below in (29):

\[(29) \text{EPP (Rothstein 1983:69)}\]
\[\text{For a sentence to be well-formed, both syntactic and lexical functions must be appropriately saturated.}\]

It follows that Rothstein’s Predication Condition given in (3), and repeated below in (30), is a subcase of (29), namely, the subcase that refers to the selectional requirement of T:

\[(30) \text{Predication Condition (Rothstein 1983:9, 1984, 1995)}\]
\[\text{Every syntactic predicate must be syntactically saturated.}\]

By “syntactic predicate,” Rothstein (1983, chapter 2) refers to all non-argument maximal projections. Here, we restrict our attention to TP, the projection that hosts the predicate’s

---

29 Note that neither covert feature-movement nor the stipulation of “feature-strength” is assumed in this work. As noted by many, the combination of covert movement and covert (empty) elements (including word-final morphology) significantly compromises the restrictiveness and, thus, the explanatory power of the theory (see, e.g., Williams 1998). Feature-strength, the regulator of Procrastinate, likewise is essentially non-explanatory. The assignment of a value for strength to a morpholexical feature provides a mere description of surface phenomena with no true explanation for what this [+/- strong] value follows from. Finally, a purely empirical problem with feature strength is that, in some instances, strong features have been shown to apply only optionally, as in the well-known case of Scandinavian Object Shift. Diesing (1996), for example, has observed that the strong case feature apparently responsible for an object’s
“formal subject.” That is, the saturation of VP, as a one-place predicate, will be viewed to take place in the specifier of its highest extended projection (TP) (cf. Grimshaw 1997).

Note that the requirement in (30) is a non-trivial matter only for those predicates whose external argument is non-thematic. Under such circumstances, as we have seen, different languages make different choices with respect to the set of formal subjects (EPP-satisfiers) and syntactic mechanisms that make the saturation of TP possible. The central claim of this chapter is that in the case of the nonagreeing predicates in Russian and Ukrainian (1-2), the EPP--now understood as a selectional property of T, requiring that its specifier be filled--is satisfied by means of the syntactic movement of an internal, structurally case-marked NP. We now turn to argumentation against this function being filled by a phonologically-null expletive.

2.2 On the Status of Expletives in Slavic Impersonals

It is a curious fact that natural language would contain expletives. They bear no thematic relation to the main predicate and, thus, in a lexico-semantic sense, they are not truly interpreted. In some cases, they are not even pronounced. It is therefore valid to ask why expletives should exist at all. The answer to such a question involves an interesting interaction between the formal syntactic requirements of the clause and the discourse-interpretive mechanism. Expletives allow for syntactic well-formedness with respect to the EPP, while permitting certain subjects to remain VP-internal, within the domain of existential closure in Diesing’s (1992) terms, which, as we will see, is what accounts for their particular interpretation. In fact, this interpretation, descriptively referred to as the

movement out of the VP reduces to this NP’s discourse interpretation (or, at least, is superseded by it) (see section 2.3.2).
“Definiteness Effect,” is one of the main diagnostics for establishing the presence of a null expletive element in subject (EPP-) position (see, e.g., Safir 1985, Borer 1986, and Belletti 1988).

2.2.1 The Existential Expletive

The there-type expletive has existential quantificational force over the postverbal subject, with the effect of enforcing, in most cases, an indefinite reading. Note crucially that the existential quantifier has the effect of ruling out universal quantification, which is marked by definite determiners (the, this) and universally-quantified pronouns (all, every, each). Assuming that the there-type expletive is an existential quantifier of some sort, following Milsark 1977, Williams 1984, and Diesing 1992, the presence of an additional, universal quantifier would result in a semantically ill-formed “doubly quantified” structure. Note, for example, the ill-formed English there-insertion structures in (31) versus their well-formed counterparts in (32):

(31) English: there-insertion
   a. *There entered the harbor each foreign vessel.
   b. *There is every woman in the garden.

(32) English: there-insertion
   a. There entered the harbor a foreign vessel.
   b. There is a woman in the garden.

In fact, the presence of there (and the attendant postposing of the subject) appears to be an obligatory condition on the marking of existentiality in English, as demonstrated by the following ill-formed existential sentence in (33) from Milsark (1977:2):

(33) *Space is in the room.

The Slavic languages also mark existential closure by means of word order (Chvany 1975, Babby 1980). That is, the existentially-closed subject NP (in affirmative
In Russian existentials, for example, the EPP is usually satisfied by a preverbal locative element, as illustrated by the (a) examples in (34-35). When the subject appears preverbally, as in the (b) examples, it loses its existential force:

(34) Russian
a. V ovrage blestelo bitoe steklo.
in ravine shined:NEUT.SG broken glass: NOM. NEUT.SG
‘There shined broken glass in the ravine.’ [Babby 1980:136]

b. Bitoe steklo blestelo v ovrage.
‘The broken glass shined in the ravine.’

(35) Russian (repeated from (25a))
a. V klasse pojavilsja noven’kij.
in class appeared: MASC.SG new-one: NOM. MASC.SG
‘There appeared a new boy in our class.’ [Babyonyshev 1996:52]

b. Noven’kij pojavilsja v klasse.
‘The new boy appeared in class.’

Babyonyshev notes that the preverbal, EPP-satisfying locative PP can also appear as a phonologically-null expletive element, as in the examples in (36a-b), with a definite deictic interpretation as indicated in the English glosses.

(36) Russian Locative Inversion: Null PP (Babyonyshev 1996:49)
a. [e] zazvonil telefon.
rang: MASC.SG telephone: NOM. MASC.SG
‘The phone rang (at my place).’

b. [e] prišel Petja.
arrived: MASC.SG Petja: NOM. MASC.SG
‘Petja arrived (to my place).’

Existential sentences generally pattern crosslinguistically with copular verbs and unaccusatives. Since copular verbs themselves may be best treated as a subclass of unaccusatives (see, e.g., Hoekstra & Mulder 1990, Moro 1997, and Harves 1999), the postverbal NP of all existential predicates may actually be an underlying object of some sort, rather than a postverbal subject.

Such word-order facts for existentials and locatives are well known crosslinguistically and have been discussed as early as Lyons 1967. For recent discussion relating the locative PP in Russian existentials to EPP-satisfaction, see Babyonyshev (1996:52-54) and Kondrashova (1996:192-194).
In (36c-d), in which the EPP is satisfied by an overt lexical subject, this definite deictic interpretation is lost:

c. Telefon zazvonil.
   ‘The phone rang (somewhere).’

d. Petja prišel.
   ‘Petja arrived (somewhere).’

It is interesting to note that English *there*, in its non-locative, expletive function, arose in Middle English (1100-1500) as a result of the frequent use of its homophonous, locative counterpart in marking the EPP-position in “free word order” Old English (449-1100), along the modern-day Slavic pattern. When Middle English became a fixed, SVO language, the preverbal adverbial was reanalyzed as a non-locative “formal subject,” in the sense of Rothstein 1983 (see van Kemenade 1987, Lightfoot 1979, and, especially, Butler 1980 for details).

The central question of this section is whether a null version of the existential expletive is involved (as an EPP-satisfier) in the syntax of Slavic impersonals. Under

---

32 Thus, by Chaucer’s time (late 14th century), Old English locative *þær* was reanalyzed as an existential pronoun (*there*). The new use of expletive *there* in late Middle English is illustrated in the following example from Chaucer (cited in Butler:1980:252):

(i) Late Middle English
   This conclusioun wol I declare in the last chapitre of the 4 partie of this tretyes so openly that there shal lakke no word that nedith to the declaracioun.
   ‘I will declare this declaration in the last chapter of part four of this treatise so openly that there will be lacking no word that is necessary to the declaration.’

The strictly formal status of the subject *there* in Middle English is underscored by its substitution, in some early English dialects, by expletive *it*, as in (ii) (Butler 1980:10-11):

(ii) Middle English
   And Salomon says þat it er rightwys men & wise men…
   ‘And Solomon says that there are righteous men and wise men…’

It is interesting to note that Labov (1969/1972:214-215) identifies the use of the existential expletive *it* in contemporary Black English Vernacular, as in (iii):

(iii) Black English Vernacular
   you see, doesn’ nobody really know that it’s a God… ‘cause you ain’t goin’ to no heaven, ‘cause it ain’t no heaven for you to go to.

33 Slavic lacks overt subject-place-holding expletives. Various particles, such as Russian *èto* and Ukrainian *vono*, are used strictly optionally and are equally felicitous with fully-thematic subjects. These would be
the assumption that null expletives have the same semantic properties as their phonologically-realized counterparts, it follows that if the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals discussed in this section have a null expletive in EPP-position, these predicates should exhibit the same behavior as impersonals in other null-expletive languages (such as Italian). That is, under standard methodological assumptions, we do not want to stipulate a new “special” expletive just for Russian and Ukrainian. Instead, let us assume that the set of expletives made available by UG is closed, consisting only of those that are uniquely realized in English, i.e., *it* and *there*. The expletive *it* is associated exclusively with clausal (CP) complements and weather verbs. As a result, *it* is an inappropriate EPP-satisfying element for Russian and Ukrainian (1-2). In contrast, expletive *there* patterns with an NP-associate lower in the clause, as in the French and German examples in (19), repeated below in (37):

(37) *there*-Expletive + NP Associate

a. French

   Il a été tué un homme.
   ‘There has been killed a man.’

b. German

   Es wurde ein alter Hund gesehen.
   ‘There was seen an old dog.’

Thus, at least superficially, it appears that Russian and Ukrainian impersonals should be legitimate candidates for *there*-insertion (or “expletive-Merge”). Compare the Russian and Ukrainian examples in (15-16), repeated again in (38):

(38) a. Russian: Adversity Impersonal

   Rabočego ubilo oskolkom plity.
   ‘A worker:ACC killed:[-AGR] a splinter:INST of-concrete-slab’

‘A worker was killed by a splinter of concrete slab.’

b. Ukrainian Impersonal Passive

Inozemca bulo posadzeno do v'jaznyci.
foreigner:ACC was placed:[-AGR] to prison
‘A foreigner was put in prison.’

The examples in both (37) and (38) have a non-thematic subject position and a direct internal argument. The latter can serve as the NP-associate, which, in some sense, is usually taken to license the presence of the expletive.34 Note that these structures differ, however, with respect to the case assigned to the underlying object and the surface word order. In the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals in (38a-b), the object (exceptionally, from the point of view of Burzio’s Generalization) receives ACC case and appears in the preverbal position discourse-neutrally.35

Word order is discussed in more detail in section 2.3 on EPP-satisfaction by XP-movement. In what follows in section 2.2.2, the relation between the existential expletive and the interpretive restriction that it imposes on the NP-associate is examined. Expletive-Merge will be considered to hold for Russian and Ukrainian impersonals only if the underlying object in structures such as (38a-b) show the same interpretive properties as those in (37a-b), where the existential expletive is present overtly.

---

34 This relationship between the expletive and its associate was initially believed to concern the “transmission” of case from the former to the latter (Safir 1985). In Chomsky 1991, 1993, and 1994 the expletive was viewed as an LF-affix, which needed to be licensed (or replaced) by covert adjunction of the associate. In section 2.2.2, I will suggest that the expletive-associate relationship is simply one of quantification.

35 That is, the word order given in (38) optionally marks maximally-wide focus, where each constituent is existentially bound (and, thus, indefinite). The corresponding V-initial order is interpreted as either a narrative-inversion construction or a structure with narrow focus on the right-aligned constituent, with no focus projection (see section 2.3.1). In short, the V-initial structure is obligatorily interpreted as involving some form of scrambling.
2.2.2 The Definiteness Effect and Existential Closure

Empty categories, such as null expletives, can be detected only indirectly. In the case of *there*-insertion structures, there is a well-known restriction on the interpretation of the postverbal subject NP (underlying object) known descriptively as the Definiteness Effect (DE). Since this interpretive restriction is a result of the expletive-associate relationship, the DE provides an immediate diagnostic for the presence of an expletive element. Note that in the absence of such an expletive element (null or overt), there would be no reason to expect such a semantic effect.

The DE is an extremely strong crosslinguistic generalization. Clark (1978) lists over 30 languages that exhibit the DE in existentially-quantified (*there*-insertion) structures, including those in which there is no overt instantiation of the existential expletive. The languages she lists are as diverse as Chinese, Chamorro (Austronesian), Dutch, Finnish, Hebrew, and Italian. Let us begin by noting how the DE applies in languages with overt existential expletives, as in the impersonal passive constructions in German, Yiddish, Icelandic, and French, given in (39).

(39) Impersonal Passives / Overt Existential Expletive
   a. German
      Es wurde ein alter Hund / *der Hund gesehen.
      EXPL was an old dog:NOM the dog:NOM seen
      ‘There was seen an old dog (/ *the dog).’
   b. Yiddish
      Es iz geshtorbn a raykher goy / *der raykhergoy.
      EXPL is died a rich gentile:NOM the rich gentile:NOM
      ‘There died a rich gentile (*the rich gentile).’ [Prince 1993:59]

36 Here I exclude from discussion certain exceptions to the Definiteness Effect that are not directly relevant. These include the list-reading and the reading in which a postposed subject is individuated under modification by a relative clause. For discussion, see Prince 1993 and Birner & Ward 1998.
c. Icelandic

\[ \text{Páð var stolið stól} / *\text{stólnum}. \]

EXPL was stolen a-chair:DAT the-chair:DAT

‘There was stolen a chair (/ *the chair).’ [Sigurðsson 1992:15]

d. French

Il a été tué un homme / *l’ homme.

EXPL has been killed a man:NOM the man:NOM

‘There has been killed a man (/ *the man).’

The question is whether the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals are simply the ACC-case-assigning correlate of these Germanic and Romance examples, with a covert variant of the expletive in the EPP-satisfying position. That is, do Russian and Ukrainian follow the pattern of the null-expletive constructions given in (40), in which the DE obligatorily holds? These examples include the well-known null-subject Romance languages, a dialect of Dutch (in which expletive er is not pronounced), and Modern Israeli Hebrew:

(40) Null-Existential-Expletive Constructions\(^{37}\)

a. Italian

\[ [e] è stato trovato qualche /*ogni articolo nel dossier. \]

AUX been found some every article in-the dossier

‘There has been found some (/*every) article in the dossier.’ [Belletti 1988:10]

b. Dutch (“Silent Dummy [= Null Expletive] Dialect”)\(^{39}\)

Ik verwachtte dat [e] voor Marie’s handtas niemand / *Piet zou come-back

I expected that for Marie’s purse no-one Piet would return no one (/*Piet).’

---

\(^{37}\) Recall that the null expletive is marked by bracketed bold “e”.

\(^{38}\) Belletti (1988) notes that examples such as (40a) are not free-inversion structures. Under free inversion, there is no DE and subjects appear postverbally regardless of their underlying argument structure; that is, free inversion is possible for transitives and unergatives, in addition to unaccusatives. According to Belletti, in all instances of free inversion, the postverbal subject appears in the VP-adjoined position, where it apparently escapes the interpretive effect of the null expletive (i.e., the VP-adjoined postverbal subject escapes existential closure). For Belletti, the DE in Italian involves only the object position of unaccusative verbs.

\(^{39}\) These data (as well as the term “dummy subject”) are from Perlmutter & Zaenen 1984:201. Note for (40b) that in Dutch subordinate clauses, a surface subject, such as an expletive, appears immediately after the complementizer. The standard Dutch variant of (40b) is given in (i):

(i) Standard Dutch

Ik verwachtte dat er voor Marie’s handtas niemand zou terugkomen.

I expected that expl for Marie’s purse no-one would come-back
c. Hebrew

Be’-ša’a ševa [e] karta te’una / *ha- te’una ba-derex le-Tel-Aviv.

on our seven happened accident the accident on-the-way to Tel Aviv

‘At seven o’clock there occurred an accident (/*the accident) on the way to Tel Aviv.’

The examples in (40) show that existential quantification (resulting in the DE) is possible in the absence of an overt existential expletive. The existential quantificational force related to the null expletive is taken to be the cause of the ungrammatical postverbal definite (or universally-quantified) NPs.

Having reasonably established the possibility of phonologically-null (EPP-satisfying) expletives, let us now turn to Russian and Ukrainian to determine whether a null expletive in such constructions is equally well-motivated. The presence of a null (existential) expletive in Russian and Ukrainian accusative unaccusatives would be detected by the requirement that the V-initial structure pattern with indefinite complements only. This is clearly not the case, as shown by the examples in (41-42), in which the ACC objects are narrowly focused definite NPs:

(41) Russian: Adversity Impersonal


some fool:ACC

‘Irina Petrovna was crushed by the flying carpet, not just any fool.’

b. On vse žalovalsja na nasmork, a založilo uši.

he PRT complained at sniffles and clogged: [-AGR] ears:ACC

‘He kept complaining of sniffles and then his ears clogged up.’

[Lavine 1998a:214]

---

40 This example is adapted from Borer (1986:385). I thank Yosi Grodzinsky for helpful discussion of the Hebrew facts.

41 The narrow focus in (41) is indicated in the English glosses by bold-type, which should be read with heavy constituent stress.
Ukrainian: Impersonal Passive

a. Bulo posadženo do v'jaznyci Vasyl'ja.
   was placed:[-AGR] to prison Vasyl':ACC
   ‘Vasyl’ was put in prison.’

b. Bulo vyhnano z roboty Ivan Jakovyča.
   was driven-out:[-AGR] from work Ivan Jakovyč:ACC
   ‘Ivan Jakovyč was fired.’

The key observation here is that the postverbal position in the V-initial Russian and Ukrainian examples in (41-42), in contrast to the examples in (39-40), is not existentially closed. It freely admits definite NPs, as long as they are discourse appropriate as narrowly focused constituents. The question, then, is whether the Russian and Ukrainian predicates in (41-42), with definite postverbal complements, can be reconciled with the null expletive analysis argued for the examples in (40). This question, in part, hinges on the semantic properties that are associated with the indefinite reading on the NP-associates in (39-40), and, more importantly, on what governs this reading.

Diesing (1992) suggests that the definiteness restriction follows from the more general notion of quantification; i.e., the representation of the relative scope of operators. Following Heim’s (1982) terminology, Diesing divides clauses into the restrictive clause and the nuclear scope. Under Diesing’s framework, the nuclear scope is closed off by existential quantification. The expletive there (or il, es, er, and pað) overtly marks the domain of existential closure (it is a “scope marker” in the sense of Williams 1984). Let us assume, following Diesing, that indefinites (or bare NPs, in general) have no quantificational force of their own. Instead, they introduce variables that are obligatorily

---

Note that уши ‘ears:acc’ in (41b) is treated as a definite here by virtue of inalienable possession, which pragmatically entails presupposition. Russian and Ukrainian lack both a definite and indefinite article. We will see that “definiteness,” in the relevant sense here, refers to Milsark’s (1977:8) “strong” NPs: demonstratives, pronouns, possessive determiners, universally quantified NPs, proper names (cf. (41a) and (42)), and generics.
bound either by an implicit existential operator forming the nuclear clause, or by some form of definite or universal quantification, with the effect of mapping the NPs into the restricted clause. This has the effect of preventing the occurrence of unbound variables, while, at the same time, ruling out definite or universal quantification in *there*-insertion structures. If both types of quantifiers were allowed to quantify over the same domain, this would invariably lead to a violation of the constraint on vacuous quantification: one of the quantifiers would be have nothing to quantify over.

As we noted earlier, it is precisely the constraint on vacuous quantification that accounts for the ungrammaticality of the doubly-quantified English *there*-insertion structures in (31), repeated below in (43):

(43) English: *there*-insertion
   a. *There entered the harbor each foreign vessel.
   b. *There is every woman in the garden.

Existential *there* and universal *each/every* cannot quantify the same NP. The indefinite reading on the postverbal NP in *there*-insertion structures crosslinguistically is, thus, the result of existential closure having sole quantificational force. Like universally-quantified NPs more generally, definite NPs, have quantification force of their own and, thus, are similarly infelicitous under existential quantification. In Diesing’s framework, definite NPs (by “presupposition accommodation”) will be interpreted (at LF) in the higher, restrictive clause, leaving the existential expletive (or the abstract existential operator) with nothing to quantify over, again, resulting in a violation of the constraint on vacuous quantification. This is illustrated in (44):
Note crucially that all definite descriptions, including proper names, as in (41a) and (42), are inherently presuppositional. Under the assumption that the Russian and Ukrainian accusative unaccusatives obligatorily involve an expletive-associate chain (in order to account for EPP-satisfaction by means of a null expletive), the examples in (41-42) will inevitably lead to a situation in which a null existential operator is permitted to vacuously quantify. This, in fact, is the cost of the null expletive analysis for such predicates.

To review, NPs with a presuppositional interpretation are quantified by virtue of mapping onto the restrictive clause, where they are no longer in the scope of existential closure (Diesing 1992:62-63). Diesing assimilates this “mapping” mechanism to the LF operation of Quantifier Raising. Note, in such cases, that the existential operator associated with the expletive (or with the domain of existential closure, more generally, i.e., the nuclear scope) has nothing to quantify over.43

The structure in (44) is meant to apply to the Russian and Ukrainian examples in (41-42) in which the verb’s complement is a definite NP. Although this NP is interpreted at

---

43 Although I have adopted the specific terms used in Diesing 1992, nothing crucial hinges on the choice of this particular analysis. The descriptive generalization here, which is due initially to Milsark 1974 and 1977, is that the DE reduces to the ban on vacuous (or double) quantification.
LF outside of the VP, it is pronounced in a right-aligned position in order to receive narrow focus. The key difference, then, between the expletive-insertion examples in (39-40) and the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals in (41-42) is that only the former involve existential quantification. The latter involve a focus structure, namely, the right-alignment of the object.\footnote{The right-alignment of narrowly-focused material is not confined to impersonal predicates. This is the standard focus strategy (under neutral intonation) for all predicate types in most Slavic languages.} It is precisely the lack of existential quantification in the Russian and Ukrainian examples that allows the definiteness restriction on the underlying object to be circumvented.

We have now ruled out any principled motivation for the presence of an expletive-associate chain along the pattern of the null-expletive examples given in (40). Under the proposal that I am suggesting, which holds that null expletives are not part of the syntax of Russian and Ukrainian (1-2), the lack of a DE in (41-42) is now completely unexceptional. Since the DE follows from existential quantification, the latter a consequence of expletive-associate chains, we would not expect this interpretive restriction to hold in the absence of such a chain. To summarize the main claim of this section, the Russian and Ukrainian examples in (41-42) are not doubly-quantified and, thus, there is no violation of the vacuous quantification constraint.\footnote{Vacuous quantification effects in Russian are discussed in Kondrashova 1996, also in connection to existential quantification. She cites, for example, the following pair in (i-ii) to show that where existential be (est’) is pronounced, it cannot cooccur with universally-quantified NPs in its scope. The structure in (ii) is thus a violation of the constraint on vacuous quantification, like the ungrammatical examples in non-Slavic (39-40), and unlike the grammatical Russian and Ukrainian examples in (41-42).}

\(\text{(i) V komnate est’ lingvistyi.}
\text{in room is linguists:NOM}
\text{‘There are linguists in the room.’}
\)

\(\text{(ii) * V komnate est’ vse lingvistyi.}
\text{in room is all linguists:NOM}
\text{‘There are all the linguists in the room.’}
\)
2.2.2.1 Excursus on the EPP and Focus Structure

Before proceeding, it should be noted that not only does the DE fail to hold in (41-42), but the EPP apparently fails to hold as well. That is, on the surface, it appears that we have dispensed with both an ad hoc EPP-satisfying mechanism (null expletives) as well as with the EPP itself. Indeed, accounting for the effect of discourse-driven movement on feature checking is one of the thorniest issues in current theory.46

Let us briefly examine, for example, the case of (41a), repeated in (45):

(45) Russian: Adversity Impersonal
Zadavilo kovrom-samoletom [\textsubscript{foc} Irina Petrovnu].
crushed:[-AGR] carpet airplane:INST Irina Petrovna:ACC
‘Irina Petrovna was crushed by the flying carpet…’

Note that in Russian (and Ukrainian) the focused constituent must bear prominent stress. Under neutral intonation, prominent stress falls on the stressed syllable of the rightmost constituent. It follows that there is a conflict of some sort in (45) between the normal satisfaction of the EPP (as in (1-2)) and the discourse requirement to establish an appropriate focus structure.47 That is, movement of \textit{Irina Petrovna} to fill T’s specifier will result in a structure that fails to converge \textit{prosodically}: the constituent marked as focused by prominent stress (\textit{kovrom-samoletom}) will not be the same constituent that is selected as focused by the discourse (\textit{Irina Petrovna}).

There are numerous strategies to account for the apparent EPP-violation in (45). The first, and least attractive, is to assume that the EPP holds only optionally. Optionality undermines the restrictiveness of the theory and should be avoided on purely conceptual

---

47 Note, however, that in (1-2), in contrast to (45), focus projects (optionally) to the entire clause. As we will see in section 2.3, focus projection is a diagnostic for a non-scrambled, basic structure.
grounds. Other strategies to “get around” the EPP might include assuming that movement of narrowly-focused material proceeds through the EPP position on the way to a right VP-adjointed focus position, or that EPP-effects are simply masked by a higher-order focus constraint (perhaps in an optimality-theoretic sense). These options, and others, will have to be sorted out in future work. Such work will undoubtedly refer to the notion of “competition” in syntax between components of differing orders (such as case, AGR, EPP, and focus structure) and their parametric variation in terms of relative language-specific prominence at the surface (see Williams 1999 for related discussion).

Note that, here, I have focused instead on EPP-effects where they can be reasonably established at this stage in the theory; that is, EPP-effects under neutral discourse. In the case of Russian and Ukrainian accusative unaccusatives, I have identified an EPP-effect that has gone unnoticed in recent work on Slavic syntax (see Bailyn 1995, King 1995, Babyonyshev 1996, Kondrashova 1996, and Sekerina 1997). Factoring out discourse as a trigger for movement allows us to tease apart competing focus-structure constraints from a genuine and unexceptional instance of formal feature-driven movement.

Note, for example, the question-answer paradigm in (46). Here, neutral discourse is established by the what-happened-type question (cf. (6)); the reply correspondingly involves maximally wide focus:

(46) Russian: Adversity Impersonal

Q. Čto za probka?
   ‘Why is there such a traffic jam?’

A. (a) #Sbilo olenja mašinoj.
     hit: [-AGR] deer:ACC car:INST

     (b) Olenja sbilo mašinoj.

---

48 This latter approach was proposed in Lavine 1998b.
‘A deer was hit by a car.’

Evidence that (46b) does not involve some strong form of topicalization is given in (46c), in which the response to an out-of-the-blue question appears in an embedded clause. If (46c) involved movement to [Spec, CP], we would expect the displaced object to dominate the complementizer (with a resulting root-embedded asymmetry from a doubly-filled COMP violation), which is clearly not the case:

(46)  (c) Kažetsja, čto olenja sbilo mašinoj.

\[
\text{seems that } \text{deer:ACC hit:[-AGR] car:INST} \\
\text{‘It seems that a deer was hit by a car.’}
\]

To be sure, (46c) does not rule out the more-likely possibility of movement to a prominence-related A’-bar position between TP and CP, such as an adjoined TP (King 1995, Sekerina 1997), or some other dedicated functional projection (see Babyonyshev 1996:33-46). Evidence against such an A’-movement account for (46b-c) comes from binding facts. Binding generally does not take place from the A’-position associated with scrambling; instead, binding in such instances is usually established by reconstruction. A-movement, on the other hand, does create new binding relations. A-movement, in fact, is exactly what we would expect for movement into a feature-checking domain. The examples in (47) show that this is precisely the case.

(47) Russian Adversity Impersonal: Binding Facts\(^{49}\)

a. Soldata, ubilo snarjadom svoego/ ego\(_{[[\text{uk}]]}\) otrjada.
\[
\text{soldier:ACC killed:[-AGR] bomb:INST REFL his regiment:GEN} \\
\text{‘A soldier was killed by a bomb of his own regiment.’}
\]

b. Milicionera, ranilo pulej svoego/ ego\(_{[[\text{uk}]]}\) pistoleta.
\[
\text{militiaman:ACC wounded:[-AGR] bullet:INST REFL his gun:GEN} \\
\text{‘A militiaman was wounded by a bullet from his own gun.’}
\]

---

\(^{49}\) Similar facts are discussed in Bailyn 1999.
Note that the Russian REFL pronoun is generally treated as a “subject-oriented” anaphor.

The subjectless examples in (47) thus show additionally that the binding of anaphors in Russian cannot refer directly to “subject” as a syntactic primitive.\(^{50}\)

The examples in (47) contrast with (48), in which a truly A’-moved (scrambled) ACC object fails to be a potential binder for a lower reflexive:

(48) Russian: Scrambling\(^{51}\)

\[
\text{Mašu}_i \text{ ne ljubjat na *svoej/ ee}_i \text{ kafedre.}
\]

\[
\text{Maša:ACC NEGlove:3.PL in REFL her department}
\]

‘Maša is not liked in her department.’

To review, movement of the direct internal argument in Russian Adversity Impersonals is neither discourse-oriented, nor associated with an A’-position.\(^{52}\) Under neutral discourse, an internal argument can raise to satisfy T’s EPP-feature without altering its existential interpretation. It follows that neither EPP-satisfaction nor existential closure requires an existential expletive.

### 2.2.3 The Predicate-Type Restriction

The Predicate Restriction on there-insertion structures holds that the postverbal NP-associate must denote a temporary state, rather than a property. In other words, expletive-associate chains have been shown crosslinguistically to pattern with stage-level

\(^{50}\) The examples in (47) are consistent with Chomsky’s (1986:169) proposal that anaphor binding takes place in the “complete functional complex,” which is defined as the minimal domain, containing the anaphor, in which all grammatical relations of the predicate are satisfied.

\(^{51}\) In (48) REFL svoj (svoej) is bound by the intervening pro subject of ljubjat ‘love:3.pl’. What is interesting here is that the scrambled ACC object (Mašu) does not compete with the pro subject for control over the anaphor. The ACC object here, in contrast with (47), patterns only with the non-REFL possessive pronoun.

\(^{52}\) Kovtunova (1980:354) notes that the indirect internal argument may also raise to the preverbal position, while maintaining an indefinite interpretation. That is, strictly speaking, the EPP may be satisfied in (46), for example, by the word order in (i):

\[
\text{(i) Mašinoj sbilo olenja.}
\]

\[
\text{car:inst hit:[-agr] deer:acc}
\]

‘A car hit a deer.’

The difference, then, between (i) and (46b) is one of perspective, or the theme-rheme partition, bearing in
predicates only, that is, those predicates that describe events or temporary states. As for individual-level predicates, which describe permanent properties of individuals or permanent states, expletive-associate chains are ruled out. This is illustrated by the following examples in (49-50):

(49) English *there*-Insertion
   a. Stage-Level Predicate
      There are three pigs loose.
   
   b. Individual-Level Predicate
      *There are three pigs stupid. [Stowell 1978:460]

(50) English *there*-Insertion
   a. Stage-Level Predicate
      There are carrots in the refrigerator.
   
   b. Individual-Level Predicate
      *There are carrots nutritious. [Diesing 1992:42; Milsark 1974]

According to Diesing (1992), the ungrammaticality of the (b) examples in (49-50) stems from the fact that the indefinite, postverbal NPs have a generic interpretation and are therefore bound by an abstract generic operator. Thus, *there*-insertion with individual-level predicates is ruled out by the more general constraint that bans quantified NPs, even indefinites, from appearing as expletive *there’s* associate.53

Recall that the main conclusion of the previous section (2.2.2) was that a null version of existential *there* is not involved in the syntax of accusative unaccusatives in Slavic. Under neutral discourse, the EPP is checked instead by a raised internal argument, optionally existentially-closed. One way to test this conclusion would be to determine whether the accusative unaccusative is compatible with individual-level predicates and mind that thematic material can represent new information. Regardless, the two structures can be considered formally equivalent from the point of view of EPP-satisfaction.
the accompanying generic interpretation on the object argument. Under the hypothesis that these Slavic impersonals do not contain a null version of there, there should be no conflict with a generically-quantified object NP.

Russian Adversity Impersonals are inherently eventive (even in the imperfective they are interpreted as episodic) and, thus, the individual-level interpretation is ruled out independently. Note, however, that the Ukrainian impersonal passive, especially when imperfective, may denote both events and states, and, thus, serves as an appropriate testing ground for individual-level predicates.\(^{54, 55}\)

Note, for example, the Ukrainian forms in (51) ((51a) is repeated from (2c)):

(51) Ukrainian: Impersonal Passive

partners:ACC

‘Ukrainian members of parliament are treated as equal partners.’

[Wieczorek 1994:17]

b. Divčat stryženo todi rokov do desjaty. girls:ACC shorn: [-AGR] then years:GEN up-to ten:GEN

‘At that time girls were shorn up to the age of ten.’ [Zatovkanjuk 1984:9]


‘Streets are paved by wooden logs.’ [adapted from Wieczorek 1994:105]

d. Vidminkovi zakinčennja nejtralizovano u miscevomu vidminku.
case endings:ACC neutralized: [-AGR] in locative case

‘Case endings are neutralized in the locative case.’

---

\(^{53}\) This predicate-type restriction with respect to there-insertion was first discussed in Milsark 1974, 1977. See also Chomsky 1975 and Stowell 1978. Milsark’s initial observation concerning the incompatibility of the generic (individual-level) reading with expletive there is most fully developed in Diesing 1992.

\(^{54}\) Of course, the permissibility of generically-quantified NPs in the Ukrainian impersonal passive would not be expected to differ from that of definite or universally-quantified NPs. In both cases, grammaticality hinges on the absence of obligatory existential quantification (i.e., on the absence of a null existential expletive).

\(^{55}\) The stative reading of Ukrainian impersonal passives is discussed in Wieczorek 1994. These may be best interpreted as adjectival, rather than verbal, passives since there is no implicit reference made to an initial external argument (Agent).
The sentences in (51a-d) are interpreted as generic statements about members of parliament, girls, streets, and case endings, respectively. Under the assumption that these NPs are bound by a generic operator (and, thus map onto Diesing’s Restrictive Clause), their interpretation provides additional evidence against the presence of a null existential expletive. If such a null expletive were present, we would expect (51a-d) to exhibit the ungrammatical doubly-quantified reading illustrated in the (b) examples in (49-50).

2.3 EPP-Satisfaction by XP-Movement

Argumentation in the previous section showed that the postulation of a there-type null expletive for Russian and Ukrainian accusative unaccusatives is inconsistent with the semantic (quantificational) properties of these constructions. That is, the assumption that a null expletive is present in such structures (for purely theory-internal reasons, i.e., EPP-satisfaction) is contradicted by the facts of our two main diagnostics thus far: the Definiteness Effect and the Predicate-type Restriction. Both diagnostics reduce to the ban on doubly-quantified structures, or the constraint on vacuous quantification. For the null-expletive hypothesis to be maintained, a new, typologically-unattested expletive would have to be posited just for these constructions. However, we have also noted repeatedly that the formal requirement behind the null-expletive hypothesis, namely, satisfaction of the EPP in a “subjectless” construction, appears to be instantiated without the poorly motivated expletive. Thanks to the availability of an internal argument for movement to T’s EPP-position (along the pattern of NP-movement in passives and unaccusatives without the case-theoretic motivation), the presence of null expletives in such structures
is not only semantically inconsistent with what we know about expletive-associate structures in other languages, but syntactically unnecessary for Russian and Ukrainian. In what follows, evidence from word order, discourse interpretation and, mainly, focus projection will be introduced to further the central claim regarding EPP-satisfaction by XP-movement.

2.3.1 On the Interpretation of V-Initial Structures

Consider the V-initial structures given in (52-53):

(52) Russian: Adversity Impersonal (cf. (1a-b))
   a. Ubilo rabočego oskolkom plity.
      killed:[-AGR] worker:ACC splinter:INST of-concrete-slab
   b. Zadavilo moloduju ženščinu kovrom-samoletom.
      crushed:[-AGR] young woman:ACC carpet airplane:INST

(53) Ukrainian: Impersonal Passive (cf. (2a-b))
   a. Bulo posadženo inozemca do v’jaznyci.
      was placed:[-AGR] foreigner:ACC to prison
   b. Bulo znajdено nemovlja u košyku.
      was found:[-AGR] baby:ACC in basket

There are two different interpretations available to V-initial structures in Slavic, in general. The first, as pointed out by Babyonyshev (1996:24-25), is the “narrative inversion” interpretation, typical of the beginning of particular narratives, such as stories, jokes, and fairly tales. Following Diesing (1990) and Zwart (1993) on Germanic, Babyonyshev suggests that narrative inversion involves a null narrative operator in [Spec, CP], which is responsible, in some way, for V’s movement to C (while at the same time blocking XP-movement into C’s specifier, yielding the non-V-2 structure in Germanic
narrative inversion constructions). As an example of narrative inversion in Russian, Babyonyshev cites the beginning of a “Vovochka joke,” a series of anecdotes about a poor-mannered boy, given in (54a). The example in (54b), also cited by Babyonyshev, comes from the first line of a “folksy” poem by Pushkin:

(54) Russian: Narrative Inversion
   a. Priyodit Vovočka domoj i...
      comes:3.SG Vovochka:NOM home and
      ‘So Vovochka comes home and …’ [Babyonyshev 1996:25]
   b. Pribežali v izbu deti, vtoropja zovut otca.
      ran:PL into hut children:NOM in-a-rush call:PL father:ACC
      ‘Children ran into the hut, calling their father in a rush.’
      [Babyonyshev 1996:21]

This narrative reading is discussed in the Russian Academy Grammar with specific reference to the Adversity Impersonal in (55):

(55) Russian: Adversity Impersonal/Narrative Inversion
   Proxvatilo putnikov morozom.
   seized:[-AGR] travelers:ACC chill:INST
   ‘The travelers were seized with a chill.’ (or: ‘It all began with the travelers being seized by a chill.’) [Kovtunova 1980:354]

The other reading for (52-53) is one in which the constituent on the right-edge is narrowly focused, with all other elements interpreted as part of the presupposed segment of the clause (that is, interpreted in Diesing’s restrictive clause). So, when not used in the narrative-inversion sense discussed above, a V-initial structure such as (52a) is a felicitous response only to those questions that exclusively target the NP:INST as the focused material (e.g., *How was the worker killed*?). This narrow focus on the indirect

---

56 For additional discussion of the Russian facts, see Bailyn 1999. Under Bailyn’s structure for narrative inversion, V moves to T, rather than to C (with the corresponding null operator in [Spec, TP]). Note that the precise structure of V-initial sentences in Russian and Ukrainian is not crucial here. The goal is merely to establish the possible interpretations for this word order.

57 The citation, Kovtunova 1980, refers to the author’s sections on word order in the Russian Academy Grammar (Ed. Švedova). Note that the Ukrainian Academy Grammar (Bilodid 1972) does not discuss this
internal argument is reminiscent of VP-internal scrambling in Russian double-object constructions. Both cases of VP-internal scrambling in ditransitive predicates result in narrow focus on the NP (or adjunct) stranded on the right edge. In the case of the Russian double-object construction, Junghanns & Zybatow (1997) show on the basis of focus facts that the basic order is the one in which the DAT Goal precedes the ACC Theme (see also Kondrashova 1996:142-143). Assuming, crucially, that focus projects only in case the order is basic (i.e., when no scrambling has taken place), the following facts obtain with respect to the interpretation of the VP-internal arguments:

(56) Russian: Double-Object Construction\(^{58}\)

a. Basic Order

\begin{verbatim}
Odna ženščina podarila mal’čiku jabloko.
one woman:NOM gave boy:DAT apple:ACC
\end{verbatim}

(i) ‘A woman gave a boy an apple.’

(ii) ‘A woman gave the boy an apple.’

b. Scrambled Order

\begin{verbatim}
Odna ženščina podarila jabloko, mal’čiku ti.
one woman:NOM gave apple:ACC boy:DAT
\end{verbatim}

(i) *’A woman gave an apple to a boy.’

(ii) ‘A woman gave the apple to a boy.’ [Junghanns & Zybatow 1997:295]

When the ACC NP scrambles over the DAT NP in (56b), it not only has the effect of removing apple:ACC from the focus, but, more importantly, focus now can no longer project to the entire VP; the DAT NP, as a result, is narrowly focused. In (56a), there is no discourse-oriented scrambling, with the result that focus potentially projects to take scope over the entire sentence. The focus projection facts for (56a-b) are schematized in (57a-b), respectively:

---

\(^{58}\) Focus projection is detected here on the basis of whether an indefinite reading is available for both internal arguments. The judgments, as well as the examples themselves, are Junghanns & Zybatow’s 1997.
Focus Projection

a. \[(56a): \quad \text{IP}\ (\text{FOC}) \text{S} \quad \text{VP}\ (\text{FOC}) \text{V}\ (\text{FOC}) \text{NP:DAT} \quad \text{NP:ACC}\)]

b. \[(56b): \quad \text{IP}\ S \quad \text{VP}\ V\ \text{NP:ACC} \quad \text{NP:DAT}\)]

So, under neutral intonation, the focus (new, or, non-D(iscourse)-linked material) projects potentially from the most embedded element (NP:ACC in (56)) to the whole VP or clause, the latter case resulting in maximally wide focus (see Cinque 1993, Reinhart 1995, Zubizarreta 1998). The wide-focus interpretation asserts the whole sentence as new, and can be felicitously uttered in an out-of-the-blue context (cf. the *what happened* question in (46)). Focus projection obtains when constituents appear in the order in which they were merged (Junghanns & Zybatow 1997:300-312; Kondrashova 1996:138-148). It is generally held that narrow focus on the right edge of the clause, as in (52-53) under the non-narrative-inversion reading, as well as in (56b), is the result of scrambling.

What is remarkable about the Russian and Ukrainian V-initial examples in (52-53) is that focus fails to project, despite the fact that the constituents appear to be lined up in their merged order. Given that the SVOO order in (56a) exhibits a well-known focal ambiguity (which is shown in (57a) to be potentially four-ways ambiguous), why should it be that VO(O), in the absence of S, fails to exhibit the same property? That is, for the Russian and Ukrainian impersonals in (52-53), why is the V-initial word order obligatorily interpreted as a non-basic, scrambled structure?

This question will be taken up shortly. For now, let us summarize the results of the present section. The VO(O) order for Russian and Ukrainian accusative unaccusatives has two possible interpretations: (i) narrative inversion; and (ii) narrow focus on the indirect internal NP:OBL argument (or PP adjunct). By analogy with the focus projection
pattern in double-object constructions, we are forced to assume that the VO(O) structure (on the non-narrative-inversion reading) involves discourse-oriented scrambling. It is precisely in this way that the V-initial structure fails to be interpreted as basic, and that the expected maximally-wide focus interpretation is not available. The narrow focus on the most embedded internal argument can only be the result of a structure in which both V and the higher O have scrambled out of the VP. This type of movement is best analyzed not as movement for focus, but movement to avoid focus; that is, movement to interrupt focus projection.

2.3.2 Focus Projection and EPP-Motivated Movement

Note that it is not only surprising that the VO(O) structure cannot be interpreted as maximally focused, but that the EPP-satisfying OVO structure, given in (1-2) and elsewhere, can be. That is, the claim being made here is that only the OVO structure, as in (58) (repeated from (1a)), allows for focus projection (with the accompanying focal ambiguities):

(58) Russian: Adversity Impersonal
    Rabočego ubilo oskolkom plity.
    worker:ACC killed:[-AGR] splinter:INST of-concrete-slab

Thus, (58) felicitously responds to: (i) čto slučilos? ‘what happened?’; (ii) čto slučilos’ s rabočim? ‘what happened to the worker?’; and (iii) kak ubilo rabočego? ‘how was the worker killed?’.

The possible focus domains for (58) are given in (59):

(59) Focus Projection: OVO (cf. (58))
    [IP (FOC) NP:ACC [VP (FOC) V [NP:OBL]]]

---

59 As we noted earlier, the latter question, how was the worker killed?, may also yield a VSO structure; I will leave the matter of the internal distribution of elements within the Topic (here, V and S) to specialized work on focus structure.
The central claim here is that movement of NP:ACC to a preverbal position is strictly EPP-motivated and, thus, is not (necessarily) interpreted as scrambling. The focus projection facts in (59) directly support this claim. The failure of focus projection in the VO(O) structure is, then, the result of a conflict between a formal syntactic requirement of the clause and an underlying argument structure that does not trivially satisfy this requirement at Merge. Thus, contrary to standard assumptions, focus projection does not merely require the basic, linear order that is established by Merge. This basic-order requirement is dependent on the more general requirement of syntactic well-formedness. Focus does not project, for example, in the VO(O) structure in (60) (below) due to the fact that this structure is interpreted either as the result of scrambling or, under neutral discourse, as ill-formed syntactically (i.e., as containing an uninterpretable (unchecked) EPP-feature in T):

(60) \[ \text{IP} *_{(\text{FOC})} \text{VP} *_{(\text{FOC})} \text{V} *_{(\text{FOC})} \text{NP:ACC} *_{(\text{FOC})} \text{NP:OBL}. \]

Let us assume that genuine instances of feature-checking do not affect the discourse-semantics of the sentence. The EPP-feature in T, for example, is blind to discourse appropriateness. Although in non-neutral discourse, as we have seen, the EPP is systematically overridden, movement to satisfy the EPP under neutral discourse is “discourse-free.” This is precisely what accounts for the focus-projection facts of OVO versus VOO. If movement of the NP:ACC to the preverbal, EPP-position were interpreted as a normal instance of scrambling, the NP:OBL would be obligatorily narrowly focused and the OVO order would not be a felicitous reply to out-of-the-blue-type questions that assume no previous shared knowledge. The discourse-felicity of the OVO order is, thus, another piece of evidence in support of the strong hypothesis for the EPP in Slavic.
It is precisely the discourse-free property of the EPP-feature of T that distinguishes it from other formal features that have been proposed to drive purely syntactic movement. Note, for example, the case of Object Shift, or the leftward displacement of object NPs out of VP. In the framework of Chomsky 1998, Object Shift targets the EPP-feature of light-\(v\); under earlier theory (e.g., Chomsky 1991), Object Shift was believed to be driven by a strong case feature (in AgrO). In Icelandic, the prototypical Object-Shift language, full object NPs appear to move to the specifier of a higher functional projection, as in (61) (where the NEG element \(ekki\) is taken to mark the left edge of the VP):

(61) Icelandic: Object Shift

\[ \text{Jólasveinninnið borðaði \[v \text{ hattinni [vp ekki t\text{verb} t\_i]} \]} \]

\[ \text{the-christmas-troll ate the-hat not} \]


Note, however, that unlike EPP-motivated movement in Russian and Ukrainian accusative unaccusatives, Object Shift in Icelandic appears to be sensitive to discourse interpretation. The data in (62) show that Object Shift is licit just in case the NP undergoing movement is definite (or not part of the focus) as in (62a) (see the English gloss); otherwise, Object Shift does not obtain, as in (62b):

(62) Icelandic: Object Shift

a. \[ v \text{P [VP \[I \text{read three books not} \]} ] \]

\[ \text{I didn’t read the three books.’} \]

b. \[ vp \text{ ekki [brjár bækur]} ]

\[ \text{I didn’t read three books.’} \] [Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998:53]

As noted by Diesing (1996), Bobaljik & Thráinsson (1998), and others, these data pose a serious problem for the strong-Case-feature assumption (as well as for the assumption of a strong EPP-feature in light-\(v\)). That is, under a theory of “strong” features, the optional checking of such features should not be permitted. On a purely speculative note, the EPP-
feature of T and the corresponding feature of v, both “core functional projections” in the sense of Chomsky 1998, may be of fundamentally different orders (in a sense that I will leave for future research). For now, it may be noted merely that the question of EPP-checking in Slavic impersonal predicates is not confounded by the possibility of multiple sources of movement, such as focus.

2.3.3 Structure

Let us now turn to a brief discussion of the structure of the Russian and Ukrainian forms. For the sake of convenience, (1a) and (2b) are repeated below as (63-64):

(63) Russian: Adversity Impersonal (= (1a))
Rabočego ubilo oskolkom plity.
worker:ACC killed:[-AGR] splinter:INST of-concrete-slab
‘A worker was killed by a splinter of concrete slab.’

(64) Ukrainian: Impersonal Passive (= (2b))
Nemovlja bulo znajdeno u košyku.
baby:ACC was found:[-AGR] in basket
‘A baby was found in a basket.’

It will be recalled from chapter 1 that the presentation of phrase structure in this work makes use neither of feature strength nor of covert (feature-) movement (contra Chomsky 1995; see Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998, Chomsky 1998, and Epstein et al. 1998). Features must be checked as soon as they enter the derivation; thus, there can be no strict complementarity between theta-assignment and feature-checking. Both may be instantiated in the “lexical” domain of the derivation. Note, finally, that if features can be checked at Merge, then, by necessity, the head-complement relation must be readmitted into the computational system as a licit feature-checking configuration (see Epstein

60 The structure of the Ukrainian impersonal passive is treated in more detail in chapter 3 (section 3.4).
The structure for a Russian Adversity Impersonal is given in (65). Note that Adversity Impersonals are finite predicates that mark events without external causation. This is reflected in (65) by the projection of a vP with no specifier:

(65) Russian Adversity Impersonal (cf. (63)): Structure

Let us first note the initial instances of Merge. Following Larson (1988), the predicate V first forms a constituent with the indirect internal argument, excluding, at this point, the direct object. The direct object is then assigned its theta role by this initial VP compositionally, in the same way that an external argument in the case of monotransitive verbs is assigned compositionally by the verb plus its object. Note, crucially, that in ditransitive unaccusatives, as in (63/65), it is precisely the selection of the indirect internal argument that determines the non-selection of an external theta role. In this sense, the indirect internal argument is believed to bear a closer relation to the predicate than the direct internal argument. Thus, after this initial instance of Merge, the first VP is then predicated of the direct object (of an “inner subject” in Larson’s terms (1988:342)), forming a new VP.

---

61 This is consistent with the semantics of Russian Adversity Impersonals as discussed in Babby 1994a.
On the first instance of Merge, V discharges its indirect internal argument and assigns the “inherent” case that is associated with this theta role. On the next instance of Merge, in which the direct object is concatenated with the first VP, non-quirky, transitive V not only saturates its only remaining theta role, but also assigns (checks) structural ACC in situ, by the spec-head relation. Light-ν, an Event-head, in the sense of Harley 1995, then merges with this higher VP. I assume, following previous work on the light-ν projection, that lexical V adjoins to ν in the overt syntax (see Chomsky 1994, as well as Larson 1988 (VP-shell), Bowers 1993 (PredP), Kratzer 1993 (VoiceP), and Harley 1995 (EventP)). The question now is how T’s EPP-feature is satisfied. Assuming the lack of a special null expletive for this purpose (i.e., assuming the results of this chapter), the EPP is satisfied by movement of the direct internal argument.

The structure for the Ukrainian impersonal passive in (64) differs from that proposed for the Russian Adversity Impersonal in the following two ways: (i) the Ukrainian structure is monotransitive; and (ii) the Ukrainian structure lacks a light-ν projection. The structure for (64) is given in (66):

(66) Ukrainian Impersonal Passive (cf. (64)): Structure

---

62 Note in the examples in (1), as well as in Babby 1994a, that the indirect internal argument need not be marked INST. The Source theta role, for example, will be realized as an ot ‘from’ + GEN PP (cf. (1c)).

63 The dethematization of the external theta role in passives has the result of suppressing the functional projection dedicated to external causation.

64 For the sake of simplicity, I abstract away from the locative PP. Unlike the NP:OBL in the Russian Adversity Impersonal, the locative PP in the Ukrainian impersonal passive is not an argument of the main predicate.
First, V merges with its complement and checks its ACC case feature in situ. The ACC object subsequently raises to check T’s EPP-feature, after Tense is merged (again, following the conclusions of this chapter). In chapter 3 (section 3.4) it will be shown that there is a correlation between V’s ability to check ACC (exceptionally, from the point of view of “case absorption”) and the main predicate’s lack of agreement features.

Note that (65-66) share a point in their derivations in which V appears to the left of its internal argument(s). Recall that these internal arguments, by hypothesis, have had their case checked at Merge and, thus, do not need to enter the functional domain of the tree for their own licensing (the categorial D-feature that they bear is [+ Interpretable]). Thus, if we take, for example, the partial derivation in (67) (based on (65)), the sole remaining uninterpretable feature is the EPP-feature of T:

(67) Russian Adversity Impersonal: Partial Derivation

```
TP
   T'
   T vP
      v
      VP
      NP:ACC VP
      V NP:OBL
```

Under the null-expletive hypothesis, expletive-Merge would take place at this point in the derivation to fill T’s specifier and check its EPP-feature. This is precisely the derivation that I have sought to rule out on the basis of both semantic and syntactic evidence. In particular, note that expletive-Merge in (67) would result in a V-initial word order and the latter’s attendant focus structure, which is incompatible, as we have seen, with the
semantics of expletive-insertion structures. Recall that the NP:ACC argument in the V-initial structure receives a definite interpretation while still in the scope of the existential, EPP-satisfying expletive. As we have seen, this results in an ill-formed doubly-quantified structure. Expletive-Merge is not only semantically unmotivated, but syntactically unnecessary. As we have noted repeatedly, a structurally-case-marked internal argument raises to satisfy T’s EPP-feature without inducing the discourse-interpretive effects typical of scrambling.

2.4 Chapter Summary

On the basis of evidence from Russian and Ukrainian impersonal predicates, I have argued for the EPP as a formal property of the clause that is independent from the main predicate’s underlying argument structure. That is, the EPP was shown to hold in the absence of a thematic subject position. Further, I have found that there is no typological or interpretive evidence that this clausal subject position is filled by a phonologically-null expletive element. As a result of this analysis, we have a genuine explanation for the appearance of a case-marked internal argument in a preverbal position. It is precisely the need to satisfy the uninterpretable EPP-feature in T that allows this instance of dislocation to be licit in light of the general economy condition, Last Resort, which bans all unnecessary movement.

Early work on the notion of a subject condition focused on a typological generalization that sought to account for the properties that cluster with those languages that do not pronounce non-emphatic subject pronouns (pro-drop). One of the central predictions of the subsequent Null-Subject Parameter was that null expletives occurred
only where there was pro-drop and “free inversion.” Assuming the Null-Subject Parameter to be basically correct, and not subject to further sub-parameterization, the presence of null expletives in non-pro-drop, non-free-inversion Russian and Ukrainian was, thus, shown to be typologically anomalous. As a result, under standard GB theory, in which the set of possible EPP-satisfiers consisted solely of thematic (phonologically-null or overt) NOM subjects and non-thematic null expletives, the case of nonagreeing, impersonal predicates in Slavic appeared to constitute a strong counterexample to the EPP (see Babby 1989). The analytical choice at the time was either to assume that the EPP was subject to crosslinguistic parameterization (in which case Slavic would be set as [-EPP]) or to assume that null expletives were simply inserted into a structure as a theory-internal last-resort mechanism whenever the EPP needed to be “saved.” The result of the former approach was that genuine EPP-effects went unnoticed. The problem with the latter approach was that the EPP could not be tested; it had the feel of an analytical convenience, rather than a genuine principle.

Under the D-feature theory of the EPP, first proposed in Chomsky 1993, any NP (or PP) could potentially enter into a checking relation with Tense. The prediction was that the EPP could be checked in the absence of NOM case and subject-predicate agreement. An immediate effect of this reformulation of the EPP was to account for EPP-checking in Slavic impersonal predicates by means of the syntactic movement of case-marked, internal arguments. At this point, the null-expletive hypothesis was no longer necessary even theory-internally. What remained was to show that the null-expletive hypothesis failed on purely empirical grounds.
The presence of null expletives in Russian and Ukrainian impersonals was tested on the basis of a series of diagnostics from languages in which an expletive element appears overtly. That is, the null expletive was assumed to have the same semantic and syntactic properties as its phonologically-realized counterpart. Here, the focus was on the well-known interpretive effects that the existential expletive imposes on its NP associate (the direct internal argument). Assuming that expletive-insertion involves existential closure, itself, a form of quantification, it follows that in such cases further quantification (either by a universal quantifier or by virtue of the formation of a restrictive clause for inherently presupposed material) should be ruled out by the ban on vacuous quantification. In such cases, one of the two (abstract) quantifiers would have nothing to quantify over. The appearance of definite objects (i.e., the lack of the Definiteness Effect) in Russian and Ukrainian accusative unaccusatives was, thus, taken to indicate a lack both of existential quantification and of the expletive that imposes this quantification force. This conclusion was confirmed by the presence of individual-level impersonal-passive predicates in Ukrainian. Individual-level predicates involve generic quantification, which was also shown to be incompatible with the existential reading.

The final step in this chapter was to demonstrate that the syntactic movement involved in EPP-checking in Russian and Ukrainian impersonals satisfied a purely formal requirement of the clause, rather than being reducible to focus structure. Here, it was shown that V-initial structures in Slavic are interpreted as obligatorily involving some form of discourse scrambling. The main diagnostic used to establish “discourse-neutrality” involved focus projection. Here, it was shown that the focal ambiguities associated with a non-scrambled structure were instantiated in Russian and Ukrainian
impersonals only in those cases in which the EPP was satisfied. That is, focus was found to project (yielding potentially maximally-wide focus) only in the OVO structure. The broader implication for such instances of non-discourse-motivated movement of case-marked internal arguments is that the EPP, rather than case, may be the driving force behind more standard instances of movement in passives and basic unaccusatives.

Having established that the EPP-feature of Tense is an independent property of the clause, instantiated in Slavic in the absence of both a thematic NOM subject as well as a null expletive, we are now in a position to examine the syntax of nonagreeing predicates in Slavic more closely. We will see in chapters 3 and 4 that the notion of the EPP developed here, along with the argument against null expletives, will find further support in other closely (and not so closely) related languages.