

(4) then provides an answer to the question of why V, PP and O raise in (3) (as suggested by the Q float test)¹: being given/presupposed, they vacate the domain of existential closure.

However, while (4) strongly suggests that Q remains floated inside the VP in (4), we argue that this is not the case for the similarly non-presupposed/focused S in (3), that is, that S in (3) crucially cannot be in its original Spec,vP position. Instead, we argue that S in OVS must undergo extraposition to the right, arguably to a high position above TP, Polarity Phrase, which has been argued to host focus features in Russian (Gribanova 2017). Furthermore, we argue that when S undergoes extraposition to the right, this instance of overt focus movement licenses obligatory vP deletion (thus providing novel cross-linguistic support for Thoms 2010; 2016).

These crucial additional assumptions about S extraposition and obligatory vP ellipsis can be deduced by examining our data in (2)-(3) more closely. As suggested by (2), the lowest occurrence of Q float is inside the VP, with the V+PP having undergone movement to adjoin to v via LPR. Crucially, Q cannot be floated in this position in (3). Assuming subject extraposition in OVS structures as in (3) provides a straightforward way to account for a number of OVS properties (see Bailyn 2012), but especially for the inverse scope prominence/preference in OVS sentences in a language in which surface QP scope is usually much more prominent. However, assuming S extraposition alone will not account for why Q cannot be floated in the pre-subject position marked with the star in (3). If we assume that S extraposition is followed by an obligatory vP ellipsis, the impossibility of Q float in this otherwise available position below the subject's base position is then accounted for. Crucially, Thoms (2016) provides strong evidence that overt focus movement in English licenses vP ellipsis in English. Thus, our analysis of Q float in (3), if correct, seems to be another instance of overt focus movement licensing (and, in fact, forcing, vP ellipsis). The analysis is made even more plausible by the strong case made in Gribanova (2013; 2017) for the crucial role of head raising and subsequent by ellipsis in derived word orders in Russian.

We then compare our account to two other prominent accounts of Slavic OVS, the somewhat similar "hybrid" account of Bailyn (2012) and the copy-deletion account of Stjepanovic (1999, 2002). The former differs from our account in assuming subject extraposition and adjunction to vP, which we show is not sufficiently high to derive the data in (3). Stjepanovic (1999, 2002), on the other hand, is a radically different account, which derives the sentence-final position of S by assuming that the lower copy of the subject is pronounced, while the higher copies of moved O and V are selected, with the lower ones being deleted. Nevertheless, the latter account makes almost identical predictions to ours, which we show can nevertheless be teased apart and in doing so suggest that our account is in fact superior. Finally, we discuss the theoretical implications of our analysis, arguing that it provides a more adequate view of focus movement as being an instance of clearly syntactic, but nevertheless (and crucially), non-feature driven movement. In this respect we depart from most accounts of focus movement in Russian, including those we follow in other respects, such as Gribanova (2017).

¹ Assuming the V+PP Light Predicate Raising option in (3) we show that V raises (at least) as high as Aspect. If LPR option is not adopted and V raises separately, an option clearly available as well, as indicated by the penultimate stranded Q in (2), for instance, leads to the conclusion that the verb raises even higher (which is fully consistent with the proposal in Gribanova 2017).