

- (4) a. ✓ [vP O [_{Subj} XP NP] v-V t_O] b. * [XP O [_{Subj} t NP] v-V t_O]

Since such extraction from subject can't occur within vP, the word order needed for (2b) cannot be generated.

Russian also allows inverted DP splits, where NP moves, stranding its modifiers. The above constraints correctly predict that object scrambling can't intervene between the parts of an inverted split subject either.

PREDICTIONS FOR OTHER vP-INTERNAL MATERIAL: As expected, scrambling of other material within vP similarly blocks extraction from subjects, as we see below for a dative argument (5a) and vP-internal PP (5b). LBE from the subject must reach a position in vP above any material that has scrambled over the subject, but such movement is impossible, since v does not c-command the subject.

- (5) a. ***Etot**_k drugu t_k **student** predstavil jejo b. ***Pjat'**_k v klass t_k **mal'čikov** prinesli pivo
this friend.DAT **student** introduced her **five** in class **boy** brought beer
 'This student introduced her to a friend.' 'Five boys brought beer into the classroom.'

The same reasoning accurately predicts that a low (vP-level) adverb will interrupt LBE from subject. External or internal merge of an adverb into the vP edge will necessitate LBE from the subject to target a higher specifier of the same vP, above that adverb, but such movement is banned. The resulting ungrammaticality is shown in (6). This example also shows a high temporal adverb, which does not block LBE from subject. This is expected, since an adverb that originates outside of vP doesn't effect the linearization in vP.

- (6) **Každaja**_k [✓ včera večerom] / *polnostju t_k **devočka** vyčistila jaščik
every yesterday evening / completely **girl** cleaned drawer
 'Every girl cleaned a drawer yesterday evening / *completely.'

LATE MERGE AND THE EXCEPTION OF ADJUNCTS: As mentioned, examples like (2b) can be formed by LBE of some elements: adjectives (for all speakers) as well as 1st/2nd person and lexical possessors (for some speakers). These can be extracted from subjects even when the object scrambles, as in (7):

- (7) a. **Naš/Vasin**_j knigu_k t_j **syn** pročital t_k b. **Vesjolaja**_j tort_k t_j **devočka** jela t_k
our/Vasja's book **son** read **happy** cake **girl** ate
 'Our/Vasja's son read the book.' 'The happy girl ate cake.'

Lebeaux (1988, a.o.) argues that adjuncts may be externally merged late, post-movement of DP. Adjectives are plausibly adjuncts. Lyutikova (2014) argues that pre-nominal possessors in Russian are adjuncts, and indeed, they bear adjective-like agreement morphology. (Though 3rd person pronominal possessors uniquely don't, and also cannot form strings like (7), perhaps due to not being typical adjuncts.) We posit that in (7), the subject covertly moves over the object to a vP-external position, and that the adjunct late merges to that high covert position of the subject. Thus such sentences have a grammatical non-LBE derivation. CL is not violated by that movement of the subject over the object because it is covert, and thus not linearized.

HEAD MOVEMENT AND PHASE EXTENSION: The above examples all use SV word order, but Russian also permits VS orders. Interestingly, the restriction examined above often disappears when V precedes the subject, as in (8). Here V precedes the subject NP, from which LBE successfully occurs:

- (8) a. **Každaja/eta**_j kota_k pogladila t_j **devočka** t_k b. **Každaja/eta**_j pogladila kota_k t_j **devočka** t_k
every/this cat stroked **girl** **every/this** stroked cat **girl**
 'Every/this girl stroked the cat.' 'Every/this girl stroked the cat.'

Several works argue that if a phase head moves, it extends phasehood up to the head moved to (Den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2010, Alexiadou et al. 2014). Following such works, we argue that in sentences like (8), V moves to a head above vP, carrying v into a higher head, which thereby inherits the phasehood of v:

- (9) [_{XP[Phase]} X-v-V [_{vP} SUBJ v-V [_{VP} V ...]]] (Head movement enlarges the phase)

The constraints on LBE from subjects discussed above only hold when vP is a phase. In (9) above, V-v movement to X causes XP to become the relevant phase, instead of vP. Within XP, word orders like (8) are derivable by scrambling the object to spec-XP or spec-vP, followed by X extracting something from the subject and into a spec-XP above the scrambled object. Since X c-commands the subject in its θ-position in vP, such extraction is permitted. Thus we argue that while Russian V typically raises no higher than v in the syntax, when it does move, the relevant phase is expanded, and the usual constraints on LBE are relaxed.