Chapter 1

Object control: Hidden modals

Irina Burukina

Eötvös Loránd University

The paper proposes a novel analysis for object control verbs in Russian. First, I argue that object control verbs are not a homogeneous class, despite the common opinion advocated by Franks & Hornstein (1992); Babby (1998); Boeckx et al. (2010), a.o. In Russian, desiderative object control verbs with a dative argument (*velet'* 'order', *razrešit'* 'allow', etc.) differ significantly in their syntactic and semantic properties from implicative object control verbs with an accusative argument (*zastavit'* 'force', *ubedit'* 'persuade', etc.). However, this distinction does not match existing classifications. Second, I develop a structural description for dative control verbs and argue that (i) the dative argument and the embedded clause form a single constituent that excludes the matrix verb, and (ii) this constituent is headed by a silent modal element. This analysis accounts for many semantic and syntactic properties of dative object control verb including the unavailability of split control with dative control verbs and their distributional similarity with modal predicatives (*možno* 'allowed', *nado* 'necessary').

Keywords: object control, non-finite complement, covert modality, dative, Russian

1 Introduction

The present paper investigates Russian OBJECT CONTROL VERBS (OCVs) that require either a dative or an accusative argument: *velet'* 'order', *prikazat'* 'order', *zastavit'* 'make' etc. During the past decades several major theories of control have been developed (Wurmbrand 2001; Boeckx et al. 2010; Landau 2015), however, Slavic languages have not been sufficiently approached (Franks & Hornstein 1992; Babby 1998). Existing approaches usually draw a line between subject and object control predicates, and the latter are treated as a homogeneous class. The most significant attempt for further sub-categorization has been made by

Landau (2015), and has resulted in the development of the two-tiered theory of control. However, when the Russian data is analyzed, the two-tiered theory of control makes a wrong prediction: the suggested attitude vs. non-attitude distinction does not correspond to the real availability of partial control.

The classification proposed in this paper captures the correlation between syntactic and semantic properties of Russian OCVs, partially inheriting Jackendoff & Culicover (2003) idea to sub-categorize verbs of control according to their meaning. I distinguish between desiderative dative predicates (1a), on the one hand, and implicative accusative predicates (1b), on the other.[1] As will be demonstrated, the two groups differ significantly in their behavior.

(1) a. Petja   razrešil Maše$_i$ PRO$_i$ vzjat'   kuklu.
        Petja.NOM allowed Maša.DAT   take.INF doll
        'Petja allowed Maša to take the doll.'

     b. Petja   zastavil Mašu$_i$ PRO$_i$ vzjat'   kuklu.
        Petja.NOM forced   Maša.ACC   take.INF doll
        'Petja forced Maša to take the doll.'

The paper continues with a novel two-part analysis for Russian dative OCVs: (i) the dative argument and the embedded clause form a single constituent that excludes the main predicate head, and (ii) this constituent is headed by a silent modal-like element that takes a non-finite clause as its complement (2).[2] Therefore, the core claim is that the modal item is not merely a part of semantic decomposition, but that it is present in the syntactic structure, separately from the main predicate. I further suggest that, in Russian, this silent modal head belongs to the existing class of modal predicatives (*možno* 'allowed', *nado* 'necessary', etc.).

(2) [$_{vP}$ Petja [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ razrešil][$_{ModP}$ [Maše$_i$] [$_{Mod'}$ *modal* [$_{CP}$ PRO$_i$ vzjat'
        Petja   allow   Maša   take
     kuklu]]]]]
     doll
     'Petja allowed Maša to take the doll.'

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: §2 examines general properties of Russian dative OCVs in comparison with accusative OCVs and addresses the con-

---

[1]I use the terms "desiderative" and "implicative" to refer to these particular verbs following Wurmbrand (2001) and Landau (2013).

[2]I leave the question about the size of the embedded non-finite clause for further research and I mark it as a CP, adopting the traditional Lasnik (1998) approach to infinitives in Slavic languages.

stituency issue; and §3 presents the analysis of sentences with a matrix desiderative control predicate. Finally, §4 discusses the peculiar unavailability of split control in the presence of a desiderative OCVs.

2 Desiderative control predicates and their properties

Desiderative OCVs in Russian include the verbs *razrešit'* 'allow', *pozvolit'* 'allow', *zapretit'* 'prohibit', *prikazat'* 'order', *velet'* 'order', *predpisat'* 'obligate', *poručit'* 'charge', *skazat'* 'tell'. They cannot assign accusative case and require a dative DP. OCVs that select an accusative argument are implicatives *zastavit'* 'force', *vynudit'* 'force', *ugovorit'* 'persuade', *ubedit'* 'persuade' (3).

(3) a. Vrač   zapretil Ivanu$_i$ PRO$_i$ jest' konfety.
         doctor.NOM forbade Ivan.DAT   eat.INF candies
         'The doctor forbade Ivan to eat candies.'

     b. Vrač   ubedil   Ivana$_i$ PRO$_i$ ne jest' konfety.
         doctor.NOM persuaded Ivan.ACC   not eat.INF candies
         'The doctor persuaded Ivan not to eat candies.'

As demonstrated in (3), both types of control predicates under consideration can embed a non-finite clause. Aside from this, desiderative OCVs often embed a finite subjunctive clause; importantly, a dative DP is still present and its referent can differ from that of the embedded subject (4).[3]

(4) a. Vrač   zapretil Ivanu$_i$, čtoby on$_i$ jel   konfety.
         doctor.NOM forbade Ivan.DAT so that he.NOM eat.SBJV candies
         'The doctor forbade Ivan to eat candies.'

---

[3] Accusative OCVs only marginally allow embedded finite clauses; in such cases the accusative DP and the embedded subject should be co-referential (i). It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine these constructions in details, and I will only briefly return to this problem in §3.

   (i) a. ?? Vrač   zastavil Ivana$_i$, čtoby on$_i$ ne jel   konfety.
             doctor.NOM forced   Ivan.ACC so that he.NOM not eat.SBJV candies
             'The doctor forced Ivan not to eat candies.'

        b. * Vrač   zastavil medsestru, čtoby Ivan   ne jel   konfety.
             doctor.NOM forced   nurse.ACC so that Ivan.NOM not eat.SBJV candies
             Intended: 'The doctor told the nurse that Ivan must not eat candies.'

    b. Vrač   zapretil medsestre, čtoby Ivan   jel   konfety.
         doctor.NOM forbade nurse.DAT so that Ivan.NOM eat.SBJV candies
         'The doctor told the nurse that Ivan should not eat candies.'

Constructions with implicative and desiderative OCVs in Russian differ when it comes to structural relations established between a DP argument and an embedded clause. In sentences with an implicative OCV an accusative DP and an embedded clause together do not pass constituency tests; they cannot be separated from the rest of a clause, excluding the main predicate. This is exemplified in (5), where attempted pseudo-cleft and short answer constructions are ungrammatical.

(5)   a. * Čto ja zastavil, tak eto Petju   pojti v   kino.
          what I forced   so that Petja.ACC go.DAT into cinema
          Intended 'What I forced is that Petja would go to the cinema.'

      b. * Čto ty zastavil? Petju   pomyt' posudu.
          what you forced   Petja.ACC wash.INF dishes
          Intended: 'What did you force him to do? I forced Petja to wash the dishes.'

In contrast, a dative DP and an embedded clause apparently form a single constituent that excludes the main predicate in sentences with a desiderative OCV; see the examples in (6), which are judged as acceptable by native speakers.

(6)   a. Čto ja razrešil, tak eto Pete   pojti v   kino.
          what I allowed so that Petja.DAT go.INF into cinema
          'What I allowed is that Petja would go to the cinema.'

      b. Čto ty razrešil? Pete   pojti v   kino.
          what you allowed Petja.DAT go.INF into cinema
          'What did you allow? I allowed Petja to go to the cinema.'

It is possible to suggest that the sentences in (5) are ungrammatical because of the case assignment problems: as a structural case, accusative is licensed by a functional head that must be structurally present. Nevertheless, this does not directly affect the results of the constituency tests for sentences with desiderative predicates, as we would not expected two unrelated constituents to be clefted or questioned.

    Furthermore, the boundaries of the immediate constituent that includes the dative DP and the embedded clause and, apparently, does not contain the matrix predicate, become visible in multiple wh-questions and in case of quantifier

stranding. As a result of successive cyclic A-bar movement, an interrogative pronoun or a quantifier from a moved phrase can stay in an intermediate position; the position at the edge of an embedded clause is expected; however, there is another one, to the left of the dative DP. All possible positions where an interrogative pronoun or a quantifier can be realized are shown in (7).

(7) a. Kto (kuda$_i$) razrešil [(kuda$_i$) emu [(kuda$_i$) pojti t$_i$]]?
who where allowed where he.DAT where go.INF
'Who allowed him to go where?'

b. (Vse) knigi$_i$ ja razrešil [(vse) Maše [(vse) pročitat' t$_i$]].
 all books.ACC I allowed all Maša.DAT all read.INF
'As for the books, I allowed Maša to read all of them.'

A possible way to account for the examples in (7) is in terms of scrambling across the border of an embedded clause. However, as demonstrated by Bailyn (2003), a.o., the long-distance scrambling in Russian is normally limited to a movement of a constituent from the embedded clause into the right focus position of the matrix clause, and embedded constituents cannot move freely. Furthermore, the ungrammaticality of (8a) suggests that it is also usually unacceptable to put a matrix constituent between the main predicate and the dative DP. Finally, the contrast in speakers' judgments for sentences with a desiderative OCV (7) and an implicative OCV (9) provides additional support for the idea about the presence of a syntactic boundary.[4]

(8) a. *Kto kuda razrešil včera emu pojti?
who where allowed yesterday he.DAT go.INF
Intended: 'Who allowed him yesterday to go where?'

b. Kto kuda včera razrešil emu pojti?
who where yesterday allowed he.DAT go.INF
'Who allowed him yesterday to go where?'

(9) a. ???Kto zastavil kuda ego pojti?
 who forced where he.ACC go.INF
Intended: 'Who forced him to go where?'

b. *Knigi$_i$ ja zastavil [(vse) Mašu [pročitat' t$_i$]].
books.ACC I forced all Maša.ACC read.INF
Intended: 'As for the books, I forced Maša to read all of them.'

---

[4]24 out of 32 native speakers reported (8a) to be ungrammatical; 6 native speakers said that it is 'weird'.

In addition to the syntactic differences described above, desiderative and implicative OCVs can be distinguished with regard to one additional property: availability of partial control for PRO. Desiderative OCVs require exhaustive control, while implicative OCVs allow partial coreference between an embedded PRO and its matrix controller.[5] Evidence for this comes from constructions with a semantically single dative or accusative controller and various embedded elements that require a semantically plural subject. For this purpose, first, collective predicates can be used; in Russian many of those are derived using the pattern *raz + sja*: *razrugat'sja* 'break up, quarrel', *razojtis'* 'disperse', etc. (10).[6]

(10) a. Mal'čiki   razrugalis'.
          boys.NOM.PL broke up
          'The boys broke up.'

      b. Komanda   razrugalas'.
          team.NOM.SG broke up
          'The team broke up.'

      c. *Petja   razrugalsja.
          Petja.NOM broke up
          Intended: 'Petja broke up (with someone).'

Placed in an embedded non-finite clause with a single matrix controller, these verbs are allowed only if the matrix predicate is implicative (11a), and they are prohibited in sentences with a desiderative OCV (11b).

(11) a. Ivan   ubedil'   direktora   razojtis'   v sem'.
          Ivan.NOM persuaded director.ACC disperse.INF at seven
          'Ivan persuaded the director that they should disperse at seven.'

      b. *Direktor   razrešil Ivanu   razojtis' v sem'.
          director.NOM allowed Ivan.DAT disperse.INF at seven
          Intended: 'The director allowed Ivan to disperse at seven.'

Collective modifiers, for example, *vmeste* 'together', behave the same way. When subject-oriented, *vmeste* requires semantically plural PRO; in case of a semantically singular controller, *vmeste* is permitted in constructions with a matrix implicative verb (12a), but not a matrix desiderative predicate (12b).

---

[5]In case of partial control referent of the controller still must be included among referents of PRO.

[6]The same *raz + sja* pattern is used to derive non-collective predicates with different meanings and (often) selection properties. For example, *Petja razrugalsja* can be considered grammatical if the verb is interpreted as the homonymous one meaning 'begin to swear at someone angrily'.

(12)   a.   Direktor   zastavil Ivana   poobedat'   vmeste.
            director.ɴᴏᴍ forced   Ivan.ᴀᴄᴄ have lunch.ɪɴꜰ together
            'The director forced Ivan to have lunch together with him.'

    b.   *Direktor   velel   Ivanu   poobedat'   vmeste.
            director.ɴᴏᴍ ordered Ivan.ᴅᴀᴛ have lunch.ɪɴꜰ together
            Intended: 'The director ordered Ivan to have lunch together with
            him.'

Taking into account all the differences in the behavior of implicative and desiderative OCVs in Russian, I propose that the two groups require separate structural representations. In this paper I focus on desiderative dative OCVs and I proceed by suggesting a novel way to analyze these predicates. The core idea is that, aside from the main verb, an additional silent deontic modal head should be structurally introduced to connect a dative DP and an embedded clause.[7]

3 Proposed analysis

The two prominent current frameworks that address the problem of detailed sub-categorization of control verbs, namely Wurmbrand's (2001) theory of restructuring configurations and Landau's (2015) two-tiered theory of control, cannot fully account for the Russian data. According to Wurmbrand's classification based on the structural properties of embedded clauses selected by various control predicates, Russian implicative and desiderative OCVs fall into one category of restructuring irrealis predicates; the differences between the two types remain unexplained further.

Landau (2015) distinguishes between attitude and non-attitude predicates, selecting attitude and non-attitude complements. The former refer to the world of the main actor's beliefs; the later receives an interpretation with regard to the real world context. This semantic difference yields different syntactic structures, with additional functional projections above an embedded clause required by attitude predicates. Importantly, the theory predicts that attitude predicates (desideratives, propositionals) must support partial control, while non-attitude

---

[7]At least two options might be suggested for a structural representation of implicative OCVs: (i) an accusative DP and an embedded clause are both internal arguments of the main verb, located in SpecVP and CompVP, respectively (Babby 1998; Bailyn 2012 on Russian), or (ii) an accusative DP and an embedded clause together form a small clause in the complement position of the matrix 'causative-like' predicate (Franks & Hornstein 1992; Landau 2015, a.o.). I am unable to provide a detailed comparison of these two approaches within the limits of this paper and I leave this problem for future investigations.

predicates (implicatives, modals) must require strict coreference between PRO and its controller. As was demonstrated in §2, as for the Russian data, this prediction is not borne out: attitude desiderative dative OCVs allow only exhaustive control, while non-attitude implicative accusative OCVs do not prohibit partial coreference.

Thus, another way should be found to represent the structure of desiderative OCVs. I propose that sentences with these predicates contain a hidden component that is responsible for their peculiar properties – a lexical deontic modal head that, in Russian, belongs to the class of the so-called modal predicatives.

The results of the constituency tests provided in §2 suggest that the dative controller and the embedded clause form a single constituent that excludes the matrix predicate. The question remains about the nature of this constituent; it might be suggested that the two form a small clause or there can be another lexical head that selects a dative DP and a clause as its arguments. I argue that the second option is more plausible and that this lexical head is a silent modal.

In case of desiderative predicates the embedded non-finite clause is a fully saturated proposition; for example, it can be individually substituted by a proform (13a) or an interrogative pronoun (13b).

(13)   a. Ja uže   velel   Pete   eto.
         I   already ordered Petja.DAT this
         'I have already ordered Petja to do this.'

       b. Čto ty velel   Pete?
         what you ordered Petja.DAT
         'What did you order Petja to do?'

It is unlikely that a saturated embedded clause itself functions as a predicate of the dative argument. This is further supported by the availability of an embedded finite clause; as was illustrated in (4), if a finite subjunctive clause is selected, a dative DP argument is still available. Importantly, the latter does not have to be coreferent with the embedded subject (4b), which rules out possible copy-raising analyses. No semantic or syntactic difference can be found between a dative DP present together with an embedded infinitival construction and an argument selected simultaneously with a finite clause. Therefore, I assume that there is no reason to believe that the two are related to different predicates.

I propose that a dative DP and an embedded clause (either finite or non-finite) are selected together by a silent lexical modal head; this modal phrase is later merged as a complement of a desiderative OCV. The structure is schematized in (14). In other words, I argue that deontic modality, intuitively perceived in

desiderative predicates, is represented structurally. At least two properties of desiderative OCV constructions support this idea.

(14) [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ desiderative][$_{ModP}$ [dative DP][$_{Mod'}$ modal [$_{CP}$ infinitival clause]]]]

Firstly, there is the possibility of ambiguous interpretation of examples with sentential negation. Consider the example in (15), for which two readings (15a) and (15b) are available, while interpretation (15c) is prohibited. However, simply assuming that *razrešit'* 'permit' allows Neg-raising, we would expect negation to scope either above the matrix verb (reading (15a)) or above an embedded clause (reading (15c)).

(15) Petja   ne razrešal Maše   ostat'sja.
      Petja.NOM not allowed Maša.DAT stay.INF
      'Petja didn't allow Maša to stay.'

    a. 'Petja said that for Maša it is not possible to stay.'

    b. 'Petja didn't say that for Maša it is possible to stay.'

    c. Not available: 'Petja said that for Maša it is possible not to stay.'

Furthermore, according to von Fintel & Iatridou (2007) and Iatridou & Zeijlstra (2013), a.o., predicates denoting permission typically do not support neg-raising; see, for example, English modal verbs and Russian modal predicatives (16). Although this generalization is originally formulated for deontic modals, deontic modality is a part of constructions with desiderative OCVs like order and permit, and an additional explanation is required for (15) if we assume that this modality is encoded in *razrešit'* itself.

(16) a. Ivan cannot stay.
          = Ivan must leave. ≠ Ivan may leave.

      b. Pete   nel'zja   ostavat'sja.
          Petja.DAT not allowed.SG.N stay.INF
          'Petja is not allowed to stay here.'
          = Petja must leave. ≠ Petja may leave

Introducing a separate deontic head, as shown in (14), splits the structure into two parts: the higher 'communication' component and the lower 'permission' constituent. In (15) negation can scope above either one of them yielding the interpretations (15a) and (15b); however, the may-type modal prohibit neg-raising and the interpretation (15c) becomes impossible.

Second, almost all predicates of communication in Russian have desiderative 'counterparts'. As demonstrated in (17a), Russian verbs of communication, similar to English say, write, whisper, normally embed a finite indicative clause with the *čto* complementizer. However, they can also co-occur with embedded non-finite or finite subjunctive clauses, and such sentences receive a desiderative (modal) interpretation (17b)–(17c). It is true that the contrast between (17a) and (17b)–(17c) could, in principle, be accounted for by postulating two morphologically identical lexical entries for each of the verbs of information transfer. However, there is another possible explanation in line with the hidden modal approach presented in this paper: verbs of communication always select a saturated proposition, that can be either a finite indicative CP or a saturated modal phrase with two arguments (18). Although the behavior of verbs of communication alone does not prove that the proposed analysis is the correct one, taking into account the Neg-raising facts reported above, being able to capture both of these properties of sentences with a desiderative OCV is an important advantage of the hidden modal approach.

(17)   a.   Petja   {skazal / napisal / šepnul}   Maše,   čto Ivan
             Petja.NOM said   wrote   whispered Maša.DAT that Ivan.NOM
             pomyl   posudu.
             washed dishes
             'Petja {said/wrote/whispered} Maša that Ivan had washed the dishes.'

       b.   Petja   {skazal / napisal / šepnul}   Maše   pomyt' posudu.
             Petja.NOM said   wrote   whispered Maša.DAT wash.INF dishes
             'Petja {said/wrote/whispered} that Maša should wash the dishes.'

       c.   Petja   {skazal / napisal / šepnul}   Maše,   čtoby ona
             Petja.NOM said   wrote   whispered Maša.DAT so that she.NOM
             pomyla   posudu.
             wash.SBJV dishes
             'Petja {said/wrote/whispered} that Maša should wash the dishes.'

(18)   Petja   {skazal / napisal / šepnul}   [Maše   Ø   pomyt'
        Petja.NOM said   wrote   whispered Maša.DAT necessary wash.INF
        posudu].
        dishes
        'Petja {said/wrote/whispered} that Maša should wash the dishes.'
        = 'Petja {said/wrote/whispered} that for Maša it is necessary to wash the dishes.'

In (19) the proposed structure is repeated; at this point I denote the complex modal constituent as ModP and leave the exact size of it for future investigation.

(19) [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ desiderative][$_{ModP}$ [dative DP][$_{Mod'}$ modal [$_{CP}$ infinitival clause]]]]

Furthermore, I argue that the embedded silent head belongs to the existing class of deontic modals. In Russian, in addition to modal verbs, there is also a group of the so called modal predicatives (*nado* 'necessary', *možno* 'allowed'). Modal predicatives prohibit a nominative subject and require a dative DP argument (20); morphologically, they are invariant and usually end with a neutral singular ending -*o*.

(20) Ivanu   možno   ne rabotat' segodnja.
      Ivan.DAT allowed.SG.N not work.INF today
      'Ivan is allowed not to work today.'

Similar to desiderative OCVs, modal predicatives embed a non-finite or a finite subjunctive clause (21).

(21) a. Petja   velel Maše$_i$ {ostat'sja / čtoby ona$_i$ ostalas'}.
          Petja.NOM ordered Maša.DAT stay.INF   so that she.NOM stay.SBJV
          'Petja ordered Maša to stay.'

      b. Maše$_i$ nužno   {ostat'sja / čtoby ona$_i$ ostalas'}.
          Maša.DAT necessary.SG.N stay.INF   so that she.NOM stay.SBJV
          'Maša should stay.'

However, in contrast with sentences with desiderative OCVs, in constructions with an overt modal predicatives a dative DP and an embedded clause do not form a single constituent: the two cannot be separated together in clefts (22) and short answers (23).

(22) * Čto možno,   tak eto Pete   posmotret' multiki.
      what allowed.SG.N so that Petja.DAT watch.INF cartoons
      Intended: 'What is allowed is for Petja to watch cartoons.'

(23) Čto možno?   *Pete   posmotret' multiki.
      what allowed.SG.N Petja.DAT watch.INF cartoons
      Intended: 'What is allowed? It is allowed for Petja to watch cartoons.'

For deontic modal predicatives, I propose the following structural representation (24). Importantly, as was already said about silent modals in desiderative

constructions, I argue that modal predicatives are lexical heads, not functional elements. At first sight, this idea contradicts existing analyses of modals (Cinque 1999; Wurmbrand 1999, a.o.); however the latter usually consider only modal agreeing verbs, whereas the present paper discusses a different class of modal elements. Predicatives in Russian select a wide variety of constructions as a complement; crucially, they select embedded finite subjunctive clauses (25), which is a reflex of the lexical-semantic properties of the modal head.

(24) [$_{ModP}$ DP [$_{Mod'}$ modal [embedded proposition]]]

(25) Tebe   neobxodimo, čtoby ty   vypolnil eto zadanie.
       you.DAT necessary.SG.N so that you.NOM do.SBJV   this task
       'It is necessary for you to do this task.'

Going back to sentences with a desiderative OCV, the final structural representation and an example are given in (26).

(26) [$_{vP}$ Petja   [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ skazal][$_{ModP}$ [Maše$_i$][$_{Mod'}$ modal [$_{CP}$ PRO$_i$
       Petja.NOM   said   Mary.DAT
       vzjat'   kuklu   ]]]]]
       take.INF doll.ACC
       'Petja told Maša that for her it is necessary to take the doll.'

4 Split control

The proposed analysis for desiderative OCVs provides a straightforward explanation for the unavailability of split and partial coreference ((27) reproduced from (11) and (12)).

(27) a. * Direktor   razrešil Ivanu   razojtis'   v sem'.
           director.NOM allowed Ivan.DAT disperse.INF at seven
           Intended: 'The director allowed Ivan to disperse at seven.'
       b. * Direktor   velel Ivanu   poobedat'   vmeste.
           director.NOM ordered Ivan.DAT have lunch.INF together
           Intended: 'The director ordered Ivan to have lunch together with him.'

As illustrated in (26), the main predicate (interpreted as desiderative) selects a propositional modal-headed constituent. Within this phrase the control relation is established strictly between the dative argument and the embedded PRO, adherent to the Minimal Distance Principle.

5 Conclusion

In this paper I have used the Russian data to demonstrate that OCVs are not a homogeneous class, and that they can be sub-categorized based on their semantic and syntactic properties. Not rejecting Landau's (2015) attitude vs. non-attitude predicates dichotomy, I propose to distinguish between implicative predicates, which require an accusative argument, and desiderative predicates, which cannot assign accusative case and require a dative controller.

The developed structural representation for desiderative dative OCVs are two-fold: (i) the dative argument and the embedded clause are united into a single constituent that excludes the matrix verb, and (ii) this constituent is headed by a silent deontic modal. I suggest that the central idea of the proposed analysis – syntactic decomposition of desiderative predicates into a verb of communication and a silent modal head – can be further applied to other languages.

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	OCV	object control verbs
DAT	dative	PL	plural
INF	infinitive	SBJV	subjunctive
N	neuter	SG	singular
NOM	nominative		

Acknowledgements

References

Babby, Leonard H. 1998. Subject control as direct predication: Evidence from Russian. In Željko Bošković, Steven Franks & William Snyder (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 6: The Connecticut Meeting 1997*, 17–37. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bailyn, John F. 2003. A (purely) derivational account of Russian scrambling. In Wayles Browne, Ji-Yung Kim, Barbara Partee & Robert Rothstein (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 11: The Amherst Meeting 2002*, 41–62. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bailyn, John F. 2012. *The syntax of Russian.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boeckx, Cedric, Jairo Nunes & Norbert Hornstein. 2010. *Control as movement.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Franks, Steven & Norbert Hornstein. 1992. Secondary predication in Russian and proper government of pro. In *Control and grammar*, 1–50. Dordrecht: Springer.

Iatridou, Sabine & Hedde Zeijlstra. 2013. Negation, polarity, and deontic modals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(4). 529–68.   DOI:10.1162/ling_a_00138

Jackendoff, Ray & Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79(3). 517–56.   DOI:10.1353/lan.2003.0166

Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar: A research companion.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Landau, Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lasnik, Howard. 1998. Exceptional case marking: Perspectives old and new. In Željko Bošković, Steven Franks & William Snyder (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 6: The Connecticut Meeting 1997*, 187–211. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

von Fintel, Kai & Sabine Iatridou. 2007. Anatomy of a modal construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(3). 445–83.   DOI:10.1162/ling.2007.38.3.445

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 1999. Modal verbs must be raising verbs. In Sonya Bird, Andrew Carnie, Jason D. Haugen & Peter Norquest (eds.), *WCCFL 18: Proceedings of the 18th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 599–612. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.