

# DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

## Raising and control in non-finite clausal complementation

Irina Burukina

2019

Eötvös Loránd University  
Faculty of Humanities

**Irina Burukina**

**Raising and control**  
**in non-finite clausal complementation**

Doctoral School of Linguistics  
Head of the doctoral school: Prof. Dr. Gábor Tolcsvai Nagy  
Doctoral Program of English Linguistics  
Head of the doctoral program: Prof. Dr. Miklós Törkenczy

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Marcel den Dikken  
Members of the Assessment Committee:  
Prof. Dr. Péter Siptár, Chair  
Dr. Zoltán G. Kiss, Secretary  
Dr. Krisztina Szécsényi, opponent  
Prof. Dr. Maria Polinsky, opponent  
Dr. Éva Dékány, member  
Dr. Mark Newson, member  
Dr. A. Péter Lázár, member

2019

## DECLARATION FORM for disclosure of a doctoral dissertation

### I. The data of the doctoral dissertation:

Name of the author: Irina Burukina

MTMT-identifier: 10063441

Title and subtitle of the doctoral dissertation: Raising and control in non-finite clausal complementation

DOI-identifier:<sup>1</sup> 10.15476/ELTE2019.104

Name of the doctoral school: Doctoral School of Linguistics

Name of the doctoral programme: English Linguistics

Name and scientific degree of the supervisor: Prof. Dr. Marcel den Dikken

Workplace of the supervisor: DELG, SEAS, Eötvös Loránd University

### II. Declarations

#### 1. As the author of the doctoral dissertation,<sup>2</sup>

a) I agree to public disclosure of my doctoral dissertation after obtaining a doctoral degree in the storage of ELTE Digital Institutional Repository. I authorize ....., the administrator of the Department of Doctoral and Academic Affairs Office of the Faculty of Humanities of ELTE to upload the dissertation and the abstract to ELTE Digital Institutional Repository, and I authorize the administrator to fill all the declarations that are required in this procedure.

b) I request to defer public disclosure to the University Library and the ELTE Digital Institutional Repository until the date of announcement of the patent or protection. For details, see the attached application form;<sup>3</sup>

c) I request in case the doctoral dissertation contains qualified data pertaining to national security, to disclose the doctoral dissertation publicly to the University Library and the ELTE Digital Institutional Repository ensuing the lapse of the period of the qualification process;<sup>4</sup>

d) I request to defer public disclosure to the University Library and the ELTE Digital Institutional Repository, in case there is a publishing contract concluded during the doctoral procedure or up until the award of the degree. However, the bibliographical data of the work shall be accessible to the public. If the publication of the doctoral dissertation will not be carried out within a year from the award of the degree subject to the publishing contract, I agree to the public disclosure of the doctoral dissertation and abstract to the University Library and the ELTE Digital Institutional Repository.<sup>5</sup>

#### 2. As the author of the doctoral dissertation, I declare that

a) the doctoral dissertation and abstract uploaded to the ELTE Digital Institutional Repository are entirely the result of my own intellectual work and as far as I know, I did not infringe anyone's intellectual property rights.

b) the printed version of the doctoral dissertation and the abstract are identical with the doctoral dissertation files (texts and diagrams) submitted on electronic device.

#### 3. As the author of the doctoral dissertation, I agree to the inspection of the dissertation and the abstract by uploading them to a plagiarism checker software.

Budapest, 31.05, 2019

Signature of dissertation author



1 Filled by the administrator of the faculty offices.

2 The relevant part shall be underlined.

3 Submitting the doctoral dissertation to the Discipline Doctoral Council, the patent or protection application form and the request for deferment of public disclosure shall also be attached.

4 Submitting the doctoral dissertation, the notarial deed pertaining to the qualified data shall also be attached.

5 Submitting the doctoral dissertation, the publishing contract shall also be attached.

# Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to the people without whom this thesis would not exist.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Marcel den Dikken, for all his intellectual and moral support. He has always been there when I needed his help and I owe to him most of what I know about syntax. He inspired me with his knowledge of linguistics and never-ending interest in seemingly all linguistic topics, and I could have never made it to this point without his guidance.

I am immensely grateful to my committee: Krisztina Szécsényi, Maria Polinsky, Éva Dékány and Mark Newson, who have always been willing to read numerous versions of the thesis and whose questions and commentaries made the final work possible. If there are any good ideas in this thesis they were inspired by these people.

I am lucky to have had the opportunity to meet and talk to incredible people whose ideas and suggestions inspired me and contributed to this project. Of the many people who helped me along the way, I am extremely thankful to Katalin É. Kiss, Balázs Surányi, Scott Grimm, Winfried Lechner, Omer Preminger, Idan Landau, Tim Stowell, Jim McCloskey, Yakov Testelefsky, Peter Arkadiev, Maria Trubitsina.

My very special thanks go to Péter Szigetvári, Miklós Törkenczy, Ádám Nádasdy, Péter Lázár, Péter Siptár, Zoltán Kiss, and Béla Stipich for their invaluable help with every step of the doctoral process.

My deepest gratitude goes to my friends for their unending support. Thank you! to my beloved *buločki* Oksana, Liza, Anya and Sasha, for their continuing support throughout my life, and to Mitya, who went through this with me, for his love and understanding.

I thank my parents and my grandparents for never doubting me and for all their unconditional love, which makes me better. *Mama, papa, babulya i deduška, spasibo vam.*

# Abbreviations

ABS	–	Absolutive	LA/LONG	–	Long adjective
ACC	–	Accusative	M	–	Masculine
AGR	–	Agreement	N	–	Neuter
APPL	–	Applicative	NEG	–	Negation
ATT	–	Attributive	NOM	–	Nominative
AUX	–	Auxiliary	NPST	–	Non-past
CL	–	Clitic	O	–	Object
CMP	–	Comparative	PASS	–	Passive
COMP	–	Complementizer	PFV	–	Perfective
COND	–	Conditional	PL	–	Plural
COP	–	Copula	PLAIN	–	Plain (level of formality)
DAT	–	Dative	PST	–	Past
DEM	–	Demonstrative	PTCL	–	Particle
ERG	–	Ergative	PTCP	–	Participle
F	–	Feminine	REFL	–	Reflexive
FOC	–	Focus	SA/SHORT	–	Short adjective
GEN	–	Genitive	SBJ	–	Subject
HAB	–	Habitual	SG	–	Singular
IMP	–	Imperfective	SUBJ	–	Subjunctive
INF	–	Infinitive	VN	–	Verbal noun
INS	–	Instrumental			
INV	–	Invariable			

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	Overview of the problem . . . . .	7
1.1.1	The research question . . . . .	7
1.1.2	Control vs. raising / ECM . . . . .	8
1.1.3	Overt DP / PRO distribution . . . . .	10
1.1.4	DP / PRO alternation across the world's languages . . . . .	11
1.1.5	DP / PRO alternation in Russian . . . . .	17
1.2	Theoretical framework . . . . .	21
1.2.1	Case and Agree . . . . .	21
1.2.2	Control and PRO . . . . .	22
1.3	Overview of Russian morphosyntax . . . . .	24
1.3.1	Argument structure . . . . .	24
1.3.2	Tense and mood . . . . .	30
1.3.3	Word order and the left periphery . . . . .	32
1.4	Outline of the thesis . . . . .	36
<b>2</b>	<b>The distribution and structure of predicatives</b>	<b>38</b>
2.1	Overview . . . . .	38
2.2	Sub-categorization of predicatives . . . . .	39
2.3	Syntactic distribution . . . . .	42

2.3.1	Embedded clauses . . . . .	42
2.3.2	Dative DP . . . . .	44
2.3.3	Interim summary and parallels with English . . . . .	46
2.3.4	Adjectival vs. non-adjectival predicatives . . . . .	47
2.4	The status of the embedded clause . . . . .	53
2.4.1	Argument vs. adjunct . . . . .	53
2.4.2	Evaluatives and deontic modals as unaccusative predicates . . . . .	55
2.5	The status of a matrix Holder . . . . .	60
2.5.1	The argumental status of a matrix Holder . . . . .	60
2.5.2	Structural position . . . . .	64
2.6	Summary . . . . .	72
<b>3</b>	<b>Predicatives and non-finite clauses:</b>	
	<b>DP / RPO alternation</b>	<b>73</b>
3.1	Overview of the problem . . . . .	73
3.2	The dative DP belongs to the embedded clause . . . . .	76
3.2.1	The dative DP is an embedded argument . . . . .	76
3.2.2	The dative DP can stay within the embedded clause . . . . .	82
3.2.3	Are predicatives raising predicates? Ambiguous datives . . . . .	90
3.3	The dative DP is a matrix participant . . . . .	92
3.3.1	Matrix Holders . . . . .	92
3.3.2	Interim summary . . . . .	94
3.4	Embedded non-finite clauses with covert vs. overt subjects . . . . .	95
3.5	The Two-Dative generalization . . . . .	98
3.5.1	The generalization . . . . .	98
3.5.2	Against a morphological restriction . . . . .	101
3.6	A closer look at the Two-Dative Generalization and prepositional Holders . .	102
3.7	Summary . . . . .	106

<b>4</b>	<b>The analysis and its implications</b>	<b>108</b>
4.1	Overview . . . . .	108
4.2	Potential analyses . . . . .	110
4.2.1	Case licensing and TP / CP distinction . . . . .	110
4.2.2	Landau's (2004) calculus of control . . . . .	111
4.2.3	Anaphoric vs. non-anaphoric clauses and selection . . . . .	112
4.2.4	Interim summary . . . . .	113
4.3	The proposed analysis . . . . .	114
4.3.1	Cross-clausal Case assignment . . . . .	114
4.3.2	Syntactically projected implicit Holders . . . . .	119
4.3.3	The distance of Case licensing . . . . .	123
4.4	Additional support . . . . .	130
4.4.1	Epistemic modals . . . . .	130
4.4.2	Constructions with covert modality . . . . .	131
4.5	Theoretical implications . . . . .	135
4.5.1	The DP / PRO alternation in Russian: back to the general picture . . . . .	135
4.5.2	Cross-clausal A-dependencies . . . . .	137
4.6	Summary . . . . .	142
<b>5</b>	<b>Mandative verbs</b>	<b>144</b>
5.1	Overview . . . . .	144
5.2	Mandative verbs and overt embedded subjects . . . . .	147
5.2.1	General properties . . . . .	147
5.2.2	Overt embedded subject diagnostics . . . . .	149
5.2.3	Subject raising diagnostics . . . . .	151
5.3	Control vs. overt embedded subject ambiguity . . . . .	153
5.3.1	Supporting the ambiguity . . . . .	153



5.3.2	The dative DP as a matrix Holder . . . . .	156
5.3.3	Embedded non-finite clauses with overt vs. implicit subject . . . . .	157
5.4	The analysis: mandatives as verbs of communication embedding modals . . . . .	158
5.4.1	Outline of the analysis . . . . .	158
5.4.2	Mandative verbs and deontic modals . . . . .	162
5.4.3	Structural representations . . . . .	165
5.5	Summary . . . . .	169
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>170</b>
6.1	Summarizing the results . . . . .	170
6.2	Theoretical contribution . . . . .	173
6.3	Directions for future research . . . . .	173
	<b>References</b>	<b>175</b>

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Overview of the problem

#### 1.1.1 The research question

The thesis contributes to the ongoing discussions of non-finite clausal complementation, distribution of overt and covert subjects and cross-clausal A-dependencies, presenting previously undescribed puzzling data from Russian and developing a novel analysis to account for them.

The central question that I will consider is: What can be the subject of an embedded non-finite clause? In other words, is the subject position of a non-finite clause restricted to an empty category only, and if not, what is required for an overt DP subject to become licit?

The research focuses on sentences with a matrix evaluative adjectival predicate, such as *važno* ‘important’, *interesno* ‘interesting’, or a deontic modal (*možno* ‘allowed’, *nužno* necessary, *nel’zja* ‘not allowed’) that selects a non-finite clausal complement. I will demonstrate that in these contexts both obligatory control and ECM-like relations can be established, as the DP / PRO alternation is allowed for the subject of the embedded infinitival clause. After considering several possible ways to restrict this alternation, I will come up with an analysis in terms of cross-clausal Case assignment, inspired by a combination of Chomsky’s (1981) classical Case licensing theory and a more recent claim that DPs and PRO are not inherently in complementary distribution, put forward by McFadden (2004) and Sundaresan

and McFadden (2009), a.o.

I will further demonstrate that the Russian data complement the known cases of cross-clausal A-dependencies, adding Appl<sup>0</sup> to the set of functional heads that allow long-distance Case licensing and providing an example of a genuinely long-distance Case assignment within a non-finite clause, which can be analyzed in terms of cyclic Agree (Legate 2005, a.o.).

The problem under consideration is closely related to the following two parallel discussions: (i) the status of the embedded subject and control vs. raising / ECM ambiguity in non-finite complementation, and (ii) the mutual distribution of overt DPs and PRO.

### 1.1.2 Control vs. raising / ECM

The difference between sentences like those exemplified in (1) and those in (2) has already been noticed in the first works on non-finite clausal complementation in English (Chomsky 1965; Postal 1974; Rosenbaum 1974; Ruwet 1987, and Rooryck 1992, to name a few).

- (1) a. Mary<sub>i</sub> decided [ PRO<sub>i</sub> to write the report].  
b. John<sub>k</sub> persuaded Mary<sub>i</sub> [ PRO<sub>i+k</sub> to write the report together ].
- (2) a. Mary<sub>i</sub> seems [ t<sub>i</sub> to have written the report ].  
b. John believes Mary<sub>i</sub> sincerely [ t<sub>i</sub> to have written the report ].

In (1), despite the fact that *Mary* and the understood subjects of the embedded clause are coreferent, the two are, to an extent, independent (control cases). *Mary* is a matrix argument that receives both its thematic role and Case within the matrix clause, and PRO is a separate silent syntactic item in the subject position of the non-finite clause. Coreference between the two does not have to be strict, as suggested by the grammaticality of the embedded *together* modifier in (1b), which indicates that PRO is semantically plural even though the matrix controller is semantically singular.

In contrast, in the two sentences in (2) the overt DP *Mary* is thematically related to the embedded predicate and not the matrix one, even though it is apparently located within a matrix clause (raising / ECM cases). The fact that, unlike the matrix predicates in (1), *seem* and *believe* do not select *Mary* as an argument is further supported by the contrast between in (3a, 3b) and (3c, 3d).

- (3) a. \*Mary seems that she has written the report.  
 b. #John believes Mary that she has written the report.  
 Acceptable only as ‘John believes Mary’s words that ...’  
 c. Mary decided that she should write the report.  
 d. John persuaded Mary that she should write the report.

Ungrammaticality of (3a) and (3b) presumably results from the following two factors: first, subject raising out of a finite clause with an overt complementizer is illicit, and, second, there is nothing in the matrix clauses per se that could justify the presence of *Mary*.

Above I mentioned raising and ECM as the two ‘options’ for constructions with an overt subject in a non-finite clause. The principled difference between the two is the following: in the case of raising, the embedded subject DP actually moves into a matrix clause; under ECM, the subject stays within the embedded constituent and gets exceptionally licensed by a matrix verb that has an inherent ability to assign Case (Chomsky 1981). Thus, depending on the results for movement diagnostics and constituency tests, (4) can be shown to have either of the two underlying structures given in (b) and (c).

- (4) a. The prosecutor proved John to be guilty.  
 b. *Raising-to-Object*  
 $[_{VP} [_{DP} \text{the prosecutor}] [_{v'} v^0 [_{XP} \text{John}_i [_{X'} X^0 [_{VP} \text{prove} [_{TP} \text{to be } t_i \text{ guilty} ]]]]]]]]$   
 c. *ECM*  
 $[_{VP} [_{DP} \text{the prosecutor}] [_{v'} v^0 [_{VP} \text{prove} [_{TP} \text{John to be guilty} ]]]]]]$

Many of the works that advocate the existence of PRO and draw a distinction between control and raising / ECM aim to determine the contexts where these phenomena are available, often arguing for their complementary distribution. Multiple classifications have been proposed for predicates that can embed a non-finite clause: for example, Davies and Dubinsky (2004) compile a classification of English verbs as ‘control’ vs. ‘raising’, while Sag and Pollard (1991) and Jackendoff and Culicover (2003, 2006) propose semantic categorizations. Another seminal work on the topic is Wurmbrand’s (2001) monograph presenting the theory of restructuring configurations that distinguishes four types of constructions with respect to the size of an embedded non-finite constituent.

Rare exceptions – for instance, English aspectual predicates such as *begin* (Perlmutter 1970) or *likely* (Lasnik 1999) – that support both control and raising have been reported, however, they are often analyzed in terms of lexical ambiguity. Consider, for example, the contrast between *begin*<sub>1</sub> and *begin*<sub>2</sub>, as noted by Perlmutter (1970), illustrated in (5).

- (5) a. *begin*<sub>1</sub> – a raising verb  
       It began to rain.  
       There began to be commotion.
- b. *begin*<sub>2</sub> – a control verb  
       Tom began his work.  
       Tom began working on this project.  
       I forced Tom<sub>i</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> to begin work.

In (5), the raising *begin*<sub>1</sub> selects one propositional argument and allows expletives in the matrix subject position, while the control *begin*<sub>2</sub> is a transitive verb selecting an Agent and an internal event (expressed as a nominal or a non-finite clause). As mentioned above, the commonly adopted approach is to treat the two ‘variants’ of *begin* as distinct lexical items with different selectional specifications.

Going back to the original idea about the control vs. raising / ECM distinction and the first papers advocating the existence of PRO as a zero element in the subject position of non-finite clauses (Koster and May 1982, Williams 1987, a.o.), a question arises about the distribution of this item in comparison with overt referential DPs.

### 1.1.3 Overt DP / PRO distribution

For many years the core claim at the heart of almost all attempts to answer the question about the relations between DPs and PRO has been that overt subjects and PRO are in complementary distribution. To account for this a later version of Case theory has introduced a special null Case assigned in a non-finite environment exclusively to PRO (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Bošković 1997), thus leaving overt DP subjects Case-less and illicit (following Chomsky’s (1981) Case filter constraint).

Opponents of the null Case approach postulate special features to distinguish between finite and non-finite functional heads that select referential and non-referential subjects

(Landau 2004; Sigurðsson 2008, a.o.), primarily paying attention to Agr(ement) and Tense. To this picture should also be added one of the most prominent modern theories of control – Landau’s (2015) Two-Tiered theory of control. It adopts and elaborates the obligatory control vs. no control generalization proposed by Landau (2000, 2004) and explicitly prohibits referential DP subjects in obligatory control environments.<sup>1</sup>

The two groups of approaches will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4, when I consider them with regard to the Russian data. What is crucial for this introductory part is to further note that the ‘DP / PRO complementarity’ assumption, which has been considered almost axiomatic for many decades, is, in fact, constantly challenged by examples of apparent DP / PRO alternation found in various languages.

#### 1.1.4 DP / PRO alternation across the world’s languages

The DP / PRO alternation has already been reported for several languages, including English (Pires 2007), Irish (McCloskey 1980, 1985; Chung and McCloskey 1987, and Bondaruk 2006, a.o.), Romance languages (Mensching 2000; Sitaridou 2007; Herbeck 2011), Tamil and other Dravidian languages (Mohanar 1982; Sundaresan and McFadden 2009). In this subsection I will provide an overview of the analyses proposed for these languages to establish the empirical and theoretical background for the upcoming discussion of the Russian data. While some of these analyses attempt to reconcile problematic data with the existing approaches to DP / PRO distribution as complementary, many researchers embrace the idea that DPs and PRO can appear in the same syntactic environments and argue that the distribution of non-finite clauses with overt / covert subjects is regulated by external factors, such as, for instance, selectional properties of matrix predicates (Harley 2000; Sundaresan and McFadden 2009, a.o.).

##### English gerunds

A famous example of apparent DP / PRO alternation is English clausal gerunds, which, on the one hand, require obligatory coreference between a matrix argument and the covert

---

1. The sole goal of a large part of Landau’s (2015) book is ensuring that overt DPs are excluded from the embedded subject position in a potential obligatory control environment. Eventually, he does so by proposing that an embedded FinP (TP) must always be a predicate, that is, contain a variable (PRO) in the higher Spec position.

embedded subject, and on the other hand, allow the subject to be an overt DP (6).

- (6) a. Susan<sub>i</sub> preferred [PRO<sub>i</sub> being late for dinner].  
b. Susan preferred [John/him being late for dinner].

Discussing this phenomenon, Pires (2007) builds upon Chomsky (1970), Reuland (1983), Abney (1987), Milsark (1988), and Kaiser (1999) and his own earlier works (Pires 1999, 2006) and offers the following explanation for the alternation. Noting after Reuland (1983) that clausal gerunds that allow the alternation must appear in a Case position, Pires proposes that an overt subject in a gerund is licensed by Case that is valued on the inflectional head corresponding to *-ing* from the outside: the matrix  $v^0$  values Case on the embedded Agr<sup>0</sup> and the latter, in turn, can be matched by the embedded DP. As for the obligatory control configuration, Pires, following Hornstein (2001) and Boeckx and Hornstein (2004), assumes that the embedded subject in sentences like (6a) is not PRO but a trace. He argues that the embedded subject can A-move out of the gerund prior to Case valuation; this movement is motivated by the absence of another DP in the numeration that could serve as the matrix subject.

As will be discussed in Section 1.2, movement approaches to control, in general, are quite problematic; however, it is possible for Pires (2007) to suggest an A-movement analysis since clausal gerunds do not exhibit many incompatible properties, such as, for instance, availability of partial or split control.<sup>2</sup>

### Irish infinitival clauses

Availability of overt referential subjects in otherwise obligatorily controlled non-finite clauses in Irish was thoroughly described for the first time by McCloskey (1980, 1985) and Guilfoyle

---

2. Despite the fact that Pires (2007) provides a neat explanation for DP / PRO alternation in clausal complements, other types of gerunds, for instance, gerundial adjuncts (see (i) reproduced from McCawley (1988):142), that exhibit similar behavior remain a mystery. For an up-to-date discussion of adjunct control I refer the reader to Green (2018).

- (i) a. John<sub>i</sub> became disillusioned [while PRO<sub>i</sub> / \*his / \*our working for the government].  
b. John<sub>i</sub> got rich [before PRO<sub>i</sub> / his<sub>j/\*i</sub> working for the government].  
c. John<sub>i</sub> got rich [despite PRO<sub>i</sub> / his<sub>j/i</sub> having had hardly any education].  
d. Mary / PRO<sub>i</sub> having finally returned home ,  
John<sub>i</sub> felt at peace.

(1993); a couple of examples are given in (7).

- (7) a. Ba mhaith liom [PRO imeacht].  
COP good with-me go-VN  
'I would like to go.'
- b. Ba mhaith liom [é a imeacht].  
COP good with-me him PTCL go-VN  
'I would like him to go.'
- c. Tá mé sásta [PRO a bheith anseo].  
am I glad PTCL be-VN here  
'I'm glad to be here.'
- d. Bheinn sásta [iad a bheith i láthair].  
I-would-be glad them PTCL be-VN present  
'I would be glad for them to be present.'
- e. I ndiaið méadú ar mo shaibhreas  
after increase.INF on my weath  
'After my wealth increased...'  
Literally: 'After to increase on my wealth...'
- f. I ndiaið a shaibhreas méadú  
after his wealth increase.INF  
'After his weath had increased'  
Literally: 'After his wealth to increase...'

McCloskey argues that these constructions cannot be accounted for by an ECM / raising analysis and, in his joint paper with Sells, concludes that “non-finite clauses show lexical subjects in every syntactic environment, and there is no correlation at all between the presence of an external governor and the appearance of a lexical subject.” (McCloskey and Sells 1988).

Stenson (1989) further notices that, while lexical subjects are available in non-finite clauses, PRO can appear in a finite environment (8);<sup>3</sup> thus, the distribution of the two types of items seems to be, indeed, completely unrestricted.

---

3. Across the world's languages, PRO status of silent subjects in seemingly finite clauses has been famously argued for by Terzi (1992) for embedded subjunctives in Greek. Note, however, that many researchers, including Iatridou (1988–1993) and Varlokosta (1994), do not consider this behavior exceptional as they take Greek subjunctive clauses to be lacking Tense and, essentially, non-finite.



- (8) Buaileadh      PRO Ciarraísa gcluife deireanach  
 beat.PST.IMP      Kerry      in the game last.  
 ‘(They) beat Kerry in the last game’ / ‘Kerry was beaten..’

To account for this behavior of DPs and PRO, Carnie and Harley (1999) and Harley (2000) propose that it becomes possible due to the inactivity of the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) in Irish (McCloskey 1996). They reject the classical null Case approach to DP / PRO distribution, mentioned above, assuming that nominative case is always available whether  $T^0$  is finite or non-finite. Instead, Harley (2000) argues that it is an EPP feature on  $T^0$  that can be relativized to [overt] or [null], thus, respectively requiring checking by an overt or covert item in Spec,TP. Since EPP in Irish does not operate at all, both a lexical subject and a variable will be, in principle, licit in any clause.

This account is argued against by Bondaruk (2006), who questions the very idea that the absence of the EPP requirement in a language might presuppose the free occurrence of PRO and DPs. Her own analysis keeps to the classical assumption that PRO bears null Case, assigned by a non-finite anaphoric  $T\text{-Agr}^0$  (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993), and deviates from it only in that she assumes that Irish also has a non-finite non-anaphoric  $T\text{-Agr}^0$  that can check nominative case. As predicates can subcategorize TPs with both anaphoric and non-anaphoric  $T\text{-Agr}^0$ , apparent DP / PRO alternation is attested. Bondaruk supports the claim about anaphoric / non-anaphoric distinction for  $T\text{-Agr}^0$  by some data from Northern and Southern dialects of Irish, where anaphoric / non-anaphoric embedded clauses exhibit distinct word orders.

### **Infinitival clauses in Romance languages**

Another puzzle concerning the DP / PRO distribution is provided by Romance languages. As reported by Vinet (1985), Rigau (1995), Torrego (1998), Mensching (2000), Sitaridou (2002, 2007), Pöll (2007), and Herbeck (2011), a.o., in many of these languages, including, for instance, Spanish and Portuguese, the so-called personal infinitives with nominative lexical subjects and / or agreement morphology can be found (9).

(9) a. *Spanish*

[Antes de actuar Caballé], el público estaba expectante.  
before of perform.INF Caballé the audience be.PST.3.SG expectant

‘Before Caballé performed, the audience was expectant.’

b. *Italian*

[Prima di morire papà], mama era felice.  
before of die.INF father mother be.PST.3.SG happy

‘Before father died, mother was happy.’

A detailed overview and comparison of the data is offered by Mensching (2000); crucially, he demonstrates that personal infinitives appear to be prohibited in the complement position of a matrix (verbal) predicate – the typical obligatory control environment.<sup>4</sup> Thus, it might be suggested that lexical subjects alternate not with a (non-obligatory controlled) PRO but with *pro*, especially since Romance languages with personal infinitives generally allow pro-drop.

To account for the very availability of lexical nominative subjects within the ‘licensing’ framework, one would be forced to stipulate presence of either agreement and (semantic) tense in these constructions (see Landau (2013) for a cautious suggestion along this line), or a non-anaphoric T<sup>0</sup>; for the second option see Bondaruk’s analysis for Irish described above and Sitaridou’s (2007) account, which also assumes that a tensed non-finite T-Agr<sup>0</sup> can agree with the embedded subject and check nominative case.

---

4. Sitaridou (2007), a.o., revises the restriction and notes that non-finite complement clauses can have overt subjects in two cases: if they exhibit overt agreement marking or are introduced by a complementizer (i). She analyzes these cases as non-obligatory control.

(i) a. *Spanish*

\*Lamento (ellos) perder (ellos) los documentos.  
regret.1.SG they.NOM lose.INF they.NOM the documents

‘I regret that they lost the documents.’

b. *Portuguese*

Penso [terem eles comprado o livro].  
think.1.SG have.INF.3.PL they bought the book

‘I think that they have bought the book.’

## Embedded clauses in Tamil and other Dravidian languages

Finally, let us take a look at Dravidian languages. Considering data from Tamil (partially taken from Sarma (1999)) and Malayalam (Mohanan 1982) and accompanying it with examples from Sinhala (Gair 2005), Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) argue that the DP / PRO alternation in non-finite clauses in these languages is almost free and can only be restricted by selectional properties of a matrix lexical predicate; this is illustrated in (10) where both overt and PRO subjects are allowed in non-finite complements of ‘want’ and in adjuncts, while ‘try’ strictly requires controlled dependents (the examples are reproduced from Sundaresan and McFadden (2009)).

- (10) a. Champa-vukku<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> oru samosa-vai saappiḍ-a] veṇḍ-um  
 Champa-DAT a samosa-ACC eat-INF want-N.3.SG  
 ‘Champa wants to eat a samosa.’
- b. Champa-vukku [Sudha oru samosa-vai saappiḍ-a] veṇḍ-um  
 Champa-DAT Sudha.NOM a samosa-ACC eat-INF want-N.3.SG  
 ‘Champa wants Sudha to eat a samosa.’
- c. Raman<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i/\*j</sub> saadatt-ai saappiḍ-a] paa-tt-aan  
 Raman.NOM rice-ACC eat-INF try-PST-3.M.SG  
 ‘Raman tried to eat rice.’
- d. \*Raman [Anand saadatt-ai saappiḍ-a] paa-tt-aan  
 Raman.NOM Anand.NOM rice-ACC eat-INF try-PST-3.M.SG  
 ‘Raman tried Anand to eat the rice.’
- e. [pro<sub>i/\*j</sub> saadatt-ai saappiḍ-a], naan<sub>i</sub> veṇḍ-um  
 rice-ACC eat-INF I.NOM outside go-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I went out (in order) to eat rice.’ – purpose interpretation  
 ‘As I ate rice, I went out.’ – temporal interpretation
- f. [avan saadatt-ai saappiḍ-a], naan veṇḍ-um  
 he.NOM rice-ACC eat-INF I.NOM outside go-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I went out (in order) for him to eat rice.’ – purpose interpretation  
 ‘As he ate rice, I went out.’ – temporal interpretation

To account for these data and the alternation Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) abandon the licensing approach (recall Harley’s (2000) analysis for Irish) and, building upon earlier works by McFadden (2004, 2008), argue that there is no direct connection between finiteness

and the availability of either PRO or a DP subject, and that DPs and PRO are licit in practically the same syntactic environments. The major difference between DPs and PRO is not their relation to Case or agreement, but their specification with respect to the  $[\pm R]$  (referential) feature. With these assumptions in mind, the remaining steps are to restrict some embedded clauses to allow only  $[+R]$  or  $[-R]$  subjects (non-anaphoric and anaphoric clauses, respectively) and to leave a possibility for lexical predicates to select a particular type of an embedded clause. For instance, in the examples in (10), ‘want’ is unspecified for the  $[u\pm\text{anaphoric}]$  feature, ‘try’ is specified for  $[u+\text{anaphoric}]$ , and adjunct clauses are not selected by matrix predicates at all. As for the source of selectional restrictions themselves, Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) suggest that they can follow from the predicate’s semantics, however, they admit that the lack of cross-linguistic parallelism might posit a problem.

### **Interim summary**

To summarize, we have seen that, in many languages, DP / PRO alternation is free and can only be restricted by the selectional properties of a matrix predicate (Irish, Tamil, English, etc.); the most common way to account for this behavior is via anaphoric / non-anaphoric specification of non-finite clauses; note that this direction works both for Bondaruk (2006), who keeps to the Case licensing approach to DPs, and for Sundaresan and McFadden (2009), who advocate the ‘non licensing’ approach to DPs and PRO. Meanwhile, personal and inflected (agreeing) infinitives in Romance languages arguably exemplify DP / pro (not PRO) alternation and fall under non-obligatory control / no control.

As I will show in this thesis, the novel data from Russian contributes to the discussion by presenting a case of ‘true’ DP / PRO alternation in the same embedded environment restricted by availability of Case outside of the non-finite clause.

#### **1.1.5 DP / PRO alternation in Russian**

According to Williams (1987) and Lasnik (1998), a.o., Slavic languages, including Russian, prohibit subject raising or ECM out of a non-finite clause; the restriction is explained in terms of obligatory presence of semantic Tense and an opaque CP layer in infinitival constructions (in contrast with, for instance, tenseless TP infinitives in English that allow raising / ECM).

Stepanov (2007) also claims that long-distance raising is impossible in Russian and argues that a few seemingly exceptional constructions, such as sentences with a matrix aspectual verb, are, in fact, monoclausal.

This thesis introduces novel data that challenge both the idea of ‘control only’ infinitives and the assumption about DP / PRO complementarity. As I will demonstrate, in Russian, evaluative adjectival predicates (*važno* ‘important’, *interesno* ‘interesting’) and deontic modals (*možno* ‘allowed’, *nel’zja* ‘not allowed’, *nado* ‘necessary’), traditionally called predicatives, embed non-finite clauses with the embedded subject position occupied either by obligatorily controlled PRO or by an overt referential DP (11).

- (11) a. Maše važno / nado pojti v kino vmeste.  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG go.INF into cinema together  
 ‘For Maša it is important / necessary to go to the cinema together.’  
 ← ‘Maša’ is a matrix Holder, obligatory control configuration
- b. Važno / nado stroitel’stvu zakončit’sja k martu.  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG construction.DAT complete.INF by March  
 ‘It is important / necessary that construction be complete by March.’  
 ← ‘construction’ is the embedded subject, overt DP subject configuration

What makes Russian different from the languages discussed in the previous subsection is that, on the one hand, the DP / PRO alternation does not correlate with the feature specification (Tense, Mood and agreement properties) and/or the structural size of a non-finite clause, and, on the other hand, it is not completely free; the restriction is illustrated in (12).

- (12) \*Maše važno / nado stroitel’stvu zakončit’sja k  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG construction.DAT complete.INF by  
 martu.  
 March  
 Intended: ‘For Maša it is important / necessary that the construction be complete  
 by March.’


I propose the following generalization to describe the restriction (13).

- (13) **The Two-Dative Generalization:** An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential dative DP controller available within a higher clause.


To formally account for this generalization, I propose that, although DPs and PRO, in principle, can be merged within the same syntactic environment, an overt DP subject of an embedded clause must be Case licensed by a functional head. In sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative this can be done by a matrix applicative head, which introduces and (normally) licenses a Holder of an attitude or an obligation.

The structural representation is given in (14) and (15), where I indicate a constituent headed by a lexical predicative as AP (Adjectival Phrase) / ModP (Modal Phrase, for deontic modals). If the matrix Holder is an overt DP, it must check Case with Appl<sup>0</sup> (14); if, however, the Holder is implicit, a Case-less  $\varphi$ P, an overt embedded subject can get licensed and the derivation survives (15).

- (14) *Obligatory control*



(15) *Overt embedded subject*



The proposed mechanism of DP licensing is an example of a cross-clausal dependency. I will further discuss the implications of the analysis focusing on its relations with Agree and comparing it to similar phenomena in other languages. Finally, I will expand the data-set by considering Russian sentences with a matrix mandative verb, which exhibit similar properties and also fall under the Two-Dative Generalization (16).

(16) Maša        velela    dvum mal'čikam ostat'sja.  
Maša.NOM ordered two    boys.DAT stay.INF

(i) 'Maša ordered two boys to stay.'

← 'two boys' – a matrix Holder, obligatory control configuration

(ii) 'Maša ordered that two boys should stay.'

← 'two boys' – the embedded subject, cross-clausal Case assignment configuration

In general, the Russian constructions discussed in this thesis unite the problem of DP / PRO alternation and the issue of cross-clausal A-dependency, contributing to ongoing discussions and supporting the claims that DPs and PRO are not, essentially, in complementary distribution (contrary to Sigurðsson (2008) and Landau (2015), a.o.), and that long-distance Case licensing is, indeed, possible in the world's languages (supporting Legate (2005) and contrary to McFadden (2009)).

The remaining part of this chapter presents the central theoretical assumptions behind this thesis and provides a brief overview of Russian morphosyntax.

## 1.2 Theoretical framework

### 1.2.1 Case and Agree

A few words must be said about the background theoretical assumptions. The general framework for the thesis is the Minimalist Program of Chomsky (2000, 2001). I adopt the Traditional Case Theory, as represented below in (17) (Chomsky 1981, 1986; Chomsky and Lasnik 1993; Lasnik 2008), and use the standard *Case* vs. *case* notation to refer to the special (abstract) feature that licenses a nominal vs. its morphological realization.

(17) Traditional Case Theory

1. Noun phrases must be licensed through syntactic dependencies.
2. The Case specification of noun phrases has ramifications for their case morphology.

Within the traditional Case theory, Case is assumed to be crucial for licensing overt nominals; this is formulated as the Chomsky's Case Filter:

(18) traditional Case Filter

\*[Noun Phrase  $_{-Case}$ ] (if NP has phonological content)

A revised version of Case Filter, and the one that I will refer to as the 'Case Filter' throughout the thesis, has been developed within the Agree framework (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2008). It treats Case as one of many features that must be valued when a nominal enters into a dependency with a functional head (Pesetsky and Torrego 2001):<sup>5</sup>

(19) Case Filter

\*[Noun Phrase  $_{uCase}$ ]

Case valuation must comply with general restrictions on Agree between a probe  $\alpha$  and a goal  $\beta$ :

1. directionality:  $\alpha$  c-commands  $\beta$ ,

---

5. See T. Levin (2015) for a revised version of this version.



2. Activity Condition:  $\beta$  lacks values for uninterpretable features,<sup>6</sup>
3. intervention: no potential goal intervenes between  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ,
4. locality:  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are not separated by a phase head.

Regarding the directionality of Agree, it was originally proposed to be downward (Chomsky 2000, 2001) with a few exceptions known as reverse agree. Bi-directionality of Agree has been argued for by M. Baker (2008) and Béjar and Rezac (2009), a.o., while uniformly upward Agree is advocated by Zeijlstra (2012) and Bjorkman and Zeijlstra (2014). In this thesis I generally adopt the idea of downward Agree (see Preminger (2013) and Preminger and Polinsky (2015) for argumentation); I further follow Polinsky and Potsdam (2001) and Preminger (2014), a.o., in allowing long-distance Agree and, in general, long-distance dependencies across a clausal boundary (see Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion).

## 1.2.2 Control and PRO

I adopt the general PRO-approach to control, following the extensive discussion in Landau (2007) and Bobaljik and Landau (2009). Following Chomsky (1995), I assume that PRO is a referentially dependent variable, due to its lack of phi-features. Specification of phi-features must happen prior to LF either via establishing control relations with an appropriate antecedent, or by assigning arbitrary reference.

As for a particular mechanism for controlling PRO, the two well-known frameworks are binding approaches (Manzini 1983; Bouchard 1984; Koster 1984; Lebeaux 1984; Sag and Pollard 1991; Kayne 1991; Wyngaerd 1994; Rooryck 2000, a.o.) and the Agree approach (Landau 2004, 2006, and elsewhere).

Under a binding approach obligatory controlled PRO is considered to be a null anaphor, bound by the antecedent within the local domain (the higher matrix clause). Such an approach might run into a problem of null and overt anaphors of a given language exhibiting distinct properties; for instance, overt anaphors can be subject-oriented, while PRO easily appears in an object control configuration, or overt anaphors and PRO can have distinct locality domains. Note, however, that the latter is not true for Russian, where embedded

---

6. The Activity Condition is argued against by M. Baker (2003), Nevins (2004), Carstens (2010), and Asarina (2011).

reflexives can be bound by a matrix antecedent (compare English and Russian examples in (20)). For different ways to overcome these and other potential problems I refer the reader to Manzini (1983), Koster (1984), Sag and Pollard (1991), a.o.

- (20) a. \*John asked Mary to kiss himself.  
 b. Ivan<sub>i</sub> uvedil Mašu<sub>j</sub> podelovat' sebja<sub>i/j</sub>.  
 Ivan.NOM persuaded Maša.ACC kiss.INF himself.ACC / herself.ACC  
 'Ivan persuaded Maša to kiss himself.'

Under the Agree approach, phi-features on PRO are valued via Agree with a higher functional head, whose features, in turn, are matched by the matrix controller. A simplified version of the Agree mechanism can be described in the following way: in cases of exhaustive control, PRO is directly targeted by Agree and establishes a relation with matrix  $T^0 / v^0$  (subject / object control); in cases of partial control, Agree is mediated by the embedded  $C^0$ , which allows the controller and PRO to differ on the plurality feature. To further differentiate between the two routes of Agree, the theory connects the availability of partial control to the presence of semantic Tense in the embedded clause.

While the Agree theory successfully bypasses most of the problems related to the null / overt anaphors distinction, faced by binding approaches, it has its own issues: first and foremost, the proposed correlation between semantic Tense and partial control simply does not hold. Within this thesis, I believe that both analyses are consistent with the data and I do not have any particular arguments for or against either of them.

Finally, a few words must be said about a PRO-less analysis of control developed by Hornstein (1999, 2001, 2003), Boeckx and Hornstein (2003) and Boeckx (2004). It approaches obligatory control in terms of A-movement arguing that the 'controller' DP is merged within an embedded clause and undergoes raising into a higher matrix position forming an A-chain; in non-obligatory control environments the embedded subject is assumed to be *pro*. The common challenges for the MTC have been summarized by Landau (2007).<sup>7</sup> Those include overgeneration and incompatibility with the actual empirical data; undergeneration of split and partial control; introduction of 'sideward movement' to account for obligatory control in adjuncts; violation of the chain condition (Chomsky 1995) and obligatory reinterpretation

---

7. See Landau (2000, 2007), Kiss (2004), Runner (2006), Bobaljik and Landau (2009), and Wood (2012), a.o., for detailed discussions.

of the mechanism of theta-role assignment.

## 1.3 Overview of Russian morphosyntax

### 1.3.1 Argument structure

In this section I will outline the general features of Russian morphosyntax mainly focusing on affirmative root clauses with a verbal predicate.

#### Core arguments

To begin with, let us take a look at various types of predicates with respect to the number of arguments: intransitive (both unergative and unaccusative), transitive and ditransitive (21).

- (21) a. *Unergative*  
Devočki begali v sadu.  
girls.NOM ran.IMP in garden  
'Girls were running in the garden.'
- b. *Unaccusative*  
Knigi padali s polki.  
books.NOM fell.IMP from shelf  
'Books were falling from the shelf.'
- c. *Transitive*  
Deti kupili knigi.  
children.NOM bought.PFV books.ACC  
'The children bought books.'
- d. *Ditransitive*  
Maša dala Anne konfetu.  
Maša.NOM gave Ann.DAT candy.ACC  
'Maša gave a candy to Anna.'

Several language-specific diagnostics have been proposed for sentences with a verbal predicate to determine whether a particular argument is merged internally to VP or externally (Harves

2002); they are listed below with a couple of examples. First, under the scope of a clausal negation, internal arguments, unlike external arguments, can appear in genitive case, hence the term ‘genitive under negation’ (22).

- (22) a. *Deti ne kupili knjig.*  
 children.NOM NEG bought.PFV books.GEN  
 ‘The children did not buy books.’
- b. *Knjig ne padalo s polki.*  
 books.GEN NEG fell.IMP from shelf  
 ‘Books were not falling from the shelf.’
- c. *\*Devoček ne begalo v sadu.*  
 girls.GEN NEG ran.IMP in garden  
 Intended: ‘Girls were not running in the garden.’

Second, when the subject position is occupied by a coordinate structure linearized in post-position to the main verb, subject agreement with the first conjunct is allowed in case of an unaccusative verb but not an unergative one (23).

- (23) a. *Upali / upala [knjiga i stakan].*  
 fell.PL fell.F.SG book.F.SG.NOM and glass.M.SG.NOM  
 ‘A book and a glass fell.’
- b. *Begali / \*begala [Maša i Petja].*  
 ran.PL ran.F.SG Maša.NOM and Petja.NOM  
 ‘Maša and Petja ran.’

Third, verbs denoting a series of actions involving several objects of the same kind can be derived out of predicates with an internal argument using *na-*, *pere-*, *po-* prefixes (24).

- (24) a. *Deti nakupili knjig.*  
 children.NOM bought.PFV books.GEN  
 ‘The children bought many books.’
- b. *S polki napadalo knjig.*  
 from shelf fell.PFV books.GEN  
 ‘From the shelf fell many books.’
- c. *\*V sadu nabegalo devoček.*  
 in garden ran.PFV girls.GEN  
 Intended: ‘Many girls run in the garden.’

In case of ditransitive verbs, such as *dat'* 'give', *poslat'* 'send', *predstavit'* 'introduce', *skazat'* 'say', etc., the major concern is the relative placement of direct and indirect objects.<sup>8</sup> Recent papers by Pereltsvaig (2001), Richardson (2007), and Dyakonova (2009) revise the existing argumentation and persuasively argue that the Goal argument is base-generated

---

8. Note that, unlike, for instance, English, Russian does not have a double object construction and the Theme and the Goal are always realized as  $DP_{ACC}$  and  $DP_{DAT}$ , respectively, with the indirect object being never promoted to the DO position.

above the Theme.<sup>9</sup>

I adopt Pyłkkänen’s (2008) applicative approach to represent various indirect and applied objects; the structural representation for ditransitive verbs of transfer is given in (25).

---

9. Bailyn (1995, 2012) attempts to apply the binding test and the depictive tests, initially proposed by Barss and Lasnik (1986), and argues that their results support the Accusative above Dative configuration. However, as later noted by Dyakonova (2009), this claim is not unquestionable. First, speakers’ judgments on binding relations are largely affected by the surface order (i)


- (i) a. Svaxa pokazala partneram<sub>i</sub> drug druga<sub>i</sub>.  
matchmaker.NOM showed partners.DAT each other.ACC  
‘The matchmaker showed partners to each other.’
- b. Svaxa pokazala partnerov<sub>i</sub> drug druga<sub>i</sub>.  
matchmaker.NOM showed partners.ACC each other.DAT  
‘The matchmaker showed partners to each other.’
- c. ??/\*Svaxa pokazala drug druga<sub>i</sub> partneram<sub>i</sub>.  
matchmaker.NOM showed each other.ACC partners.DAT  
‘The matchmaker showed partners to each other.’
- d. ??/\*Svaxa pokazala drug druga<sub>i</sub> partnerov<sub>i</sub>.  
matchmaker.NOM showed each other.DAT partners.ACC  
‘The matchmaker showed partners to each other.’

Second, Bailyn notes that indirect objects of ditransitive verbs are never visible for instrumental depictives (ii) (adjunct PredPs with a controlled PRO subject, see Bailyn and Citko (1998), Bailyn (1995, 2001), Franks and Hornstein (1992), and Richardson (2001, 2003), a.o.), and assumes this to be evidence for the low structural position of dative DPs. However, indirect objects are perfectly capable of obligatorily controlling into other kinds of adjuncts, for instance, rationale clauses (iii).

- (ii) Polina<sub>i</sub> predstavila svoju podrugu<sub>k</sub> otcu<sub>m</sub> pjan-oj<sub>i/k</sub> / \*pjan-ym<sub>m</sub>.  
Polina.NOM introduced REFL girl.friend.ACC father.DAT drunk-F.INS drunk-M.INS  
‘Polina introduced her girl friend to her father drunk.’
- (iii) a. Ona dala mne<sub>i</sub> raboty PRO<sub>i</sub> počitat’ večerom.  
she.NOM gave I.DAT papers.ACC read.INF evening.INS  
‘She gave me some papers to read in the evening.’
- b. Polina<sub>i</sub> predstavila otcu<sub>m</sub> svoju podrugu<sub>k</sub> pjan-oj<sub>i/k</sub> / \*pjan-ym<sub>m</sub>.  
Polina.NOM introduced father.DAT REFL girl.friend.ACC drunk-F.INS drunk-M.INS  
‘Polina introduced her girl friend to her father drunk.’

Thus, whichever factor prevents indirect objects from controlling into instrumental depictives, it is unlikely to be their merge position. Dyakonova (2009) replaces these two tests with the sub-extraction diagnostic and demonstrate that, with respect to wh-movement, indirect objects pattern with specifiers (for instance, external arguments), while direct objects pattern with complements.

(25) Ditransitive predicates



The underlying structure of ditransitives naturally matches the unmarked surface word order (26) (Janko 1991; Junghanns and Zybatow 1997). It also manifests itself in when both arguments happen to be nouns that do not exhibit overt case morphology: in this case the first one is typically interpreted as the Goal, and the second one is interpreted as the Theme (27) (Zimmerling 2007).

- (26) a. On kupil kakomu-to niščemu obed.  
he.NOM bought some beggar.DAT lunch.ACC  
'He bought some beggar a lunch.'  
this sentence can be an answer to the question:  
'What's up with Sergey? He looks so happy'. OR  
'What did Sergey buy for some beggar on the street?'
- b. On kupil obed kakomu-to niščemu.  
he.NOM bought lunch.ACC some beggar.DAT  
'He bought a lunch for some beggar.'  
this sentence can be an answer to the question:  
'Who did Sergey buy a lunch for?' but NOT  
'What's up with Sergey? He looks so happy.'

- (27) Vasja        podaril    Marlo            Pjerlo.  
 Vasja.NOM presented Marlo.ACC/DAT Pierlo.ACC/DAT  
 ‘Vasja gave (a work by) Pierlo to Marlo.’  
 Unlikely interpretation: ‘Vasja gave (a work by) Marlo to Pierlo.’

A final remark should be made about case marking of arguments. As can be seen from the examples presented above, typically, a single argument of an intransitive predicate and the external argument of a transitive / ditransitive predicate are usually assigned nominative case under Agree with  $T^0$ , while a direct object matches the accusative case feature on  $v^0$  and an indirect object receives dative, arguably from  $\text{AppI}^0$ . However, there are a few predicates that select inherently marked arguments (28).

- (28) a. Maša        gorditsja Petej.  
 Maša.NOM is.proud Petja.INS  
 ‘Maša is proud of Petja.’  
 b. Maša        pomogla Pete.  
 Maša.NOM helped Petja.DAT  
 ‘Maša helped Petja.’  
 c. Mašu        tošnit.  
 Maša.ACC feel.sick  
 ‘Maša feels sick.’

### Applied objects and adjuncts

Aside from the core arguments, Russian also offers a wide range of optionally introduced participants, for instance, Beneficiaries (29). Unlike indirect objects in ditransitive constructions discussed in Section 1.3.1, these items are not required, and can often be expressed as an adjunct PP. Their presence is not restricted to any particular type of predicates, as they combine with both intransitive and transitive verbs.

- (29) a. Maša        narisovala mame        / dlja mamy        kartinku.  
 Maša.NOM drew        mother.DAT for mother.GEN picture.ACC  
 ‘Maša drew a picture for her mother.’



- b. Maša            stancevala Pete            / dlja Peti.  
 Maša.NOM danced    Petja.DAT    for    Petja.GEN  
 ‘Maša danced for Petja.’

### Agreement and concord

In a finite clause, a lexical verb or an auxiliary obligatorily agrees with the nominative subject: in past tense, an agreement marker corresponds to the subject’s number and (if singular) gender, while in non-past tense an agreement marker matches the subject’s number and person. Note from (28) that when the subject is not nominative, the main verb exhibits the default 3p / neuter.sg agreement.

Another well-known phenomenon is concord. First, adjectives appearing as prenominal modifiers, primary and secondary predicates are marked with the same number, gender and, often, case as their head nouns (30a). Second, in the head of an appositive construction we find case concord with the modified nominal (30b).

- (30) a. eta                    krasivaja                    devočka            / etim  
           this.F.SG.NOM beautiful.F.SG.NOM girl.F.SG.NOM    this.M.SG.INS  
           krasivym                    mal’čikom  
           beautiful.M.SG.INS boy.M.SG.INS  
           ‘this beautiful girl’ / ‘(with) this handsome boy’
- b. Maša            pomogla nam,    dvum    studentam.  
       Maša.NOM helped    we.DAT two.DAT students.DAT  
       ‘Maša helped us, two students.’

### 1.3.2 Tense and mood

#### Tense

Tense is represented with a past – non-past dichotomy (31); non-past imperfective forms normally refer to the present, while non-past perfective forms normally refer to the future.<sup>10</sup>

In order for an imperfective form to have a future-oriented interpretation, an agreeing auxiliary *byt’* ‘be’ must be used.

---

10. In Russian, aspect is represented by the perfective – imperfective opposition. Aspectual forms are usually derived via prefixation and rarely via suffixation (i); in many cases, the lexical meaning of the verb also changes, which is the problem at the center of a well-known ongoing debate about the status of perfective

- (31) a. Petja čita-l. / Petja pročita-l.  
 Petja.NOM read.IMP-PST Petja.NOM read.PFV-PST  
 ‘Petja read something.’ / ‘Petja has read something.’
- b. Petja čita-et. / Petja pročita-et.  
 Petja.NOM read.IMP-NPST Petja.NOM read.PFV-NPST  
 ‘Petja reads something.’ / ‘Petja will read something.’
- c. Petja bud-et čitat’. / \*Petja bud-et pročitat’.  
 Petja.NOM be-NPST read.IMP.INF Petja.NOM be-NPST read.PFV.INF  
 ‘Peter will read something.’

With regard to the verb movement within a clause, the common assumption is that, in Russian, verbal heads can move up to  $v^0$  but do not raise to  $T^0$ . This is supported by the results for the adverb placement diagnostics (32).

- (32) a. Sobaka (bystro) begaet (\*bystro) v parke.  
 dog.NOM quickly runs quickly in garden  
 ‘The dogs runs fast in the garden.’
- b. Petja (special’no) kupil (\*special’no) banany.  
 Petja.NOM on.purpose bought on.purpose bananas.acc  
 ‘Petja bought bananas on purpose.’

As demonstrated in (32), manner adverbs and Agent-oriented purpose adverbs, which arguably mark the edge of vP, normally appear to the left of a finite verb, suggesting that the latter remains within the lower part of a clause.

---

vs. imperfective forms.

- (i) a. čitat’ – pocitat’ – pocityvat’  
 read.IMP read.PFV read.IMP  
 ‘read’
- b. slušat’ – vyslušat’ – vyslušivat’  
 listen.IMP listen.PFV listen.IMP  
 ‘listen’

I remain agnostic regarding the precise mechanism behind aspectual alternations in Russian, and, as it is not related directly to the present research and has no implications for the presented analysis, I will only refer the reader to the following works for detailed discussions of various approaches: Townsend (1975), M. Levin (1978), Schoorlemmer (1995), Richardson (2001), Pereltsvaig (2001), Svenonius (2004), MacDonald (2006), and Bailyn (2012), a.o.

## Mood

With regard to the mood category, traditionally, the distinction is made between realis mood (indicative), irrealis mood (conditional, subjunctive) and imperatives (33).

- (33) a. Petja        spit.  
      Petja.NOM sleep.NPST  
      ‘Petja sleeps.’ – *indicative*
- b. Esli by     Petja        spal        ...  
      if    COND Petja.NOM sleep.PST  
      ‘If Petja sleeps ...’ – *conditional*
- c. Xoču,                čtoby Petja        spal.  
      want.NPST.1.SG so that Petja.NOM sleep.PST/SUBJ  
      ‘I want for Petja to sleep.’ – *subjunctive*
- d. Spi-te!  
      sleep.IMP-PL  
      ‘Sleep!’

As can be seen in sentences in (33), indicative has no special mood marking. There is no specific verbal form for irrealis mood, and past tense verbs are used instead.<sup>11</sup> Conditionals are formed using the *by* particle, and subjunctive clauses normally contain the *čtoby* ‘so that’ complementizer (derived from *čto* ‘that’ via the addition of *by*). See Hansen (2010) and references therein for a more detailed description of the mood system in Russian.

### 1.3.3 Word order and the left periphery

#### Standard word order

The basic word order in Russian is SVO. Here, the term ‘subject’ is used in a narrow sense referring to a  $DP_{NOM}$  that exhibits overt agreement with the lexical / functional verb, in contrast with the broader understanding of the ‘structural subject’ as a constituent in the (subject) Spec,TP position.

---

11. To differentiate between the two contexts, throughout this thesis I use SUBJ to gloss past tense forms used in subjunctive mood.

Both A and A-bar scrambling is available. The former includes, for instance, object movement to the Spec,TP, followed by rightward movement of the nominative subject, which results in OVS word order (Bailyn 2018; Pereltsvaig 2019); compare, for instance, (34a) and (34b), where an argument in the Spec,TP c-commands and binds a reciprocal within the lower argument, regardless of its thematic roles and syntactic functions.

- (34) a. *Dueljantov<sub>i</sub> ubili družja drug druga<sub>i</sub>.*  
 duelists.ACC killed friends.NOM each other.GEN  
 ‘As for duelists, they were killed by the friends of each other.’
- b. *Sekundanty<sub>i</sub> ubili družej drug druga<sub>i</sub>.*  
 assistants.NOM killed friends.ACC each other.GEN  
 ‘The assistants killed friends of each other.’

Second, various constituents often undergo A-bar scrambling to the left periphery conditioned by Information Structure (35a). A-bar sub-extraction into a left matrix topic / focus position is also available for items embedded into a finite / non-finite clause (35b, 35c); note, however, that ‘non-motivated’ scrambling across a clause boundary is normally prohibited (Bailyn 2003) (35d).

- (35) a. *PETE<sub>i</sub> Maša podarit t<sub>i</sub> etu kartinu, a ne Ivanu.*  
 Petja.DAT Maša.NOM present.NPST this picture.ACC and NEG Ivan.DAT  
 ‘Maša will present this picture TO PETJA and not to Ivan.’
- b. *PETE<sub>i</sub> Maša zastavila Annu [podarit’ t<sub>i</sub> etu kartinu].*  
 Petja.DAT Maša.NOM forced Anna.ACC present.INF this picture.ACC  
 ‘Maša forced Anna to present this picture TO PETJA (and not to Ivan).’
- c. *PETE<sub>i</sub> Maša xotela, [čtoby Anna podarila t<sub>i</sub> etu*  
*Petja.DAT Maša.NOM wanted so that Anna.NOM present.SUBJ this*  
*kartinu].*  
 picture.ACC  
 ‘Maša wanted for Anna to present this picture TO PETJA (and not to Ivan).’


- d. \*Maša xotela Pete<sub>i</sub>, [čtoby Anna podarila t<sub>i</sub> etu Maša.NOM wanted Petja.DAT so that Anna.NOM present.SUBJ this kartinu].  
 picture.ACC  
 ‘Maša wanted for Anna to present this picture to Petja.’

For detailed discussions of scrambling in Russian I refer the reader to Bailyn (1995, 2003, 2012) and Dyakonova (2009).

### Clausal left periphery


The left periphery in Russian is usually analyzed along one of the following lines. The cartographic approach proposed by Dyakonova (2009) and inspired by Rizzi (1997), Cinque (1999), and É. Kiss (1998), a.o., assumes that there are dedicated TopP, topP, FocP projections above the TP (36).

(36) *A simplified cartographic analysis* (Dyakonova 2009)



The adjunction approach, advocated by Bailyn (1995, 2012), Junghanns and Zybatow (1997), Pereltsvaig (2004), Slioussar (2007), and Scott (2012), rejects the idea of the ‘fixed’ left periphery and tentatively suggests that topic and focus constituents occupy adjunct positions / multiple specifiers at the CP/TP levels (37).

(37) *Multiple specifiers analysis*



Both frameworks, however, agree on one particular type of fronted construction – namely, contrastive *-to* topics. *To* topics must be at the very left edge of a clause and are related to the CP layer; they always precede other topic / focus constructions ((38), reproduced from from Dyakonova (2009)) and can only scramble with *wh*-words, which themselves move into the highest clausal layer (Scott 2012, a.o.) (39).

(38) a. *multiple topics*

Mužčine-to [v takuju bumagu] [podarok] ja by ne stala  
 man.DAT-TO into such paper.ACC gift.ACC I.NOM COND NEG AUX.PST  
 upakovyvat'.  
 pack.INF

‘I would not wrap a gift for a man with such paper.’

b. ??[V takuju bumagu] mužčine-to [podarok] ja by ne stala  
 into such paper.ACC man.DAT-TO gift.ACC I.NOM COND NEG AUX.PST  
 upakovyvat'.  
 pack.INF

‘I would not wrap a gift for a man with such paper.’

c. *-to topic and focus*

\*VČERA Irinu-to ja videla, a Maksima DAVNO ne vstrečala.  
yesterday Irina.ACC-TO I.NOM saw but Max.ACC long.time NEG met

‘As to Irina, I saw her YESTERDAY, but I have not seen Max for a long time.’

d. Irinu-to včera ja videla, a Maksima davno ne vstrečala.  
Irina.ACC-TO yesterday I.NOM saw but Max.ACC long.time NEG met

‘As to Irina, I saw her YESTERDAY, but I have not seen Max for a long time.’

- (39) a. Kogo Marine-to ty predstavil?  
who.ACC Marina.DAT-TO you.NOM introduced  
‘As for Marina, who did you introduced to her?’
- b. Marine-to kogo ty predstavil?  
Marina.DAT-TO who.ACC you.NOM introduced  
‘As for Marina, who did you introduced to her?’

To account for this behavior, it is proposed that *-to* topics are hosted by a separate higher projection – a TopP (Dyakonova 2009) or a HopP generated above CP (Scott 2012).

Leaving *-to* topics aside, because of the lack of sufficient support for either of the approaches to the left periphery, I refrain from determining which of them is the correct one, and, in the next chapters, I will take both options into account.

## 1.4 Outline of the thesis

The thesis has the following structure. Chapter 2 aims to establish the empirical background by presenting the two classes predicatives that are central for the discussion of DP / PRO alternation: evaluative predicatives, such as *važno* ‘important’, *interesno* ‘interesting’, and deontic modals (*možno* ‘allowed’, *nužno* ‘necessary’), which embed a clause and allow a DP<sub>DAT</sub> / prepositional Holder.

First, I discuss the semantic and syntactic distribution of these items, drawing a parallel between adjectival predicatives and short adjectives (Bonch-Osmolovskaja 2003, Say 2013). Second, I thoroughly examine the properties of the clausal argument and the matrix Holder, determining their syntactic status. In particular, I argue that (i) evaluatives and deontic modals are unaccusative predicates that select a clausal complement, and (ii) the matrix

Holder is a noncore argument introduced by a high applicative head, adapting Pytkänen's (2008) structure.

Chapter 3 focuses on constructions with a matrix predicative, a dative DP and an embedded non-finite clause and addresses the question of the relations between the DP and the understood embedded subject. Based on the results for various diagnostics, I demonstrate that an embedded clause can contain either the PRO subject obligatorily controlled by the matrix Holder, or an overt referential subject; furthermore, the latter does not have to raise into a matrix clause position to be licensed. Contrary to the commonly adopted assumption (Williams 1987; Chomsky 1999; Lasnik 1998; Landau 2000, 2004), the DP / PRO alternation is not conditioned by the structural size or the Tense – Agr characteristics of the embedded clause. However, it is not entirely free, and can be described by the following Two-Dative Generalization (40).

- (40) The Two-Dative Generalization: An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential dative DP controller available within a higher clause.

In Chapter 4 I examine several possible ways to formally account for the proposed generalization: the Case-licensing approach, Landau's (2004) Agree theory of control and Sundaresan and McFadden's (2009) selection based approach. I argue that the Case licensing approach successfully captures most of the properties of the DP / PRO alternation in Russian, however, its standard version should be revised to allow long-distance Case assignment across a CP boundary. I demonstrate that, unlike, for instance, in Turkish (Şener 2011) and Mongolian (Fong 2019), Case licensing in Russian can be genuinely long-distance as the embedded subject stays relatively low in its clause.

Chapter 5 considers Russian verbs of order and permission and demonstrates that they, too, support both obligatory control and cross-clausal Case assignment and comply with the proposed Two-Dative Generalization. To account for the similar properties of sentences with these verbs and deontic modal predicatives, I argue that verbs of order and permission are lexical realizations of a verb of communication that embeds a silent deontic modal head; the latter, in turn, selects a proposition as its complement.

Chapter 6 concludes the thesis, summarizes the results and presents several directions for future research.



## Chapter 2

# The distribution and structure of predicatives


### 2.1 Overview

The present research centers around two groups of Russian predicatives: evaluative predicatives (*važno* ‘important’, *interesno* ‘interesting’) and deontic modals (*možno* ‘allowed’, *nužno* ‘necessary’), exemplified in (41).

- (41) Maše bylo važno / nužno / možno ostat’sja odnoj.  
Maša.DAT was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG allowed.N.SG stay.INF alone  
‘For Maša it was important / necessary / allowed to stay alone.’

This chapter examines the general semantic and syntactic properties of these predicatives, with the main goal being to develop for them the structural representations. I will consider the main components of sentences with a matrix predicative: an embedded clause and a DP<sub>DAT</sub> / prepositional Holder, and by the end of the chapter I will propose a single structure for both kinds of constructions (42), supported by the results of various diagnostics; to distinguish between evaluatives and deontic modals I use labels AP and ModP, respectively, although this is done for descriptive purposes only, as I argue that the structures are identical.

(42)



The discussion proceeds in the following way. Section 2.2 presents a semantics-based sub-categorization of predicatives, while Section 2.3 describes the syntactic distribution of evaluative predicatives and deontic modals. Section 2.4 discusses the position of the embedded clause and the status of predicatives as unaccusative / unergative predicates. Section 2.5 focuses on the status and position of the matrix dative / prepositional Holder, and Section 2.6 offers a brief summary.

## 2.2 Sub-categorization of predicatives

Predicatives are a special group of seemingly invariable predicates that can embed a clausal argument and often co-occur with a dative DP referring to an attitude / obligation Holder. Predicatives have long been known among Russian philologists; however, as the Russian linguistic tradition was shaped mostly within the functionalist framework, the focus was mostly on the semantic distribution of predicatives and their semantics-based classification (Zolotova 1982; Bonch-Osmolovskaja 2003, a.o.). For recent works discussing the syntactic properties of predicatives see, primarily, Say (2013), Zimmerling and Trubitsina (2015), and Letuchiy (2017); to the best of my knowledge, no formal minimalism-inspired syntactic analysis for sub-classes of predicatives has been proposed.

The following groups of predicatives will be central to the discussion.

1. **evaluative predicatives** that characterize a state of affairs: *interesno* ‘interesting’, *važno* ‘important’, *polezno* ‘useful’, *udivitel’no* ‘surprising’, etc. (43a),

2. **deontic modals:** *možno* ‘allowed’, *nel’zja* ‘not allowed, prohibited’, *nado* ‘necessary’, *nužno* ‘necessary’, *neobxodimo* ‘necessary’ (43b).

- (43) a. Maše bylo interesno / važno pročitat’ etu knigu.  
 Maša.DAT was interesting.N.SG important.N.SG read.INF this book.ACC  
 ‘For Maša it was interesting / important to read this book.’
- b. V etom magazine pokupatel’am možno / nel’zja /  
 in this shop buyers.DAT allowed.N.SG not.allowed.N.SG  
 nado / nužno bylo kurit’.  
 necessary.N.SG necessary.N.SG was smoke.INF  
 ‘In this shop it was allowed / not allowed / necessary for buyers to smoke.’

These classes are distinguished by most of the linguists who work on the topic, and their typical representatives, given in the examples above, are frequently used by speakers.<sup>1</sup> As will be demonstrated in the next chapter, only evaluative predicatives and deontic modals can embed non-finite clauses with either PRO or an overt referential DP subject.

There are several other sub-classes of predicatives, which I will not examine in detail in the thesis; their syntactic properties differ from those relevant for the present discussion, but on the surface sentences with these predicatives look quite similar to those with evaluatives or deontic modals and, therefore, provide valuable minimal pairs for comparison.

The first such class is **predicatives of emotional evaluation** that characterize an emotional state of an individual caused by some state of affairs: *grustno* ‘sad’, *radostno* ‘cheerful’, etc. (44).

- (44) Maše bylo grustno / radostno smotret’ na foto.  
 Maša.DAT was sad.N.SG cheerful.N.SG look.INF at photo  
 ‘For Maša it was sad / cheerful to look at the picture.’

Another group of frequently used predicatives is **epistemic modals:** *verojatno* ‘probable’, *vozmožno* ‘possible’. Within the class of predicatives, the distribution of these items is unique as they do not co-occur with a dative DP and rarely embed a non-finite clause with an implicit subject (45). Because of the very lack of a potential matrix controller and / or an

---

1. For instance, according to the modern frequency dictionary (Ljaševskaja and Šarov 2009), the deontic modals *možno* and *nel’zja* are among the 350 most frequently used lexical items of Russian, while the evaluative predicatives *važno* and *interesno* are among the first 2000.

overt subject of an embedded non-finite clause, I leave constructions with these predicatives aside from the main discussion and will only briefly return to them in Chapters 3 and 4.

- (45) a. V etom magazine (\*mne) bylo možno / verojatno vstretit'  
 in this shop I.DAT was possible.N.SG probable.N.SG meet.INF  
 znakomyx.  
 friends.ACC  
 'In this shop it is possible / probable to meet a friend.'
- b. Bylo možno / verojatno, čto ja vstreču znakomyx.  
 was possible.N.SG probable.N.SG that I.NOM meet.NPST friends.ACC  
 'It was possible / probable for me to meet my friends.'

Letuchiy (2017) further proposes to distinguish other smaller sub-class of predicatives, including, for instance, **predicatives characterizing a location**: *pusto* 'empty', *zanjato* 'occupied', etc. The distribution of these lexical items also differs from that of evaluative and modal predicatives; thus, these predicatives cannot embed a clause and do not allow an Experiencer or a Holder (46).

- (46) a. (\*Maše) v škafu bylo pusto.  
 Maša.DAT in cupboard was empty.N.SG  
 'It was empty in the cupboard.'
- b. (\*Maše) zdes' zanjato.  
 Maša.DAT here occupied.N.SG  
 'This place is occupied.'
- c. \*V škafu bylo pusto xranit' posudu.  
 in cupboard was empty.N.SG store.INF dishes.ACC  
 Intended: 'The cupboard was empty to store there dishes.'
- d. \*Zdes' bylo zanjato sest'.  
 here was occupied.N.SG sit.INF  
 Intended: 'This place was occupied to sit.'

The next section focuses on the evaluative and deontic modal predicatives and discusses their syntactic distribution in more detail.

## 2.3 Syntactic distribution

### 2.3.1 Embedded clauses

On the one hand, predicatives as a class are united by several morphosyntactic properties. First, they usually end with the *-o* inflection (characteristic of adverbs and neuter singular forms of short adjectives).<sup>2</sup> Second, they can embed a clausal argument and often lack a nominative DP subject. Third, they tend to co-occur with a dative DP that refers to a Holder (of an attitude or an obligation) or an Experiencer, depending on the semantics of a predicative.

On the other hand, predicatives also differ between themselves, parametrizing the above mentioned ‘universal’ properties. Let us start with the embedded clause. In general, it can be said that predicatives can embed all kinds of clauses: non-finite clauses, finite subjunctive clauses with the *čtoby* ‘so that’ complementizer, and finite indicative clauses with the *čto* ‘that’ complementizer. However, not all sub-classes of predicatives allow all of these options.

For instance, predicatives of emotional evaluation often embed a non-finite clause without an overt complementizer (47a), and can also co-occur with a finite indicative clause (47b). Interestingly, since these predicatives primarily characterize a state of an individual, a clausal component denoting the cause of this state can easily be omitted (47c).

---

2. The main difference between long and short adjectives in Russian is that, while long adjectives can be used as predicates or prenominal modifiers and exhibit case concord with the subject / head noun, short adjectives can only be used as primary predicates and cannot be marked for case (i).

- (i) a. Devočka byla grustnaja / grustna.  
girl.NOM was.F.SG sad.LONG.F.SG.NOM sad.SHORT.F.SG  
‘The girl was sad.’
- b. Grustnaja / \*grustna devočka tancevala.  
sad.LONG.F.SG.NOM sad.SHORT.F.SG girl.NOM danced  
‘The sad girl danced.’
- c. Devočka tancevala grustnoj / \*grustna.  
girl.NOM danced sad.LONG.F.SG.INS sad.SHORT.F.SG  
‘The girl danced sad.’

- (47) a. Maše grustno / radostno ležat' na polu.  
 Maša.DAT sad.N.SG cheerful.N.SG lie.INF on floor  
 'Maša is sad / happy to lie on the floor.'
- b. Maše grustno / radostno, što v komnate est' kamin.  
 Maša.DAT sad.N.SG cheerful.N.SG that in room is fireplace.NOM  
 'Maša is sad / cheerful that there is a fireplace in the room.'
- c. Maše bylo grustno / radostno.  
 Maša.DAT was sad.N.SG  
 'Maša was sad.'

Evaluative predicatives have a wider distribution as they embed all three kinds of clauses: non-finite, finite subjunctive and finite indicative clauses (48).

- (48) a. Maše važno ujeti / čtoby Anna ušla.  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG leave.INF so that Anna.NOM leave.SUBJ  
 'For Maša it is important to leave / that Anna would leave.'
- b. Maše važno, što Anna ušla.  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG that Anna.NOM left  
 'For Maša it is important that Anna has left.'

Deontic modals allow embedded non-finite or finite subjunctive clauses (49).<sup>3</sup>

- (49) a. Maše možno / nužno ostat'sja na noč.  
 Maša.DAT allowed.N.SG necessary.N.SG stay.INF overnight  
 'For Maša it is allowed / necessary to stay overnight.'

---

3. The connection between root modality and subjunctive mood has been thoroughly studied for many Indo-European languages, including, for instance, Romance languages (Panzeri 2002, Palmer 2006, a.o.). This pairing is often compared to that of epistemic modality and indicative mood (attested, again, in French and Spanish, a.o.); in Russian, too, epistemic modal predicatives, at least in sentences with positive polarity, can only embed finite indicative clauses, but not subjunctives (45).

For theoretical accounts of these phenomena I refer the reader to Hooper (1975), Kratzer (1991), Portner (1997, 2003), Panzeri (2002), and Giannakidou (2009), to name a few, and references therein.

- b. Maše nel'zja / neobxodimo, čtoby Anna ostavalas'  
 Maša.DAT not.allowed.N.SG necessary.N.SG so that Anna.NOM stay.SUBJ  
 na noč.  
 overnight  
 'For Maša it is not allowed / necessary for Anna to stay overnight.'

Unlike, for example, previously mentioned constructions with a predicative of emotional evaluation, in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative a clausal component must be present, and it can only be substituted with the proform *eto* 'it, this' or a nominative subject (often an event noun) in case of an adjectival predicative (50); see Section 2.3.4 of this chapter for a discussion of adjectival vs. non-adjectival predicatives.

- (50) a. \*Maše važno / udivitel'no / možno /  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG surprising.N.SG allowed.N.SG  
 nel'zja.  
 not.allowed.N.SG  
 Intended: 'For Maša it is important / surprising / allowed / not allowed.'
- b. [Petja ne prišel.] ?Maše eto važno / udivitel'no /  
 Petja NEG came Maša.DAT this important.N.SG surprising.N.SG  
 nužno.  
 necessary.N.SG  
 'Petja did not come. To Maša this was important / surprising / necessary.'

### 2.3.2 Dative DP

Dative case appears in Russian in many contexts; it is normally used to mark a Recipient or a Goal, a Beneficiary, a Holder, an Experiencer, or an External possessor. In many cases, a dative marked DP freely alternates with a PP, often headed by the *dlja* 'for' preposition, which assigns the so-called prepositional genitive, although this property is not universal. For instance, the alternation is allowed for Beneficiaries (51a), but it is prohibited for Recipients (51b).

- (51) a. Petja ispek Maše / dlja Maši pirog.  
 Petja.NOM baked Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN cake.ACC  
 'Petja baked Maša a cake.' ← 'Maša' is a Beneficiary

- b. Petja dal Maše / \*dlja Maši pirog.  
 Petja.NOM gave Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN cake.ACC  
 ‘Petja gave Maša a cake.’ ← ‘Maša’ is a Recipient

In sentences with a matrix evaluative (52) / deontic modal (53) predicative the dative DP can alternate with a PP denoting a Holder (52) (see also Serdobol’skaja and Toldova (2005) for a discussion of some corpus data).

- (52) a. Maše / dlja Maši važno ujtí.  
 Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN important.N.SG leave.INF  
 ‘For Maša it is important to leave.’
- b. Maše / dlja Maši važno, što Anna ušla.  
 Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN important.N.SG that Anna.NOM left  
 ‘For Maša it is important that Anna has left.’
- (53) a. Maše / dlja Maši možno / nužno ostat’sja.  
 Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN allowed.N.SG necessary.N.SG stay.INF  
 ‘For Maša it is allowed / necessary to stay.’
- b. Maše / dlja Masi nel’zja / nado, čtoby  
 Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN not.allowed.N.SG / necessary.N.SG so that  
 Anna ostalas’  
 Anna.NOM stay.SUBJ  
 ‘For Maša it is not allowed / necessary for Anna to stay.’

Note that there are several cases of ‘spurious alternation’ when a *dlja* PP should not be interpreted as a matrix Holder. First, recall that a true Holder of an attitude or an obligation is a person to whom something is important, necessary, etc. In Russian, prepositional *dlja* phrases can also denote the so-called ‘point of view’ – the person who determines whether the whole described proposition is true. Consider the two *dlja* PPs in (54a); here, *Maša* is a proper attitude Holder and ‘you’ is the point of view, the one who believes that *Maša* will perceive the event denoted by the embedded clause as important. A similar meaning is conveyed by such modifiers as *po-tvoemu*, *po-moemu* ‘in your / my opinion’ (54b).

- (54) a. ?Dlja tebjá, dlja Masi važno ostat’sja.  
 for you.GEN for Maša.GEN important.N.SG stay.INF  
 ‘In your opinion, to Maša it is important to stay.’



- b. Po-tvoemu, dlja Maši važno ostat'sja.  
 in your opinion for Maša.GEN important.N.SG stay.INF  
 'In your opinion, to Maša it is important to stay.'

Second, a *dlja* PP appearing within the matrix clause can be, in fact, a topicalized / focalized embedded constituent moved to the left periphery; this is illustrated in (55). In these examples the dative PPs are not matrix Holders, but Beneficiaries of an embedded predicate.

- (55) a. Dlja Maši<sub>i</sub> važno / interesno [gotovit' edu t<sub>i</sub>].  
 for Maša.GEN important.N.SG interesting.N.SG cook.INF food.ACC  
 'It is important / interesting to cook for Maša.'
- b. Dlja Maši<sub>i</sub> nado / možno [prigotovit' edu ti].  
 for Maša.GEN necessary.N.SG allowed.N.SG cook.INF food.ACC  
 'It is necessary / allowed to cook food for Maša.'

### 2.3.3 Interim summary and parallels with English

The distributional properties of evaluative and deontic modal predicatives are summarized in Table 1 (56).

(56) Table 1. Distributional properties of Russian predicatives

	DP <sub>DAT</sub>	DP <sub>DAT</sub> / PP	Embedded clause
Evaluatives	attitude Holder	Yes	indicative / subjunctive / non-finite
Deontic modals	obligation Holder	Yes	subjunctive / non-finite

A few words must be said about parallels between Russian and other languages, primarily English, and the terminology used in this thesis. There is a well-known ongoing discussion of clause-embedding evaluative adjectives in English, which might confuse the reader. The class of English adjectives traditionally called 'evaluative' includes *rude*, *smart*, *silly* and other adjectives that can be predicated over an individual or a state of affairs (see works by Wilkinson (1971, 1976), Quirk (1985), Stowell (1991), Bennis (2000, 2004), Barker (2002), Landau (2006), and Kertz (2010), to name a few); this ambiguity is illustrated in (57).

- (57) a. John is silly.  
 b. John is silly to go there alone.  
 c. It is silly of John to go there alone.  
 d. It is silly for John to go there alone.  
 e. It is silly that John went there alone.

It is clear that evaluative adjectives in English are not parallel to so-called evaluative predicatives in Russian and rather resemble predicatives of emotional evaluation (*grustno* ‘sad’, *radostno* ‘cheerful’), even though the distribution of the latter is narrower as they do not directly characterize the state of affairs, only the state of a person, and do not occur, for example, in sentences similar to either (57b) or (57c).<sup>4</sup> As noted above, Russian evaluative adjectives characterize a state of affairs itself, while English evaluative adjectives can characterize either a state of affairs or a state of an individual caused by a particular event.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, I will not refer to literature on English evaluative adjectives while discussing Russian evaluative predicatives, and I will not attempt to apply the proposed analyses to the Russian data just because the two groups are referred to using the same term.

### 2.3.4 Adjectival vs. non-adjectival predicatives

#### Predicatives with adjectival counterparts

As mentioned earlier, predicatives often end with *-o* inflection, typical for adverbs and short adjectives (see the classical work by Šaxmatov (1941) describing predicatives of state as adverbials). As argued by Letuchiy (2017), most if not all predicatives are adjectival in their nature. The crucial counter-argument against an adverbial analysis is that adverbs, unlike

---

4. Note also that not all evaluative adjectives in English have semantically equivalent predicatives in Russian: *sad* has the translation equivalent *grustno*, which can embed a non-finite clause, but, for instance, *umnyj* ‘smart’ cannot co-occur with dative DPs and clauses.

5. As was pointed to me by Mark Newson (p.c.), many sentences with an evaluative adjective in English are ambiguous between characterizing a state of affairs or an individual (ia). The state of affairs reading can be reinforced by embedding deontic modality; thus, in (ib) only one reading is available.

- (i) a. It was silly for John to go there alone.  
 b. It was silly for John to have to go there alone.

adjectives, do not function as primary predicates (58).

- (58) a. Maša bystro pribežala.  
 Maša.NOM quickly ran.in  
 ‘Maša ran in quickly.’
- b. \*(Maše) bylo bystro pribežat’.  
 Maša.DAT was fast.N.SG run.in.INF  
 Intended: ‘For Maša it was quick to run in.’

Most predicatives, including all evaluative predicatives and several deontic modals, have corresponding adjectives with similar semantic and syntactic distribution: *važno* – *važnyj* ‘important’, *interesno* – *interesnyj* ‘interesting’, *nužno* – *nužnyj* ‘necessary’, *neobxodimo* – *neobxodimyj* ‘necessary’, etc. In such pairs predicatives are identical to short adjectives (abbreviated as SA) marked with the neuter.sg *-o* inflection. Compare the examples in (59); a straightforward way to account for them is to assume that we are dealing with the same adjectival predicate in both cases (for comparison, I also provide an example with a fem.sg short form in (59c) to illustrate agreement with the subject).<sup>6</sup>

---

6. As mentioned in Chapter 1, in Russian, neuter.sg agreement can be considered the ‘default’ agreement of T<sup>0</sup> with a non-nominative subject. For instance, while the nominative subject in (ia) agrees with the verb in person and number, the dative subject in a parallel sentence in (ib) and the genitive subject in (ic), marked with quirky cases, obligatorily co-occur with neuter.sg agreement on the auxiliary and the main verb.

- (i) a. Ja žaleju Mašu.  
 I.NOM feel.sorry.NPST.1.SG Maša.ACC  
 ‘I feel sorry for Maša.’
- b. Mne bylo žal’ Mašu.  
 I.DAT was.N.SG feel.sorry.INV Maša.ACC  
 ‘I felt sorry for Maša.’
- c. Menja tošnilo.  
 I.GEN feel.sick.PST.N.SG  
 ‘I felt sick.’

- (59) a. Mne / dlja menja bylo očen' interesno / nužno takoe  
 I.DAT for I.GEN was very interesting.SA.N.SG necessary.SA.N.SG such  
 priključenie.  
 adventure.N.SG.NOM  
 'Such an adventure was very interesting / necessary to me.'
- b. Mne / dlja menja bylo očen' interesno / nužno pojti v  
 I.DAT for I.GEN was very interesting.N.SG necessary.N.SG go.INF into  
 kino.  
 cinema  
 'To me it was very interesting / necessary to go to the cinema.'
- c. Mne / dlja menja byla očen' interesna / nužna eta  
 I.DAT for I.GEN was very interesting.SA.F.SG necessary.SA.F.SG this  
 poezdka.  
 trip.F.SG.NOM  
 'To me this trip was very interesting / necessary.'

There is an ongoing discussion of whether such predicatives are actually short forms of adjectives, see Bonch-Osmolovskaja (2003), Zimmerling (2003), Say (2013), and Letuchiy (2017). On the one hand, the two classes of lexical items overlap but are not completely identical: there are several predicatives without adjectival counterparts and there are many short adjectives that do not embed clauses. On the other hand, predicatives that have an adjectival counterpart are often very similar to the latter in their morphosyntactic behavior and semantic distribution.

Short adjectives have been extensively discussed in the literature in comparison with long forms (see Siegel 1976; Babby 1973, 1994; Bailyn 1994; Zaliznjak 2002; Halle and Matushansky 2006; Grashchenkov and Grashchenkova 2007; Geist 2010, and Borik 2014, a.o). Recall that short adjectives and predicatives are prohibited in the attributive function and are always used as primary predicates; furthermore, they are never marked for case. In contrast, 'ordinary' (long) adjectives (LAs) can be used as modifiers within a DP, primary predicates and secondary predicates. They obligatorily agree with a modified noun in gender and number and are marked for case – either the same as the related noun (case concord) or instrumental (default, available for adjectives and nouns in the predicate position). This contrasting behavior is illustrated with several examples in (60), where long adjectives are

glossed as LA and short adjectives, as previously, are glossed as SA.

- (60) a. Devočka byla grustnaja / grustna.  
 girl.NOM was.F.SG sad.LA.F.SG.NOM sad.SA.F.SG  
 ‘The girl was sad.’
- b. Grustnaja / \*grustna devočka tancevala.  
 sad.LA.F.SG.NOM sad.SA.F.SG girl.NOM danced  
 ‘The sad girl danced.’
- c. Devočka tancevala grustnoj / \*grustna.  
 girl.NOM danced sad.LA.F.SG.INS sad.SA.F.SG  
 ‘The girl danced sad.’

As illustrated in (59), short adjectives and equivalent predicatives take the same set of dependent constituents: a Holder and a characterized object / event. They both allow various degree modifiers (*očen’* ‘very’, *menee* ‘less’, *tak že* ‘so’, etc.), and, furthermore, in both cases (identical) comparative and superlative forms can be derived (61).

- (61) a. Pete byla važnee / interesnee / nužnee  
 Petja.DAT was.F.SG important.CMP interesting.CMP necessary.CMP  
 poezdka v London, čem v Moskvu.  
 trip.F.SG.NOM into London than into Moscow  
 ‘For Peter a trip to London was more important / interesting / necessary than a trip to Moscow.’
- b. Pete bylo važnee / interesnee / nužnee poexat’  
 Petja.DAT was.N.SG important.CMP interesting.CMP necessary.CMP go.INF  
 v London, čem v Moskvu.  
 into London than into Moscow  
 ‘For Peter it was more important / interesting / necessary to go to London than to Moscow.’

As for the semantic distribution, as noticed by Grashchenkov (2018), a short adjective and a long adjective that apparently pair together can have distinct semantics, with long adjectives typically allowing various metaphorical readings (62). Interestingly, in a triad ‘long adjective – short adjective – predicative’, the latter is always semantically identical to the short adjective and cannot be used in a figurative sense (62b).

- (62) a. *temnaja istorija - istorija byla temnoj / temnaja / \*temna*  
 dark.LA story story was dark.LA.INS dark.LA.NOM dark.SA  
 ‘suspicious affair’ - ‘the affair was suspicious’  
 Literally: ‘dark’
- b. *Maše bylo temno.*  
 Maša.DAT was.N.SG dark.N.SG  
 ‘For Maša it was dark.’ (only the literal interpretation)

It remains impossible to firmly (dis)prove that predicatives that are identical to corresponding short adjectives in syntactic and semantic distribution are not short adjectives themselves (see Zimmerling (2003) for a historical overview of the literature on the problem dating back to the nineteenth century). I remain agnostic as for the precise answer to this question, especially since it largely depends on the adopted notion of *part of speech* and *lexical category*, which is itself not an unquestionable matter. However, I follow Bonch-Osmolovskaja (2003) and Say (2013), in assuming that predicatives form a heterogeneous class; when a sub-class of predicatives does not exhibit any semantic or morphosyntactic differences compared to the group of corresponding short adjectives, adjectival predicatives are closely related to adjectives themselves, and it is reasonable to analyze them together.

### **Predicatives without adjectival counterparts**

For some predicatives there are no adjectival counterparts, at least in modern Russian. There is a small sub-group of deontic modals that do not have corresponding short or long adjectives; they do not allow nominative DP subjects and are often described as phi-invariant, always appearing with a neuter.sg copula: *možno* ‘allowed’, *nado* ‘necessary’, *nel’zja* ‘not allowed, prohibited’ (63).

- (63) a. *\*Mne byla možna / možnoj prodaža knig.*  
 I.DAT was allowed.F.SG allowed.F.SG.INS sale.F.SG.NOM books.GEN  
 Intended: ‘Selling books was allowed to me.’
- b. *Mne bylo možno prodavat’ knigi.*  
 I.DAT was allowed.N.SG sell.INF books.ACC  
 ‘It was allowed to me to sell books.’

Furthermore, these deontic modals cannot be modified by degree modifiers and do not have

comparative forms (64a), in contrast with, for instance, other deontic modals mentioned above or epistemic modal predicatives that have adjectival counterparts (64b).

- (64) a. \*Maše      bolee možno      / možnee      idti v      kino,      čem Pete.  
           Maša.DAT more allowed.N.SG    allowed.CMP go    into cinema than Petja.DAT  
           Intended: ‘Maša is more allowed to go to the cinema than Petja.’
- b. Bolee verojatno      / verojatnee      pojti v      kino      vo vtornik, čem v  
     more probable.N.SG    probable.CMP go.INF into cinema in Tuesday than in  
     sredu.  
     Wednesday  
     ‘It is more probable to go to the cinema on Tuesday than on Wednesday.’

The question of why not all deontic modals have corresponding adjectival counterparts remains to be answered by future research. On the one hand, the fact that modals of necessity often behave differently from other modal items has been reported for many languages, starting with English *need* (Duffley 1994; Harves and Kayne 2012). On the other hand, not all deontic modals of necessity in Russian have agreeing adjectival counterparts; for instance, for *nado* ‘necessary’ there is no adjective \**nadyj*. Thus it is hard to relate this property to their semantics.<sup>7</sup>

As will be demonstrated in this chapter and Chapter 3, with regard to the structural properties and availability of the DP / PRO alternation, central to the present discussion, ‘adjectival’ deontic modals pattern with evaluative predicatives and ‘invariable’ deontic modals, and their behavior does not interfere with the proposed analysis.

---

7. Historically, *nel’zja* ‘not allowed’ and *nado* ‘necessary’ were derived from nominal forms: the Proto-Slavic noun \**l’ga* ‘possibility’ plus the negation \**ne* / \**ně* and the Old East Slavic *nadoba*, respectively (Vasmer 2009). Although denominal predicatives are rarely found in Russian, examples include *pora*, which means as a noun ‘time, period’ and as a predicative ‘(it is) time to’, and *len’* ‘laziness’ (noun), ‘(be) lazy to do something’ (predicative).

*Možno* ‘allowed’ is derived from the same root as the epistemic modal *vozmožno* ‘possible’; however, while there is an adjective *vozmožnyj*, the form *možnyj* is not used.

## 2.4 The status of the embedded clause

### 2.4.1 Argument vs. adjunct

The next two sections consider major dependent constituents in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative – an embedded clause and a Holder – in order to develop the structural representation for these constructions.

As mentioned in Section 2.3, in sentences under consideration embedded clauses are obligatory and can only be substituted by a proform / a nominative DP, if the matrix predicative is adjectival (but not omitted). This is not typical for all predicatives; recall, for instance, that predicatives of emotional evaluation often appear with a single dative DP (65).

- (65) a. \*Maše bylo važno / nužno / možno.  
Maša.DAT was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG allowed.N.SG  
Intended: ‘For Maša it was important / necessary / allowed.’
- b. Maše bylo grustno / radostno.  
Maša.DAT was sad.N.SG cheerful.N.SG  
‘Maša was sad / cheerful.’

Obligatoriness has been traditionally considered one of the core properties of canonical arguments (Somers 1984; Koenig, Mauner, and Bienvenue 2003; Kroeger 2004, and Rákosi 2006, a.o.). The obligatory status and the very semantics of evaluative and deontic modal predicatives, which characterize a state of affairs denoted by a clause, show that the latter is, indeed, an argument.

The embedded clause further patterns with clausal complements and not with adjuncts with regard to left dislocation and sub-extraction.

First, adjunct clauses with overt complementizers are typically syntactic islands opaque for sub-extraction (as per Huang’s (1982) Condition on Extraction Domain and Ross’s (1967) Adjunct Condition), while it is usually possible to move a constituent out of an embedded argument clause. In (66) I compare a subjunctive clause embedded under an evaluative / deontic modal predicative with an adjunct subjunctive clause and a complement subjunctive clause of a desiderative predicate (*xotet* ‘want’); it turns out that the former patterns with complement clauses in allowing sub-extraction.



- (66) a. Kogo<sub>i</sub> Maše bylo važno / nado [čtoby Petja  
 who.ACC Maša.DAT was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG so that Petja.NOM  
 poceloval t<sub>i</sub>]?  
 kiss.SUBJ  
 ‘Who was it important / necessary for Maša for Petja to kiss?’
- b. Kogo<sub>i</sub> Maše važno, [čto Petja poceluet t<sub>i</sub>]?  
 who.ACC Maša.DAT important.N.SG that Petja.NOM kiss.NPST  
 ‘Who is it important for Maša that Peter will kiss?’
- c. \*Kogo<sub>i</sub> Maša prišla, [čtoby Petja poceloval t<sub>i</sub>]?  
 who.ACC Maša.NOM came so that Petja.NOM kissed  
 Intended: ‘Who did Maša come so that Peter would kiss?’
- d. Kogo<sub>i</sub> Maša xotela, [čtoby Petja poceloval t<sub>i</sub>]?  
 who.ACC Maša.NOM wanted so that Petja.NOM kiss.SUBJ  
 Intended: ‘Who did Maša wanted for Peter to kiss?’

Second, argument clauses are generally hard to dislocate to the left, for instance, in focus constructions, and they normally linearly follows the predicate (67a). In contrast, a purpose clause is merged structurally higher than a complement clause; as an adjunct, it is linearized either at the right or at the left edge of the clause (67b).

- (67) a. ?\*Čtoby Petja ostalsja, Maša xotela.  
 so that Petja.NOM stay.SUBJ Maša.NOM wanted  
 Intended: ‘Maša wanted for Petja to stay.’
- b. Čtoby Petja ostalsja, Maša zaplatila.  
 so that Petja.NOM stay.SUBJ Maša.NOM paid  
 ‘Maša paid so that Petja would stay.’

As illustrated in (68), both non-finite and finite clauses embedded under an evaluative / deontic modal predicative have a strong tendency to follow the matrix predicate and are hard to move to the left periphery. This provides further confirmation that these clauses have the status of arguments rather than adjuncts.

- (68) a. #[ostat’sja] Pete bylo važno / nado.  
 stay.INF Petja.DAT was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG  
 ‘For Peter it was important / necessary to stay.’


- b. \*[čtoby Petja poceloval Annu] Maše bylo važno /  
 so that Petja.NOM kiss.SUBJ Anna.ACC Maša.DAT was important.N.SG  
 nado.  
 necessary.N.SG  
 Intended: ‘For Maša it was important / necessary for Petja to kiss Anna.’
- c. \*[čto Petja poceluet Annu] Maše važno.  
 that Petja.NOM kiss.NPST Anna.ACC Maša.DAT important.N.SG  
 ‘For Maša it is important that Peter will kiss Anna.’

## 2.4.2 Evaluatives and deontic modals as unaccusative predicates


### The same structure

The major question regarding the status of a clause embedded under an evaluative predicative or a deontic modal is whether the clause is merged as an internal argument or an external argument, i.e. the subject of predication. The two options are illustrated in (69) and (70).

(69) *Unaccusative structure*



(70) *Unergative structure*



I argue that the first option is the correct one and that evaluative and deontic modal predicatives are, essentially, unaccusative predicates taking a clause or a DP as their complement (another term often used for heads with a single internal argument is *ergative* (Cinque 1990)).

To begin with, I would like to establish that adjectival and invariable predicatives under consideration are of the same structural size. This is suggested by the fact that the two types of predicatives can be coordinated with further sub-extraction of a clausal component (71). The idea behind the test is that when the two constituents are coordinated sub-extraction out of only one of them is prohibited, and only parallel movement from the same positions

out of both conjuncts is licit (‘across-the-board movement’, as described by Ross (1967b)).

- (71) a. Pete bylo [[možno  $t_k$ ] i [interesno  $t_k$ ]] ostat’sja<sub>k</sub>.  
 Petja.DAT was allowed.N.SG and interesting.N.SG stay.INF  
 ‘For Petja it was allowed and important to stay.’
- b. Dlja Maši bylo [očen’ [važno  $t_k$ ] i [nužno  $t_k$ ]],  
 for Maša.GEN was very important.N.SG and necessary.N.SG  
 [čtoby Petja ostalsja]<sub>k</sub>.  
 so that Petja.NOM stay.SUBJ  
 ‘For Maša it was very important and necessary for Petja to stay.’

### Deontic modals as unaccusatives

As mentioned above, deontic modals *možno* ‘allowed’, *nel’zja* ‘not allowed’, and *nado* ‘necessary’ differ from other kinds of predicatives, including other modals, in that they do not have adjectival counterparts, prohibit degree modification and do not allow nominative subjects. It is, therefore, practically impossible to apply to them the standard unaccusativity diagnostics, since those often require a DP argument or a modifier (Cinque 1990; Stowell 1991).

From a cross-linguistic perspective, for many languages deontic modals are argued to be functional elements; see, for instance, the claim made by Wurmbrand (1999, 2001) that modal verbs in Germanic languages are functional heads in monoclausal constructions.

It is clear, however, that Russian deontic modal predicatives do not belong to the same class of functional heads, as, for example, the English modals *must*, *can*, *may*. The crucial difference here is that deontic predicatives in Russian allow a broad range of possible dependents, including both non-finite and finite clauses. Sentences with an embedded finite clause are undoubtedly bi-clausal; in (72) the deontic modal is the matrix predicate that selects a clausal argument and is further responsible for interpreting a dative DP as a Holder.

- (72) Maše nelzja čtoby Anna ostavalas’ na noč.  
 Maša.DAT not.allowed.N.SG so that Anna.NOM stay.SUBJ overnight  
 ‘For Maša it is not allowed for Anna to stay overnight.’

As will be demonstrated in the next chapter, non-finite clauses embedded under a deontic modal are larger than a vP or a TP and can contain an independent subject, have a distinct

time reference, etc. (73).

- (73) Včera Maše ješčo možno bylo poiti v subbotu v klub, a  
yesterday Maša.DAT yet allowed.N.SG was go.INF in Saturday into club but  
segodn'a priexal otec i vse zapretil.  
today came father.NOM and all.ACC prohibited  
'Yesterday Maša was allowed to go to the club on Saturday, but today the father has  
come back and has prohibited everything.'

I argue that deontic modal predicatives are lexical heads that normally require a single argument – a non-finite or a finite subjunctive clause merged in the complement position – and allow an additional obligation holder.

This assumption concurs with a cross-linguistic trend for modal adjectives to behave as unaccusative predicates (see, for instance, Cinque's (1990) proposal that English epistemic adjectives, such as *probable*, select an internal argument). Thus, Léger (2006) and Meltzer-Asscher (2011), following Rochette (1988), propose to distinguish between propositional adjectives (for instance, modals), which “express judgments having to do with the truth value of a proposition or its epistemological status”, and non-propositional or ‘eventive’ adjectives (for instance, adjectives of emotional evaluation), which “express subjective judgments regarding an event, or the reaction it evokes in its surroundings” (Meltzer-Asscher 2011:175). While eventive adjectives are syntactically unergative, propositional adjectives are syntactically unaccusative, which can be explained from a semantic point of view. As suggested by Meltzer-Asscher (2011), a proposition must be merged in the complement position in order to appear in the scope of the modal operator, i.e. a propositional adjective, that introduces a set of possible worlds. The truth value of the proposition in these possible worlds is then related to the ‘actual’ world.

### **Adjectival predicatives as unaccusatives**

As discussed in Section 2.3.4, I assume that adjectival predicatives can be analyzed together with the corresponding short adjectives if the two share semantic and morphosyntactic properties.

Similarly to the corresponding predicatives, evaluative and deontic modal adjectival predicates can be coordinated with subsequent parallel extraction of an argument out of both

conjuncts (74).

- (74) Maše / dlja Maši byla [očen' [važna t<sub>k</sub>] i  
Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN was very important.SA.F.SG and  
[nužna t<sub>k</sub>] [eta poezdka]<sub>k</sub>.  
necessary.SA.F.SG this trip.F.SG.NOM  
'For Maša this trip was very important and necessary.'

It is further worth noticing that short adjectives prohibit coordination with long adjectival predicates (75).

- (75) a. \*Poezdka byla važna i interesnoj.  
trip.NOM was important.SA and interesting.LA  
Intended: 'The trip was important and interesting.'
- b. \*Poezdka byla interesnoj i važna.  
trip.NOM was interesting.LA and important.SA  
Intended: 'The trip was interesting and important.'

The commonly adopted point of view is that in constructions with a long adjectival predicate in Russian the subject is introduced outside of AP in the specifier position of a dedicated predicative projection (which, among other things, assigns the predicative instrumental case) (Grashchenkov and Grashchenkova 2007; Geist 2010; Borik 2014; Pereltsvaig 2008; Babby 2011);<sup>8</sup> this idea can be traced back to M. Baker's (2003) claim that many adjectives are incapable of taking an external argument by themselves. Taking into account ungrammaticality of coordination of long and short adjectival predicates, demonstrated above (75), I argue that the two kinds of predicates differ in terms of structural size, the latter logically being smaller.

Analyzing short adjectives as unaccusative predicates that select an internal argument without 'the help' of an additional functional projection can further explain the following peculiar fact about the agreement pattern. Similarly to finite verbs, short adjectives require syntactic agreement, while long adjectives allow semantic agreement (Gvozdev 1967 and Corbett 2004, a.o.). This is illustrated in (76) where the polite second person pronoun *Vy* 'you' is the subject; grammatically, this pronoun is plural, however, as in this example, it can also refer to a single woman (or a single man).

---


8. Babby (1973) and Siegel (1976) propose a more complex analysis of long adjectives being modifiers within an NP with a null head noun meaning 'person' or 'thing'. This NP gets further selected by a Pred<sup>0</sup>.

- (76) a. Vy krasivaja / \*krasivyje.  
 You beautiful.LA.F.SG beautiful.LA.PL  
 ‘You are beautiful.’ (to a woman)
- b. Vy \*krasiva / krasivy.  
 You beautiful.SA.F.SG beautiful.SA.PL  
 ‘You are beautiful.’ (to a woman)
- c. Vy \*prišla / prišli.  
 You came.F.SG came.PL  
 ‘You came.’ (to a woman)


As proposed by Wurmbrand (2016, 2017), based on the data from German, Slovenian, Greek, Russian and Czech, formal (syntactic) agreement is characteristic of T-agreement, while semantic feature ‘matching’ is usually available under predication with a predicate AP / DP being the target. Thus, the obligatoriness of syntactic agreement in case of a matrix short adjective can be considered further support for their ‘main predicate’ status.

I conclude that the internal argument analysis better accounts for the properties of Russian short adjectives and, consequently, the corresponding adjectival predicatives, and deontic modals. The two resulting structures – for long adjectives and for short adjectives and predicatives – are given in (77) and (78), respectively.

(77) *Long adjectives*



(78) *Short adjectives / predicatives*



In the next section I will examine behavior of matrix DP<sub>DAT</sub> / prepositional Holders to determine their status and the structural position.

## 2.5 The status of a matrix Holder

I argue that in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative, a matrix Holder exhibits properties of an argument base-generated relatively high in the structure and passes most of the subject-hood tests.

To demonstrate this, I will compare behavior of a dative DP / prepositional Holder to that of canonical arguments – an Agent subject, a Theme direct object or a Recipient indirect object of a ditransitive verb – and canonical adjuncts (mostly PPs).

### 2.5.1 The argumental status of a matrix Holder

#### Properties typical for arguments

Following the discussion of canonical arguments and adjuncts in Corbett (2005) and Brown, Chumakina, and Corbett (2013), a.o., we can start with more general criteria that distinguish the two kinds of syntactic dependents: obligatoriness and the co-occurrence restriction.

Unlike optional adjuncts, arguments are required by predicates and must always be present, whether at the semantic level only or in the syntactic structure as well. Holders of evaluative / deontic modal predicatives in Russian are semantically obligatory (in Chapter 4 I will further show that implicit Holders are also syntactically present). As demonstrated in (79a), a silent Holder, interpreted as definite ‘us’, that is, the Speaker and people around him, is always a part of the reading of a sentence, in contrast with, for instance, an unexpressed unspecified Beneficiary in (79b).

- (79) a. *Važno spasat’ pandas.*  
important.N.SG save.INF pandas.ACC  
‘For us it is important to save pandas.’
- b. *Petja narisoval kartinku.*  
Petja.NOM drew picture.ACC  
‘Petja drew a picture.’ (not necessarily for someone)

The co-occurrence restriction on arguments means that they are allowed only with particular predicates, in contrast with adjuncts, whose distribution is almost unlimited (Comrie 1993; Koenig, Mauner, and Bienvenue 2003; Kroeger 2004; Rákosi 2006). In Russian, matrix

Holders appear in fewer contexts compared to, for instance, rationale, locative or temporal adjuncts. For example, epistemic modals and predicatives characterizing location, mentioned in Section 2.2, allow the latter but not the former (80).

- (80) a. Iz-za Petinogo povedenija dlja Maši bylo včera važno,  
 because of Petja.ATT behavior for Maša.GEN was yesterday important.N.SG  
 čto Anna ostalas'.  
 that Anna.NOM stayed  
 'Because of Petja's behavior, for Maša it was important yesterday that Anna stayed.'
- b. Iz-za Petinogo povedenija (\*dlja Maši) bylo včera  
 because of Petja.ATT behavior for Maša.GEN was yesterday  
 verojatno, čto Anna ostalas'.  
 probable.N.SG that Anna.NOM stayed  
 'Because of Petja's behavior, it was probable yesterday that Anna stayed.'
- c. Iz-za Petinogo povedenija (\*dlja Maši) zdes' bylo včera  
 because of Petja.ATT behavior for Maša.GEN here was yesterday  
 pusto.  
 empty.N.SG  
 'Because of Petja's behavior, it was empty here yesterday.'

Turning to less abstract syntactic properties, Holders of evaluative and deontic modal predicatives further differ from adjuncts in allowing secondary predicates and various kinds of modifiers typical for arguments.

First, similarly to nominative subjects and direct objects and unlike, for instance, prepositional adjuncts (81), Holders are 'visible' to instrumental depictives (82).

- (81) a. Petja<sub>i</sub> uvidel Ivana<sub>k</sub> pjanym<sub>i/k</sub>.  
 Petja.NOM saw Ivan.ACC drunk.INS  
 'Petja saw Ivan drunk.'
- b. Petja<sub>i</sub> prišel iz-za / radi Ivana<sub>k</sub> pjanym<sub>i/\*k</sub>.  
 Petja.NOM came because of for Ivan drunk.INS  
 'Petja came because of Ivan drunk.'



- (82) a. Pjanym<sub>i</sub> Pete<sub>i</sub> važno / nel'zja [ostat'sja vmeste] /  
 drunk.INS Petja.DAT important.N.SG not.allowed.N.SG stay.INF together  
 [čtoby Anna ostalas'].  
 so that Anna.NOM stay.SUBJ  
 'When Peter is drunk it is important / not allowed for him to stay together / for  
 Anna to stay.'
- b. Pjanym<sub>i</sub> dlja Peti<sub>i</sub> važno [čto Anna ostalas'].  
 drunk.INS for Petja.GEN important.N.SG that Anna.NOM stayed  
 'When Peter is drunk it is important for him that Anna stayed.'

Second, Holders can control into *čtoby* rationale clauses and active participial constructions

(83).

- (83) a. Čtoby *ec<sub>i</sub>* ne zlit' otca, Maše<sub>i</sub> bylo važno,  
 so that NEG make.angry.INF father.ACC Maša.DAT was important.N.SG  
 čtoby Petja ušel do semi.  
 so that Petja.NOM leave.SUBJ by seven  
 'So that not to make the father angry, to Maša it was important that Petja would  
 leave by seven.'
- b. ?Čtoby *ec<sub>i</sub>* ne zlit' otca, dlja Maši<sub>i</sub> bylo  
 so that NEG make.angry.INF father.ACC for Maša.GEN was  
 važno, čtoby Petja ušel do semi.  
 important.N.SG so that Petja.NOM leave.SUBJ by seven  
 'So that not to make the father angry, to Maša it was important that Petja would  
 leave by seven.'
- c. *ec<sub>i</sub>* buduči dobroj, Maše<sub>i</sub> bylo važno, čtoby Petja  
 be.PTCP kind.INS Maša.DAT was important.N.SG so that Petja.NOM  
 prostil ejo.  
 forgive.SUBJ her.ACC  
 'Being kind, to Maša it was important that Petja would forgive her.'
- d. ?*ec<sub>i</sub>* buduči dobroj, dlja Masi<sub>i</sub> bylo važno, čtoby Petja  
 be.PTCP kind.INS for Maša.GEN was important.N.SG so that Petja.NOM  
 prostil ejo.  
 forgive.SUBJ her.ACC  
 'Being kind, to Maša it was important that Petja would forgive her.'

This behavior is considered characteristic of arguments (usually, external), and is not attested in the case of adjuncts (84).

- (84) Čtoby  $ec_i/*k$  ne zlit' otca, Petja<sub>i</sub> sdelal eto dlja Maši<sub>k</sub>.  
 so that NEG make.angry.INF father.ACC Petja.NOM did this for Maša.GEN  
 ‘Petja did this for Maša so as not to make father angry.’

The data presented in this subsection firmly demonstrate that, in their syntactic and semantic behavior, Holders are much closer to canonical DP arguments than to typical adjuncts. In the next subsection I will further show that Holders also pass most of the subject-hood diagnostics.

### Properties typical for subjects

The properties usually related to the subject status of a constituent (in structural terms, its positioning in Spec,TP) include binding into subject-oriented modifiers, such as *sam po sebe* ‘himself, on his own’ and *na udivlenie drug druga / na svojo udivlenie* ‘to each other’s / his own surprise’.<sup>9</sup>

As illustrated in (85), only the structural subject – regardless of its thematic role and merge position – is allowed as an antecedent for anaphors contained within the subject-oriented modifiers, while arguments remaining lower in the structure and adjuncts are illicit as potential binders.

- (85) a. Petja uvidel Mašu sam po sebe.  
 Petja.NOM saw Maša.ACC himself  
 ‘Petja himself saw Maša.’  
 b. \*Petja uvidel Mašu samu po sebe.  
 Petja.NOM saw Maša.ACC herself  
 Intended: ‘Petja saw Maša herself.’

---

9. Here, the term ‘subject’ is used to refer to a constituent that occupies the Spec,TP; recall from the discussion in Chapter 1, that, under this definition, non-nominative subjects occurs quite frequently in Russian. In a narrow sense, ‘subject’ is a nominative DP that agrees with a lexical / functional verb; see Schoorlemmer (1994), Moore and Perlmutter (2000), and Sigurðsson (2002) addressing the issue of (non-)nominative subjects in more detail.

- c. \*Petja prišel iz-za Maši samoj po sebe.  
 Petja.NOM came because of Maša.GEN herself  
 Intended: ‘Petja came because of Maša herself.’

In sentences with an evaluative / deontic modal predicatives, Holders (both dative DPs and *dlja* PPs) can bind reflexives and reciprocals within the subject-oriented modifiers.

- (86) a. Maše samoj po sebe važno pojti v kino.  
 Maša.DAT herself important.N.SG go.INF into cinema  
 ‘To Maša herself it is important to go to the cinema.’
- b. ?Dlja Maši samoj po sebe važno pojti v kino.  
 for Maša.GEN herself important.N.SG go.INF into cinema  
 ‘To Maša herself it is important to go to the cinema.’
- c. Na udivljenije drug druga, detjam važno pojti v kino.  
 on surprise each other children.DAT important.N.SG go.INF into cinema  
 ‘To each other’s surprise, to the children it is important to go to the cinema.’
- d. ?Na udivljenije drug druga, dlja detej važno pojti v kino.  
 on surprise each other for children.GEN important.N.SG go.INF into cinema  
 ‘To each other’s surprise, to the children it is important to go to the cinema.’


## 2.5.2 Structural position

### Holders as high applicatives


To accommodate a matrix Holder structurally I adopt Pylkkänen’s (2008) high applicative analysis.<sup>10</sup> In her monograph, Pylkkänen (2008), heavily inspired by Marantz (1984) and Kratzer (1996), draws a distinction between the following two kinds of noncore arguments: high (87) and low (88) applied objects.

10. As shown in Chapter 1 and Chapter 5, the (low) applicative approach can also be used to represent the structure of ditransitive predicates such as *dat’* ‘give’, *otpravit’* ‘send’, *rasskazat’* ‘tell’.

(87) *High applicatives*



(88) *Low applicatives*



High applicatives can be found, for instance, in Luganda (89a) and Albanian, while low applicatives are exemplified by double object constructions in English, Japanese and Korean (89b).

(89) a. *High applicatives in Luganda*

Mukasa ya-som-e-dde                      Katonga ekitabo.  
 Mukasa 3.SG.PST-read-APPL-PST Katonga book  
 ‘Mukasa read Katonga a book.’

b. *Low applicatives in Korean*

Totuk-i    Mary-hanthey panci-lul humchi-ess-ta.  
 thief-NOM Mary-DAT    ring-ACC steal-PST-PLAIN  
 ‘The thief stole a ring from Mary.’ (Literally: ‘The thief stole Mary a ring.’)  
 Hypothesized meaning: ‘The thief stole a ring and it was from Mary’s possession.’

As mentioned above, all applied objects are noncore participants; behaving themselves as

arguments, they typically alternate with prepositional phrases, and the latter often have the status of adjuncts.<sup>11</sup>

The difference between high and low applicatives lies in their semantic and structural properties. First, high applied objects are introduced similarly to an external argument: a thematic relation is established between an individual and the event described by the verb. In contrast, low applied objects are related directly to the Theme argument by the transfer-of-possession relation; the semantic representations for high and low applicative heads are given in (90).

- (90) a. High Appl<sup>0</sup>  
 $\lambda x.\lambda e.\text{Appl}(e, x)$
- b. Low Appl<sup>0</sup>  
 $\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f_{\langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle}.\lambda e.f(e, x) \ \& \ \text{theme}(e, x) \ \& \ \text{to/from-the-possession}(x, y)$

Second, high applicatives have a broader distribution, as their less restricted semantics allows them to co-occur with, first, inherently intransitive predicates (including unergatives), and, second, static verbs.<sup>12</sup> A couple of examples are given in (91) and (92); as can be seen here, English double object constructions behave as low applicatives, while the examples from Albanian include a high applicative.

- (91) *English*
- a. I baked him a cake.
- b. \*I ran him.
- c. \*I held him a bag.

- (92) *Albanian*
- a. Drita        i    poqi    Agimit    kek.  
 Drita.NOM CL baked Agim.DAT cake  
 ‘Drita baked Agim a cake.’

---

11. Note, however, that ‘often’ does not equal ‘always’: in some languages PPs corresponding to high and low applied objects also exhibit argumental properties; see, for instance, *to* PPs in English ditransitive constructions (Collins 2005, 2018) and *dlja* PP Holders in Russian (as demonstrated in this thesis).

12. Note, however, that from a cross-linguistic perspective high applicatives can be said to have a *narrower* distribution in the sense that there are languages that have few or even no high applicatives yet do have low applicatives (for instance, English, Japanese, Korean, etc.).

- b. I                    vrapova.  
 him.DAT.CL ran.1.SG  
 ‘I ran for him.’
- c. Agimi      i    mban Drites      çanten    time.  
 Agim.NOM CL holds Drita.DAT bag.ACC my  
 ‘Agim holds my bag for Drita.’

In addition to this, high applicatives, but not low applicatives, allow secondary predication ((93) vs. (94)). Pylkkänen (2008) accounts for this by proposing a decompositional semantic analysis for depictives and arguing that, as the state denoted by the depictive adjective is linked to the main event, they easily combine with Voice-type functional heads, but low Appl<sup>0</sup> is semantically too complex for them.

(93) *Albanian*

Drita      i    poqi Agimit      të    lodhur.  
 Drita.NOM CL baked Agim.DAT AGR tired

‘Drita baked for Agim while Agim was tired.’

(94) *Japanese*

\*Taroo-ga Hanako-ni    hadaka-de hon-o      yonda.  
 Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT naked      book-ACC read.PST

‘Taro read Hanako a book while she was naked.’

(False if Taro is not naked)

In Russian, dative Holders of evaluative / deontic modal predicatives exhibit all relevant properties of high applicatives: they (i) denote noncore participants, (ii) allow alternation with a prepositional phrase, (iii) combine with unaccusative predicates denoting states, and (iv) are visible as subjects for depictives (95). Furthermore, as demonstrated above, dative Holders pattern with external arguments merged above the main projection of a lexical predicate with respect to control into rationale clauses and active participial constructions (96).

(95) Pjanym<sub>i</sub> Pete<sub>i</sub> / dlja Peti<sub>i</sub> važno / nel'zja [čtoby  
 drunk.INS Petja.DAT for Petja.GEN important.N.SG not.allowed.N.SG so that  
 Anna ostalas'].  
 Anna.NOM stay.SUBJ

‘When Peter is drunk it is important / not allowed for him for Anna to stay.’


(96) a. Čtoby *ec<sub>i</sub>* ne zlit’ otca, Maše<sub>i</sub> / ?dlja Maši<sub>i</sub> bylo  
 so that NEG make.angry.INF father.ACC Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN was  
 važno, čtoby Petja ušel do semi.  
 important.N.SG so that Petja.NOM leave.SUBJ by seven  
 ‘So that not to make the father angry, to Maša it was important that Petja would  
 leave by seven.’

b. *ec<sub>i</sub>* buduči dobroj, Maše<sub>i</sub> / ?dlja Maši<sub>i</sub> bylo važno, čtoby  
 be.PTCP kind.INS Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN was important.N.SG so that  
 Petja prostil ejo.  
 Petja.NOM forgive.SUBJ her.ACC

‘Being kind, to Maša it was important that Petja would forgive her.’

Taking these properties into account, I propose the following structure for evaluative / deontic modal predicatives (97); I further assume that dative is assigned by Appl<sup>0</sup> under Spec-Head agreement (see Anagnostopoulou (2003), Svenonius (2006), and Wood (2010) for similar analyses).


(97)



In principle, it might be suggested instead that Holders are merged as lower internal arguments in the Spec,AP / Spec,ModP (98). For instance, a ‘dyadic unaccusative’ approach has

been adopted by M. Baker (2017) for verbal predicates with (only) two absolutive arguments in Burushaski (99).

(98) *A dyadic unaccusative structure*



(99) Jé ué tsum búT peesá a-yá-am.  
 I.ABS DEM.PL from much money.X.ABS 1.SG.O-obtain-PST.1.SG.S  
 ‘I obtained much money from them.’

Note, however, that Baker primarily adopts this structural representation to account for the peculiar Case assignment / agreement pattern in Burushaski, and offers little independent support, only mentioning that the subjects of all absolutive-absolutive verbs are nonagentive Experiencers / Possessors. However, as has been persuasively demonstrated by Pesetsky (1995) for several Indo-European languages, even among the predicates that assign Experiencer / other kinds of nonagentive thematic roles, genuinely dyadic unaccusative structures with two internal arguments – a specifier and a complement of a single lexical head – are extremely rare. For instance, after examining a wide variety of experiencer predicates in English, he concludes that only a few should be analyzed as sharing such a structure: *appeal to*, *matter to*, *occur to*.

With all these considerations in mind, I keep to the high applicative analysis for constructions with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative. The final part of this section will concern prepositional Holders.

### Prepositional Holders

Recall from the discussion of various argument properties of dative and *dlja* ‘for’ PP Holders in Section 2.5.1 that the latter mostly pattern with the former. To account for this behavior I propose to take a look at another DP / PP argument alternation, namely, *by* Agents in English passive constructions.



Demoted Agents of English passive predicates are famous for their ability to behave as arguments and not adjuncts; thus, they can control into rationale clauses and bind reflexives (100).<sup>13</sup>

- (100) a. The ship was sunk (by John) to collect the insurance.  
b. The magazines were sent by Mary<sub>i</sub> to herself<sub>i</sub>.

With respect to the merge position of an Agent, various analyses for English passive constructions usually proceed along one of the following lines: (i) a prepositional phrase is base-generated as the external argument itself, in Spec,vP (Collins 2018), or (ii) a prepositional phrase is an adjunct at the vP / VoiceP level that, due to its complex semantics, can supply its own argument to saturate the unsaturated Voice function (Bruening 2013; Legate 2014, a.o.).

An apparent concern for Collins' approach is the issue of thematic role assignment. Bruening bypasses this problem by analyzing *by* phrases as adjuncts and stipulating for them particular selectional properties and semantic representation.<sup>14</sup> Collins' solution is to consider *by* semantically vacuous, i.e. denoting an identity function, in which case, for instance, *by the children* becomes equivalent to *the children*.

I believe that, within the limits of the present research, either of these analyses will correctly capture most of the properties of the DP<sub>DAT</sub> / *dlja* PP Holders alternation in Russian. Furthermore, under Collins' analysis v<sup>0</sup> / Voice<sup>0</sup> is predicted to always project a (filled) Specifier position; as we will see in Chapter 4, this prediction is borne out in Russian sentences with a covert Holder, as the latter is always structurally present. Thus, I adopt Collins' (2018) structure (adapted to the high applicative approach), as shown in (101).<sup>15</sup>

---


13. Note that the ability of *by*-phrases to bind reflexives is questioned by C. Baker (1995) and Reed (2011), a.o. I follow Collins (2005) and den Dikken (2017) in considering examples similar to (100b) to be acceptable.

14. A similar view is advocated by Legate (2014) who proposes that *by* phrases are adjuncts that assign an initiator  $\theta$ -role to their DP complements that gets linked to the initiator  $\theta$ -role introduced by Voice.

15. As will be demonstrated in Section 3.6, prepositional Holders can establish obligatory control relations with the PRO subject of an embedded non-finite clause. It is a well established fact that PPs, in general, are capable of being controllers, see examples from English (i) and Russian in (ii).

(i) John pleaded [with Mary<sub>i</sub>] [PRO<sub>i</sub> to forgive him].

(101)



Finally, note that both types of Holders usually move into the structural subject position – Spec,TP, which is suggested by the fact that they exhibit several subject properties, such as the ability to bind into subject-oriented modifiers (102).

- (102) Maše / ?dlja Maši samoj po sebe važno pojti v kino.  
Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN herself important.N.SG go.INF into cinema  
'To Mary herself it is important to go to the cinema.'

As discussed briefly in the introductory chapter of this thesis, Russian, in general, offers a

- 
- (ii) Petja potreboval ot / u Maši<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> pomoč' emu].  
Petja.NOM demanded from at Maša.GEN help.INF him  
'Petja demanded from Maša to help him.'

The reader might question the suggested comparison of PP Holders in Russian and *by* Agents in English, since, as captured by the famous Visser's Generalization, subject control verbs often cannot be passivized (iii).

- (iii) a. \*It was tried by John<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> to take the medicine].  
b. \*Peter was promised by John<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> to take the medicine].

Note, however, that Visser's Generalization has been constantly argued against by many researchers, including Bach (1979), Bresnan (1982), Larson (1991), Sag and Pollard (1991), Cutrer (1993), and Landau (2000), to name a few; the major challenge for the generalization is control in impersonal passive (iv).

- (iv) a. It was decided to move forward.  
b. It was hoped to provide an accessible and more effective service.

To account for these cases, a revised version of the generalization has been proposed by van Urk (2011): Implicit subjects cannot control if T agrees with a referential DP. Taking this into account together with the fact that Russian sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative exhibit the 'default' neuter.sg agreement, I assume that the comparison of PP Holders with implicit subjects is not contradictory.

range of constructions with non-nominative subjects. In other words, in many cases, despite the fact that a DP does not bear nominative case and does not agree with the matrix verb, it still can be shown to occupy the higher, Spec,TP position and be the most prominent element of a sentence (Bailyn 2012).

## 2.6 Summary

The main goal of this chapter was to establish the empirical background by presenting the two classes of Russian predicatives that will become central for the discussion of DP / PRO alternation: evaluative predicatives, such as *važno* ‘important’, *interesno* ‘interesting’, and deontic modals (*možno* ‘allowed’, *nužno* ‘necessary’), which embed a clause and allow a DP<sub>DAT</sub> / prepositional Holder.

First, I discussed the semantic and syntactic distribution of these items, drawing a parallel between adjectival predicatives and short adjectives. Second, I thoroughly examined the properties of the clausal argument and the matrix Holder, determining their syntactic status. In particular, I argued that (i) evaluatives and deontic modals are unaccusative predicates that select a clausal complement, and (ii) the matrix Holder is a noncore argument introduced by a high applicative head. The developed structure for the two classes of predicatives under discussion will be used in the next chapters, which focus on sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal and an embedded non-finite clause.

# Chapter 3

## Predicatives and non-finite clauses: DP / RPO alternation

### 3.1 Overview of the problem

Having described general syntactic properties of sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative, I will now focus on constructions with a dative DP and an embedded non-finite clause and address the question of the relations between the DP and the understood embedded subject. There are three and a half theoretically possible options, listed below.

1. The dative DP and a silent embedded subject are distinct syntactic items that, because of some pragmatic factors, are sometimes, though not always, coreferential (non-obligatory control or no control, adopting Landau's (2013) terminology).
2. The dative DP and a silent embedded subject (PRO) are distinct syntactic items, yet they must be coreferential, as the former obligatorily controls the later.
3. The dative DP is the embedded subject itself:
  - the dative DP obligatorily moves into a matrix A-position (Raising-to-Object),
  - the dative DP stays within its original clause (ECM-like).

A non-obligatory control (NOC) and no control analyses for the silent embedded subject in sentences with a matrix predicative are ruled out by the fact that the dative DP must

always be coreferential with the understood subject of the embedded clause. To ensure that coreference is, indeed, required, I test the three environments typical for non-obligatory control, as suggested by Landau (2013): (i) arbitrary control, (ii) non-local control, and (iii) non-c-commanding control.

As illustrated in (103), sentences with a matrix predicative, a dative DP and an embedded non-finite clause cannot appear in the above mentioned configurations and obligatory coreference is forced whenever it is possible: for instance, in (103b) and (103c) the referent of the embedded subject cannot be established pragmatically and is determined by a local c-commanding antecedent.<sup>1</sup> In the following sections, I will compare sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative and constructions with a matrix predicative of emotional evaluation to provide minimal pairs.

(103) a. *Arbitrary*

\*Pete<sub>k</sub> grustno / važno / možno PRO<sub>arb</sub> vyxodit' замуž  
 Petja.DAT sad.N.SG important.N.SG allowed.N.SG marry.INF  
 do vosemnadcati let.  
 before eighteen years

Intended: 'For Peter it is sad / important / allowed for somebody to get married younger than 18 years old.'

b. *Non-local*

Maša<sub>i</sub> skazala, čto Anne<sub>k</sub> grustno / važno / možno  
 Maša.NOM said that Anna.DAT sad.N.SG important.N.SG allowed.N.SG  
*ec<sub>i\*/j/k</sub>* ujtí.  
 leave.INF

'Maša said that for Anna it was sad / important / allowed to leave.'

c. *Non-c-commanding*

[Kollegam Maši<sub>k</sub>]<sub>i</sub> grustno / važno / možno *ec<sub>i\*/j/k</sub>*  
 colleagues.DAT Maša.GEN sad.N.SG important.N.SG allowed.N.SG  
 ujtí.  
 leave.INF

'For Maša's colleagues it is sad / important / allowed to leave.'

---

1. Note that in (103a), the particular 'feminine' variant of the verb 'marry' – *vyxodit' замуž* – excludes *Ivan* (male) from the set of potential embedded Agents and eliminates the possibility of partial control.

This contrasts with the behavior of non-finite subject clauses, where non-obligatory control is attested (104), and falls in line with Landau’s (2013) assumption that OC is typical for complement clauses while NOC can be found in subject and adjunct infinitives.

(104) a. *Arbitrary*

PRO<sub>arb</sub> vyxodit’ zamůž do vosemnadcati let – xorošo.  
 marry.INF before eighteen years good.N.SG  
 ‘To get married younger than 18 years old is good.’

b. *Non-local*

Maša<sub>i</sub> skazala, čto ec<sub>i</sub> ujti – xorošo.  
 Maša.NOM said that leave.INF good.N.SG  
 ‘Maša said that to leave was good.’

c. *Non-c-commanding*

[Kollegi Maši<sub>k</sub>]<sub>i</sub> sčitajut, čto ec<sub>i/j/k</sub> ujti – xorošo.  
 colleagues.NOM Maša.GEN believe that leave.INF good.N.SG  
 Maša’s colleagues believe that to leave is good.

Furthermore, as shown in (105a), the embedded zero subject can only receive a bound variable interpretation under ellipsis. Impossibility of a strict reading, normally available for elided pronouns (105b), suggests that in (105a) the subject position is occupied by a variable and not *pro*.

(105) a. Maše<sub>i</sub> grustno / važno / možno ec<sub>i</sub> ujti i  
 Maša.DAT sad.N.SG important.N.SG allowed.N.SG leave.INF and  
 Anne tože.  
 Anna.DAT too

Sloppy reading: ‘For Maša it was sad / important / allowed to leave and for Anna it was sad / important / allowed to leave too.’

Strict reading, not available: ‘For Maša it was sad / important / allowed to leave and, from Anna’s point of view, it was sad / important / allowed for Maša to leave too.’

b. Maša<sub>i</sub> uvidela ejo<sub>i/k</sub> podarok i Anna tože.  
 Maša.NOM saw her present.ACC and Anna.NOM too

Sloppy reading: ‘Maša saw her present and Anna saw her own present too.’

Strict reading: ‘Maša saw her present and Anna saw this present too.’

Ensuring that the covert embedded subject is not pronominal, we are left with the following options: it can either be an obligatorily controlled PRO or an overt DP<sub>DAT</sub> itself / a trace left behind by the DP's movement into a higher clause. In what follows, I will show that both the PRO option and the overt subject option are attested, as the dative DP that appears on the surface can, in fact, be base-generated either as a matrix constituent (the controller) or as an argument of the embedded predicate. I will further demonstrate that an overt referential embedded subject does not have to undergo A-movement into the matrix clause, thus discarding a potential analysis in terms of Subject-to-Object raising.

## 3.2 The dative DP belongs to the embedded clause

### 3.2.1 The dative DP is an embedded argument

Let us start with raising diagnostics. The traditional tests for subject raising fall into two categories: (i) those proving that the DP under consideration is base-generated as the embedded subject and gets its thematic role from the embedded predicate, and (ii) those demonstrating that the DP actually moves into the matrix clause. In this subsection I will consider the first group of diagnostics and I will turn to the second group in the next subsections.

I will approach sentences with a matrix predicative and an embedded non-finite clause with the well-known diagnostics for an overt embedded subject: the idiom chunks, voice transparency and sentience tests. Another commonly used diagnostic – insertion of an expletive pronoun – cannot be applied, since, in Russian, there are no overt expletive pronouns. See Franks (1990) and Moore and Perlmutter (2000), a.o., for a discussion of null expletives in Slavic languages.

#### Idiom chunk test

The idea behind the idiom chunk test is that idiom chunks (i.e. parts of an idiomatic expression) are only interpretable when they are thematically related to the idiomatic predicate. Compare, for instance, (106a) and (106b): in the first case, *the cat* is a matrix argument unrelated to the embedded predicate and cannot be interpreted as a part of the idiom *the cat is out of the bag* meaning ‘the secrets have been revealed’. In contrast, in the second sentence

*the cat* is semantically unrelated to the matrix predicate *seem* (note also ungrammaticality of the sentence *The cat seems.*) and belongs to the embedded clause; thus, the idiomatic reading is available.

- (106) a. The cat decided to be out of the bag.  
 Idiomatic reading not available
- b. The cat seems to be out of the bag.  
 Idiomatic: ‘It seems that the secrets have been revealed’

For another example, let us take a look at Russian sentences with a matrix predicative of emotional evaluation; to apply the idiom chunk test, I use the idiom *černaja koška (ne) probežit meždu nami*, literally translated as ‘a black cat will (not) run between us’.<sup>2</sup> As shown in (107), embedded under *grustno* ‘sad’ or *radostno* ‘cheerful’, the phrase loses its idiomatic interpretation and ‘the black cat’ can only be interpreted as a matrix Experiencer.

- (107) Černoj koške budet grustno / radostno probežat’ meždu nami.  
 black cat.DAT be.NPST sad.N.SG cheerful.N.SG run.INF between us  
 Only literally: ‘For a black cat it will be sad / cheerful to run between us.’  
 Idiomatic reading not available: ‘It will be sad / cheerful for us to quarrel.’

If, however, the same phrase is embedded under an evaluative predicative or a deontic modal, the idiomatic reading is retained (108), which implies that ‘a black cat’ is base-generated as a part of the idiom and is thematically related to the embedded predicate.

- (108) a. Očen’ važno [černoj koške ne probegat’ meždu nami].  
 very important.N.SG black cat.DAT NEG run.INF between us  
 Literally: ‘It is very important for a black cat not to run between us.’  
 Idiomatic reading available: ‘It is very important for us not to quarrel.’

---

2. Another idiom that can be used for this test is *jabloko padaet nedaleko ot jabloni* ‘like father, like son’, literally translated as ‘an apple falls not far from an apple tree’ (i).

- (i) V ix semje važno bylo jabloku upast’ nedaleko ot jabloni.  
 in their family important.N.SG was apple.DAT fall.INF close from apple tree  
 Idiomatic reading available: ‘In their family it was important for the children to be like their parents.’



- b. Černoj koške nel'zja bylo probegat' meždu nami  
 black cat.DAT not.allowed.N.SG was run.INF between us  
 Literally: 'A black cat is not allowed to run between us.'  
 Idiomatic reading available: 'We were not allowed to quarrel.'

Note that this does not work for all idioms in all contexts. The same phrase *černaja koška probežala meždu nami* 'a black cat run between us' does not retain its idiomatic interpretation in (109) when embedded under a different modal predicative.

- (109) Černoj koške možno bylo probežat' meždu nami.  
 black cat.DAT allowed.N.SG run.INF between us  
 Literally: 'A black cat is allowed to run between us.'  
 Idiomatic reading not available: 'We are allowed to quarrel.'

This can be explained, however, from a pragmatic point of view: as shown in (110) it is often difficult to combine an idiom or a semantically equivalent non-idiomatic expression that describes a (usually) non-volitional act with a deontic modal, especially when the former involves a first / second person participant.<sup>3</sup>

---

3. The idiomatic readings in (109) and (110) become easier to obtain if a modifier is added to the modal predicate, whose interpretation is rather shifted towards circumstantial modality (sentences similar to (i) can be found in colloquial Russian).

- (i) a. %Černoj koške absoljutno možno probežat' meždu nami.  
 black cat.DAT absolutely allowed.N.SG run.INF between us  
 Idiomatic: 'We are absolutely allowed to quarrel.'
- b. Absoljutno možno, čtoby černaja koška probežala meždu nami.  
 absolutely allowed.N.SG so that black cat.NOM run.SUBJ between us  
 Idiomatic: 'It is absolutely allowed for us to quarrel.'
- c. Absoljutno možno, čtoby my possorilis'.  
 absolutely allowed.N.SG so that we.NOM quarrel.SUBJ  
 'It is absolutely allowed that we quarrel.'

Similar behavior of embedded idiomatic expressions and modals can be found, for instance in English (ii). The question of various interfering factors requires further investigation, beyond the limits of this thesis.

- (ii) a. We are perfectly allowed to quarrel.  
 b. It's perfectly allowed for us to quarrel.

- (110) a. Možno,        čtoby   černaja koška   probežala meždu nami.  
 allowed.N.SG so that black   cat.NOM run.SUBJ between us  
 Literally: ‘It is allowed that a black cat run between us.’  
 Idiomatic reading questionable: ‘It is allowed for us to quarrel.’
- b. #Možno,        čtoby   my        possorilis’.  
 allowed.N.SG so that we.NOM quarrel.SUBJ  
 ‘It is allowed that we quarrel.’

### Voice transparency

The voice transparency diagnostic or, as it is often referred to, the embedded passivization test, relies on the fact that passivization of a predicate does not result in a truth-conditional difference between the active and the passive constructions. Consider the two sentences in (111a) and (111b), which are semantically identical. This can be easily explained if we assume that, in both cases, ‘the doctor’ and ‘Mary’ are, in fact, arguments of the embedded predicate (‘examine’), and the two sentences describe the same event (paraphrased in (111c)).

- (111) a. The doctor is likely to examine Mary. (= b)  
 b. Mary is likely to be examined by the doctor. (= a)  
 c. It is likely that the doctor will examine Mary / that Mary will be examined by the doctor.

In contrast, (112a) and (112b) receive different interpretations, as ‘the doctor’ and ‘Mary’ are distinct arguments of the matrix predicate.

- (112) a. The doctor wants to examine Mary. ( $\neq$  b)  
 b. Mary wants to be examined by the doctor. ( $\neq$  a)

In Russian, the voice transparency diagnostic yields different results for predicatives of emotional evaluation, on the one hand, and evaluative / deontic modal predicatives, on the other hand. Embedded under a predicative of emotional evaluation, active voice and the corresponding passive voice constructions receive completely different readings (113), since in each of these cases there is a different matrix Experiencer.

- (113) a. Mal'čiku bylo grustno / radostno byt' ubitym Voldemortom.  
 boy.DAT was sad.N.SG cheerful.N.SG be.INF kill.PTCP Voldemort.INS  
 'For the boy it was sad / cheerful to be killed by Voldemort.' ( $\neq$  b)
- b. Voldemortu bylo grustno / radostno ubivat' mal'čika.  
 Voldemort.DAT was sad.N.SG cheerful.N.SG kill.INF boy.ACC  
 'For Voldemort it was sad / cheerful to kill the boy.' ( $\neq$  a)

In turn, sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative and an embedded passive construction can get the same interpretation as parallel sentences with an embedded active construction. Compare (114a) and (114b): if the dative DPs in these examples – ‘the boy’ and ‘Voldemort’ – are interpreted as attitude / obligation holders, the two sentences receive distinct readings. However, it is also possible to interpret these DPs as embedded participants, while the true Holders remain implicit and, in this case, the sentences are equivalent.

- (114) a. Mal'čiku bylo važno / nado byt' ubitym  
 boy.DAT was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG be.INF kill.PTCP  
 Voldemortom.  
 Voldemort.INS  
 (i) 'To the boy it was important to be killed by Voldemort.' ( $\neq$  b)  
 (ii) 'It was important that the boy be killed by Voldemort.' (= b)
- b. Voldemortu bylo važno / nado ubit' mal'čika.  
 Voldemort.DAT was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG kill.INF boy.ACC  
 (i) 'To Voldemort it was important to kill the boy.' ( $\neq$  a)  
 (ii) 'It was important that Voldemort kill the boy.' (= a)

The ambiguity itself, of course, should be accounted for, and I will address it later; for now, it is important to focus on the possible equivalency of (114a) and (114b), in contrast with the unambiguously distinct readings of the examples in (113).

## Sentience

Finally, Experiencers and Holders are expected to denote sentient beings or groups of beings, even if grammatically they are not necessarily [+Animate] DPs (for instance, inanimate nouns like *komanda* ‘team’, *gruppa* ‘group’, or *klass* ‘class’, when referring to groups of

humans, are all acceptable). This restriction must be obeyed by a dative DP used together with a matrix predicative of emotional evaluation (115).

- (115) a. \*Grustno stroitel'stvu zakončit'sa k koncu goda  
 sad.N.SG construction.DAT complete.INF by end of year  
 Intended: 'It is sad for the construction to be complete by the end of the year.'
- b. \*Grustno ruke ne byt' zalečenoj.  
 sad.N.SG arm.DAT NEG be.INF heal.PTCP  
 Intended: 'It is sad for the arm not to be healed.'

However, the restriction can be violated in the case of the other two types of predicatives under consideration. Thus, the dative DP appearing in a sentence with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative can refer to a non-sentient inanimate object or an event. In the examples in (116), 'construction' and 'arm' cannot be interpreted as matrix Holders and unambiguously receive their thematic roles from an embedded predicate.

- (116) a. Važno stroitel'stvu zakončit'sja k koncu goda  
 important.N.SG construction.DAT complete.INF by end year  
 'It is important that the construction will be complete by the end of the year.'
- b. Važno ruke byt' zalečenoj kak možno ran'se  
 important.N.SG arm.DAT be.INF heal.PTCP as soon as possible  
 'It is important that the arm will be healed as soon as possible.'
- c. Stroitel'stvu nado zakončit'sja k martu.  
 construction.DAT necessary.N.SG complete.INF by March  
 'The construction must be complete by March.'

The three properties of sentences with evaluative / deontic modal predicatives, a dative DP and an embedded non-finite clause described above stem from the single fact that, in these cases, the DP can be base-generated as an argument of the embedded predicate, while, in the case of a matrix predicative of emotional evaluation, the dative DP is unambiguously a matrix argument (Experiencer). The question remains whether an overt embedded subject can stay within its initial clause or if it obligatorily moves into a matrix position. I will turn to this issue in the next subsection.

### 3.2.2 The dative DP can stay within the embedded clause

I argue that a dative DP interpreted as an argument of the embedded clause can stay within this clause and does not have to undergo A-movement into a matrix position. Support for this claim comes from the distribution of indefinite non-specific *-nibud'* pronouns, the licensing of negative concord items (NCIs), quantifier scope and the positioning of adjuncts.

In this section, I will continue comparing examples with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative with parallel sentences with a matrix predicative of emotional evaluation. Since it has already been established that predicatives of emotional evaluation do not embed non-finite clauses with referential subjects, the comparison will help us to determine which properties are characteristic of predicatives in general.

#### Distribution of indefinite pronouns

A first piece of support for the ‘low subject’ analysis comes from the behavior of Russian indefinite non-specific pronouns derived with the *-nibud'* suffix.

In affirmative sentences with a matrix predicative, *-nibud'* pronouns are normally allowed within an embedded clause where they scope narrowly; however, they cannot appear as a matrix constituent (117). As suggested by Haspelmath (1997) and Yanovich (2005), non-specific *-nibud'* indefinites must be licensed by an intensional operator, which, in the grammatical examples below, is presumably introduced by a matrix predicative which c-commands the clausal constituent.

- (117) a. Maše budet grustno slučajno udarit' kogo-nibud'.  
Maša.DAT be.NPST sad.N.SG accidentally hit.INF someone.ACC  
‘For Maša it will be sad to hit someone accidentally.’
- b. \*Komu-nibud' budet grustno slučajno udarit' Mašu.  
someone.DAT be.NPST sad.N.SG accidentally hit.INF Maša.ACC  
Intended: ‘For someone it will be sad to accidentally hit Maša.’

Crucially for the present discussion, a *-nibud'* pronoun is grammatical as a dative DP in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative (118), which suggests that, in these cases, the pronoun is merged and licensed within the embedded clause.

- (118) a. *Vážno komu-nibud' ostat'sja.*  
 important.N.SG someone.DAT stay.INF  
 'It is important for someone to stay.'
- b. *Nado komu-nibud' ostat'sja.*  
 necessary.N.SG someone.DAT stay.INF  
 'It is necessary for someone to stay.'

Note that an evaluative / deontic modal on its own cannot license a *-nibud'* pronoun, as illustrated by the ungrammatical affirmative sentences in (119) with adjectival predicates.

- (119) a. \**Priključenie / eto vážno komu-nibud'.*  
 adventure.NOM this important.N.SG someone.DAT  
 Intended: 'An adventure / this is important for someone.'
- b. \**Komu-nibud' nužno priključenie / eto.*  
 someone.DAT necessary.N.SG adventure.NOM this  
 Intended: 'For someone an adventure / this is necessary.'

### Licensing of negative concord items

With regard to the licensing of negative concord items (NCIs), we can first take a look at NCIs in the embedded environments. In Russian, negative concord items are proper *n*-words, adopting the terminology coined in Laka (1990): they usually appear together with a clausemate negation and can also be used in fragment answers (120).

- (120) a. *Nikto \*(ne) kupil čaj.*  
 nobody.NOM NEG bought tea.ACC  
 'Nobody bought tea.'
- b. *Petja \*(ne) kupil ničego.*  
 Petja.NOM NEG bought nothing.GEN  
 'Petja bought nothing.'
- c. *Kogo ty priglasil? Nikogo.*  
 who.ACC you.NOM invited nobody.GEN  
 'Who did you invite? Nobody.'

In a complex sentence, an embedded NCI raised to the left periphery of a non-finite clause can be licensed by the matrix negative particle even if there is no local (embedded) negation

(121a, 121b). As illustrated in (121c) and (121d), licensing is impossible if the NCI is not at the edge and only indefinite pronouns of positive polarity are allowed in this case.

- (121) a. Maša ne zastavljala Petju [nikomu pokupat' podarki].  
 Maša.NOM NEG forced Petja.ACC nobody.DAT buy.INF presents.ACC  
 'Maša did not force Petja to buy presents for anybody.'
- b. Maše ne nado [nikomu pokupat' podarki].  
 Maša.DAT NEG necessary.N.SG nobody.DAT buy.INF presents.ACC  
 'For Maša it is not necessary to buy presents for anybody.'
- c. Maša ne zastavljala Petju [pokupat' \*nikomu /  
 Maša.NOM NEG forced Petja.ACC buy.INF nobody.DAT  
 komu-nibud' podarki].  
 somebody.DAT presents.ACC  
 'Maša did not force Petja to buy presents for anybody.'
- d. Maše ne nado [pokupat' \*nikomu / komu-nibud'  
 Maša.DAT NEG necessary.N.SG buy.INF nobody.DAT somebody.DAT  
 podarki].  
 presents.ACC  
 'For Maša it is not necessary to buy presents for anybody.'

An embedded NCI, licensed by the matrix negation, can also appear in sentences with an evaluative / deontic modal predicative and a dative DP. However, as demonstrated in (122) for the predicatives *važno* 'important' and *nado* 'necessary', the dative DP cannot intervene between the NCI and the matrix clause, and must linearly follow it. Assuming that NCIs must always be at the edge of an embedded clause, we can conclude that ungrammaticality of the negative pronouns in (122b) is due to the fact that the dative DP, located within an embedded clause, occupies the necessary position and blocks the licensing.

- (122) a. Ne bylo tak už važno [nikem rane byt'  
 NEG was so PTCL important.N.SG nobody.INS wound.DAT be.INF  
 zalečenoj].  
 heal.PTCP  
 'It was not important for the wound to be healed by anybody.'

- b. Ne bylo tak už      vážno                      [rane                      (\*nikem)              byt'  
 neg was so PTCL important.N.SG wound.DAT nobody.INS be.INF  
 (\*nikem)              zalečennoj].  
 nobody.INS heal.PTCP  
 Intended: 'It was not important for the wound to be healed by anybody.'
- c. Ne nado                      bylo [nikem              rane              byt'              zalečennoj].  
 neg necessary.N.SG was nobody.INS wound.DAT be.INF heal.PTCP  
 'The wound did not need to be healed by anybody.'
- d. Ne nado                      bylo [rane                      (\*nikem)              byt'              (\*nikem)  
 neg necessary.N.SG was wound.DAT nobody.INS be.INF nobody.INS  
 zalečennoj].  
 heal.PTCP  
 'The wound did not need to be healed by anybody.'

The second piece of support comes from the behavior of matrix NCIs. As expected, matrix NCIs cannot be licensed by an embedded negation (123).

- (123) a. \*Maša              zastavila nikogo              ne uxodit'.  
 Maša.NOM forced nobody.ACC NEG leave.INF  
 Intended, literally: 'Maša forced nobody not to leave.'
- b. \*Nikomu              udobno                      ne uxodit'.  
 nobody.DAT convenient.N.SG NEG leave.INF  
 Intended, literally: 'For nobody it is convenient not to leave.'

However, in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative, a dative DP interpreted as the embedded subject can be an NCI (see, for instance, *ničemu* 'nothing.DAT' and *nikomu* 'nobody.DAT' in (124)) even when there is no matrix negation.

- (124) a. Očen' važno                      [ničemu              ne upast'].  
 very important.N.SG nothing.DAT NEG fall.INF  
 'It is important that nothing will fall.'
- b. Nado                      [nikomu              ne poterjatsja].  
 necessary.N.SG nobody.DAT NEG get.lost.INF  
 'For everybody it is necessary not to get lost.'

In sentences similar to (124), there must be a negation in the subordinate clause; it is this embedded negation that licenses an NCI, and since such licensing requires local c-command,



the NCI must itself be within the subordinate clause.<sup>4</sup>

## Quantifier scope

Additional support comes from the behavior of QPs. Normally, a QP embedded into a lower non-finite clause cannot scopally interact with matrix QPs, in the sense that it cannot scope above them. This is demonstrated in (125), where a universal QP merged within the embedded non-finite / finite clause cannot scope above an existential matrix QP, although, in principle, inverse scope is allowed in Russian (see Ionin and Luchkina (2018) for an extensive

---

4. At the end of this section I will briefly discuss the possibility of A-bar movement of an embedded overt subject into a matrix clause. In short, an embedded negative concord subject that is already properly licensed can be further topicalized or focalized (i).

- (i) a. NIKOMU nado [ne poterjatsja].  
 nobody.DAT necessary.N.SG NEG get.lost.INF  
 ‘For EVERYBODY it is necessary not to get lost.’ (focus)

It is almost impossible to demonstrate that an NCI licensed within its embedded clause cannot raise into an A-position in a matrix clause, as no cases of long-distance raising to subject / object have been reported in Russian. However, Stepanov (2007), following Schoorlemmer (1994), argues that the modal verb *moč’* ‘can, may’, which can receive both epistemic and deontic interpretations, is a functional predicate in a monoclausal construction (ii) (see also Wurmbrand (2001) for an analysis of modal verbs in English in terms of functional restructuring). Importantly, in these constructions two positions are available for negation: it can be high, scoping above the modal, or low, scoping above the lexical predicate (iib).

- (ii) a. Ty možeš ne sjest’ kuricu.  
 you.NOM can.NPST.2.SG NEG eat.INF chicken.ACC  
 ‘You are able / allowed not to eat the chicken.’  
 b. Ty ne možeš ne sjest’ kuricu.  
 you.NOM NEG can.NPST.2.SG NEG eat.INF chicken.ACC  
 ‘You are not able / allowed not to eat the chicken.’

The lower negation can license a negative concord item in the object / indirect object position, however, it cannot license the subject, which, according to Stepanov (2007) is merged as an argument of the lexical predicate and raises to the matrix subject position (iii).

- (iii) a. Ty možeš ne est’ ničego.  
 you.NOM can.NPST.2.SG NEG eat.INF nothing.GEN  
 ‘You are able / allowed not to eat anything.’  
 b. \*Nikto možet ne est’ kuricu.  
 nobody.NOM can.NPST.2.SG NEG eat.INF chicken.ACC  
 Intended: ‘Anybody is able / allowed not to eat the chicken.’

Despite the limitations of the argument, this behavior could still be considered supporting the claim that a negative concord item cannot undergo A-movement out of its local licensing domain.

discussion of the problem and experimental data).

- (125) a. Kak minimum odnoj devočke radostno [ponravit'sja každomu mal'čiku].  
 at least one girl.DAT cheerful.N.SG be.liked.INF every boy.DAT  
 'For at least one girl it is cheerful to be liked by every boy.'  
 at least one > every, \*every > at least one
- b. Kak minimum dlja odnoj devočki važno / nado  
 at least for one girl.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG  
 [ponravit'sja každomu mal'čiku].  
 be.liked.INF every boy.DAT  
 'For at least one girl it is important / necessary to be liked by every boy.'  
 at least one > every, \*every > at least one
- c. Kak minimum odnoj devočke važno / nado, [čtoby  
 at least one girl.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG so that  
 ona ponravilas' každomu mal'čiku].  
 she.NOM be.liked.SUBJ every boy.DAT  
 'For at least one girl it is important / necessary that she would be liked by every  
 boy.'  
 at least one > every, \*every > at least one
- d. Kak minimum odnoj devočke važno / nado, [čtoby každyj  
 at least one girl.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG so that every  
 mal'čik poljubil ejo].  
 boy.NOM liked.SUBJ her.ACC  
 'For at least one girl it is important / necessary that every boy would like her.'  
 at least one > every, \*every > at least one

At the same time, if a QP that we see on the surface is itself merged within the embedded clause, we would expect it to interact with other embedded QPs; this prediction is borne out for the sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative under consideration (126).

- (126) Važno / nado [kak minimum odnoj knige ponravit'sja  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG at least one book.DAT be.liked.INF  
 každomu učeniku].  
 every student.DAT  
 'It is important / necessary that at least one book would be liked by every student.'  
 at least one > every, every > at least one

## Placement of adjuncts

Finally, the adjunct placement diagnostic is applicable to the Russian data. In Russian, relatively unrestricted adjunct scrambling is attested within a single clause, even though adjunct movement across a clausal boundary is normally allowed only into a focus / topic position at the left periphery ((127), see Bailyn (2003) on scrambling in Russian).

- (127) a. (včera) Maša (včera) pročítala (včera) etu knigu (včera).  
yesterday Maša.NOM yesterday read yesterday this book.ACC yesterday  
'Maša read this book yesterday.'
- b. Maša (\*zavtra) zastavila (\*zavtra) Petju (zavtra) poexat'  
Maša.NOM tomorrow forced tomorrow Petja.ACC tomorrow go.INF  
(zavtra) tuda (zavtra).  
tomorrow there tomorrow  
'Maša forced Petja to go there tomorrow.'

As illustrated in (128), in case of a matrix predicative and an embedded finite clause, matrix adjuncts can also be linearized after a dative DP or between a dative DP and the predicate.

- (128) a. Očen' važno bylo Maše včera, čto Anna ušla.  
very important.N.SG was Maša.DAT yesterday that Anna.NOM left  
'Yesterday it was very important for Maša that Anna had left.'
- b. Očen' važno bylo včera Maše, čto Anna ušla.  
very important.N.SG was yesterday Maša.DAT that Anna.NOM left  
'Yesterday it was very important for Maša that Anna had left.' (= a)

However, in cases of non-finite embedding, an adjunct inserted between a dative DP unambiguously interpreted as the embedded subject and the rest of the infinitival clause can modify only the embedded predicate and not the matrix one (129).

- (129) a. Ešče včera bylo važno / nado rane zažit'  
just yesterday was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG wound.DAT heal.INF  
kak možno bystree.  
as soon as possible  
'Just yesterday it was important / necessary that the wound would heal asap.'

- b. Važno / nado bylo rane ešče včera zažit'.  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG was wound.DAT already yesterday heal.INF  
 Only: 'It was important / necessary that the wound would have healed already yesterday.'  
 Not available: 'Already yesterday it was important / necessary that the wound would heal.'

In contrast, an adjunct preceding the dative DP can be interpreted as either matrix or embedded (130).

- (130) Važno / nado bylo ešče včera rane zažit'.  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG was just yesterday wound.DAT heal.INF  
 (i) 'Just yesterday is was important / necessary that the wound would heal.'  
 (ii) 'It was important / necessary that the wound would have healed already yesterday.'

Notice that in the case of a matrix predicative of emotional evaluation, an adjunct positioned between a dative Experiencer and an embedded clause can also be related to each of the predicates (131).

- (131) Grustno bylo Maše včera uežžat'.  
 sad.N.SG was Maša.DAT yesterday leave.INF  
 (i) 'Yesterday it was sad that Maša would leave.'  
 (ii) 'It was sad that Maša would leave yesterday.'

Taking all these data into account, we can infer that the dative DP in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative can be base-generated within the embedded non-finite clause and, crucially, can stay within this clause. Although further subject movement into the matrix clause is possible (for instance, A-bar movement under focalization or topicalization (132)), it is not obligatory.

- (132)  $\text{Projekt}_i$  /  $\text{PROJEKT}_i$        $\text{važno}$       /  $\text{nado}$        $[\text{t}_i \text{ zakončit'sja}$   
 project.DAT    project.DAT.FOC important.N.SG    necessary.N.SG    complete.INF  
 k ponedel'niku].  
 by Monday  
 'It is important / necessary for the project to be finished by Monday.'  
 ('project' can be the focus)

Non-sentient DPs in (132) do not occupy the structural A-position, as demonstrated, for instance, by their inability to serve as subjects for matrix depictives (133a) and control into matrix active participles (133b).

- (133) a. \* $\text{Nezaveršonnym}$ ,  $\text{projekt}_i$        $\text{važno}$        $\text{bylo}$   $[\text{t}_i \text{ zakončit'sja}$  k  
 incomplete.INS    project.DAT important.N.SG    was    complete.INF by  
 ponedel'niku].  
 Monday  
 Intended: 'When the project was incomplete, it was important to finish it by  
 Monday.'
- b. \* $\text{Buduči}$   $\text{nezaveršonnym}$ ,  $\text{projekt}_i$        $\text{važno}$        $\text{bylo}$   $[\text{t}_i \text{ zakončit'sja}$  k  
 be.PTCP incomplete.INS    project.DAT important.N.SG    was    complete.INF by  
 ponedel'niku].  
 Monday  
 Intended: 'Being incomplete, it was important for the project to be finished by  
 Monday.'

### 3.2.3 Are predicatives raising predicates? Ambiguous datives

The data presented in the previous subsections point towards an ECM-style analysis for sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative, in contrast with constructions with a matrix predicative of emotional evaluation. Recall that, on the one hand, the dative DP under consideration can be base generated as an argument of the embedded predicate, and, on the other hand, there is no support for obligatory subject raising.<sup>5</sup>

5. Note that I am using the term 'ECM' rather tentatively at this point; recall the example of an ECM construction in English, discussed in Chapter 1 and reproduced here in (i). As was initially proposed by Chomsky (1981), in cases similar to (i), a matrix verb has an exceptional inherent ability to assign Case to the embedded subject. At this point, it is not yet clear if in the Russian sentences with an overt referential

The situation, however, is more complex. As I will show in the remaining part of this section, sentences with evaluative / deontic modal predicatives can still pass obligatory control diagnostics and the subject position of an embedded non-finite clause can be occupied either by a referential DP or PRO. Under the control configuration, the dative DP is interpreted as a matrix Holder and controls the silent embedded subject.

It has been already demonstrated above in the examples with embedded voice transformations (114) that, at least in some cases, the dative DP seems to be ambiguous between being a ‘proper’ embedded argument and denoting an attitude / obligation holder related to the matrix event.

The ambiguity is also easily noticed in examples with quantified expressions and evaluative predicatives. In (134) I compare parallel sentences with a *dlja* ‘for’ PP and a dative DP; while the prepositional phrase in the first example unambiguously refers to specific Holders, for whom it is important to stay, in the second example the dative DP is ambiguous between denoting specific Holders or only specific / non-specific agents of the embedded event.

- (134) a. *Dlja dvux devoček važno ujti.*  
 for two girls.GEN important.N.SG leave.INF  
 ‘For two girls it is important to leave.’  
 = There are two girls who believe that it is important to leave.
- b. *Dvum devočkam važno ujti.*  
 two girls.DAT important.N.SG leave.INF  
 ‘For two girls it is important to leave.’  
 = There are two girls who believe that it is important to leave.  
 = It is important that two girls would leave.

Additionally, the adjunct placement diagnostic yields different results depending on the type of dative DP. For instance, if the latter is an indefinite *-nibud’* pronoun or an inanimate DP denoting a non-sentient object that cannot be interpreted as a Holder, an adverb placed to the right of this DP can only modify the embedded predicate (see (129) above). However, if

---

subject under consideration Case plays a similarly crucial role and if there is anything exceptional in its assignment, even though in the next chapter I will eventually demonstrate that, indeed, an embedded DP subject needs to be licensed by a matrix functional head.

- (i) Maša expected [John to win].

the dative DP refers to a sentient being or a group of beings, the sentence is ambiguous and the adjunct can be related either to the embedded or to the matrix predicate (135).

- (135) *Važno / nado bylo Anne ešče včera uexat'.*  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG was Anna.DAT already yesterday leave.INF  
 (i) ‘Already yesterday it was important / necessary that Anna would leave.’  
 (ii) ‘It was important that Anna would have left already yesterday.’

The next section will further demonstrate that in particular environments the dative DP can only be interpreted as a matrix constituent; these include sentences with partial coreference between the dative DP and the understood embedded subject and constructions with a matrix predicative and a finite clausal subject.

### 3.3 The dative DP is a matrix participant

#### 3.3.1 Matrix Holders

As demonstrated in Section 3.1, in constructions with an evaluative / deontic modal predicative and an embedded non-finite clause coreference must be established between an overt dative DP and the understood embedded subject. However, it does not have to be strict and can be partial.

This can be seen in examples with a singular dative DP and an embedded item that requires plurality of the embedded subject. First, there are predicates derived using the *raz-sja* affixes that can only have a semantically plural subject: *razojtis'* ‘disperse’, *razbežat'sja* ‘scatter’ (136).

- (136) a. *Mal'čiki razošlis' v vosem'.*  
 boy.PL.NOM dispersed in eight  
 ‘The boy dispersed at eight o’clock.’  
 b. *Komanda razošlas' v vosem'.*  
 team.SG.NOM dispersed in eight  
 ‘The team dispersed at eight o’clock.’

- c. \*Mal'čik        razošelsja v vosem'.  
 boy.SG.NOM dispersed in eight  
 Intended, not available: 'The boy dispersed at eight o'clock.'

Second, there are *together* type modifiers, which also require a semantically plural antecedent (137).

- (137) a. Mal'čiki        pošli v kino        vmeste.  
 boy.PL.NOM went in cinema together  
 'The boys went to the cinema together.'
- b. \*Maša        skazala čto Petja        pošel v kino        vmeste.  
 Maša.NOM said        that Petja.NOM went in cinema together  
 Intended: 'Maša said that Petja went to the cinema together (with her).'

Both *raz-sja* predicates and subject-oriented *together*-type modifiers are allowed in non-finite clauses embedded under a matrix evaluative predicative or a deontic modal when the overt dative Holder is both morphosyntactically and semantically singular (138).

- (138) a. Anna<sub>k</sub>        skazala, čto Maše<sub>i</sub>        važno        / nel'zja  
 Anna.NOM said        that Maša.DAT important.N.SG        not.allowed.N.SG  
 PRO<sub>i+k</sub> pojt<sub>i</sub> v kino        vmeste.  
 go.INF into cinema together  
 'Anna said that for Maša it was important / not allowed to go to the cinema together (with her).'
- b. Maše<sub>i</sub>        bylo važno        / nado        PRO<sub>i+</sub> razojtis'        v  
 Maša.DAT was important.N.SG        necessary.N.SG        disperse.INF in  
 vosem'.  
 eight  
 'For Maša it was important / necessary to disperse at eight o'clock.'

I follow Wurmbrand (2002) in assuming that availability of partial coreference requires the presence of PRO and supports a control analysis for sentences with evaluative adjectival / deontic modal predicatives.<sup>6</sup>

---

6. In short, Wurmbrand (2002) argues that non-obligatory control, which, in her terminology inherited from Williams (1980), includes partial and split control, is determined syntactically and requires the structural presence of a PRO subject. As she draws distinction between non-obligatory and obligatory control, she assumes that, while the latter is semantic, the former has little to do with the inherent semantic prop-



Furthermore, as has been noted in Chapter 2, Russian evaluative and deontic modal predicatives allow finite clausal subjects; in these cases, a dative Holder can still be present as an unambiguously independent item. Note that, as illustrated in (139), the embedded subject and the dative DP do not have to be coreferent at all. Crucially, in (139b) Petja is still a Holder responsible for Anna’s staying.

- (139) a. Pete            bylo važno                    / interesno            čtoby Anna  
 Petja.DAT was important.N.SG    interesting.N.SG so that Anna.NOM  
 ostalas.  
 stay.SUBJ  
 ‘For Petja it was important / interesting that Anna would stay.’
- b. Pete            nado                    / možno            bylo čtoby Anna            ostalas’.  
 Petja.DAT necessary.N.SG    allowed.N.SG was so that Anna.NOM stay.SUBJ  
 ‘For Petja it was necessary / allowed that Anna would stay.’

### 3.3.2 Interim summary

The syntactic properties of constructions with a matrix predicative with respect to the raising and control diagnostics are summarized in Table 2 below, where SOR stands for Subject-to-Object raising (that is, raising of the embedded subject into a matrix clause position).

(140) Table 2. The results for raising and control diagnostics

	DP <sub>DAT</sub>	coreference	overt embedded S	SOR	OC
Evaluatives	attitude Holder	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Deontic modals	obligation Holder	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Emotional evaluation	Experiencer	Yes	No	No	Yes

The results for the diagnostics suggest that, while predicatives of emotional evaluation implement obligatory control into clauses, evaluative predicatives and deontic modals support

---

erties of the matrix predicate: when an infinitival subject is projected, its antecedent is determined purely syntactically, and the whole construction is interpreted based on the syntactic output.

Wurmbrand’s analysis is supported by absence of restructuring in sentences with partial / split control and by the fact that anaphors are licit in these contexts even when there is no appropriate antecedent in the matrix predicate.

both obligatory control and an analysis in terms of an overt referential embedded subject in their complements.

### 3.4 Embedded non-finite clauses with covert vs. overt subjects

It might be suggested that all evaluative and deontic modal predicatives are represented by homonymous pairs – a predicate selecting a non-finite clause with an overt subject and a control predicate that embeds a non-finite clause with PRO or a finite clause. This would concur with many existing analyses for raising vs. control ambiguity characteristic of, for instance, the predicates *likely* or *begin* in English (Perlmutter 1970; Lasnik 1999).

Many researchers connect the availability of overt referential subjects with finiteness, which is understood as presence of agreement and (semantic or syntactic) tense (see Landau (2004) for a detailed discussion and references). Adopting such an approach, we would expect embedded clauses with dative DP subjects to differ sufficiently from embedded constructions with PRO subjects. However, in sentences with a matrix predicative in Russian, no detectable difference can be found between non-finite complements of these two kinds.

First, no infinitive in Russian can be overtly marked for agreement. Thus, unless we want to stipulate covert agreement morphology in non-finite clauses with overt subjects, clauses with DP and PRO subjects are identical in this respect.

Second, as demonstrated in (141), there is no overt tense morphology present and time reference of all non-finite constituents embedded under a predicative verb is determined in the same way relatively to the time reference of the matrix event.

- (141) a. Včera Marina ješčo bylo važno / interesno /  
 yesterday Marina.DAT yet was important.N.SG interesting.N.SG  
 možno pojtı v ponedel'nik v kino.  
 allowed.N.SG go.INF in Monday into cinema  
 'Yesterday for Marina it was yet important / interesting / allowed to go on  
 Monday to the cinema.'

- b. Včera ješčo bylo važno / nado stroitel'stvu  
 yesterday yet was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG construction.DAT  
 zakončit'sja k martu.  
 complete.INF by March  
 'Yesterday it was yet important / necessary for the construction to be complete  
 by March.'

Another common approach is to draw a parallel between availability of control or raising / ECM relations and the structural size of an infinitival clause. Thus, Williams (1987), Lasnik (1998), and Chomsky (1999), a.o., propose that subject raising and ECM are available only in smaller non-finite constructions, such as TPs or even vP. However, in Russian, all embedded non-finite clauses with overt / covert subjects appear to be structurally larger than TP.

As illustrated in (142), an embedded constituent can be moved to the embedded left focus position both in sentences with a dative holder (142a) and in those where the dative DP can only be analyzed as the embedded subject, since it refers to a non-sentient object that cannot be a Holder (142b).

- (142) a. Anne bylo važno TOL'KO SEGODN'A pojti v kino  
 Anna.DAT was important.N.SG only today go.INF into cinema  
 vmeste.  
 together.  
 'To Anna it was important that only today they would go to the cinema together.'
- b. Očen' važno IMENNO K MARTU sroitel'stvu zakončit'sja.  
 very important.N.SG precisely by March construction.DAT complete.INF  
 'It is very important that the construction be complete precisely BY MARCH.' (...  
 not by June)

As discussed in Chapter 1, the two existing approaches to the structure of the left periphery in Russian – the cartographic approach advocated by Dyakonova (2009) and the adjunction approach proposed by Bailyn (1995, 2012), Pereltsvaig (2004), Slioussar (2007), and Scott (2012), a.o. – disagree on the exact placement of the left Focus position: Dyakonova assumes that there is a dedicated FocP projection above the TP, while adjunction approaches tentatively suggest that Focus adjoins to TP. However, both frameworks admit that contrastive *-to* topics must be higher and are related to the CP layer; importantly, this kind of topic is

allowed in both embedded non-finite clauses with covert and overt subjects (143).<sup>7</sup>

- (143) a. Tebe<sub>i</sub> važno / nado [projekt-to PRO<sub>i+</sub> ran'she  
 you.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG project.ACC-TO earlier  
 zakončit']?  
 complete.INF  
 'As for the project, is it important / necessary for you to complete it earlier?'
- b. Važno / nado [projektu-to ran'she zakončit'sja]?  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG project.DAT-TO earlier complete.INF  
 'Is it important / necessary for the project to be complete erlier?'

Although argumental infinitival constituents, in general, cannot be accompanied by an overt complementizer and it is hard to prove or disprove presence of an embedded C head, the examples with embedded focus in (142) and *-to* topics in (143) suggest that both non-finite clauses with overt and those with covert subjects have left periphery above the TP level.

Furthermore, the presence of the left periphery is also required by constructions with embedded negative concord items that cannot be licensed locally within their clause. In (144) I reproduce the examples from (121) and (122), where there must be some position at the very left edge of the embedded clause that an NCI could move to in order to become 'visible' to the matrix negation.

- (144) a. Maša ne zastavl'ala Petju [nikomu pokupat' podarki].  
 Maša.NOM NEG forced Petja.ACC nobody.DAT buy.INF presents.ACC  
 'Maša did not force Petja to buy presents for anybody.'
- b. \*Maša ne zastavl'ala Petju [pokupat' nikomu podarki].  
 Maša.NOM NEG forced Petja.ACC buy.INF nobody.DAT presents.ACC  
 'Maša did not force Petja to buy presents for anybody.'
- c. Ne bylo tak už važno [(nikem) rane (\*nikem)  
 NEG was so PTCL important.N.SG nobody.INS wound.DAT nobody.INS  
 byt' zalečenoj].  
 be.INF heal.PTCP  
 'It was not important for the wound to be healed by anybody.'


To summarize, I argue that the constructions with embedded non-finite clauses under consid-

---

7. For a description of the distribution of these items see McCoy (2001). I will provide a more detailed discussion in Section 4.3.3.

eration exhibit DP / PRO alternation in the same syntactic environment; see the proposed structural representation in (145).

(145)



The data presented in these sections contradict the assumption that referential expressions cannot stay within infinitival clauses (Landau 2004, 2015; Sigurðsson 2008, a.o.) and support Sundaresan and McFadden’s (2009) claim that referential DPs can, in principle, appear in any environment as long as independently motivated requirements of grammar are not violated. As will be shown in the following sections, the DP / PRO alternation in Russian is not free, and the rest of this thesis will be devoted to developing an analysis that could restrict it.

## 3.5 The Two-Dative generalization

### 3.5.1 The generalization

In Chapter 1 I presented an overview of existing works on DP / PRO alternation in various languages. For many of them it is claimed that the alternation is completely free; see, for instance, Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) on Tamil, Malayalam and other Dravidian languages or Harley (2000) on Irish. I give a couple of examples from Malayalam (Dravidian) and Irish in (146) and (147) to illustrate the alternation.

(146) a. *Malayalam*

amma<sub>i</sub>            [PRO<sub>i/\*j</sub> wisa:kk-aan]    aagṛahiccu  
 mother.NOM            be.hungry-INF wanted  
 ‘Mother wanted to be hungry.’

- b. amma [kuʃʃi tʌaʃaan] aagʃahiccu  
 mother.NOM child.NOM be.tired.INF wanted  
 ‘Mother wanted the child to be tired.’

- (147) a. *Irish*  
 Ba mhaith liom [PRO imeacht].  
 COP good with-me go-VN  
 ‘I would like to go.’
- b. Ba mhaith liom [é a imeacht].  
 COP good with-me he PTCL go-VN  
 ‘I would like him to go.’

What distinguishes the Russian examples discussed above from cases of DP / PRO alternation reported for other languages is that, in Russian, overt DP subjects and PRO do not alternate freely. Given the ultimate structure of sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative and an embedded non-finite clauses, reproduced in (148), we would expect sentences with two overt dative DPs – a Holder and the embedded subject – to be grammatical.

- (148) [<sub>AppIP</sub> Holder [<sub>AppI'</sub> AppI<sup>0</sup> [<sub>AP/ModP</sub> predicative [<sub>CP</sub> DP / PRO ... ]]]]

However, examples like (149) are evaluated as strictly unacceptable by all native speakers of Russian.

- (149) \*Maše važno Anne sdat' ekzamen.  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG Anna.DAT pass.INF exam  
 Intended: ‘For Maša it is important for Anna to pass the exam.’

Importantly, there is no general prohibition on co-occurrence of multiple dative DPs in a complex sentence or a restriction that would require complementarity of an overt Holder and an overt embedded subject with a different referent. Above we have already seen many examples with embedded finite clauses; to these can also be added sentences with a Holder expressed by a PP. Although speakers’ opinions vary as to whether examples like (150) are perfect or only marginally acceptable, they generally get much higher acceptability scores than (149).

- (150) %Dlja Maši bylo važno vsem detjam polučit' podarki.  
 for Maša was important.N.SG all children.DAT receive.INF presents.ACC  
 'To Maša it was important that all children receive their presents.'

The question arises: Why can only one dative DP appear in a sentence with an evaluative predicate / deontic modal? To put it in different words, what conditions the DP / PRO alternation in Russian?

The following data-driven generalization can be formulated to describe the mutual distribution of Holders and overt embedded subjects.

- (151) **The Two-Dative Generalization:** An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential dative DP controller available within a higher clause.

Importantly, the absence of an overt controller in the matrix clause merely allows but does not require presence of a referential DP subject in the embedded clause. I will discuss the problem in detail in Section 4.3.2; at this point it suffices to say that an implicit Holder, often interpreted as 'Speaker+', can still control the PRO subject of an embedded clause (see (152a) vs. (152b) where I denote an implicit Holder as an empty category).

- (152) a.  $ec_i$  važno / nado [ $PRO_{i+}$  ujti zavtra ran'se].  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG leave.INF tomorrow earlier  
 '(For us) it is important to leave tomorrow earlier.'
- b.  $ec$  važno / nado [Anne ujti zavtra ran'se].  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG Anna.DAT leave.INF tomorrow earlier  
 '(For us) it is important for Anna to leave tomorrow earlier.'

Thus, the proposed generalization can be paraphrased as 'Always try to establish a control relation between the subject of an embedded non-finite clause and a c-commanding DP within the matrix clause. Only if there is no overt  $DP_{DAT}$  controller, you may use an embedded referential subject.'

### 3.5.2 Against a morphological restriction

It might be suggested that a post-syntactic morphological restriction rules out sentences with two dative DPs in a row. At first sight, this explanation seems to work well for Russian: two dative DPs are normally prohibited within a single clause. This is illustrated in (153) where either the Beneficiary ('Anna') or the external Possessor ('Petja') can be expressed by a dative DP but not both at the same time (153a). When the two co-occur, one of them must be substituted with either a PP (the Beneficiary in (153b)) or a genitive DP (the Possessor in (153c)).

- (153) a. \*Maša razbila Anne Pete vazu.  
 Maša.NOM broke Anna.DAT Petja.DAT vase.ACC  
 'Maša broke Petja's vase for Anna.'
- b. Maša razbila dlja Anny Pete vazu.  
 Maša.NOM broke for Anna Petja.DAT vase.ACC  
 'Maša broke Petja's vase for Anna.'
- c. Maša razbila Anne vazu Peti.  
 Maša.NOM broke Anna.DAT vase.ACC Petja.GEN  
 'Maša broke Petja's vase for Anna.'

However, this restriction does not hold for bi-clausal constructions. In (154a) and (154b) two dative DPs are base-generated within different clauses: one of them is a matrix Holder and the other is an argument of the embedded predicate (but not the embedded subject); the sentences are perfectly grammatical even when the two datives are topicalized and appear next to each other. In contrast, (154c) and (154d) are judged as unacceptable by native speakers if the second dative DP is to be interpreted as the embedded subject.

- (154) a. Maše<sub>i</sub> važno / nado [Anne<sub>k</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> pomoč' t<sub>k</sub>].  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG Anna.DAT help.INF  
 'To Anna it was important / necessary to help Anna.'
- b. Maše<sub>i</sub> Anne<sub>k</sub> važno / nado [PRO<sub>i</sub> pomoč' t<sub>k</sub>].  
 Maša.DAT Anna.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG help.INF  
 'For Maša it is important / necessary to help Anna.'
- c. \*Maše važno / nado [Anne pomoč' Pete].  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG Anna.DAT help.INF Petja.DAT  
 Intended: 'For Maša it is important / necessary for Anna to help Petja.'



- d. \*Maše Anne<sub>i</sub> važno / nado [ t<sub>i</sub> pomoč Pete].  
 Maša.DAT Anna.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG help.INF Petja.DAT  
 Intended: ‘For Maša it is important / necessary for Anna to help Petja.’

Therefore, if one wants to adhere to a general explanation along the above mentioned line it will be necessary to formulate the ‘two dative DPs’ restriction in a very narrow way. While the behavior of two dative constituents within a single clause can be accounted for by proposing either a morphological restriction or a restriction on recursion that would prohibit projection of an applicative phrase above another applicative phrase (see the analyses developed by Koopman (2014) and den Dikken and Dékány (2018), a.o.), such a restriction does not extend to cover bi-clausal constituents.

### 3.6 A closer look at the Two-Dative Generalization and prepositional Holders

In sentences with a matrix predicative, a matrix *dlja* ‘for’ PP cannot be interpreted as an argument of the embedded predicate, and usually unambiguously denotes the (attitude / obligation) Holder. This is demonstrated by the results for all relevant diagnostics mentioned above: the idiom chunk test (155a), the voice transparency test (155b, 155c), and the sentence test (155d).

- (155) a. *Idiom chunks*

Dlja černoj koški važno / nado bylo probežat’ meždu  
 for black cat.GEN important.N.SG necessary.N.SG was run.INF between  
 nami.  
 us

Only literally: ‘For a black cat it was important / necessary to run between us.’  
 Idiomatic reading not available: ‘It was important / necessary for us to quarrel.’

b. *Voice transparency: passive*

Dlja mal'čika bylo važno / nado byt' ubitym  
 for boy.GEN was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG be.INF kill.PTCP

Voldemortom.

Voldemort.INS

Only: 'To the boy it was important / necessary to be killed by Voldemort.'

(≠ c)

c. *Voice transparency: active*

Dlja Voldemorta bylo važno / nado ubit' mal'čika.  
 for Voldemort.GEN was important.N.SG necessary.N.SG kill.INF boy.ACC

Only: 'To Voldemort it was important / necessary to kill the boy.' (≠ b)

d. *Obligatory sentience*

\*Dlja stroitel'stva važno / nado zakončit'sja k  
 for construction.GEN important.N.SG necessary.N.SG complete.INF by

martu.

March

Intended: 'It is important / necessary for the construction to be complete by

March.'

With regard to PP Holders, the following questions remain to be answered before we proceed by discussing the formal mechanism behind the Two-Dative Generalization: (i) What relations are established between a prepositional Holder and embedded PRO? and (ii) Can a prepositional Holder co-occur with an embedded overt subject?

In this section I will argue that (i) in sentences with a matrix predicative, a matrix *dlja* 'for' PP obligatorily controls the embedded PRO, and (ii) that a prepositional Holder and an overt embedded subject are not in strictly complementary distribution. Thus, the proposed Two-Dative Generalization (reproduced in (156)) should not be revised and, indeed, holds only for dative DP controllers.

(156) **The Two-Dative Generalization:** An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential **dative** DP controller available within a higher clause.

Let us start by showing that a prepositional Holder obligatorily controls a covert embedded subject. The relevant examples are given in (157), where I demonstrate, first, that only

a local DP can be the antecedent for embedded PRO (157a, 157b) and, second, that the implicit embedded subject behaves as a variable and not as a pronominal (157c).

(157) a. *Non-local control – failed*

Anna<sub>k</sub>      sčitaet, što dlja Maši<sub>i</sub>      važno      [PRO<sub>i/\*k</sub> pojti v  
 Anna.NOM believes that for Mary.GEN important.N.SG      go.INF into  
 kino].  
 cinema

‘Mary believes that for Mary it is important to go to the cinema.’

b. *Non-c-commanding control – failed*

[Dlja kolleg      Maši<sub>k</sub>]<sub>i</sub>      važno      [PRO<sub>i/\*k</sub> ostat’sja.  
 for colleagues.GEN Maša.GEN important.N.SG      stay.INF

‘For Maša’s colleagues it is important ot stay.’

c. *PRO as a bound variable*

Dlja Anny<sub>i</sub>      važno      [PRO<sub>i</sub> ostat’sja], i      dlja Maši      tože.  
 for Anna.GEN important.N.SG      stay.INF      and for Maša.GEN too

‘For Anna it is important to stay and for Maša it is important that she (Maša) would stay, too.’

The coreference established between the prepositional phrase and the covert subject can be partial or split; this is demonstrated in (158) where I use already familiar embedded predicates and modifiers that require a syntactically plural subject.

(158) a. Dlja Peti<sub>i</sub>      važno      [PRO<sub>i+</sub> razojtis’      v šest’].  
 for Petja.GEN important.N.SG      disperse.INF in six

‘For Peter it is important to disperse at 6.’

b. Anna<sub>k</sub>      znaet, što dlja Maši<sub>i</sub>      važno      [PRO<sub>i<sub>k</sub></sub> pojti v  
 Anna.NOM knows that for Maša.GEN important.N.SG      go.INF into  
 kino      vmeste].  
 cinema together

‘Anna knows that for Maša it is important to go to the cinema together.’

It should not be surprising that a DP complement can obligatorily control PRO from within a prepositional phrase; such cases are well attested in other languages, including English (159) (Farkas 1988; Sag and Pollard 1991; Runner 2006, a.o.), and there are other control

verbs in Russian with similar behavior (160).

- (159) a. John pleaded [with Mary<sub>i</sub>] [PRO<sub>i</sub> to forgive him].  
 b. Mary recommended [to John<sub>i</sub>] [PRO<sub>i</sub> to eat something].  
 c. Mary counted [on John<sub>i</sub>] [PRO<sub>i</sub> to be help her on Monday].  
 d. John whispered [PP to Mary<sub>i</sub>] [PRO<sub>i</sub> to bring him more food].
- (160) a. %Ja ne ožidal ot Maši<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> prinesti knigi].  
 I.NOM NEG expected from Maša.GEN bring.INF books.ACC  
 ‘I did not expect that Maša would bring books.’  
 b. Petja potreboval ot / u Maši<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> pomoč’ emu].  
 Petja.NOM demanded from at Maša.GEN help.INF him  
 ‘Petja demanded from Maša to help him.’

Having established that a covert subject of a non-finite clause embedded under a matrix predicative is PRO, obligatorily controlled by the prepositional Holder, we can now turn to the second question: Is DP / PRO alternation attested in the presence of a matrix *dlja* ‘for’ PP?

According to native speakers of Russian, examples with a prepositional Holder and an overt embedded subject are either marginal or acceptable. While there are hidden intervening factors to be further investigated (compare, for instance, marginal (161a) and acceptable (162b),<sup>8</sup> it is clear that such sentences receive much better acceptability scores than parallel examples with two dative DPs (161b and (162b)).

- (161) a. ??Dlja sotrudnikov očen’ važno projektu zakončit’sja  
 for employees.GEN very important.N.SG project.DAT complete.INF  
 kak možno bystree.  
 as soon as possible  
 ‘For the employees it is very important for the project to be complete as soon as possible.’

---

8. More experimental data are needed, and I leave examination of the contrast between (161a) and (162b) for future research.

- b. \*Sotrudnikam očen' važno projektu zakončit'sja  
 employees.DAT very important.N.SG project.DAT complete.INF  
 kak možno bystree.  
 as soon as possible  
 Intended: 'For the employees it is very important for the project to be complete  
 as soon as possible.'

- (162) a. Dlja menja očen' važno rebjatam nikogda ne ssorit'sja.  
 for I.GEN very important.N.SG children.DAT never NEG quarrel.INF  
 'For me it is very important for the children never to quarrel.'
- b. \*Mne očen' važno rebjatam nikogda ne ssorit'sja.  
 I.DAT very important.N.SG children.DAT never NEG quarrel.INF  
 Intended: 'For me it is very important for the children never to quarrel.'

Based on these data, we can conclude that the Two-Dative Generalization, true to its name, applies only to sentences with two dative DPs, while a prepositional Holder (a potential controller) and an overt embedded subject of a non-finite clause can, in principle, co-occur.

### 3.7 Summary

This chapter focused on sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative and an embedded non-finite clause. I applied various diagnostics for control and overt embedded subjects to demonstrate that, these predicates support both obligatory control and ECM-like configurations, as the subject of an infinitival clause can be either PRO or an overt referential DP.

Despite the fact that the DP / PRO alternation is not conditioned by the structural size or the Tense – Agr characteristics of the embedded clause, it is not completely free. To capture the DP / PRO distribution in non-finite clauses, I proposed the following Two-Dative Generalization (163):

- (163) The Two-Dative Generalization: An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential dative DP controller available within a higher clause.

I argue that the generalization should be restricted to dative DP controllers, since a matrix prepositional Holder can co-occur with an embedded non-finite clause with a lexical subject.

Finally, I dismissed the idea of a morphological restriction that would simply prohibit co-occurrence of two dative DPs.

The next chapter discusses other potential ways to formally account for the generalization. Eventually, I will propose that, although both an overt DP and PRO can be generated as the subject of an embedded non-finite clause, the former needs to value its [uCase] feature with a functional head and, because of the deficiency of non-finite  $T^0 / C^0$ , has to compete with an overt DP Holder for Case licensed by the matrix Appl<sup>0</sup>.

# Chapter 4

## The analysis and its implications

### 4.1 Overview

Before I proceed by presenting a formal analysis for the DP / PRO alternation in Russian, I would like to begin this chapter by briefly summarizing the data points that we need to account for, discussed in the previous parts of the thesis, and listing the existing kinds of approaches that could potentially help to describe the distribution of overt and covert subjects, which were mentioned in Chapter 1.

#### **The data:**

- Evaluative and deontic modal predicatives in Russian allow an attitude / obligation Holder and a clausal argument.
- The latter can be either a finite clause or a non-finite clause.
- The subject of the embedded non-finite clause can be either a silent PRO, obligatorily controlled by the matrix Holder, or an overt referential DP.
- An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential dative DP controller available within a higher clause (the Two-Dative Generalization); at the same time, there is no general morphosyntactic restriction on co-occurrence of two dative DPs in a complex sentence and / or a semantic prohibition to use an overt Holder and an overt embedded subject together.

The three major existing approaches to DP / PRO licensing that could be used to account for these data are the following:

1. Analyses in terms of Case licensing, which assume that an overt DP, in contrast with silent PRO, must be licensed by Case, which is often unavailable for subjects in non-finite clauses.
2. Landau's (2004) calculus of control, which essentially proposes that overt DP subjects are allowed only in finite clauses, while PRO is used everywhere else in various non-finite environments.
3. No complementarity approaches based on the idea that no special feature is needed to license a DP, but the matrix predicate may select a particular kind of embedded clause (Sundaresan and McFadden 2009).

After briefly discussing these approaches in the next section, I will demonstrate that a combination of them is necessary to account for the Russian data under discussion and I will propose an analysis in terms of cross-clausal Case licensing of overt embedded subjects. I argue that, although both DPs and PRO can be base-generated as subjects of non-finite clauses, an overt referential embedded subject must be licensed by a functional head. Inherently deficient non-finite  $T^0$  is incapable of doing this; however, in the case of evaluative and modal predicatives, licensing can be done across an embedded clause boundary by the matrix  $\text{Appl}^0$  that normally licenses an overt matrix Holder.

I will further present additional support for the proposed analysis, coming from two different sources: sentences with a matrix epistemic modal, which prohibit both matrix applied objects and non-finite clauses with referential subjects, and other constructions that, apparently, allow DP / PRO alternation and fall under the Two-Dative Generalization (modal existential constructions (MECs) and main clause infinitives). Finally, in the last sections of this chapter I will discuss the theoretical implications of the developed analysis from a cross-linguistic perspective.



## 4.2 Potential analyses

### 4.2.1 Case licensing and TP / CP distinction

Let us consider the major existing accounts for DP / PRO distribution and see if one of them can fully capture behaviour of overt and covert embedded subjects in Russian, discussed in this thesis. First, there is a class of traditional analyses stemming from the original Chomsky's (1981) Case filter theory, which argue that an overt DP (NP, for Chomsky (1981)) must be licensed by Case. A non-finite  $T^0$  is arguably not capable of assigning a 'proper' structural case, hence, an overt DP either has to raise into a matrix clause or, if it stays within the embedded clause, it has to receive Case from a matrix predicate via so called *Exceptional Case Marking* (ECM); otherwise the derivation will crash.

An analysis along this line will account for the Russian data, and the main claim that I present in this thesis is that the DP / PRO alternation in embedded non-finite clauses in Russian is regulated by the mechanism of cross-clausal Case assignment, required to license a referential DP within a Case deficient non-finite clause.

However, it should be noted that most of the traditional approaches that postulate a dependency between the realization of a referential DP and Case also assume that the 'survival' operations (subject raising or ECM) are available only in the case of smaller non-finite clauses, such as TPs (Williams 1987; Lasnik 1998; Chomsky 1999, a.o.). This assumption does not match the data under discussion, since, as demonstrated in Section 3.4, embedded non-finite clauses in Russian allow various operations at the left periphery and are larger than TPs.

Cases of cross-clausal A-dependencies across a CP boundary have been argued to exist for several other languages: for instance, hyper raising in Brazilian Portuguese (Nunes 2009; Ferreira 2009), long-distance agreement in Hindi-Urdu and Tsez (Mahajan 1989, 1990; Polinsky and Potsdam 2001; Chandra 2007, a.o.), and cross-clausal ECM in Turkish (Şener 2011). Russian with its large infinitival clauses falls into this category, and the distance of Case licensing should be further taken into account (see Section 4.3.3).

## 4.2.2 Landau's (2004) calculus of control

Another prominent theory attempting to account for the cross-linguistic distribution of DPs and PRO in non-finite clauses is Landau's (2004) calculus of control, which distinguishes between obligatory control and no control environments based on the agreement and tense features of the embedded clause.

In short, Landau differentiates between no control (NC) and obligatory control (OC) environments, described in terms of subject agreement with  $I^0$  [Agr] / tense [T] specification. I reproduce Landau's (2004) original definition in (164).

(164) The finiteness rule for OC (Landau 2004)

In a fully specified complement clause (i.e., the  $I^0$  head carries slots for both [T] and [Agr]):

- a. If  $I^0$  carries both semantic tense and agreement ([+T,+Agr]), NC obtains.
- b. Elsewhere, OC obtains.

The calculus of control does not fully account for the Russian data considered in this thesis. As shown in Section 3.4, (i) all Russian non-finite clauses are unmarked for agreement, and (ii) in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative, embedded non-finite clauses with overt / covert subjects do not differ in terms of Tense marking (none possible) and time reference. Therefore, unless we stipulate subject agreement with a completely silent paradigm, it appears that, in Russian, DP and PRO subjects are available within the same environment with respect to the [T/Agr] specification.

It is important to note that Landau himself heavily relies on morphology as an indicator of agreement / Tense. For instance, in his (2013) monograph he mentions that Korean might posit a problem for the proposed calculus and its cross-linguistic implementation, since, in Korean, OC complements exhibit no agreement or tense morphology, and the control status of the complement is determined by the combination of the matrix verb and a specific mood marker in the embedded clause (Madigan 2008; Lee 2009). Therefore, I assume that lack of morphological agreement in non-finite clauses in Russian will also be problematic for Landau's framework.

### 4.2.3 Anaphoric vs. non-anaphoric clauses and selection

Finally, we can consider analyses that are based on the preliminary assumption that DPs and PRO are, essentially, not in complementary distribution, and that try to account for cases of apparent complementarity in some other way. In this thesis, I will consider one such approach – an elaborated theory of selection proposed by Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) (S&M).

S&M examine the DP / PRO alternation in embedded non-finite clauses in various languages, focusing on novel data from Tamil (165), and propose (i) that there is no direct connection between finiteness and the availability of either PRO or a DP subject, and (ii) that both overt DPs and PRO are licit in all A-positions and that only ‘exceptional’ cases of complementarity need to be specifically accounted for.

- (165) a. Champa-vukku<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> oru samosa-vai saappiḍ-a] veṇḍ-um  
Champa-DAT a samosa-ACC eat-INF want-N.3.SG  
‘Champa wants to eat a samosa.’
- b. Champa-vukku [Sudha oru samosa-vai saappiḍ-a] veṇḍ-um  
Champa-DAT Sudha.NOM a samosa-ACC eat-INF want-N.3.SG  
‘Champa wants Sudha to eat a samosa.’

S&M depart from attempts to correlate the presence of an overt / covert subject with the availability of Case or the [Agr] characteristics of an embedded clause. Instead, they develop a three-fold categorization of embedded clauses in terms of their relation to the matrix clause, distinguishing between [–anaphoric] embedded clauses (with a referential subject) and [+anaphoric] embedded clauses (with controlled PRO subjects), where [ $\pm$ anaphoric] is an interpretable feature on  $C^0$ . They further propose that matrix lexical predicates can select an embedded clause of a particular type if they have an uninterpretable [ $u\pm$ anaphoric] feature themselves. Thus, for example, the English verb *try* has the [ $u+$ anaphoric] feature; this means that it requires an embedded clause with [+anaphoric]  $C^0$ , which in turn requires a non-referential variable subject. In contrast, the English verb *want* is unspecified for [ $u\pm$ anaphoric], therefore it is compatible with [+anaphoric] and [–anaphoric] embedded clauses and can co-occur with PRO / overt DP embedded subjects (the ‘dependent’ category). Finally, S&M suggest that selectional restrictions for a specific predicate can be derived from its semantics.

Although the dependent category, introduced by S&M, is extremely useful to account for the free DP / PRO alternation in Tamil and several other languages, it does not help much in the case of Russian. To apply S&M's analysis to Russian, it would be necessary to postulate lexical homonymy for each evaluative and deontic predicative. Importantly, to capture the Two-Dative Generalization, we would have to somehow establish a connection between the selectional properties of a predicate and the overt realization of a Holder.

For instance, it might be suggested that there is *predicative*<sub>1</sub> that requires a covert or a prepositional Holder and a non-anaphoric clause and *predicative*<sub>2</sub> that selects any kind of Holder and an anaphoric clause. At first sight, sentences with an embedded finite, that is, [−anaphoric], clause would also include a matrix ‘*predicative*<sub>1</sub>’; however, since embedded finite clauses can co-occur with all three types of Holders – covert, DP<sub>DAT</sub> and prepositional, – it would, perhaps, be better to attribute them to *predicative*<sub>2</sub>, removing the [+anaphoric] restriction. Thus, apparently, ‘*predicatives*<sub>2</sub>’ would simply be unspecified for a [±anaphoric] feature, while ‘*predicatives*<sub>1</sub>’ should be somehow adjusted to distinguish not only between different morphosyntactic realizations of a Holder, but, crucially, between different types of non-anaphoric clauses – non-finite vs. finite, which is simply not provided for by the original S&M's analysis. A simplified schema, thus, should look the following way (166).

- (166) a. *predicative*<sub>1</sub> [−anaphoric], covert / PP Holder, only non-finite clauses  
 b. *predicative*<sub>2</sub> [±anaphoric]

It is easy to see that to account for such a schema, a very complex mechanism should be developed to relate inherent selectional restrictions of a predicate that stem from its semantics with the purely morphosyntactic properties of a Holder. One of the major advantages of the original S&M proposal is that they aim to make as few unmotivated speculations as possible; however, it is hard to imagine that (166) could be accounted for within their framework in an insightful way.

#### 4.2.4 Interim summary

To summarize the overview of the major existing approaches to DP / PRO distribution when applied to the Russian data under discussion, we have seen that the Case licensing approach is the closest one to capture the DP / PRO alternation in Russian; however, the traditional

TP / CP distinction, which Case licensing is often related to, must be revised.

The other two approaches (Landau's (2000, 2004) calculus of control and a 'free DP / PRO alternation' approach) make wrong predictions with regard to the Russian data. On the one hand, the calculus of control appears to be too restrictive by postulating that DPs and PRO are always in complementary distribution when an obligatory control configuration is available. On the other hand, Sundaresan and McFadden's (2009) 'free alternation' approach is also problematic, since the reported alternation is hard to regulate in terms of a [ $\pm$ anaphoric] feature specification on the matrix predicate.

The rest of this chapter is dedicated to presenting a combined analysis for the DP / PRO alternation in non-finite clauses in Russian. I follow traditional approaches to DP licensing via Case, however, I also adopt Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) and McFadden's (2004) idea about DPs and PROs being essentially allowed to appear in the same structural environments as long as other interfering restrictions are satisfied.

## 4.3 The proposed analysis

### 4.3.1 Cross-clausal Case assignment

I propose to account for the Two-Dative Generalization in terms of Case licensing and cross-clausal Case assignment:

1. Both overt DPs and PRO can be the subject of an embedded non-finite clause.
2. Overt referential DPs must be licensed by Case, normally assigned by a functional head.
3. Since a non-finite  $I^0 / T^0$  is incapable of assigning Case, an embedded referential subject competes with a matrix Holder for the Case licensed by a matrix  $\text{Appl}^0$ , the closest functional head available.

Finally, I assume that Case assignment happens by establishing a long-distance cross-clausal A-dependency between  $\text{Appl}^0$  and the embedded subject.

The data presented and discussed in this thesis persuasively demonstrate that, in Russian, DP and PRO subjects can be merged within the same syntactic environments, and yet the

DP / PRO alternation is severely restricted; examples similar to those in (167a) and (167b) gave rise to the proposed Two-Dative Generalization, and, aside from the particular cases described in the thesis, overt referential subjects are generally prohibited in embedded non-finite clauses (167c, 167d).

- (167) a. Maše<sub>i</sub>      važno                      / nado                      [PRO<sub>i</sub> pojti vmeste v kino].  
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG      necessary.N.SG                      go.INF together into cinema  
 ‘For Maša it is important / necessary to go to the cinema together.’
- b. Važno                      / možno                      [stroitel’stvu zakončitsja ran’še].  
 important.N.SG      necessary.N.SG      construction.DAT complete.INF earlier  
 ‘It is important for the construction to be complete earlier.’
- c. \*Maša      xotela [stroitel’stvu                      / stroitel’stvo                      zakončitsja].  
 Maša.NOM wanted      construction.DAT      construction.NOM complete.INF  
 Intended: ‘Maša wanted for the construction to be complete.’
- d. \*Maša      dogovorilas’ s      Petej      [stroitel’stvu                      / stroitel’stvo  
 Maša.NOM arranged      with Petja.INS      construction.DAT      construction.NOM  
 zakončitsja].  
 complete.INF  
 Intended: ‘Maša arranged with Petja for the construction to be complete.’


I assume that infinitival clauses are deficient and that the non-finite T<sup>0</sup> is not enough to license an overt embedded subject.<sup>1</sup> As covert PRO subjects in embedded non-finite clauses are not licensed by a ‘proper’ Case,<sup>2</sup> in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative the control configuration is always available; the structure is schematized in (168).

---

1. I will discuss the theoretical possibility of a structural subject Case being available within a non-finite clause at the end of this section.

2. As mentioned earlier, it has been proposed that PRO either is not licensed by Case at all (Chomsky 1981) or gets assigned the so-called ‘null Case’, which is incompatible with overt DPs (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993).

(168)




I argue that a covert Holder is a syntactically present weak implicit argument, a DP-less  $\varphi$ P, following the distinction between strong and weak implicit arguments proposed by Landau (2010) (I will provide support for this claim in the next subsection).<sup>3</sup> Crucially, a  $\varphi$ P does not have a DP layer and does not need Case to be licensed, and thus, a functional Applicative head is free to assign Case to the lower subject of an embedded clause (169).<sup>4</sup>

---

3. Although in this thesis I primarily refer to Landau's (2010) article, the idea that pronouns come in different sizes is by no means novel, and can be traced back to Cardinaletti (1994) and Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). Other important works on the topic include Ritter (1995) and Noguchi (1997), to name a few; in particular, Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002, 2017) should be mentioned, where the authors develop a typology of personal pronouns and anaphors based on their structural size, from DPs to  $\varphi$ Ps and bare Ns.

4. I assume that multiple Case assignment is unavailable in Russian. Despite the fact that in some languages a single Case feature can arguably be checked by several nominals at the same time (see, for instance, Scandinavian double object constructions where both the Goal and the Theme are, arguably, accusative), to the best of my knowledge, no support for multiple Case assignment can be found in Russian.

(169)



The proposed analysis is based on the idea of the defective non-finite  $T^0 / C^0$ . It has been argued, however, that in Russian a structural subject Case is assigned within non-finite clauses. Support for this claim usually comes from the availability of dative-marked embedded subject-oriented semi-predicatives; in the remaining part of this subsection I will challenge this argument with some empirical data.

As has been noticed by many linguists, including Comrie (1974), Greenberg (1989), Franks (1990), Franks and Hornstein (1992), Babby (1998), Moore and Perlmutter (2000), Fleisher (2006), and Landau (2008), in Russian semi-predicatives *sam* ‘oneself’ and *odin* ‘alone’, which in finite clauses get the same case as a nominal phrase they are related to (i.e. their antecedent or a ‘shared argument’), when embedded into a non-finite clause and oriented towards the local subject can be marked dative even if the matrix controller receives a different case (170).

- (170) a. Petja rešil sdelat’ ?odnomu / samomu zadanije.  
Petja.NOM decided do.INF alone.DAT himself.DAT task.ACC  
‘Petja decided to do the task alone / himself.’
- b. Maša zastavila Petju sdelat’ ?odnomu / samomu zadanije.  
Maša.NOM forced Petja.ACC do.INF alone.DAT himself.DAT task.ACC  
‘Maša forced Petja to do the task alone / himself.’

The most popular and widely accepted account for these data is developed along the following



line. The antecedent for a subject oriented semi-predicative embedded in a non-finite clause is the silent PRO subject; since a semi-predicative always gets the same case as its antecedent, the dative-marked *sam* / *odin* indicates that PRO is dative. The source of dative case on PRO is assumed to be a functional head within a non-finite clause itself (either Inff<sup>0</sup> or C<sup>0</sup>) (Fleisher 2006; Sigurðsson 2008; Landau 2008, a.o.).

It should be noted that the dative case is not the only option for an embedded semi-predicative. Under obligatory control, *sam* and *odin* in embedded non-finite clauses can bear the same case as the matrix controller (171).

- (171) a. Petja rešil sdelat' zadanije odin / sam.  
 Petja.NOM decided do.INF task.ACC alone.NOM himself.NOM  
 'Petja decided to do the task alone / himself.'
- b. Maša zastavila Petju sdelat' zadanije odnogo / samomu.  
 Maša.NOM forced Petja.ACC do.INF task.ACC alone.NOM himself.NOM  
 'Maša forced Petja to do the task alone / himself.'

Originally, it was assumed in the literature that 'controller's case' and 'the unexpected dative' are characteristic of distinct structural environments; thus, Comrie (1974), Franks and Hornstein (1992), Babby (1998), and Landau (2008) propose to group control environments in different ways to predict the morphological case of an embedded semi-predicative. However, the data turn out to be more complex, and there are, clearly, other factors yet to be examined that influence speakers' judgments and lead to apparent inconsistency of evaluations. Consider, for instance, the difference between *odin* and *sam* in (170) (the dative *odin* being questionable and the dative *sam* being acceptable) and the different word orders in (170) and (171). The choice of a semi-predicative and / or a matrix predicate, the surface position or pragmatics may play an important role, and further research is required to determine and control the interfering factors.

Crucially for the present discussion, secondary predicates (that in simple clauses bear the same case as their antecedents) can never be dative in an embedded non-finite clause (172).

- (172) a. Petja rešil ne prixodit' bol'she pjanyj / pjanyj /  
 Petja.NOM decided NEG come.INF anymore drunk.INS drunk.NOM  
 \*pjanomu domoj.  
 drunk.DAT home  
 'Petja decided not to come home drunk anymore.'

- b. Maša zastavila Petju pojtj pjanym / \*pjanogo / \*pjanomu  
 Maša.NOM forced Petja.ACC go.INF drunk.INS drunk.ACC drunk.DAT  
 domoj.  
 home.  
 ‘Maša forced Petja to go home drunk.’

Following Grebenyova (2005) and Franks (2014), I assume that the difference between secondary predicates and semi-predicatives is unexpected under the assumption that they establish case concord with the embedded dative-marked PRO subject. Until we fully account for concord of semi-predicatives and non-verbal predicates, these data cannot be considered reliable evidence of the availability of a subject Case in non-finite clauses.

### 4.3.2 Syntactically projected implicit Holders

I argue that an implicit Holder is a structurally present  $\varphi$ P (adopting Landau’s (2010) distinction between weak and strong implicit arguments), which justifies the presence of a high applicative projection. Main support for this comes from constructions with an implicit Holder and a covert embedded subject: in these cases obligatory control is still established between the two.

Let us take a look at a couple of examples. Intuitively, in (173) the covert Holder and the covert embedded subject are coreferent, with both referring to ‘us’, ‘people’; note that the Speaker must be among those to whom the embedded situation is important and those who will be eventually saving pandas. However, it is not yet clear if this is a case of obligatory control or just coincidental coreference with an abstract ‘default’ participant.

- (173)  $ec_i$  važno  $ec_i$  spasat’ pand.  
 important.N.SG save.INF pandas.ACC  
 ‘(To us) it is important (for us) to save pandas.’

Obligatory control between the two covert elements is ‘visible’ when the implicit Holder refers not to the default ‘us’ but to a specified being. Compare the basic sentence in (174a) with the test sentence in (174b): within the given context (174a), the bosses believe that the employees should work as much as possible, while the employees themselves may have a completely different opinion on the issue. Taking this into account and assuming that the reference of implicit Holders and covert embedded subjects is established independently, we

would expect (174b) to be interpreted as ‘The employees say / have learned that to their bosses it is important that they (the employees) would work as much as possible’. This reading, however, turns out to be unavailable, and in (174b) the silent Holder and the silent embedded subject must refer to the same group of people – only the bosses or only the employees.

- (174) a. Načal’nikam važno,                      čtoby sotrudniki                      rabotali  
 bosses.DAT    important.N.SG so that employees.NOM work.SUBJ  
 kak možno bol’še.  
 as much as possible  
 ‘For the bosses it is important that the employees work as much as possible.’
- b. Sotrudniki                      govornjat / uznali, čto *ec<sub>i</sub>* važno                      [*ec<sub>i</sub>* rabotat’  
 employees.NOM say                      learned that                      important.N.SG                      work.INF  
 kak možno bol’še].  
 as much as possible  
 (i) ‘The employees say / learned that for them it is important to work as much as possible.’  
 (ii) ‘... that for the bosses it is important to work as much as possible.’  
 Not available: ‘... that for the bosses it is important for them (the employees) to work as much as possible.’

It might be suggested that in (174b) coreference is forced by the logophoric nature of the antecedent; as demonstrated in (175), the logophoric center (in a broad sense, the source of information; see Hagège (1974), Clements (1975), and Sells (1987), a.o.) can exceptionally become the antecedent to a pronoun, either covert or overt.

- (175) a. Mary<sub>*i*</sub> thought that it helped John [PRO<sub>*i*</sub> to speak her mind].  
 b. \*Mary<sub>*i*</sub> heard from Peter that it helped John [PRO<sub>*i*</sub> to speak her mind].  
 c. John<sub>*i*</sub> said to Mary that physicists like himself<sub>*i*</sub> were a godsend.  
 d. \*Mary heard about John<sub>*i*</sub> that physicists like himself<sub>*i*</sub> were a godsend.

This, however, is not the case for the Russian constructions under discussion. The examples in (176) also do not allow a mismatching interpretation where an implicit Holder and a covert embedded subject would have distinct referents, although in both cases the chosen antecedent is clearly not a logophoric center.

- (176) a. Sotrudniki uslyšali ot načal'stva, čto *ec<sub>i</sub>* važno [*ec<sub>i</sub>* rabotat'  
 employees.NOM heard from bosses that important.N.SG work.INF  
 kak možno bol'se].  
 as much as possible  
 'The employees heard from the bosses that to them (employees) it is important  
 to work as much as possible.'
- b. Sotrudniki uznali, čto *ec<sub>i</sub>* važno [*ec<sub>i</sub>* platit' im  
 employees.NOM learned that important.N.SG pay.INF them  
 kak možno men'se].  
 as little as possible  
 'The employees learned that (for the bosses) it is important to pay them as little  
 as possible.'

Based on these data I argue that an implicit Holder, similarly to an explicit one, is syntactically present and obligatorily controls a covert embedded subject. The question remains about the nature of this implicit matrix participant; here, I adopt Landau's (2010) classification of implicit arguments (IA).<sup>5</sup>

Landau (2010) proposes to distinguish between strong and weak implicit arguments, for instance, strong IAs being *pro*, and weak IAs including passive agents. The two kinds of entities are structurally different, as weak implicit arguments are 'deficient' D-less  $\varphi$ Ps, yet all of them are syntactically projected and are potentially visible as controllers. To differentiate between the two types of IAs Landau identifies the following distinguishing properties:

- (177) a. Strong IAs, but not weak IAs, are visible as subjects of predication, in other words, an implicit argument must be strong to license a secondary predicate.  
 b. Strong IAs, but not weak IAs, are visible as binders to Condition A.

The contrast between strong and weak IAs with regard to the licensing of secondary predicates is illustrated in (178) and (179), with secondary predicates in italics.

- (178) *Strong implicit objects in Italian*  
 a. Questa musica rende *allegri*.  
 this music renders happy.PL  
 'This music renders happy.'

---

5. Landau's (2010) research, in turn, relies heavily on such works as Ross (1969), Rizzi (1986), Safir (1987, 1991), and Bhatt and Pancheva (2006).

- b. Di solito, Gianni fotografa *seduti*.  
 in general Gianni photographs seated.PL  
 ‘In general, Gianni photographs seated.’

(179) *Weak implicit agents in English*

- a. It is impossible [for me to be visited (*\*together*)].
- b. The room was left (*\*angry*).

Considering the Russian data, as discussed in Chapter 2, overt matrix Holders in sentences with an evaluative / deontic predicative can license instrumental secondary predicates and bind reflexives and reciprocals within subject-oriented modifiers (180).

- (180) a. Maše samoj po sebe važno / možno poiti v kino  
 Maša.DAT herself important.N.SG allowed.N.SG go.INF into cinema  
 vmeste.  
 together  
 ‘For Maša herself it is important / allowed to go to the cinema together.’
- b. Na udivljenije drug druga, detjam važno / možno  
 on surprise each other children.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG  
 poiti v kino.  
 go.INF into cinema  
 ‘To each other’s surprise, for the children it is possible / allowed to go to the cinema.’
- c. Pjanym, Pete važno / nado bylo vernut’sja domoj  
 drunk.INS Petja.DAT important.N.SG / necessary.N.SG was return.INF home  
 kak možno ran’she.  
 as soon as possible  
 ‘When Petja was drunk it was important / necessary to him to return home as soon as possible.’

Although subject *pro*-drop is relatively restricted in Russian (Bailyn 2012), it can be shown that implicit *pro* subjects in embedded indicative clauses behave as strong arguments allowing the above mentioned operations – predication and binding (181a and 181b). In contrast, implicit Holders are invisible as subjects of secondary predication and / or binders (181c and 181d).

- (181) a. *Deti znali, čto na udivlenije drug druga pro sdali ekzamen.*  
 children.NOM knew that on surprise each other passed exam.ACC  
 ‘The children knew that, to each other’s surprise, they had passed the exam.’
- b. *Petja ponjal, čto pro pjanym vernulsja domoj.*  
 Petja.NOM realized that drunk.INS returned home  
 ‘Petja realized that he had returned home drunk.’
- c. \**Samim po sebe važno / nado spasat’ pandas.*  
 ourselves / themselves important.N.SG necessary.N.SG save.INF pandas.ACC  
 Intended: ‘It is important / necessary for ourselves to save pandas.’
- d. \**Pjanymi važno / nado vernutsja domoj*  
 drunk important.N.SG necessary.N.SG return.INF home  
*kak možno ran’še.*  
 as soon as possible  
 Intended: ‘Drunk, it is important (for us) to return home as soon as possible.’

This behavior of implicit Holders suggests that they are, in Landau’s (2010) terms, weak arguments,  $\varphi$ Ps. Thus, on the one hand, they are syntactically present, and, on the other hand, as structurally deficient elements, do not have a DP layer and, importantly for the analysis presented in this thesis, do not need Case to be licensed.

### 4.3.3 The distance of Case licensing

After proposing that the overt subject of an embedded non-finite clause can be licensed by a higher functional head within the matrix clause, the question remains whether this Case licensing is local or long-distance. In this section I will argue that an overt embedded subject can remain relatively low in its clause (presumably, in Spec,TP / Spec,FinP) and still be licensed by the matrix applicative head; evidence for this comes from the relative ordering of overt embedded subjects and higher embedded topics. I will discuss long-distance Case assignment from the cross-linguistic perspective further in Section 4.5.2.


Let us consider the two options: local vs. long-distance A-dependency, one by one. First, Case licensing would comply with the general locality restriction on Agree operations if the embedded subjects moves to the transparent left edge of its clause – the Spec,CP. In this case, there would be no violation of Chomsky’s (2000) Phase Impenetrability Condition,<sup>6</sup>

---

6. Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 2000):

and the DP would end up within the local probing range of the matrix Applicative head, as schematized in (182).

(182) *The embedded subject moves into Spec,CP*




The second option would be for the embedded subject to stay lower, presumably in Spec,TP or in Spec,FinP. In this case, the established dependency would be long-distance and licensing would have to overcome the PIC or the PIC itself would have to be revised (183).

---

In phase  $\alpha$  with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside  $\alpha$ ; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

(183)



As we will discuss in more detail in Section 4.5.2, both options are cross-linguistically attested: see, for instance, movement to the embedded Spec,CP in Mongolian (Fong 2019) and long-distance Agree in Hindi-Urdu (Bhatt 2005). The important task is to determine to which of these two groups Russian sentences with evaluative / deontic modal predicatives belong.

Recall from the overview of the basic syntactic properties of Russian given in Chapter 1 that there are two major approaches to the structure of the left periphery and the relative positioning of various fronted items, such as *wh*-words, topics, and focus. The cartographic approach (Dyakonova 2009) postulates that for each of these items there is a dedicated projection – TopP, topP, FocP, FinP, etc. – and that these projections are strictly ordered.<sup>7</sup>

Various adjunction approaches proposed by Bailyn (1995, 2012), Junghanns and Zybatow (1997), Pereltsvaig (2004), Slioussar (2007), and Scott (2012), mostly agree that some items can move to the left periphery and that their ordering is not completely free; however, they argue that a cartographic model would be too strict, and that topics and focused constituents

7. Among the studies of Slavic languages, functional category analyses of topic and Focus can be traced back to Rudin (1985).



merely move to some adjunct positions – or multiple specifiers – of the CP / TP layers.

As suggested by the increasing popularity of both of these approaches, it is extremely hard to prove or disprove either one of them; furthermore, there are no reliable diagnostics to demonstrate that, for instance, the subject of a finite clause, often described as the most prominent element in the discourse (i.e. the topic), is by default located within Spec,TP and not, for instance, in Spec,FinP or Spec,TopP.

However, there is at least one construction that all of the major analyses agree on: contrastive *-to* topics (McCoy 2001). As described by Dyakonova (2009), Scott (2012), a.o., these topics are unique and tend to appear at the very left edge of the clause, not scrambling with other kinds of topic / Focus constructions (the examples in (184) are reproduced from Dyakonova (2009)).

(184) a. *multiple -to topics*

\*My-to        Novyj God-to        budem        vstrečat' doma.  
 we.NOM-TO New Year.ACC-TO be.NPST.1.PL meet.INF home  
 'As for us, as for the New Year, we will celebrate it at home.'

b. *multiple topics*

Mužčine-to [v takuju bumagu] [podarok] ja by ne stala  
 man.DAT-TO into such paper.ACC gift.ACC I.NOM COND NEG AUX.PST  
 upakovyvati'.  
 pack.INF  
 'I would not wrap a gift for a man with such paper.'

c. ??[V takuju bumagu] mužčine-to [podarok] ja by ne stala  
 into such paper.ACC man.DAT-TO gift.ACC I.NOM COND NEG AUX.PST  
 upakovyvati'.  
 pack.INF

'I would not wrap a gift for a man with such paper.'

d. *-to topic and focus*

\*VČERA Irinu-to ja videla, a Maksima DAVNO ne vstrečala.  
 yesterday Irina.ACC-TO I.NOM saw but Max.ACC long.time NEG met

'As to Irina, I saw her YESTERDAY, but I have not seen Max for a long time.'

e. Irinu-to včera ja videla, a Maksima davno ne vstrečala.  
 Irina.ACC-TO yesterday I.NOM saw but Max.ACC long.time NEG met

'As to Irina, I saw her YESTERDAY, but I have not seen Max for a long time.'

The exception is *wh*-words: as illustrated in (185), they can either precede or follow *-to* topics, and both orders receive the same interpretation.

- (185) a. Kogo Marina-to ty predstavil?  
 who.ACC Marina.DAT-TO you.NOM introduced  
 ‘As for Marina, who did you introduced to her?’
- b. Marina-to kogo ty predstavil?  
 Marina.DAT-TO who.ACC you.NOM introduced  
 ‘As for Marina, who did you introduced to her?’

Considering this peculiar behavior of *-to* topics and taking into account the fact that *wh*-words move to the Spec,CP position (Scott 2012), both kinds of approaches agree that there must be a special position for *-to* topics at the CP level. The implementations of this idea vary: for instance, Dyakonova (2009) introduces a designated TopP projection exclusively for higher topics, Bailyn (2012) tentatively suggests that items at the left edge of phasal domains (including CP) are interpreted as topics, while Scott (2012) argues that they move to the so-called HopP projected above CP.

Importantly, *-to* topics allow us to divide the left periphery into two parts: the lower layer (lower functional projections or multiple specifiers of T<sup>0</sup>) and the higher layer (higher functional projections or multiple specifiers of C<sup>0</sup>). Furthermore, since *-to* topics can also occur in embedded non-finite clauses, this supports the claim that infinitival constructions can be larger than TPs (see Section 3.4).

- (186) a. Tebe važno / nado projekt-to ran’she zakončit’?  
 you.DAT important.N.SG necessary.N.SG project.ACC-TO earlier complete.INF  
 ‘As for the project, is it important / necessary for you to complete it earlier?’
- b. Važno / nado projektu-to ran’she zakončit’sja?  
 important.N.SG necessary.N.SG project.DAT-TO earlier complete.INF  
 ‘Is it important / necessary for the project to be complete erlier?’

That the higher layer of the embedded left periphery is transparent can be seen from the behavior of embedded negative concord items licensed by the matrix negation. As discussed in Section 3.2, in these cases, negative pronouns must be at the very left edge of their clause: they cannot be lower than focus (187), and, as shown in (188), are preferably located above *-to* topics.

- (187) a. Maše ne bylo važno ničem načal'stvo-to udivit'.  
 Maša.DAT NEG was important.N.SG nothing.INS bosses.ACC-TO surprise.INF  
 'As for the bosses, for Maša it was not important to surprise them with anything.'
- b. ??Maše ne bylo važno načal'stvo-to ničem udivit'.  
 Maša.DAT NEG was important.N.SG bosses.ACC-TO nothing.INS surprise.INF  
 'As for the bosses, for Maša it was not important to surprise them with anything.'

Taking all these data into account, we can finally take a look at sentences with an overt dative subject and a higher *-to* / NCI or a lower focus.<sup>8</sup> The relevant examples provided below in (188) and (189) are hard to find in corpora, and due to their complex nature they receive lower acceptability scores than similar sentences with a single embedded topic, focus or a NCI. However, I believe that comparison of the judgments provided by the native speakers I consulted is instructive to understand which word orders are preferable and which are almost unanimously prohibited.

First, as we have already seen in Section 3.2, NCIs tend to precede overt embedded subjects (188). Second, *-to* topics also turn out to appear to the left of dative DPs (189a and 189b); the only exception is embedded subjects – NCIs licensed by the matrix negation (189c and 189d).

- (188) a. Ne bylo tak už važno [nikem rane byt'  
 NEG was so PTCL important.N.SG nobody.INS wound.DAT be.INF  
 zalečenoj].  
 heal.PTCP  
 'It was not important for the wound to be healed by anybody.'
- b. ?\*Ne bylo tak už važno [rane nikem byt'  
 NEG was so PTCL important.N.SG wound.DAT nobody.INS be.INF  
 zalečenoj].  
 heal.PTCP  
 'It was not important for the wound to be healed by anybody.'

---

8. Unlike, for instance, in Hungarian, where a true syntactic Focus position is easily detectable (É. Kiss 1998, 2002, and elsewhere), the only unquestionable fact about Russian Focus is that the contrastive Focus usually appears at the left periphery of a clause, while Information Focus (*Rheme*) tends to appear sentence-finally (Neeleman and Titov 2009, a.o.).

- (189) a. ?\*Važno                    rezul'tatam načal'stvo-to    udivit'?
- important.N.SG results.DAT bosses.ACC-TO surprise.INF
- 'As for the bosses, is it important for the results to surprise them?'
- b. ?Važno                    načal'stvo-to    rezul'tatam udivit'?
- important.N.SG bosses.ACC-TO results.DAT surprise.INF
- 'As for the bosses, is it important for the results to surprise them?'
- c. ?Ne    bylo važno                    nikomu        /    ničemu            načal'stvo-to
- NEG was important.N.SG nobody.DAT    nothing.DAT bosses.ACC-TO
- udivit'
- surprise.INF
- 'As for the bosses, it was not important for anyone / anything to surprise them.'
- d. ?\*Ne    bylo važno                    načal'stvo-to    nikomu        /    ničemu
- NEG was important.N.SG bosses.ACC-TO nobody.DAT    nothing.DAT
- udivit'
- surprise.INF
- 'As for the bosses, it was not important for anyone / anything to surprise them.'

This suggests that overt embedded subjects can stay relatively low, within the lower left periphery layer. This is further confirmed by the availability of scrambling of overt dative subjects and embedded focused constituents (190).


- (190) a. Važno                    projektu    K PONEDEL'NIKU byt'    zakončennym.
- important.N.SG project.DAT by Monday        be.INF complete.PTCP
- 'It is important for the project to be complete BY MONDAY.'
- b. Važno                    K PONEDEL'NIKU projektu    byt'    zakončennym.
- important.N.SG by Monday        project.DAT be.INF complete.PTCP
- 'It is important for the project to be complete BY MONDAY.'

Under a cartographic analysis such scrambling would imply that the two items are in the Spec,topP and the higher / lower Spec,FocP, respectively, and under a non-cartographic approach they will be hosted in free order by multiple specifier positions of the TP.

To summarize, the data discussed in this section demonstrate that an overt embedded subject licensed by the matrix applicative head can remain relatively low within its clause, in the lower left periphery layer among secondary topics and Focus. The simplified structure

of a sentence with a matrix predicative and an embedded non-finite clause with an overt subject is repeated in (191).

(191)



In the next section I will turn back to the Two-Dative Generalization and provide additional support for the present analysis.

## 4.4 Additional support

### 4.4.1 Epistemic modals

The first piece of additional support for the proposed analysis comes from constructions with matrix epistemic predicatives that do not allow dative Holders and, at the same time, prohibit embedded non-finite clauses with overt subjects.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, epistemic modal predicatives, such as *vozmožno* ‘possible’, *verojatno* ‘probable’, cannot occur with a matrix Holder (192).

- (192) (\*Maše) vozmožno vstretit' znakomyx / čto Anna vstretit  
 Maša.DAT possible.N.SG meet friends.ACC that Anna.NOM meet.NPST  
 znakomyx.  
 friends.ACC  
 'It is probable to meet friends / that Anna will meet her friends.'

As further shown in (193), overt referential subjects are also unavailable in non-finite clauses embedded under such a predicative.

- (193) \*Vozmožno stroitel'stvu zakončit'sja k martu.  
 possible.N.SG construction.DAT complete.INF by March  
 Intended: 'It is possible that the construction will be complete by March.'

This can be easily accounted for by the present analysis: no applicative head is projected in the matrix clause with an epistemic modal and there is no accessible external source for Case that would be able, if available, to license an embedded overt DP subject.

Although the behavior of epistemic modals does not necessarily prove that the proposed cross-clausal Case assignment analysis is the only viable approach, the fact that dative Holders and overt embedded subjects not only are allowed but can also be **disallowed** simultaneously strengthens the connection between the two.

#### 4.4.2 Constructions with covert modality

##### DP / PRO alternation in MECs and main clause infinitives

As the second piece of additional support, I would like to present several other constructions that fall under the Two-Dative Generalization and can be accounted for by the proposed analysis in term of cross-clausal Case licensing. The whole Chapter 5 of this thesis is devoted to mandative verbs, such as *prikazat'* 'order' and *razrešit'* 'allow', which turn out to also support both control and ECM-like configurations, and in this section I will briefly discuss two constructions with covert modality: modal existential constructions (MECs) and main clause infinitives.

Modal existential constructions (MECs) in Russian consist of a dative DP, a finite existential BE verb that exhibits default third person / neuter singular agreement, an interrogative

pronoun and a non-finite clause; semantically, their interpretations involve root existential modality ('can', 'may') (194).

- (194) a. Nam jest' čto počitat'.  
 we.DAT exists what.ACC read.INF  
 'We have something to read.'
- b. Pete bylo kogo otpravit' za molokom.  
 Petja.DAT existed someone.ACC send.INF after milk  
 'Petja had someone to send for more milk.'
- c. Maše budet gde spat'.  
 Maša.DAT exist.NPST where sleep.INF  
 'Maša will have where to sleep.'

The so-called main clause infinitives are also well-known in the literature on Russian syntax (see Moore and Perlmutter (2000), Fleisher (2006), and references therein). As illustrated in (195), a non-finite clause combines with a dative DP with the help of the BE copula (covert in present tense); in contrast with MECs, main clauses imply universal modality.

- (195) a. Maše rano vstavat'.  
 Maša.DAT early wake.up.INF  
 'Maša should wake up early.'
- b. Maše budet rano vstavat'.  
 Maša.DAT be.NPST early wake.up.INF  
 'Maša will have to wake up early.'
- c. Pete bylo ne rešit' etu zadaču.  
 Petja.DAT existed NEG solve.INF this task.ACC  
 'Petja could not solve this task.'

Note also that neither of these constructions allows an embedded finite clause (196).

- (196) a. \*Nam jest' čto my počitaem.  
 we.DAT exists what.ACC we.NOM read.NPST  
 Intended: 'We have something that we will be able to read.'
- b. \*Maše budet čtoby ona rano vstala.  
 Maša.DAT be.NPST so that she.NOM early wake.up.SUBJ  
 Intended: 'Maša will have to wake up early.'

- c. \*Petje bylo čto on ne rešil etu zadaču.  
 Petja.DAT was that he.NOM NEG solved this task.ACC  
 Intended: ‘Peter could not solve this task.’

In both constructions coreference between the dative DP and the understood subject of the embedded clause is obligatory (197).<sup>9</sup>

- (197) a. Petja<sub>j</sub> znaet, čto Maše<sub>i</sub> est’ čto *ec<sub>i/\*j</sub>* počitat’.  
 Petja.NOM knows that Maša.DAT exists what.ACC read.INF  
 ‘Petja knows that Maša has something to read.’  
 b. [Roditeljam Peti<sub>j</sub>]<sub>i</sub> est’ čto *ec<sub>i/\*j</sub>* počitat’.  
 parents.DAT Petja.GEN exists what.ACC read.INF  
 ‘Petja’s parents have something to read.’

Regarding both constructions, there are ongoing debates on whether a control relation is established between the dative DP and the embedded PRO subject or the overt embedded subject itself raises to a matrix position. I argue that, just as in the case of evaluative / modal predicatives, the two lines of argumentation should be reconciled to reveal the truth.

On the one hand, both MECs and main clause infinitives exhibit a crucial obligatory control property: partial coreference between the dative DP and the covert embedded subject is allowed (198).

- (198) a. Maše<sub>i</sub> jest’ kogda PRO<sub>i+</sub> vstretit’sja.  
 Maša.DAT is when meet.INF  
 ‘Maša has time to meet.’  
 b. Maše jest’ čto PRO<sub>i+</sub> vmeste delat’.  
 Maša.DAT is what together do.INF  
 ‘Maša has something to do together.’  
 c. ?Petja sčitaet, čto Maše<sub>i</sub> PRO<sub>i+</sub> ne pojti vmeste v kino.  
 Petja.NOM believes that Maše.DAT NEG go.INF together into cinema  
 ‘Petja believes that Maša cannot go to the cinema together.’

---

9. Bi-clausality of main clause infinitives has been demonstrated by Fleisher (2006) (see Moore and Perlmutter (2000) suggesting a monoclausal analysis). Fleisher’s arguments include the following: (i) presence of the finite matrix *byt’* ‘be’, (ii) positioning of (embedded) negation after *byt’*, (iii) co-occurrence of *byt’* with perfective infinitives, normally prohibited in monoclausal constructions. A bi-clausal approach is also implied in Veyrenc (1979), Schein (1982), and Sigurðsson (2002).



On the other hand, both constructions show positive results for the diagnostics for an overt embedded subject, such as the idiom chunk and non-sentence tests (199).

- (199) a. Černoj koške<sub>i</sub> bylo iz-za čěgo t<sub>i</sub> probežat' meždu nimi.  
 black cat.DAT was because of what run.INF between them  
 Idiomatic reading available: 'They had a reason to quarrel.'  
 Literally: 'The black cat had a reason to run between them.'
- b. Petja sčítaet, čto gruzovikam zdes' ne projexat'.  
 Petja.NOM believes that trucks.DAT here NEG pass.INF  
 'Petja believes that the trucks cannot pass here.'

A detailed examination of all peculiar properties of these constructions is beyond the limits of this thesis, and, for the present discussion, it suffices to conclude that they both allow the DP / PRO alternation in the embedded non-finite environment.

Furthermore, both MECs and main clause infinitives fall under the proposed Two-Dative Generalization: the matrix dative DP cannot co-occur with an overt embedded subject (200).

- (200) a. \*Nam jest' čto tebe pojest'.  
 we.DAT is what you.DAT eat.INF  
 Intended: 'We have something for you to eat.'
- b. U nas jest' čto tebe pojest'.  
 at us is what you.DAT eat.INF  
 'At our place there is something for you to eat.'
- (201) \*Pete bylo gruzovikam ne proexat'.  
 Petja.DAT was trucks.DAT NEG pass  
 Intended: 'For Petja for the trucks it was impossible to pass.'

## The analysis

Building upon Simík (2011) and den Dikken (2006), I suggest the following (simplified) structural representations for modal existential constructions and main clause infinitives (202).

- (202) a.  $[_{RP} DP_{DAT} [_{R'} R^0 [_{CP} wh [_{C'} C^0 [PRO \text{ infinitive}]]]]]$   
 b.  $[_{RP} DP_{DAT} [_{R'} R^0 [_{CP} PRO \text{ infinitive}]]]$

I argue that the traditional descriptions should be further revised to account for the possibility of an overt embedded subject, licensed by the higher functional head (here, R(elator)) when the matrix participant is an implicit  $\varphi$ P, in the way presented in (203).

- (203) a.  $[_{RP} \varphi P [_R R^0 [_{CP} wh [_C C^0 [PRO \text{ infinitive}]]]]]$   
 b.  $[_{RP} \varphi P [_R R^0 [_{CP} PRO \text{ infinitive}]]]$

As in the case of sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative and an embedded non-finite clause, the cross-clausal Case assignment analysis might be not the only way to account for the control vs. no control ambiguity of MECs and main clause infinitives. However, the proposed approach can straightforwardly capture the relevant properties noted by the two competitive lines of research.

## 4.5 Theoretical implications

### 4.5.1 The DP / PRO alternation in Russian: back to the general picture

#### Combining Case licensing and free alternation

In this section I will discuss the presented generalization and analysis in a broader perspective. To begin with, let us briefly go over the proposal and see what impact it has on the existing approaches to DP / PRO distribution.

To summarize, I have demonstrated that, in Russian, the DP / PRO alternation is attested in non-finite clauses of the same structural size (arguably, CP) and Tense – Agr characteristics, embedded under an evaluative / deontic modal predicative. The alternation is restricted by the presence of a potential matrix  $DP_{DAT}$  controller, as lexical embedded subjects are available only when the closest matrix argument (a Holder) is either covert or a PP. Thus it turns out that it is not a lexical subject and PRO that are in complementary distribution, but rather overt embedded subjects and overt potential DP controllers.

We have also seen that the correlation between the presence of a matrix  $DP_{DAT}$  argument and the availability of an embedded  $DP_{DAT}$  subject holds for other kinds of constructions,

including epistemic modals, modal existential constructions and main clause infinitives. The matrix DP and the embedded DP appear to be closely connected, and I propose that this connection and the complementarity follow from the simple fact that the two are licensed by the same functional head, namely, the matrix Appl<sup>0</sup> in the case of evaluative / deontic modal predicatives.

This explanation sides with other approaches to DP / PRO alternation in terms of Case licensing. Adopting the common idea that Case is a feature valued under Agree and the modern version of Case filter, presented in (204), I argue that a lexical embedded subject can check [uCase] with a matrix applicative head, if it is not checked by a DP in the Spec,AppIP (the issue of locality will be discussed in the next subsection); in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative in Russian this could happen if the matrix Holder is an implicit  $\varphi$ P that does not have a Case layer (DP / KP) or a PP.

- (204) Case Filter  
 \*[Noun Phrase *uCase*]

I further assume that PRO does not need Case to be licensed;<sup>10</sup> this can be formulated either in terms of absence of Case (resembling caseless PRO in Government and Binding theory (Chomsky 1981)) or the special null Case (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993; Bošković 1997; Martin 2001, a.o.).

Crucially, although I clearly advocate the Case licensing approach, the analysis proposed in this thesis falls in line (to a certain extent) with approaches that postulate a relatively free distribution of DPs and PRO. This highlights the issue that, in its core, the Case licensing framework does not prohibit overt DPs to be merged as subjects of non-finite clauses, as it merely states that they will not ‘survive’ in that position without some help from the outside. This contrasts with many ‘non-Case licensing’ approaches, such as Landau’s (2015) Two-Tiered theory of control and Sigurðsson (2008). Although at first glance these analyses agree with, for instance, Sundaresan and McFadden’s (2009) approach in rejecting relevance of Case, they introduce various mechanisms to prevent lexical and PRO subjects from ever appearing in the same embedded environments.

---

10. With respect to Case licensing, it can be proposed that PRO is similar to Case-less implicit Holders,  $\varphi$ Ps.

## Direction of Case licensing

Before I proceed by addressing the crucial issue of the distance of Case licensing, a few words should be said about the direction of it. As mentioned earlier, I assume that downward Case licensing, which complies with the general idea of downward Agree (see Preminger and Polinsky (2015) for argumentation), is available in Russian together with Spec-Head Case assignment (Kayne 1989; Koopman 2006). Recall that, under the proposed analysis, a matrix applicative head normally licences an applied object in the Spec,ApplP position; only when the latter is a weak implicit argument or a PP can a cross-clausal dependency between the applicative head and the embedded subject be established. This discrepancy can be accounted for by adopting a restricted ‘hybrid’ approach to Agree. From a cross-linguistic perspective, support for downward agree has been found in many languages; at the same time, as noted by Koopman (2006), Chomsky’s original (2001) notion of Agree leaves a possibility for (a kind of) agreement to be triggered under Merge. Given that Specifiers are in a relation to a lexical / functional head, the idea of Spec-Head agreement as a by-product of Merge should not be surprising.

### 4.5.2 Cross-clausal A-dependencies

#### Adding applicatives to the picture

The cases of cross-clausal Case assignment presented in this thesis fall under the general discussion of various cross-clausal A-dependencies: subject raising, ECM, and agreement across clause boundaries; see Wurmbrand (2018) for an overview.<sup>11</sup> A couple of examples of these phenomena in various languages are given in (205).

(205) a. *Raising out of a finite clause in Brazilian Portuguese* (Nunes 2009)

Os meninos parecem que fizeram a tarefa.  
the boys seem.3.PL that did.3.PL the homework  
‘The boys seem to have done their homework.’

---

11. A cross-clausal A-dependency can be established across a non-finite or a finite clause boundary. The terms, often used in the literature to refer to the latter cases are hyper raising/ECM and long-distance agreement.

b. *ECM in finite clauses in Turkish* (Şener 2011)

John [makarna-yı ye-n-di diye] duy-du.  
 John.NOM pasta-ACC eat-PASS-PST COMP hear-PST

‘John heard that pasta was eaten.’

c. *Long-distance object agreement in Nez Perce* (Deal 2017)

Taamsas-nim hi-nees-nek-se [<sub>CP</sub> mamay’as-nim poo-payata-six  
 Taamsas-ERG 3.SBJ-O.PL-think-IMP children-ERG 3/3-help-IMP.S.PL  
 Angel-ne].  
 Angel-ACC

‘Taamsas thinks the children are helping Angel.’

Most of the attested cross-clausal dependencies involve either matrix  $T^0$  or  $v^0$  /  $\text{Voice}^0$ . Consider, for instance, the phenomena illustrated above in (205): the subject raising in Brazilian Portuguese is arguably triggered by the matrix  $T^0$  (Nunes 2009), while Case licensing in Turkish and object agreement in Nez Perce depend on  $v^0/\text{Voice}^0$  (note that, in Turkish, the embedded passive predicate is in principle incapable of assigning accusative case) (Şener 2011; Deal 2017).

To these cases can be added well-known long-distance object agreement in Basque (Etxepare 2006; Boeckx 2010; Preminger 2009) and in Hindi-Urdu (Hook 1979; Mahajan 1989; Davison 1991; Butt 1995; Boeckx 2004; Bhatt 2005; Chandra 2007; Keine 2013, a.o.), illustrated in (206) and (207), respectively; in both cases the matrix verb agrees with an embedded object.

(206) [Nobela erromantiko-ak irakur-tze-a] gustatzen  
 novel(s) romantic-ART.PL(ABS) read-NMZ-ART(ABS) like(HAB)  
 ∅-ZAI-ZKI-O.  
 3.ABS-BE-PL.ABS-3.SG.DAT

‘He or she likes to read romantic novels.’

(207) Raam-ne [rotii khaa-nii] caah-ii.  
 Ram-ERG bread.F eat-INF.F.SG want-PFV.F.SG

‘Ram wanted to eat bread.’

The Russian constructions considered in this thesis complement the data and add  $\text{Appl}^0$  to the general picture, suggesting that all functional heads on the clausal spine that have Case features are capable of establishing inter-clausal relations with a DP. This opens up

many directions for future research. One of them would be examination of languages where applicative heads overtly agree with an applied object; if a similar kind of DP / PRO alternation is attested there, we would expect to find correlation with the agreement pattern. Another would be to find a language with subject raising to Spec,ApplP across a clause boundary.

### Long-distance Case licensing

The most striking property of the cross-clausal Case licensing in Russian, discussed in this thesis, is that it appears to be long-distance and established across a CP boundary (see the discussion in Section 4.3.3). From an empirical point of view, this nicely complements the existing data from various languages, since most of the known cases of cross-clausal A dependencies are attested either in smaller non-phasal infinitives (see, for instance, raising / ECM in English) or in finite clauses with embedded agreement and an overt complementizer (see the examples in (205)).

Taking into account the common assumption that CPs are phases, subject to the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC),<sup>12</sup> it might be assumed that an embedded subject moves to the ‘transparent’ edge of the embedded clause (Spec,CP) and so becomes accessible to higher functional elements. An analysis along this line has been proposed, for example, for hyper-raising in Mongolian by Fong (2019) to explain the fact that embedded subjects are assigned accusative case and can optionally surface in a matrix A-position (208); see also Tanaka (2002), Takeuchi (2010), and Şener (2008), a.o., for similar analyses for cross-clausal A-dependencies in Japanese and Turkish.

(208) *Hyper-raising via the Spec,CP in Mongolian* (Fong 2019)

- a. Bat [margaash Dulmaa-g nom unsh-n ge] khel-sen.  
Bat tomorrow Dulmaa-ACC book read-N.PST COMP say-PST  
‘Bat said that Dulmaa will read a book tomorrow.’
- b. Bat nokhoi-g chang-aar [t gaikhal-tai ge] khel-sen.  
Bat dog-ACC loud-INS wonder-with COMP say-PST  
‘Bat said loudly that dogs are wonderful.’

---

12. See Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2005), den Dikken (2007, 2012), and Bošković (2014), a.o., on phases as the highest projection of a cyclic domain – vP, CP.

However, the interaction of embedded lexical subjects with embedded fronted NCIs, high and low topics and focus, described in Section 4.3.3, demonstrates that they can stay relatively low in the left periphery (arguably, in the Spec,FinP / Spec,TP) and still get licensed by the matrix Appl<sup>0</sup>; a couple of examples are repeated in (209) to show that an embedded subject can only scramble with topics / focus within the lower (TP-related) layer of the left periphery but not with the contrastive *-to* topic within the higher (CP-related) layer.

- (209) a. Važno [k martu-to sroitel'stvu (\*k martu-to) zakončit'sja]?  
 important.N.SG by March-TO construction.DAT by March-TO complete.INF  
 'As for the construction, is it important for it to be complete by March?'
- b. Važno [K PONEDEL'NIKU projektu byt' zakončennym].  
 important.N.SG by Monday project.DAT be.INF complete.PTCP  
 'It is important for the project to be complete BY MONDAY.'
- c. Važno [projektu K PONEDEL'NIKU byt' zakončennym].  
 important.N.SG project.DAT by Monday be.INF complete.PTCP  
 'It is important for the project to be complete BY MONDAY.'

Thus, we are left with an apparent violation of PIC and the locality restriction on Agree, reproduced from Chapter 1 in (210), that must be accounted for.

- (210) *Locality restriction on Agree:*  
 (given that  $\alpha$  is a probe and  $\beta$  is a goal)  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are not separated by a phase head

There are two potential ways to overcome the locality problem. First, one might propose that, for some reason, PIC is not applicable to embedded infinitives in Russian (see Ferreira (2009), Zeller (2006), Ura (2007), and Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Wurmbrand (2014), a.o., for similar proposals for other languages). For instance, developing the Agree theory of control, Landau (2004) argues that a matrix functional head can directly agree with embedded PRO across a CP boundary; to account for this, he assumes that control infinitives are weak phases, without providing further support for this claim. In a similar fashion, Ura (2007) suggests for long-distance ECM constructions in a dialect of Japanese that this kind of clauses are headed by a special 'non-phasal' complementizer.<sup>13</sup>

---

13. In those languages where a cross-clausal dependency is established between an embedded subject and matrix T<sup>0</sup>, the higher vP phase remains a problem. To deal with it, Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Wurmbrand (2014), based on the long-distance Case licensing examples from Spanish, Romanian and Greek, propose that matrix v<sup>0</sup> raises to T<sup>0</sup>, extending the higher phase (den Dikken 2007; Gallego 2005, 2010; Gallego and Uriagereka 2006).

However, to the best of my knowledge, there is no data that would support the idea that embedded CPs in Russian are fully transparent; recall, for instance, that negative concord items that are not at very edge of an embedded clause cannot be licensed by the matrix negation (211).


- (211) a. Petja ne zastavljal Mašu [(*\*Anne*) ničego (Anne)  
 Petja.NOM NEG forced Maša.ACC Anna.DAT nothing.GEN Anna.DAT  
 darit' zavtra].  
 present.INF tomorrow  
 'Petja did not forced Maša to present anything to Anna tomorrow.'
- b. Korolju ne nraivilos' [(*\*zavtra*) nikogo (zavtra) posylat' na  
 king.DAT NEG liked tomorrow nobody.GEN tomorrow send.INF to  
 vernuju smert'].  
 certain death  
 'The king did not like to send anybody to a certain death tomorrow.'

The second possible solution for the locality problem, and the one that I actually adopt for the Russian constructions, is to analyze long-distance Case licensing / Agree as cyclic. Approaches along this line have been proposed for several languages under different names, such as cyclic Agree, Agree-chaining, head-to-head Agree, indirect Agree; see, for instance, Bhatt's (2005) analysis for long-distance object agreement in Hindi-Urdu, Stjepanovic and Takahashi (2001), Legate's (2005) proposal based on examples from English, Celtic, Pas-samaquoddy, a.o.

The idea of cyclic Agree is straightforward: instead of postulating direct feature sharing between a matrix probe and an embedded goal, we divide this process into smaller steps identifying intermediate probes / goals. In the case of Russian, I propose that the embedded  $C^0$  is such an 'intermediary'. The Case feature sharing proceeds as follows: the matrix  $Appl^0$  establishes relations with the embedded  $C^0$  which, in turn, allows the embedded DP to check [uCase] on the  $C^0$ . The operation is schematized in (212).



(212)



I assume that  $C^0$  can participate in Agree having  $\varphi$ -features (see also van Urk's (2015) proposal, based on data from Dinka, that C exhibits both A-bar and A properties). If the proposed analysis is on the right track, it further supports Legate's (2005), a.o., claim about the possibility of genuinely long-distance Case licensing, and presents a challenge for its opponents, including, for instance, McFadden (2009), who argues that, unlike Agree in other features, Case valuation is always local.

## 4.6 Summary

In this chapter I examined several possible ways to formally account for the proposed generalization: the Case-licensing approach adopted from Chomsky and Lasnik (1993), Landau's (2004) Agree theory of control and Sundaresan and McFadden's (2009) selection based approach. I argued that the Case licensing approach successfully captures most of the properties of the DP / PRO alternation in Russian, however, its standard version should be revised to allow a long-distance Case assignment across a CP boundary (contrary to Williams (1987)

and Lasnik (1998) claims that long-distance subject-raising and ECM are restricted to TP infinitives).

I developed an analysis in terms of cross-clausal Case licensing, and demonstrated that, from an empirical point of view, the Russian data nicely complement other examples of cross-clausal A-dependencies from various languages, since most of the known cases of are attested either in smaller non-phasal infinitives or in finite clauses with embedded agreement and an overt complementizer. Finally I argued that, unlike, for instance, in Turkish (Şener 2011) and Mongolian (Fong 2019), Case licensing in Russian can be genuinely long-distance as the embedded subject stays relatively low in its clause. I proposed to account for this in terms of cyclic Agree / Case assignment via  $C^0$ , essentially adopting Legate's approach.

# Chapter 5

## Mandative verbs

### 5.1 Overview

In this chapter I will further expand the set of constructions that allow the discussed DP / PRO alternation and fall under the Two-Dative Generalization, adding mandative verbs, such as *velet* ‘order’, *prikazat* ‘order’, *razrešit* ‘permit’, to the picture.

Traditionally, these verbs, similarly to their English translation equivalents, are listed among object control predicates,<sup>1</sup> however, the more recent works by Barrie and Pittman (2010) and Minor (2013) propose that mandatives should be re-analyzed as subject-to-object raising verbs. In what follows, I will apply the already familiar set of diagnostics (see Chapter 3) to demonstrate that Russian mandatives that embed non-finite clauses support both obligatory object control and a configuration with an overt embedded subject. This often gives rise to interpretational ambiguity and sentences similar to (213) can get multiple readings, depending on whether the dative DP is the matrix controller or the embedded subject itself. The ambiguity can be resolved in cases of, for example, an inanimate embedded subject (213b) or partial coreference between the matrix Holder and PRO (213c).

---


1. The relevant works that discuss non-finite complementation in Russian include but are not limited to Schein (1982), Greenberg (1985), Franks and Hornstein (1992), Babby (1998), Landau (2008), and Bailyn (2012).

- (213) a. Maša velela mal'čikam ostat'sja.  
 Maša.NOM ordered boys.DAT stay.INF  
 (i) 'Maša ordered the boys to stay.' ← 'the boys' = a matrix constituent  
 (ii) 'Maša ordered someone for the boys to stay.' ← 'the boys' = the embedded subject
- b. Maša velela [stroitel'stvu zakončit'sja k srede].  
 Maša.NOM ordered construction.DAT complete.INF by Wednesday  
 'Maša ordered for the construction to be complete by Wednesday.'  
 ← 'construction' = the embedded subject
- c. Maša velela Ivanu<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i+</sub> razojtis' ne pozže šesti].  
 Maša.NOM ordered Ivan.DAT disperse.INF NEG later six  
 'Maša ordered Ivan to disperse by six.' ← 'Ivan' = a matrix constituent


I argue that, similarly to sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative, there is no difference in terms of agreement, tense or structural size between non-finite embedded clauses with PRO and those with an overt DP subject that could justify postulating lexical ambiguity of mandative predicates and predict their distribution. Again, the attested DP / PRO alternation turns out not to be entirely 'free' and complies with the proposed Two-Dative Generalization.

I propose that the similarity between mandative verbs and predicatives, in particular, deontic modals, stems from the fact that mandative verbs are overt manifestations of a verb of communication (SAY) that embeds a silent deontic modal; the latter, in turn, selects a clause as its argument. Unlike in approaches that place a modal component within an infinitival clause itself (Bhatt 1999; Pesetsky and Torrego 2001; Wurmbrand 2014), in this case, the modal is a separate lexical head, although it remains covert. The ultimate structures are given in (214) and (215), where the embedded subject position is occupied either by PRO or by an overt referential DP.

(214)



(215)



Before I proceed, a few words should be said about the data presented in this Chapter. I elicited grammaticality judgments from 20 monolingual native speakers of Russian, 20 – 35 y.o. Although my own intuition does not always agree with that of the others, a certain

degree of variation is expected and the data should not be ignored. The variation itself deserves further consideration, however, its thorough examination lies beyond the scope of this thesis. For the present discussion it suffices to say that, although there are less permissive and more permissive speakers, the ambiguity under consideration holds for the same group of consultants. That is, the same speakers accept, for example, sentences with a matrix mandative verb and an inanimate dative DP (an overt embedded subject) and sentences with partial coreference between the matrix Holder and the understood embedded subject (obligatory control cases).

In what follows, I will discuss general properties of mandative verbs and the results for the raising / control diagnostics applied to sentences with a matrix mandative predicate and an embedded non-finite clause (Section 5.2). After that, I will demonstrate that, contrary to the existing analyses that attempt to classify mandatives as either control or raising verbs, they exhibit control vs. lexical embedded subject ambiguity (Section 5.3). Finally, I will present the decomposition approach that analyzes mandatives as overt realizations of a verb of communication embedding a silent deontic modal (Section 5.4).

## 5.2 Mandative verbs and overt embedded subjects

### 5.2.1 General properties

Let us start by describing the syntactic behavior of Russian mandative verbs: *razrešit'* 'allow', *pozvolit'* 'allow', *zapretit'* 'prohibit', *prikazat'* 'order', *velet'* 'order', *predpisat'* 'obligate', *poručit'* 'charge', *skazat'* 'tell' and their derived forms.

Mandative verbs co-occur with a dative DP that refers to the obligation / permission holder and an embedded constituent (usually a clause) denoting an event that should or should not happen (216); as illustrated in (216b), a Holder can be implicit.<sup>2</sup>

---

2. I focus primarily on constructions with overt dative DPs and I leave those with implicit participants aside for future research; for discussions of the problem see Bouchard (1982), Sag and Pollard (1991), Wyngaerd (1994), Jackendoff and Culicover (2003), and Landau (2013), a.o.

- (216) a. Vrač            velel    Maše        jest'    ovošči.  
 doctor.NOM ordered Maša.DAT eat.INF vegetables  
 'The doctor ordered Maša to eat vegetables.'
- b. Vrač            velel    jest'        ovošči.  
 doctor.NOM ordered eat.INF vegetables  
 'The doctor ordered (someone) to eat vegetables.'

When a mandative predicate is used together with an overt dative DP and a non-finite clause, the former must be coreferent with the understood subject of the embedded clause. As demonstrated in (217), the relation between the two complies with structural requirements and cannot be established solely from a pragmatic perspective.

- (217) a. Ivan<sub>k</sub>        znal'    što    Petja        velel    Maše<sub>i</sub>        sdelat' zadanije samoj<sub>i</sub> /  
 Ivan.NOM knew that Petja.NOM ordered Maša.DAT do.INF task.ACC herself  
 \*samomu<sub>k</sub>.  
 himself  
 'Ivan knew that Petja had ordered Maša to do the task herself.'
- b. Petja            velel    [druzjam    Maši<sub>k</sub>]<sub>i</sub>    sdelat' zadanije samim<sub>i</sub> /  
 Petja.NOM ordered friends.DAT Maša.GEN do.INF task.ACC themselves  
 \*samoj<sub>k</sub>.  
 herself  
 'Petja ordered Maša's friends to do the task themselves.'
- c. Učitel'            velel    Maše        sdelat' zadanije, i    direktor        Ivanu  
 teacher.NOM ordered Maša.DAT do.INF task.ACC and director.NOM Ivan.DAT  
 tože.  
 too  
 'The teacher ordered Maša to do the task and the director ordered Ivan to do the task.'
- Not available: '... the director ordered Ivan for Maša to do the task.'

With regard to mandative verbs, the two options already familiar from the discussion in Chapter 3 are potentially available to describe the relation between the overt dative DP and the understood embedded subject in sentences with a matrix mandative predicate. The first option is to treat the two as syntactically distinct items, with the matrix dative DP controlling the embedded silent subject. The second option is to analyze the dative DP as

the subject of the non-finite clause itself. Traditionally, mandatives are considered to be ordinary object control predicates (Franks and Hornstein 1992; Babby 1998; Landau 2013, a.o.); however, recent works by Barrie and Pittman (2010) (for English) and Minor (2013) (for Russian) argue that these verbs should be analyzed as raising predicates with an overt embedded subject. In the next section I will demonstrate that the dative DP corresponds to either a matrix participant ('controller') or the embedded subject.

### 5.2.2 Overt embedded subject diagnostics

In a sentence with a matrix mandative verb, a dative DP and an embedded non-finite clause, the DP can be base-generated within the lower clause receiving its thematic role from the embedded predicate; thus, it can be completely independent from the matrix verb. Evidence for this is found in the results for the idiom chunk, embedded passivization and sentence tests.

First, embedded under a mandative predicate, the idiom *černaja koška probežala meždu nimi* 'a black cat run between them' can receive an idiomatic interpretation 'the two people quarrelled' (218), which is possible if 'a black cat' is base-generated as a part of the embedded collocation. Sentences with mandative verbs can be compared to parallel constructions with ordinary object control predicates, for instance, implicative verbs (*zastavit'* 'force', *ubedit'* 'persuade', etc.).

- (218) a. Ja ne velel černoj koške probegat' meždu nimi.  
 I NEG ordered black cat.DAT run.INF between them  
 Literal reading available: 'I did not order a black cat to run between them.'  
 Idiomatic reading available: 'I did not order / force them to quarrel.'
- b. Ja vynudil černuju košku probežat' meždu nimi.  
 I forced black cat.ACC run.INF between them  
 Only literally: 'I forced a black cat to run between them.'  
 Idiomatic reading not available: 'I forced them to quarrel.'

Second, sentences with a matrix mandative verb and an embedded passive construction can get the same interpretation as parallel sentences with an embedded active construction. In the examples in (219) the two dative DPs can refer to volitional obligation holders addressed directly by 'the director', which yields two distinct readings for these sentences. It is also



possible to interpret these sentences as equivalent, since the dative DPs can be analyzed as embedded participants. As further illustrated in (219c) and (219d), semantic equivalency under voice transformations is not allowed in case of ordinary object control verbs.

- (219) a. Direktor prikazal mal'čiku byt' ubitym Voldemortom.  
 director.NOM ordered boy.DAT be.INF kill.PTCP Voldemort.INS  
 (i) 'The director ordered the boy that he should be killed by Voldemort.' ( $\neq$  b)  
 (ii) 'The director ordered that the boy be killed by Voldemort.' (= b)
- b. Direktor prikazal Voldemortu ubit' mal'čika.  
 director.NOM ordered Voldemort.DAT kill.INF boy.ACC  
 (i) 'The director ordered Voldemort that he should kill the boy.' ( $\neq$  a)  
 (ii) 'The director ordered that Voldemort should kill the boy.' (= a)
- c. Direktor zastavil mal'čika byt' ubitym Voldemortom.  
 director.NOM forced boy.ACC be.INF kill.PTCP Voldemort.INS  
 'The director forced the boy to be killed by Voldemort.' ( $\neq$  d)
- d. Direktor zastavil Voldemorta ubit' mal'čika.  
 director.NOM forced Voldemort.ACC kill.INF boy.ACC  
 'The director forced Voldemort to kill the boy.' ( $\neq$  c)

Finally, a dative DP co-occurring with a matrix desiderative predicate can refer to a non-sentient object that cannot be interpreted as a matrix obligation holder (220). Again, as shown in (220c), this property distinguishes mandatives from ordinary object control verbs.

- (220) a. %Direktor razrešil večerinke prodolžat'sja do polunoči.  
 director.NOM permitted party.DAT continue.INF until midnight  
 'The director permitted that the party continue until midnight.'
- b. %Direktor prikazal xorkruksam byt' uničtožennymi  
 director.NOM ordered horcruxes.DAT be.INF destroy.PTCP  
 kak možno skoreje.  
 as soon as possible  
 'The director ordered that the horcruxes be destroyed as soon as possible.'  
 = 'The director ordered to destroy the horcruxes as soon as possible.'
- c. \*Direktor zastavil večerinku prodolžat'sja do polunoči.  
 director.NOM forced party.ACC continue.INF until midnight  
 Intended: 'The director forced the party to continue until midnight.'

The results for these three diagnostics show that the dative DP can be base-generated as an argument of the embedded predicate. In the next subsection, I will further demonstrate that the DP does not have to raise out of its clause.

### 5.2.3 Subject raising diagnostics

I will use the same set of diagnostics applied to predicatives in Chapter 3: the behavior of embedded indefinite *-nibud'* pronouns, the distribution of negative polarity items (NPIs), and the positioning of adjuncts.

First, a *-nibud'* pronoun is grammatical as a dative DP in sentences with a matrix mandative verb (221a), in contrast with sentences with a matrix implicative control verb (221b). Recall from Chapter 3 that *-nibud'* pronouns are normally ungrammatical in affirmative matrix clauses (221c) and can only occur in an embedded environment (221d).

- (221) a. Koroleva velela Ivanu pozvat' kogo-nibud'.  
 queen.NOM ordered Ivan.DAT call.INF someone.ACC  
 'The queen ordered Ivan to call someone.'
- b. \*Kto-nibud' velel Ivanu pozvat' korolevu.  
 someone.NOM ordered Ivan.DAT call.INF queen.ACC  
 Intended: 'Someone ordered Ivan to call the queen.'
- c. Koroleva velela komu-nibud' pozvat' Ivana.  
 queen.NOM ordered someone.DAT call.INF Ivan.ACC  
 'The queen ordered that there be someone who would call Ivan.'
- d. \*Koroleva vynudila kogo-nibud' pozvat' Ivana.  
 queen.NOM forced someone.ACC call.INF Ivan.ACC  
 Intended: 'The queen forced someone to call Ivan.'

Second, a negative *ni-* pronoun (an NPI), which must be licensed by a local clausemate negation (222a), can appear as a dative DP in a sentence with a mandative predicate and a non-finite clause that contains an embedded negation (222b). In parallel constructions with an implicative verb, an accusative NPI is illicit (222c). Taking this contrasting behavior into account, we can conclude that the dative DP under consideration is base-generated and licensed within the embedded constituent, while accusative DPs used together with implicative verbs are genuine matrix objects.

- (222) a. \*Nikto velel Ivanu ne prixodit'.  
 nobody.NOM ordered Ivan.DAT NEG come.INF  
 Intended: 'Nobody ordered Ivan not to come.'
- b. Ivan velel nikomu ne prixodit'.  
 Ivan.NOM ordered nobody.DAT NEG come.INF  
 'Ivan ordered that nobody would come.'
- c. \*Ivan vynudil nikogo ne prixodit'.  
 Ivan.NOM forced nobody.ACC NEG come.INF  
 Intended: 'Ivan forced everybody not to come.'

Finally, as shown in (223), manner adverbs (*tixon'ko* 'quietly' and *nepremenno* 'certainly, necessarily') and temporal adjuncts (*v ponedel'nik* 'on Monday') positioned between the dative DP and the rest of the embedded clause can only modify the embedded predicate but not the matrix one. Note that in these examples I am using a *-nibud'* pronoun, an inanimate DP and an NCI licensed by the embedded negation, which are unambiguously interpreted as the embedded subjects.

- (223) a. Maša velela komu-nibud' tixon'ko pomyt' posudu.  
 Maša.NOM ordered someone.DAT quietly wash.INF dishes  
 'Maša ordered for someone to wash the dishes quietly.'  
 Not available: 'Maša quietly ordered for someone to wash the dishes.'
- b. Maša velit projektu nepremenno byt' zakončennym k  
 Maša.NOM order.NPST project.DAT certainly be.INF finish.PTCP by  
 ponedel'niku.  
 Monday  
 'Maša will order that the project be necessarily finished by Monday.'  
 Not available: 'Maša will certainly order that the project be finished by Monday.'
- c. Maša velela nikomu v ponedel'nik ne prixodit'.  
 Maša.NOM ordered nobody.DAT in Monday NEG come.INF  
 'Maša ordered that nobody would come on Monday.'  
 Not available: 'Maša ordered on Monday that nobody would come.'

In contrast, if an adverb or a temporal adjunct is positioned between a mandative predicate and a dative DP (224a) or, in sentences with an object control implicative verb, after an accusative DP, examples receive an ambiguous interpretation (224b).

- (224) a. Maša velit nepremenno projektu byt' zakončennym k  
 Maša.NOM order.NPST certainly project.DAT be.INF finish.PTCP by  
 ponedel'niku.  
 Monday  
 (i) 'Maša will order that the project be necessarily finished by Monday.'  
 (ii) 'Maša will certainly order that the project be finished by Monday.'
- b. Maša zastavila Ivana v ponedel'nik ne prixodit'.  
 Maša.NOM forced Ivan.ACC in Monday NEG come.INF  
 (i) 'Maša forced Ivan not to come on Monday.'  
 (ii) 'On Monday Maša forced Ivan not to come.'

Taking all these data into account, we can conclude that the dative DP under consideration can be base-generated within the embedded non-finite clause and, importantly, can stay within its clause.

## 5.3 Control vs. overt embedded subject ambiguity

### 5.3.1 Supporting the ambiguity

All the properties of mandative verbs discussed so far point towards an ECM-style approach. The most straightforward possible representation for the structure of sentences similar to those presented in (223) is given in (225).

- (225) [<sub>VP</sub> Subject [<sub>v'</sub> v<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> mandative [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> Subject<sub>DAT</sub>] infinitive ]]]

The structure presented in (225) resembles the ones proposed for English mandatives by Barrie and Pittman (2010) and for Russian 'speech act verbs' by Minor (2013). Since, to the best of my knowledge, these are the two recent works touching upon the problem of mandative predicates passing at least some raising diagnostics, I will briefly describe them in more detail, before I proceed by examining the raising vs. control ambiguity and developing a novel analysis that will fully account for it.

The first work that overlaps with the present discussion is Barrie and Pittman's (2010) paper. In short, they demonstrate that English mandative verbs like *order* and *permit* can pass some Raising-to-Object tests (see their examples for expletives in (226a), idiom chunk in

(226b) and embedded passivization in (226c)) and argue that sentences with these predicates always involve raising.

- (226) a. John ordered/commanded/permitted there to be fruit available at the reception.  
 b. John ordered/permitted/commanded tabs to be kept on Kenji.  
 c. The chief medical officer ordered an ophthalmologist to examine the patient.  
 = The chief medical officer ordered the patient to be examined by an ophthalmologist.

Barrie and Pittman (B&P) assume the obligatory presence of an overt or implicit *mandee* – a goal of mandation that is usually co-referent with the embedded subject. The authors do not further elaborate on the syntactic properties of desiderative predicates and provide only a preliminary structural representation (227). Importantly, B&P argue that the embedded subject always raises into the matrix clause over the *mandee* (presumably, to be assigned Case), although they do not support this claim with results for movement diagnostics. This subject-to-object raising violates the Minimal Link Condition; to deal with this, B&P tentatively suggest that a *mandee* can be a part of a PP with a silent P head, however, they leave this hypothesis to be further investigated (see Boeckx and Hornstein (2003) for a similar proposal for *promise*).

- (227) a. John [<sub>VP</sub> ordered [<sub>XP</sub> *mandee*<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>TP</sub> Bill<sub>i</sub> to sweep the floor]]  
 b. John [<sub>FP</sub> ordered [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> the floor] ordered [<sub>XP</sub> *mandee*] [<sub>TP</sub> the floor to be swept]]]]

However, as demonstrated in the previous subsection, there is a reason not to stipulate obligatory subject-to-object raising for Russian. This problem was addressed by Minor 2013, who came up with the following structural representation for sentences with a matrix mandative verb (228), which looks very similar to the one presented in (225).

- (228) [<sub>vP</sub> the doctor v<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> advised{uθ} [<sub>TP</sub> someone{iD} to get medicine]]]

Minor's (2013) claims that the dative DP, even though generated within the embedded clause, still must comply with the selectional restriction of a matrix mandative predicate and be potentially suitable as the matrix obligation holder (normally animate and volitional); he

assumes that a matrix predicate carries an unvalued theta-feature to be checked by a lower suitable DP (marked with *iD*). Minor further argues that only overt DPs with a hidden restrictor bound by the matrix ‘controller’ can occupy the embedded subject position (i.e. indefinite pronouns, quantified expressions but not, for example, referential non-quantified DPs), and proceeds to develop a complex analysis within the Movement Theory of Control framework allowing a DP to check multiple theta roles via Agree. However, in Section 5.2, we have already seen that the dative DP can belong exclusively to the embedded clause, contrary to Minor’s assumptions.

Furthermore, both approaches under discussion face the following, more serious, problem: as I will show in the next section, sentences with mandatives can still pass control diagnostics and the subject position of an embedded non-finite clause can be occupied either by a referential DP or PRO; thus, under a control configuration, the dative DP should be analyzed as a Holder located within the matrix clause and controlling the silent embedded subject.

The dative DP is ambiguous between being a ‘proper’ embedded argument and denoting a Holder related rather to the matrix mandative verb in sentences with embedded voice transformations (219). The ambiguity further manifests itself in sentences with quantified DPs, which can have wide scope and narrow scope interpretations. For example, consider (229), for which two readings are available: the dative DP ‘five boys’ can scope either above the matrix predicate (wide scope) or within the embedded clause (narrow scope).<sup>3</sup>

- (229) Petja        razrešil    pjati        malčikam ostat’sja.  
 Petja.NOM permitted five.DAT boys.DAT stay.INF
- (i) ‘There are five boys such that Petja permitted them to stay.’ (wide scope)
- (ii) ‘Petja permitted (someone) that there be five (random) boys who would stay.’  
 (narrow scope)

The availability of a narrow scope reading signals that the quantified DP is base-generated within the lower clause; compare, for example, (229) and a parallel construction with an implicative object control predicate and a matrix direct object (230).

---

3. This ambiguity has also been reported by Minor (2013); however, he focuses primarily on the availability of a narrow-scope reading and does not mention the fact that narrow-scope and wide-scope interpretations, as described in the present paper, are normally mutually exclusive.

- (230) Petja zastavil pjat' malčikov ostat'sja.  
 Petja.NOM forced five.ACC boys.ACC stay.INF  
 'There are five boys such that Petja forced them to stay.' (wide scope)  
 Not available: 'Petja forced someone that there be five boys who stay.' (narrow scope)

A wide scope reading, however, is usually unavailable for embedded items (231), which implies that in (229) the quantified DP must be within the higher clause to receive such an interpretation.

- (231) Kak minimum odin učitel' velel Maše pročitat' každyju knigu.  
 at least one teacher.NOM ordered Maša.DAT read.INF every book.ACC  
 'There is at least one teacher that ordered Maša to read every book.' (narrow scope for 'every book')  
 Not available: 'For every book there is at least one teacher that ordered Maša to read it.' (wide scope for 'every book')

### 5.3.2 The dative DP as a matrix Holder

There are contexts in which the dative DP is unambiguously interpreted as a Holder distinct from the embedded subject. First, partial coreference is allowed between the dative DP and the embedded subject in sentences with an embedded non-finite clause; thus, (232a) and (232b) are judged as acceptable even though the embedded predicate and the modifier *vmeste* 'together' require a semantically plural subject while the dative DPs in these sentences are semantically singular.

- (232) a. %Ivan velel Pete razojtis' ne pozže šesti.  
 Ivan.NOM ordered Petja.DAT disperse.INF NEG later six  
 'John ordered Petja to disperse by six.'  
 b. %Marina razrešila Anne pojti v kino vmeste.  
 Marina.NOM permitted Anna.DAT go.INF into cinema together  
 'Marina permitted Anna to go to the cinema together.'

As discussed in Section 3.3, the availability of partial control implies the presence of an

independent PRO subject (Wurmbrand 2002).

Second, Russian mandative verbs can also embed a finite subjunctive clause that can co-occur with a dative DP (233).

- (233) a. *Vrač velel / razrešil Maše<sub>i</sub>, čtoby ona<sub>i/j</sub> jela*  
doctor.NOM ordered permitted Maša.DAT so that she.NOM eat.SUBJ  
*ovošči.*  
vegetables  
'The doctor ordered / permitted Maša to eat vegetables.'
- b. *Vrač velel / razrešil medsestre, čtoby Maša jela*  
doctor.NOM ordered permitted nurse.DAT so that Maša.NOM eat.SUBJ  
*ovošči.*  
vegetables  
'The doctor ordered / permitted the nurse to let Maša eat vegetables.'

In sentences similar to (233), a matrix dative DP is interpreted as an obligation holder and not merely as a goal of communication. For example, in (233b), 'the nurse' is held at least partially responsible for Maša's behavior; if we try to substitute this DP with another one referring to a person unrelated to *Maša*, the sentence will make no sense. This is further illustrated in (234), where the sentences receives a meaningful interpretation if we are talking about Anna's staying at Maša's place, and Maša is responsible for ensuring that this will not happen.

- (234) *Otec zapretil Maše, čtoby Anna ostavalas' na noč'.*  
father.NOM prohibited Maša.DAT so that Anna.NOM stay.SUBJ overnight  
'Father prohibited Maša Anna's staying overnight.'

### 5.3.3 Embedded non-finite clauses with overt vs. implicit subject

Finally, I would like to demonstrate that non-finite clauses with covert / overt subjects embedded under a mandative verb do not differ in terms of Tense, and are all larger than TP, which prevent us from stipulating an analysis in terms of lexical homonymy and inherent selectional properties of a matrix predicate.

First, as demonstrated in (235) and similarly to sentences with a matrix deontic predicative discussed in Chapter 3, the time reference of all constituents embedded under a mandative



verb is determined in accordance with the time reference of the matrix event and can refer to the relative future.

- (235) a. Včera Marina razrešila Anne<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> pojtí v kino  
yesterday Marina.NOM permitted Anna.DAT go.INF into cinema  
vmeste v ponedel'nik].  
together in Monday  
'Yesterday Marina permitted Anna to go to the cinema together on Monday.'
- b. Včera prezident velel [stroitel'stvu zakončit'sja k martu].  
yesterday president.NOM ordered construction.DAT complete.INF by March  
'Yesterday the president ordered for the construction to be complete by March.'

Second, the presence of a relatively large left periphery in embedded non-finite clauses with an overt / covert subject is indicated by availability of a *to* topic, which occupies a dedicated position related CP (236) (see the discussion in Chapters 1 to 4).

- (236) a. Marina razrešila Anne<sub>i</sub> [v kino-to PRO<sub>i</sub> pojtí vmeste]?  
Marina.NOM permitted Anna.DAT into cinema-TO go.INF together.  
'Marina permitted Anna to go to the cinema together.'
- b. Prezident velel [k martu-to stroitel'stvu zakončit'sja].  
president.NOM ordered by March-TO construction.DAT complete.INF  
'The president ordered for the construction to be complete by March.'

Based on these data, I assume that the constructions with embedded non-finite clauses under consideration exhibit DP / PRO alternation in the same syntactic environment.

## 5.4 The analysis: mandatives as verbs of communication embedding modals

### 5.4.1 Outline of the analysis


I consider mandative verbs to be a sub-class of ditransitive communication verbs (verbs of information transfer): an order or a permission, denoted by an embedded proposition, is transmitted to a Holder / Goal, similar to the transfer of factual information (237).

- (237) a. Maša velela Anne, čtoby ona pomyla posudu.  
 Maša.NOM ordered Anna.DAT so that she.NOM wash.SUBJ dishes  
 ‘Maša ordered Anna to wash the dishes.’
- b. Maša skazala Anne, čto Vanja pomyl posudu.  
 Maša.NOM told Anna.DAT that Vanja.NOM washed dishes  
 ‘Maša told Anna that Vanja had washed the dishes.’

Verbs of communication are, by their nature, ditransitive predicates, for which I adopt a structural representation in line with Pykkänen’s (2008) low applicative approach (see also Dyakonova (2005) and Boneh and Nash (2017) for applicative analyses).<sup>4</sup>

The structure for verbs of communication is schematized in (238), where the matrix verb of communication (denoted here as SAY) takes as its complement an applicative phrase with a Goal of communication (an Addressee) as an applied object.

(238)



Under the assumption that mandative verbs belong to the class of communication verbs,

4. An alternative approach to ditransitive predicates is the Small Clause analysis (Hale and Keyser 2002; Harley 2003, den Dikken 2006, a.o.). The dative Goal is considered to be a PP predicate with a silent P head, while the transferred proposition is generated as the small clause subject; in case of verbs that embed a non-finite clause, the predication is reverse so that a dative Goal could control an embedded subject (i).

(i) [<sub>VP</sub> Subject [<sub>v/</sub> v<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> SAY [<sub>SC</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> P<sup>0</sup> [<sub>DP</sub> Goal<sub>DAT</sub>]] [<sub>R/</sub> R<sup>0</sup> [<sub>CP</sub> ... ]]]]]]]

As for now, I refrain from entering into a detailed discussion of verbs of communication in Russian in general, and I consider both analyses viable. For the sake of simplicity, in this paper I adopt an applicative analysis and Pykkänen’s basic semantics and denote the functional head that relates a Goal / Holder and an embedded clause as Appl.

the structure in (238) apparently accommodates (i) cases of an embedded finite subjunctive clause together with an overt Holder, and (ii) those sentences with an embedded non-finite clause that exhibit obligatory control properties (239).

- (239) a. Maša velela [AppIP Anne<sub>i</sub> [AppI<sub>v</sub> AppI<sup>0</sup> [CP čtoby ona<sub>i</sub>  
 Maša.NOM ordered Anna.DAT so that she.NOM  
 pomyla posudu]]]  
 wash.SUBJ dishes.ACC  
 ‘Maša ordered Anna to wash the dishes.’  
 Literally: ‘Maša ordered Anna so that she would wash the dishes.’
- b. Maša velela [AppIP Anne<sub>i</sub> [AppI<sub>v</sub> AppI<sup>0</sup> [CP PRO<sub>i</sub> pomyt’ posudu]]]  
 Maša.NOM ordered Anna.DAT wash.INF dishes.ACC  
 ‘Maša ordered Anna to wash the dishes.’

However, the two important questions remain to be answered: (i) What could explain the difference between ordinary verbs of communication and mandative predicates? In other words, what makes us interpret addressees as (obligation) Holders? and (ii) How should sentences with an embedded non-finite clause with a lexical subject be accommodated? To answer these questions, I propose that mandative verbs are verbs of communication that embed a proposition ‘enclosed’ into a larger constituent headed by a structurally present although silent deontic modal head. I assume that an applied object related by the applicative head to a saturated modal constituent (which, in turn, embeds a proposition) always gets interpreted as a Holder, both in root and embedded contexts, including those cases when a deontic modal phrase is embedded under a verb of communication. The ultimate structure is given in (240).<sup>5</sup>

---


5. Given the structures for verbs of communication and deontic modals, one might expect that the combination of the two would result in a construction with simultaneously present referentially different Goal / Addressee and obligation holder; however, sentences similar to (i) are unacceptable for all native speakers of Russian.

- (i) \*Vrač skazal Pete medsestre<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> dat’ Maše lekarstvo].  
 doctor.NOM told Petja.DAT nurse.DAT give.INF Maša.DAT medicine.ACC  
 Intended: ‘The doctor told Petja that for the nurse it is necessary to give Maša the medicine.’

- (ii) [VP SAY [AppIP Goal [AppI<sub>v</sub> AppI<sup>0</sup> [AppIP Holder [AppI<sub>v</sub> AppI<sup>0</sup> [ModP modal [CP ... ]]]]]]]

I assume that (i) and the structure (ii) in general are ruled out because of an independent restriction on recursion: an applicative phrase cannot be selected as the complement of another applicative head. The precise nature of this restriction remains to be further investigated (see Koopman (2014) and den Dikken

(240)



I further argue that the silent modal in (240) belongs to the class of modal predicatives, which pattern with mandatives in their syntactic behavior. The properties common for and Dékány (2018), a.o.), however, its presence is further supported by ungrammaticality of examples with multiple Beneficiaries, External Possessors and dative Goals (iii).

- (iii) a. \*Ivan Maše Petru razbil vazú.  
Ivan.NOM Maša.DAT Petja.DAT broke vase.ACC  
Intended: ‘Ivan broke Petja’s vase for Maša.’
- b. Ivan Maše razbil vazú.  
Ivan.NOM Maša.DAT broke vase.ACC
- (i) ‘Ivan broke Maša’s vase.’ (*Maša* = external possessor)
- (ii) ‘Ivan broke a vase for Maša.’ (*Maša* = beneficiary)

To introduce both an Addressee and an obligation holder additional ‘layers’ should be inserted between the two applicative phrases: for example, a modal part can be embedded within a finite clause (iva) or introduced in form of direct speech (ivb).

- (iv) a. Vrač skazal Pete, što medsestre nužno dat’ Maše lekarstvo.  
doctor.NOM told Petja.DAT that nurse.DAT necessary.N.SG give.INF Maša.DAT medicine.ACC  
‘The doctor told Petja that for the nurse it is necessary to give Maša the medicine.’
- b. Vrač skazal Pete: ‘Medsestre nužno dat’ Maše lekarstvo.’  
doctor.NOM told Petja.DAT nurse.DAT necessary.N.SG give.INF Maša.DAT medicine.ACC  
‘The doctor told Petja: ‘For the nurse it is necessary to give Maša the medicine.’

both kinds of predicates are summarized in Table 3 (241), where DP/PRO stands for the DP / PRO alternation in embedded non-finite clauses and TGD stands for the Two-Dative Generalization.

(241) Table 3. Mandatives and deontic modals

	DP <sub>DAT</sub>	Embedded clause	DP/PRO	TGD
Mandatives	obligation Holder	subjunctive / non-finite	Yes	Yes
Deontic modals	Obligation Holder	subjunctive / non-finite	Yes	Yes

The proposed decomposition analysis straightforwardly explains the distributional similarities between mandative verbs and deontic modal / evaluative predicatives, including obligatory control vs. overt embedded subject ambiguity.

Furthermore, the structure in (238) leaves aside examples with an overt referential embedded subject, discussed in detail in Section 5.2. Indeed, if a mandative verb can embed a propositional non-finite clause with an overt subject, why cannot a simple verb of communication do this as well? I argue that the availability of an embedded non-finite clause with a covert / overt subject is directly related to the structural presence of a silent deontic modal. As I will show in Section 5.4.3, sentences with a mandative verb comply with the Two-Dative Generalization and support cross-clausal Case assignment, which is expected if an overt Holder and an embedded clause with an overt DP subject are introduced by a deontic modal predicative.

In the next section I will provide additional support for decomposing constructions with mandative verbs.

### 5.4.2 Mandative verbs and deontic modals

At least two properties of sentences with a matrix mandative verb that might posit a problem under a different approach are straightforwardly accounted for by a decomposition analysis presented in this chapter. The first is the possibility of the ambiguous interpretation of examples with sentential negation. Let us first take a look at desiderative predicates in general. The fact that desiderative deontic universal ‘must’-type predicates can be Neg-raisers has been widely discussed in the literature, including von Stechow and Iatridou (2007),

and Iatridou and Zeijlstra (2013), a.o. In contrast, existential predicates denoting permission typically do not support Neg-raising and do not allow ambiguous interpretations (Iatridou and Zeijlstra 2013) (242).

- (242) a. John cannot stay.  
           = John must leave.  $\neq$  John may leave.
- b. Maše        nel'zja                ostavat'sja.  
           Maša.DAT prohibited.N.SG stay.INF  
           'Maša is not allowed to stay.'  
           = Maša must leave.  $\neq$  Maša may leave.

Consider now the example in (243) in its 'overt embedded subject' configuration, which involves the mandative verb of permission *razrešit'* 'permit', and its possible interpretations. If *razrešit'* itself belongs to the class of deontic modal predicates, we would expect (a) to be interpreted only as (b). The fact that both the (b) and (c) readings are available is easy to explain if the 'communication' and the modal components are separated and there is an intermediate position available between the two. Furthermore, the fact that the interpretation in (d) is blocked is compatible with the idea that the lower modal is indeed permissive and Neg-raising is not allowed.

- (243) a. Anna        ne razrešala Maše        ostat'sja.  
           Anna.NOM NEG permitted Maša.DAT stay.INF  
           'Anna didn't allow Maša to stay.'
- b. 'Anna said that it is not possible for Maša to stay.'
- c. 'Anna didn't say that it is possible for Maša to stay.'
- d. Not available: 'Anna said that it is possible for Maša not to stay.'

Second, almost all predicates denoting information transfer can be 'transformed' into mandative verbs, at least in colloquial Russian. Consider the verbs in (244a): they are interpreted as ordinary verbs of communication, require an embedded finite indicative clause and can optionally have an overt dative Addressee. However, as illustrated in (244b) and (244c), they can also appear with a non-finite or a finite subjunctive embedded clause. In this case they get a mandative (modal) interpretation, and a dative DP can be interpreted as an obligation holder.

- (244) a. Petja skazal / napisal / šepnul Maše, što Vanja ujet.  
 Petja.NOM said wrote whispered Maša.DAT that Vanja.NOM leave.NPST  
 ‘Petja said / wrote / whispered to Maša that Vanja would leave.’
- b. Petja skazal / napisal / šepnul Maše ujt.  
 Petja.NOM said wrote whispered Maša.DAT leave.INF  
 ‘Petja said / wrote / whispered to Maša that she should leave.’  
 ‘Petja said / wrote / whispered that Maša should leave.’
- c. Petja skazal / napisal / šepnul Maše, što by ona ušla.  
 Petja.NOM said wrote whispered Maša.DAT so that she.NOM leave.SUBJ  
 ‘Petja said / wrote / whispered to Maša that she should leave.’

The contrast between (244a) and (244b, 244c) might be accounted for by postulating two morphologically identical lexical entries for each of the verbs of information transfer. However, encoding modality in a structurally independent modal head makes lexical duplication unnecessary and, at the same time, helps to explain the distribution of indicative and subjunctive mood in the embedded clause. Although this does not necessarily prove that the modal head is present, the analysis proposed in this chapter provides a simple explanation for the similarity between various sub-classes of predicates which otherwise might be harder to achieve.

The proposed approach differs from analyses that place a functional modal component within an infinitival clause itself (Bhatt 1999; Pesetsky and Torrego 2001; Wurmbrand 2014). However, the claim that silent lexical modals are attested in Russian has been independently made to account for the behavior of the main clause infinitives (Moore and Perlmutter 2000; Fleisher 2006), discussed in Chapter 4 of this thesis. Although on the surface root infinitives look like non-finite clauses with a dative DP ‘subject’ (245), as was persuasively demonstrated by Fleisher (2006), they are, in fact, biclausal constructions with a silent matrix modal element.

- (245) a. Maše ∅ zavtra rano vstavat’.  
 Maša.DAT *necessary* tomorrow early wake.up.INF  
 ‘Maša should wake up early tomorrow.’
- b. Mašine ∅ zdes’ ne projekat.  
 car.DAT *possible* here neg pass.INF  
 ‘The car cannot pass here.’

Considering examples similar to those in (245), one might ask if sentences with a matrix mandative predicate embed a ‘root infinitive type’ direct speech. In other words, could (246a) be parallel to (246b)?

- (246) a. Petja skazal Maše (\*budet) rano vstavat’.  
 Petja.NOM told Maša.DAT be.NPST early wake.up.INF  
 ‘Petja told Maša to wake up early.’
- b. Petja skazal: ‘Maše (budet) rano vstavat’  
 Petja.NOM said Maša.DAT be.NPST early wake.up.INF  
 ‘Peter said: “Mary should wake up early”’.

At least three facts speak against analyzing (246a) as an equivalent to (246b). First, the prosody is different; in particular, direct speech is normally separated from the matrix part with a long pause. Second, in case of direct speech, a finite clause is embedded, which is visible in past / future tense when an overt copula is present. Third, direct speech requires indexical shift; thus, an embedded first person pronoun will be interpreted as referring to the logophoric center not the actual SPEAKER. Again, this is impossible in sentences similar to (246a).

In the next section I will go through all types of constructions with a matrix mandative verb attested in Russian and propose for them the structural representations based on the structure in (240).

### 5.4.3 Structural representations


#### Embedded finite clauses

The analysis for sentences with a matrix mandative verb and a finite clause is straightforward: the proposition is selected by a silent deontic modal and the whole modal constituent is embedded under a verb of communication (SAY); this is illustrated in (247) and (248).

- (247) Maša velela (Anne) [čtoby ona pomyla posudu].  
 Maša.NOM ordered Anna.DAT so that she.NOM wash.SUBJ dishes.ACC  
 ‘Maša ordered Anna to wash the dishes.’  
 Literally: ‘Maša ordered Anna so that she washed the dishes.’



(248)




### Embedded non-finite clauses

A structure similar to in (248) is also applicable to sentences with a mandative predicate embedding a non-finite clause with a controlled PRO subject (249 and 250).

- (249) Maša velela Anne<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> pomyt' vmeste posudu].  
Maša.NOM ordered Anna.DAT wash.INF together dishes.ACC  
'Maša ordered Anna to wash the dishes together.'

(250)




Note that, as in the case of a matrix deontic modal, a Holder can be implicit, a  $\varphi$ P, still controlling PRO within a lower non-finite clause (251).

- (251) a. Maša velela  $ec_i$  [PRO<sub>*i*</sub> spasat' pand].  
Maša.NOM ordered save.INF pandas.ACC  
'Maša ordered to save pandas.'
- b.  $ec_i$  neobxodimo [PRO<sub>*i*</sub> spasat' pand].  
necessary.N.SG save.INF pandas.ACC  
'It is necessary to save pandas.'

Another option that appears when the Holder is covert is to embed a non-finite clause with an overt subject (252); the structure is given in (253).

- (252) Maša velela [proektu zakončit'sja k martu].  
Maša.NOM ordered project.DAT complete.INF by March  
'Maša ordered for the project to be complete by March.'

(253)



Overt realization of the two dative DPs – the Holder and the embedded subject – together is prohibited (254).

- (254) \*Maša velela Anne [projektu zakončit'sja k Martu].  
Maša.NOM ordered Anna.DAT project.DAT complete.INF by March  
Intended: 'Maša ordered Anna for the project to be complete by March.'

Thus, the DP / PRO alternation under a mandative verb complies with the proposed Two-Dative Generalization (255)

- (255) The Two-Dative Generalization: An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential dative DP controller available within a higher clause.

I argue that this property should be analyzed in terms of cross-clausal Case licensing, as described in Chapter 4: in (254) and in the other examples presented above, there is one source for Case available ( $\text{Appl}^0$ ) and the two overt DPs (a Holder and the embedded subject) compete for it. When the Holder is overt it obligatorily values its [uCase] feature under Spec-Head agreement with  $\text{Appl}^0$ ; however, when it is a covert  $\varphi\text{P}$  that lacks a DP/KP layer (Landau 2010, a.o.), the Case feature on  $\text{Appl}^0$  can be matched by the embedded lexical

subject via establishing a long-distance A-dependency.

The proposed structural representation fully describes the Russian data, relying on similarities between mandative predicates and verbs of communication, corresponds to the semantic intuition that desiderativity involves deontic modality, and draws a parallel between the almost identical distributions of modal predicatives and desiderative verbs.

## 5.5 Summary

In this chapter, I focused on mandative verbs in Russian and demonstrated that they, too, support both obligatory control and cross-clausal Case assignment, and that this ambiguity cannot be reduced to postulating lexical homonymy and / or assuming that the embedded non-finite clauses differ in size or have different Tense – Agr characteristics. I further demonstrated that the proposed Two-Dative Generalization holds for the DP / PRO alternation available within non-finite clauses embedded under a mandative verb.

To account for the similar properties of sentences with a matrix mandative verb and deontic modal predicatives, I developed a single analysis arguing that constructions with a matrix mandative verb should be decomposed: a mandative verb is an overt realization of a verb of communication (SAY) that embeds a silent deontic modal head, selecting a proposition as its complement.

# Chapter 6

## Conclusion

### 6.1 Summarizing the results

In this thesis I considered the question of DP / PRO alternation in non-finite clausal complements in an attempt to answer the following question: Is the subject position of an infinitive restricted to an empty category only, and if not, what is required for an overt DP subject to become licit?

I began the discussion by introducing the three major approaches that can arguably describe the DP / PRO distribution across the world's languages: (i) the Case licensing approach stemming from Chomsky (1981), (ii) the most well-known of the 'non Case licensing' analyses, Landau's (2000, 2004) Agree-based calculus of control, and (iii) the 'free alternation' approach advocated by Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) and inspired by McFadden's (2004) work. My goal was to find some novel data that could further contribute to the discussion supporting one of these analyses or demanding a novel approach.

I focused on a particular construction from Russian – sentences with a matrix evaluative predicative or a deontic modal and an embedded clause. On the one hand, these constructions are well-known in the literature on Russian and Slavic languages (Zolotova 1982; Bonch-Osmolovskaja 2003; Say 2013; Zimmerling and Trubitsina 2015; Letuchiy 2017), while on the other hand, they remain understudied, especially within the minimalist framework, and no formal analysis has been developed to account for their syntactic properties. Having thoroughly examined the semantic and syntactic distribution of these predicatives, I demon-

strated that they allow both the obligatory control and ECM-like configurations and can embed non-finite clauses with either PRO or lexical DP subjects.

The main goal of Chapter 2 of this thesis was to establish the empirical background: I presented the two classes of predicatives central to the discussion, described their main properties, comparing them to other kinds of non-verbal predicates (mainly short adjectives), and developed for them a single structural representation. I argued that evaluative and deontic modal predicatives are unaccusative, that is, select a single internal argument (a clause) that is merged in the complement position. In addition to this, a noncore argument that denotes a Holder of an attitude or an obligation is usually introduced by a high applicative head (adapting Pyllkkänen's 2008 approach), expressed with a dative DP or a PP.

Chapter 3 considered sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative and an embedded non-finite clause. I argued that in these constructions both obligatory control (between a matrix Holder and an embedded covert subject) and an ECM-like phenomenon are attested. After applying various diagnostics, I showed that the dative DP that appears in these sentences corresponds either to a matrix Holder or to the embedded subject itself; furthermore, the latter does not have to raise into a matrix position and can stay within its clause. Crucially, the distribution of lexical DP subjects is not restricted by the structural size (always a CP) or the Tense – agreement characteristics of an embedded non-finite clause. However, the DP / PRO alternation is not completely free, as the availability of an overt embedded subject correlates with the presence of an overt DP Holder in the matrix clause. To capture this behavior, I formulated the following generalization:

- (256) The Two-Dative Generalization: An embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential dative DP controller available within a higher clause.

In chapter 4 I went back to the existing approaches to the DP / PRO distribution and licensing to see if they can provide a formal explanation for the generalization. Landau's calculus of control appeared to be too restrictive by postulating that DPs and PRO are always in complementary distribution when an obligatory control configuration is available. Furthermore, it would have to stipulate an unmotivated structural difference between non-finite clauses with overt and covert subject. Sundaresan and McFadden (2009)'s 'free alternation' approach is also problematic, since the reported alternation and, in particular, the correlation between referentiality of an embedded subject and morphosyntactic realizations of a

matrix Holder are hard to regulate in terms of a [ $\pm$ anaphoric] feature specification on the matrix predicate.

I argued that the Case licensing approach comes closest to capturing the DP / PRO alternation in Russian. I proposed that, although DPs and PRO can be merged within the same syntactic environment, an overt DP subject of an embedded clause must be licensed by checking its [uCase] feature with a functional head. Although  $T^0$  in a non-finite construction is inherently deficient, in sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative Case valuation can be done by a matrix applicative head, which introduces a Holder.

Importantly, this analysis requires a revised version of the traditional Case theory to account for the fact that Case valuation happens across a CP boundary (contrary to Williams 1987; Chomsky 1999; Lasnik 1998). In the last section of Chapter 4 I shifted attention towards the discussion of cross-clausal A-dependencies in general, considering similar phenomena reported for other languages (see Polinsky and Potsdam (2001), Boeckx (2004), Bhatt (2005), Şener (2008), and Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Wurmbrand (2014), to name a few papers on the topic). I demonstrated that lexical subjects of embedded infinitives can stay relatively low, arguably, in Spec,TP, and I proposed that Case licensing is cyclic and, similarly to other known cases of cyclic Agree, is mediated by  $C^0$  (Legate 2005). From an empirical point of view, the Russian data complement the other cases of cross-clausal A-dependencies, since most of them are attested either in smaller non-phasal infinitives or in finite clauses with embedded agreement and an overt complementizer.

Aside from sentences with a matrix evaluative / deontic modal predicative, I provided additional support for the availability of DP / PRO alternation in Russian, as I showed that the pattern is also found in modal existential constructions (MECs), main clause infinitives and sentences with a matrix mandative verb (*velet* ‘order’, *razrešit* ‘permit’). As for the latter, in Chapter 5 I discussed them in more detail and proposed that the peculiar properties of mandative verbs are easily accounted for if we analyze them as a lexical realization of a verb of communication (SAY) that embeds a silent deontic modal. I assumed that this analysis can be further adopted for similar constructions in other languages; for instance, raising properties of the English verbs *order* and *permit* have been reported by Barrie and Pittman (2010).

## 6.2 Theoretical contribution

The main findings of this thesis from a broader theoretical perspective are summarized below.

1. DPs and PRO can be available in the same embedded environment and their distribution does not necessarily correlate with the structural size, Tense and agreement characteristics of the non-finite clause.
2. Unlike PRO and  $\varphi$ P variables, overt DPs must be licensed by Case, complying with Chomsky's (1981) Case filter. As non-finite  $T^0 / C^0$  is inherently defective and cannot value the [uCase] feature on a nominal, DPs are often illicit in the embedded subject position. However, they can, in principle, be licensed by a higher functional head, if its Case is not checked by a matrix argument.
3. The reported cross-clausal Case licensing complies with the general restriction on Agree. High Appl<sup>0</sup> is added to the set of functional heads that can establish an A-dependency non-locally –  $T^0$  and  $v^0$ .
4. To value its [uCase] feature with a matrix head, an embedded subject does not have to raise to the embedded Spec,CP to become accessible. In Russian, genuinely long-distance Case licensing is attested, confirming the idea of cyclic downward Agree and Case assignment (via  $C^0$ ) (supporting Legate (2005) and contrary to McFadden (2009)).

The research has also contributed to the study of Russian and Slavic languages in general, as I presented a formal syntactic analysis for the previously under-described groups of predicatives. In addition to this, a novel structural representation for constructions with a mandative verb was proposed. Finally, the thesis touched upon such topics as non-finite subordination in modal existential constructions, syntactic properties of main clause infinitives and the distribution of case concord predicates in embedded infinitival clauses.

## 6.3 Directions for future research

The presented research opens up several directions for future investigation. First, it would be worth looking at whether the reported DP / PRO alternation pattern is attested in non-finite



clauses embedded under nominal predicates, in particular those derived from the predicatives and verbs under discussion. For instance, examples in (257) were found in corpora, and the question arises whether in these cases the dative DP should be interpreted as a Holder or as an argument of the embedded predicate.

- (257) a. *Voznikaet [neobxodimost' rieltoru porabotat' čut' bol'se].*  
 appears need.NOM estate.agent.DAT work.INF a.little more  
 'There is a need for the estate agent to work a bit more.'
- b. *Nazrela [neobxodimost' vsem učenym prinjat' učastie v razrabotke].*  
 appeared need.NOM all scientists.DAT take.INF part in development  
 'There was a need for all scientists to take part in the development.'

This issue is directly related to the problem of varying structural size of deverbal and deadjectival nominals and presence of particular functional heads, including, for instance, Appl<sup>0</sup>.

Another direction would be examination of languages where applicative heads overtly agree with an applied object; if a similar kind of DP / PRO alternation is attested there, we would expect to find a correlation with the agreement pattern. Furthermore, it would be important to look for a language with subject raising to Spec,ApplP across a clause boundary.

Finally, recall that the proposed long-distance Case licensing analysis relies on availability of phi-features on the embedded C<sup>0</sup> and cyclic Agree. This assumption leaves open the following question: How could such an operation be restricted? Although I do not have the answer, I follow Wurmbrand (2018), Yoon (2007), Horn (2008), and Lødrup (2008) and suggest that it could involve the semantics properties of the matrix predicates that appear in constructions where a cross-clausal A-dependency is established. For instance, Horn (2008) argues that in Japanese, where cross-clausal Case assignment is also allowed, the attitude / non-attitude distinction plays an important role (258).

- (258) Semantic/pragmatic constraint (Horn 2008)

The proposition expressed by an accusative-quotative complement must be a property ascription on the referent of the accusative subject when evaluated with respect to the belief world of the agent of attitude.

Likewise, in English, ECM constructions normally report attitudes of acceptance/belief (Moulton 2009); for instance, while *believe* and *expect* allow ECM, *declare* and *decide* do

not. All Russian predicatives and verbs that allow the obligatory control vs. overt embedded subject ambiguity, discussed in this thesis, are also attitude predicates. Therefore, the Russian data fit in with the general trend and their comparison with the relevant examples from other languages can further provide novel insights into the general restrictions on cross-clausal A-dependencies.

# Bibliography

- Abney, Steven P. 1987. The english noun phrase in its sentential aspect. PhD diss., MIT.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Susi Wurmbrand. 2014. Movement vs. long distance agree in raising: disappearing phases and feature valuation. In *Proceedings of the north eastern linguistics society annual meeting*, 1–12. 43.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Asarina, Alya. 2011. Case in Uyghur and beyond. PhD diss., MIT.
- Babby, Leonard H. 1973. The deep structure of adjectives and participles in Russian. *Language* 49 (2): 349–360.
- . 1994. A theta-theoretic analysis of adversity impersonal sentences in Russian. In *Annual workshop on formal approaches to slavic linguistics. the MIT meeting 1993*, edited by S. Avrutin, 25–67. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- . 1998. Subject control as direct predication: evidence from Russian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, edited by Ž. Bošković, S. Franks, and W. Snyder. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- . 2011. *A transformational grammar of Russian adjectives*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Bach, Emmon. 1979. Control in Montague grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10:515–531.
- Bailyn, John F. 1994. The syntax and semantics of Russian long and short form adjectives. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, edited by J. Toman, 1–30. 1. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- . 1995. A configurational approach to Russian ‘free’ word order. PhD diss., Cornell University.
- . 2001. The syntax of Slavic predicate case. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 22:1–26.

- Bailyn, John F. 2003. A (purely) derivational account of Russian scrambling. In *Formal approaches to slavic linguistics*, edited by B. Partee, 11:41–62. Michigan Slavic Publications.
- . 2012. *The syntax of Russian*. Cambridge syntax guides. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2018. Russian word order and the fate of syntactic theory. Talk presented at the Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters 8, Moscow.
- Bailyn, John F., and Barbara Citko. 1998. Case and agreement in Slavic predicates. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, edited by K. Dziwirek, H. Coats, and C. Vakareliyska, 17–37. 7. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Baker, Carl L. 1995. Contrast, discourse prominence, and intensification, with special reference to locally free reflexives. *Language* 71:63–101.
- Baker, Mark C. 2003. *Lexical categories: verbs, nouns, and adjectives*. Cambridge studies in linguistics. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2017. Ergative case in burushaski: a dependent case analysis. In *The oxford handbook of ergativity*, edited by J. Coon, D. Massam, and L. D. Travis, 759–781.
- Barker, Chris. 2002. The dynamics of vagueness. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25 (1): 1–36.
- Barrie, Michael, and Christine Pittman. 2010. Mandatives: lessons on raising/control diagnostics. *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics/La revue canadienne de linguistique* 55 (1): 131–138.
- Barss, Andrew, and Howard Lasnik. 1986. A note on anaphora and the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17 (2): 347–354.
- Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35–73.
- Bennis, Hans. 2000. Adjectives and argument structure. In *Current issues in linguistic theory*, edited by P. Coopmans, M. Everaert, and J. Grimshaw, 197:27. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2004. Unergative adjectives and psych verbs. In *The unaccusativity puzzle*, edited by A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, and M. Everaert. Oxford University Press.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 1999. Covert modality in non-finite contexts. PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- . 2005. Long distance agreement in hindi-urdu. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23 (4): 757.

- Bhatt, Rajesh, and Roumyana Pancheva. 2006. Implicit arguments. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax, volume 2*, edited by M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, 558–588. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bjorkman, Bronwyn, and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2014. Upwards agree is superior. Ms. University of Toronto.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D., and Susi Wurmbrand. 2005. The domain of agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23 (4): 809–865.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan, and Idan Landau. 2009. Icelandic control is not A-movement: the case from Case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:113–132.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2004. Long-distance agreement in hindi: some theoretical implications. *Studia Linguistica* 58 (1): 23–36.
- . 2010. On long-distance agree. *IBERIA: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 1 (1).
- Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2003. Reply to “control is not movement”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34 (2): 269–280.
- . 2004. Movement under control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:431–452.
- Bonch-Osmolovskaja, Anastasija. 2003. Konstrukcii s dativnym subjektom v russkom jazyke: opyt korpusnogo issledovanija. PhD diss., Moscow State University.
- Bondaruk, Anna. 2006. The licensing of subjects and objects in irish non-finite clauses. *Lingua* 116:874–894.
- Boneh, Nora, and Léa Nash. 2017. The syntax and semantics of dative DPs in Russian ditransitives. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 35, no. 4 (November 1): 899–953.
- Borik, Olga. 2014. The argument structure of long and short form adjectives and participles in Russian. *Lingua* 149:139–165.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: an economy approach*. Linguistic inquiry monographs 32. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 2014. Now i’m a phase, now i’m not a phase: on the variability of phases with extraction and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:27–89.
- Bouchard, Denis. 1982. On the context of empty categories. PhD diss., MIT.
- . 1984. *On the content of empty categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982. Control and complementation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:343–434.

- Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina, and Greville G. Corbett, eds. 2013. *Canonical morphology and syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2013. By phrases in passives and nominals. *Syntax* 16:1–41.
- Butt, Miriam. 1995. *The structure of complex predicates in urdu*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 1994. On the internal structure of pronominal DPs. *The Linguistic Review* 11:191–219.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of three classes of pronouns. In *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, edited by H. van Riemsdijk, 145–233. Berlin: Mouton.
- Carnie, Andrew, and Heidi Harley. 1999. *Clausal architecture: evidence from Irish*. University of Arizona.
- Carstens, Vicki. 2010. Implications of grammatical gender for the theory of uninterpretable features. In *Exploring crash proof grammars*, edited by M. Putnam. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chandra, Pritha. 2007. (dis)agree: movement and agreement reconsidered. PhD diss., University of Maryland.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In *Readings in english transformational grammar*, edited by R. A. Jacobs and P. S. Rosenbaum, 184–221. Needham, MA: Ginn Press.
- . 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Studies in generative grammar 9. Dordrecht, Holland ; Cinnaminson, [N.J.]: Foris Publications.
- . 1986. *Knowledge of language: its nature, origin and use*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- . 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 1999. *Derivation by phase*. MIT.
- . 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In *Step by step: essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, edited by R. Martin, D. Michels, and J. Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: a life in language*, edited by M. Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 2008. On phases. In *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, edited by R. Freidin, C. P. Otero, and M. L. Zubizarreta, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. In *Syntax: an international handbook of contemporary research*, edited by J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, and T. Vennemann, 506–569. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chung, Sandra, and James McCloskey. 1987. Government, barriers, and small clauses in modern irish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18 (2): 173–237.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. Ergative adjectives and the lexicalist hypothesis. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 8, no. 1 (February 1): 1–39.
- . 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clements, George N. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10:141–177.
- Collins, Chris. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in english. *Syntax* 8:81–120.
- . 2018. Is the passive by-phrase an adjunct. Ms. NYU.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1974. The second dative: a transformational approach. In *Slavic transformational syntax*, Michigan University Press., edited by R. Brecht and C. Chvany, 123–150. Michigan Slavic materials 10. Ann Arbor.
- . 1993. Argument structure. In *Syntax: an international handbook*, edited by J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, and T. Vennemann, 905–914. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2004. The Russian adjective: a pervasive yet elusive category. In *Adjective classes: a cross-linguistic typology*, 199–222. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2005. The canonical approach in typology. In *Linguistic diversity and language theories*, edited by Z. Frajzyngier, A. Hodges, and D. S. Rood, 25–49. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Cutrer, Michelle L. 1993. Semantic and syntactic factors in control. In *Advances in role and reference grammar*, edited by R. D. van Valin, 167–195. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Davies, William D., and Stanley Dubinsky. 2004. *The grammar of raising and control: a course in syntactic argumentation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Davison, Alice. 1991. Feature percolation and agreement in hindi/urdu. Ms. University of Iowa.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2017. Covert hyperraising to object. In *Proceedings of nels 47*, edited by A. Lamont and K. Tetzloff.
- Déchaine, Rose-Marie, and Martina Wiltschko. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33 (3): 409–442.

- Déchainé, Rose-Marie, and Martina Wiltschko. 2017. A formal typology of reflexives. *Studia Linguistica* 71:60–106.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. *Relators and linkers: the syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas*. Linguistic inquiry monographs 47. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- . 2007. Phase extension: contours of a theory of the role of head movement in phrasal extraction. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33 (1): 1–41.
- . 2012. The phase impenetrability condition and successive cyclicity: a reconsideration. Ms. City University. New York.
- . 2017. Why struggle to smuggle when merge will converge? Ms. ELTE and HAS.
- Dikken, Marcel den, and Éva Dékány. 2018. A restriction on recursion. *Syntax* 21 (1): 37–71.
- Duffley, Patrick J. 1994. Need and dare: the black sheep of the modal family. *Lingua* 94, no. 4 (December 1): 213–243.
- Dyakonova, Marina. 2005. Russian double object constructions. *ACLCL Working Papers* 2 (1): 3–30.
- . 2009. *A phase-based approach to Russian free word order*. LOT Publications.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74:245–273.
- . 2002. *The syntax of hungarian*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2006. Number long distance agreement in (substandard) basque. In *Studies in Basque and historical linguistics in memory of R. L. Trask: supplements of the anuario del seminario de filología vasca “Julio de Urquijo” xl: 1–2*, edited by J. A. Lakarra and J. I. Hualde, 303–350. Donostia-San Sebastián: Diputación Foral de Gipuzkoa.
- Farkas, Donca. 1988. On obligatory control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11:27–58.
- Ferreira, Marcelo. 2009. Null subjects and finite control in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Minimalist essays on Brazilian Portuguese syntax*, edited by J. Nunes, 17–49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fleisher, Nicholas. 2006. Russian dative subjects, case, and control. Ms. University of California, Berkeley.
- Fong, Suzana. 2019. Proper movement through Spec-CP: an argument from hyperraising in Mongolian. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4 (1): 30.
- Franks, Steven. 1990. Case, configuration and argumenthood: reflections on the second dative. *Russian Linguistics* 14 (3): 231–254.



- Franks, Steven. 2014. The overgeneration problem and the case of semipredicatives in Russian. In *Advances in the syntax of dps. structure, agreement, and case*, edited by A. Bondaruk, G. Dalmi, and A. Grosu, 13–59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franks, Steven, and Norbert Hornstein. 1992. Secondary predication in Russian and proper government of PRO. In *Control and grammar*, 1–50. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Gair, James W. 2005. Some aspects of finiteness and control in Sinhala. In *The yearbook of South Asian languages and linguistics*, edited by R. Singh and T. Bhattacharya, 117–143. Berlin and New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Gallego, Ángel. 2005. Phase sliding. Ms. University of Barcelona.
- . 2010. *Phase theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Gallego, Ángel, and Juan Uriagereka. 2006. Sub-extraction from subjects. Ms. University of Barcelona and University of Maryland.
- Geist, Ljudmila. 2010. The argument structure of predicate adjectives in Russian. *Russian Linguistics* 34:239–260.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2009. The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: temporal semantics and polarity. *Lingua* 120:1883–1908.
- Grashchenkov, Pavel. 2018. *Grammatika prilagatel'nogo*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Grashchenkov, Pavel, and Anna Grashchenkova. 2007. Argument structure of Russian adjectives. Talk given at the Workshop on argument structure and syntactic relations, Vitoria-Gasteiz.
- Grebenyova, Lydia. 2005. Agreement in Russian secondary predicates. In *Proceedings of the 40th meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 69–81. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Green, Jeffrey Jack. 2018. Adjunct control: syntax and processing. PhD diss., University of Maryland.
- Greenberg, Gerald R. 1985. The syntax and semantics of the Russian infinitive. PhD diss., Cornell University.
- . 1989. Dative subjects and the second dative within slavic. *Digest for Philology and Linguistics* 32:45–57.
- Guilfoyle, Eithne. 1993. Nonfinite clause in modern irish and old english. In *Proceedings of the chicago linguistic society*, 199–214. 29.1.
- Gvozdev, A. N. 1967. *Sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj jazyk*. Vol. 1. Moscow.

- Hagège, Claude. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69:287–310.
- Hale, Kenneth L., and S. Jay Keyser. 2002. *Prolegomenon to a theory of argument structure*. Linguistic inquiry monographs 39. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Halle, Morris, and Ora Matushansky. 2006. The morphophonology of Russian adjectival inflection. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, no. 3 (July): 351–404.
- Hansen, Björn. 2010. Mood in Russian. In *Mood in the languages of Europe*, edited by B. Rothstein and R. Thieroff, 325–341. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Harley, Heidi. 2000. Irish, the EPP and PRO. Ms. University of Arizona, Tuscon.
- . 2003. Possession and the double object construction. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2:31–70.
- Harves, Stephanie. 2002. Unaccusative syntax in Russian. PhD diss., Princeton University.
- Harves, Stephanie, and Richard Kayne. 2012. Having 'need' and needing 'have'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43, no. 1 (December): 120–132.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press.
- Herbeck, Peter. 2011. Overt subjects in spanish control infinitives and the theory of empty categories. *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 7:1–22.
- Hook, Peter E. 1979. *Hindi structures: intermediate level*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Center of South / Southeast Asian Studies.
- Hooper, Joan B. 1975. On assertive predicates. In *Syntax and semantics*, edited by J. Kimball, 4:91–124. New York/London: Academic Press.
- Horn, Stephen W. 2008. Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of accusative-quotative constructions in japanese. PhD diss., Ohio State University.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69–96.
- . 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2003. On control. In *Minimalist syntax*, edited by R. Hendrick, 6–81. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Huang, Cheng-Teh J. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. PhD diss., MIT.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1988–1993. On nominative case assignment and few related things. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 175–196. 19.

- Iatridou, Sabine, and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2013. Negation, polarity, and deontic modals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44 (4): 529–568.
- Ionin, Tania, and Tatiana Luchkina. 2018. Focus on Russian scope: an experimental investigation of the relationship between quantifier scope, prosody, and information structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49 (4): 741–779.
- Jackendoff, Ray, and Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The semantic basis of control in english. *Language* 79 (3): 517–556.
- . 2006. Turn over control to the semantics! *Syntax* 9 (2): 131–152.
- Janko, T. E. 1991. Kommunikativnaya struktura s neingerentnoj temoj. *Naučno-Tehničeskaja Informacija* 7:27–32.
- Junghanns, Uwe, and Gilhard Zybatow. 1997. Syntax and information structure of Russian clauses. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, edited by W. Browne, 289–319. 4. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Kaiser, Lizanne. 1999. The morphosyntax of clausal nominalization constructions. PhD diss., Yale University.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1989. Facets of romance past participle agreement. In *Dialect variation and the theory of grammar*, edited by P. Benica, 85–103. Dordrecht: Foris.
- . 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:647–686.
- Keine, Stefan. 2013. On the role of movement in hindi/urdu long-distance agreement. In *Proceedings of the 42nd north east linguistic society (NELS 42)*, edited by S. Keine and S. Sloggett, 273–284. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Kertz, Laura. 2010. The argument structure of evaluative adjectives: a case of pseudo-raising. In *Linguistik aktuell/linguistics today*, edited by N. Hornstein and M. Polinsky, 154:269–298. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kiss, Tibor. 2004. On the empirical viability of the Movement Theory of Control. Ms. Ruhr-Universität Bochum.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre, Gail Mauner, and Breton Bienvenue. 2003. Arguments for adjuncts. *Cognition* 89:67–103.
- Koopman, Hilda. 2006. Agreement configurations: in defense of “spec head”. In *Agreement systems*, edited by C. Boeckx, 159–199. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2014. Recursion restrictions: where grammars count. In *Recursion: complexity in cognition*, edited by T. Roeper. Springer.

- Koster, Jan. 1984. On binding and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15:417–459.
- Koster, Jan, and Robert May. 1982. On the constituency of infinitives. *Language* 58 (1): 116–143.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. Modality. In *Semantik/semantics: an international handbook of contemporary research*, edited by A. Stechow and D. Wunderlich, 639–650. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, edited by J. Rooryck and L. Zaring, 109–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kroeger, Paul R. 2004. *Analyzing syntax: a lexical-functional approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laka, Itziar M. 1990. Negation in syntax: on the nature of functional categories and projections. PhD diss., MIT.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- . 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22 (4): 811–877.
- . 2006. Ways of being rude. Ms. Ben Gurion University.
- . 2007. Movement-resistant aspects of control. In *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, edited by W. D. Davies and S. Dubinsky, 293–325. Dordrecht: Springer.
- . 2008. Two routes of control: evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26 (4): 877–924.
- . 2010. The explicit syntax of implicit arguments. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41 (3): 357–388.
- . 2013. *Control in generative grammar: a research companion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Larson, Richard. 1991. Promise and the theory of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:103–139.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1998. Exceptional case marking: perspectives old and new. In *Formal approaches to slavic linguistics: the connecticut meeting 1997*, edited by Ž. Bošković, S. Franks, and W. Snyder, 187–211. Michigan Slavic Publications.

- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. Chains of arguments. In *Working minimalism*, edited by S. D. Epstein and N. Hornstein, 189–215. MIT Press.
- . 2008. On the development of Case theory: triumphs and challenges. In *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, edited by R. Freidin, C. Otero, and M. L. Zubizarreta, 17–41. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lebeaux, David. 1984. Anaphoric binding and the definition of PRO. In *Proceedings of north eastern linguistic society 14*, edited by C. Jones and P. Sells, 253–274. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Lee, Kum Young. 2009. Finite control in korean. PhD diss., University of Iowa.
- Legate, Julie. 2005. Phases and cyclic agreement. In *Perspectives on phases*, edited by M. McGinnis and N. Richards, 147–156. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 49. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- . 2014. *Voice and v: lessons from Achenese*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Léger, Catherine. 2006. La complementation de type phrastique des adjectives en français. PhD diss., Université du Québec à Montréal.
- Letuchiy, Alexander. 2017. Predicative. Ms. Moscow.
- Levin, Maurice. 1978. *Russian declension and conjugation*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Levin, Theodore. 2015. Licensing without Case. PhD diss., MIT.
- Ljaševskaja, O. N., and S. A. Šarov. 2009. *Častotnyj slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka (na materiale nacional'nogo korpusa russkogo jazyka) [frequency dictionary of the modern Russian language]*. Moscow: Azbukovnik.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2008. Raising to object in norwegian and the derived object constraint. *Studia Linguistica* 62:155–181.
- MacDonald, Jonathan. 2006. The syntax of inner Aspect. PhD diss., Stony Brook University.
- Madigan, Sean. 2008. Control constructions in korean. PhD diss., University of Delaware.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 1989. Agreement and agreement phrases. In *Functional heads and clause structure*, edited by A. Mahajan and I. Laka, 217–252. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- . 1990. The a/a-bar distinction and movement theory. PhD diss., MIT.
- Manzini, M. Rita. 1983. On control and control theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:421–446.
- Marantz, Alec. 1984. *On the nature of grammatical relations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Martin, Roger. 2001. Null case and the distribution of PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32 (1): 141–166.

- McCawley, James D. 1988. *The syntactic phenomena of English*. Chicago University Press.
- McCloskey, James. 1980. Is there raising in modern Irish? *Ériu* 31:59–99.
- . 1985. Case, movement and raising in modern Irish. In *Proceedings of WCCFL4*, edited by J. Goldberg, S. Mackaye, and M. Wescoat, 190–205. Stanford, CA: Stanford Linguistics Association.
- . 1996. Subjects and subject-positions in Irish. In *The syntax of the Celtic languages. a comparative perspective*, edited by R. D. Borsley and I. Roberts, 241–283. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCloskey, James, and Peter Sells. 1988. Control and A-chains in modern Irish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 6:143–189.
- McCoy, Svetlana G. 2001. Colloquial Russian particles -TO, ZHE, and VED' as set-generating ("kontrastive") markers: a unifying analysis. PhD diss., Boston University.
- McFadden, Thomas. 2004. The position of morphological case in the derivation: a study on the syntax-morphology interface. PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- . 2008. Overt subjects of infinitives and for-to in the history of English. Talk presented at DiGS X, Cornell.
- . 2009. Structural case, locality, and cyclicity. In *Explorations of phase theory: features and arguments*, edited by K. Grohmann, 107–130. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Meltzer-Asscher, Aya. 2011. Adjectives and argument structure. PhD diss., Tel-Aviv University.
- Mensching, Guido. 2000. *Infinitive constructions with specified subjects: a syntactic analysis of the Romance languages*. Oxford studies in comparative syntax. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Milsark, Gary. 1988. Singl-ing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:611–634.
- Minor, Serge. 2013. Controlling the hidden restrictor: a puzzle with control in Russian. In *Proceedings of the 42nd meeting of the north east linguistic society (NELS 42)*, edited by S. Keine and S. Sloggett. GLSA.
- Mohanan, K. P. 1982. Infinitival subjects, government, and abstract case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13 (2): 323–327.
- Moore, John, and David M. Perlmutter. 2000. What does it take to be a dative subject? *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 18 (2): 373–416.

- Moulton, Keir. 2009. Natural selection and the syntax of clausal complementation. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Neeleman, Ad, and Elena Titov. 2009. Focus, contrast, and stress in Russian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40 (3): 514–524.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2004. Derivations without the activity condition. In *Perspectives on phases*, edited by M. McGinnis and N. Richards. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Noguchi, Tohru. 1997. Two types of pronouns and variable binding. *Language* 73:770–797.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2009. Brazilian portuguese under minimalist lenses. In *Minimalist essays on brazilian portuguese syntax*, edited by J. Nunes, 142:3–14. *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Panzeri, Francesca. 2002. Mood and assertion. PhD diss., Università degli Studi di Milano.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2001. On the nature of intra-clausal relations: a study of copular sentences in Russian and Italian. PhD diss., McGill University.
- . 2004. Topic and focus as linear notions: evidence from Italian and Russian. *Lingua* 114:324–344.
- . 2008. *Copular sentences in Russian: a theory of intra-clausal relations*. Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 70. New York: Springer.
- . 2019. OVS in Russian, reconsidered. Talk presented at the Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 28, Stony Brook University.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1970. The two verbs begin. In *Readings in english transformational grammar*, edited by P. Rosenbaum and R. Jacobs, 107–119. Waltham, MA: Ginn-Blaisdell.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2001. T-to-c movement: causes and consequences. In *Ken Hale: a life in language*, edited by M. Kenstowicz, 355–426. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pires, Acrisio. 1999. A minimalist approach to clausal gerunds. Ms. University of Maryland.
- . 2006. *The minimalist syntax of defective domains: gerunds and infinitives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2007. The derivation of clausal gerunds. *Syntax* 10 (2): 165–203.

- Polinsky, Maria, and Eric Potsdam. 2001. Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19:583–646.
- Pöll, Bernhard. 2007. On the licensing of overt subjects in Spanish infinitival clauses. *Probus* 19.
- Portner, Paul. 1997. The semantics of mood, complementation, and conversational force. *Natural Language Semantics* 5:167–212.
- . 2003. The semantics of mood. In *The second glot international state-of-the-article book*, edited by L. Cheng and R. Sybesman, 47–77. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On raising: one rule of english grammar and its theoretical implications*. Current studies in linguistics series 5. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Preminger, Omer. 2009. Breaking agreements: distinguishing agreement and clitic doubling by their failures. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40 (4): 619–666.
- . 2013. That’s not how you agree: a reply to Zeijlstra. *The Linguistic Review* 30:491–5009.
- . 2014. *Agreement and its failures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Preminger, Omer, and Maria Polinsky. 2015. Agreement and semantic concord: a spurious unification. Ms. University of Maryland.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. MIT Press.
- Quirk, R., ed. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the english language*. London ; New York: Longman.
- Rákosi, György. 2006. *Dative experiencer predicates in Hungarian*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Reed, Lisa A. 2011. Get-passives. *The Linguistic Review* 28:41–78.
- Reuland, Eric. 1983. Governing -ing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14 (1): 101–136.
- Richardson, Kylie. 2001. Small clauses in Russian. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 217–230. 40.
- . 2003. The case for meaningful case: the interaction of tense, aspect, and case in Russian. PhD diss., Harvard University.
- . 2007. *Case and Aspect in Slavic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rigau, Gemma. 1995. The properties of the temporal infinitive constructions in Catalan and Spanish. *Probus* 7.



- Ritter, Elizabeth. 1995. On the syntactic category of pronouns and agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 13:405–443.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of pro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:501–557.
- . 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, edited by L. Haegeman, 287–296. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rochette, Anne. 1988. Semantic and syntactic aspects of Romance sentential complementation. PhD diss., MIT.
- Rooryck, Johan. 1992. On the distinction between raising and control. In *Romance languages and modern linguistic theory*, edited by K. Koerner and P. Hirschbühler, 225–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2000. *Configurations of sentential complementation: perspectives from Romance languages*. London: Routledge.
- Rosenbaum, Peter S. 1974. *The grammar of english predicate complement constructions*. 4. printing. no. 47. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ross, John R. 1967a. Constraints on variables in syntax. PhD diss., MIT.
- . 1967b. Constraints on variables in syntax. PhD diss., MIT.
- . 1969. On the cyclic nature of English pronominalization. In *Modern studies in English*, edited by D. A. Reibel and S. A. Schane, 187–200. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Runner, Jeffrey T. 2006. Lingering challenges to the Raising-to-Object and object-control constructions. *Syntax* 9:193–213.
- Ruwet, Nicolas. 1987. *Théorie syntaxique et syntaxe du français*. Paris: Ed. du Seuil.
- Safir, Ken. 1987. The syntactic projection of lexical thematic structure. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 5:561–601.
- . 1991. Evaluative predicates and the representation of implicit arguments. In *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, edited by R. Freidin, 99–131. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sag, Ivan A., and Carl Pollard. 1991. An integrated theory of complement control. *Language* 67 (1): 63–113.
- Sarma, Vaijayanthi M. 1999. Case, agreement, and word order: issues in the syntax and acquisition of Tamil. PhD diss., MIT.

- Šaxmatov, A. A. 1941. *Očerki sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow.
- Say, Sergey. 2013. On the nature of dative arguments in Russian constructions with “predicatives”. In *Current studies in slavic linguistics*, edited by I. Kor Chanine, 225–245. Studies in Language Companion Series 146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schein, Barry. 1982. Non-finite complements in Russian. In *Papers in syntax*, edited by A. Marantz and T. Stowell, 217–244. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 4.
- Schoorlemmer, Maaïke. 1994. Subject control as direct predication: evidence from Russian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, edited by S. Avrutin, L. Progovac, and J. Toman, 400–422. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- . 1995. Participial passive and Aspect in Russian. PhD diss., Utrecht University.
- Scott, Tatiana V. 2012. Whoever doesn’t HOP must be superior. PhD diss., Stony Brook University.
- Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:445–479.
- Şener, Serkan. 2008. Non-canonical case licensing is canonical: accusative subjects of CPs in Turkish. Ms. University of Connecticut.
- . 2011. Cross clausal licensing of accusative case on subjects of CPs in Turkish. In *Proceedings of the 39th north east linguistic society (NELS 39)*, edited by B. Smith, K. Mullin, and S. Lima, 679–690. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Serdobol’skaja, N. V., and S. Ju. Toldova. 2005. Očenočnye predikaty: tip ocenki i sintaksis konstrukcii. In *Komp’juternaja lingvistika i intellektual’nye texnologii. materialy meždunarodnoj konferencii «dialog’2005», zvenigorod, 1–7 ijunja 2005*, edited by I. M. Kobozeva, A. S. Narin’jani, and V. P. Selegej, 436–443. Moscow.
- Siegel, Muffy. 1976. Capturing the Russian adjective. In *Montague grammar*, edited by B. Partee, 293–309. New York: Academic Press.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 2002. To be an oblique subject: Russian versus Icelandic. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20:691–724.
- . 2008. The case of PRO. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26 (2): 403–450.
- Simík, Radek. 2011. Modal existential wh-constructions. PhD diss., University of Groningen.
- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2002. The synchrony and diachrony of Romance infinitives with nominative subjects. PhD diss., University of Manchester.

- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2007. Romance infinitives with subjects, subjunctive obviation and control theory. In *Coreference, modality, and focus*, edited by L. Eguren and O. Fernández-Soriano, 191–219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Slioussar, Natalia. 2007. *Grammar and information structure. a study with reference to Russian*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Somers, Harold L. 1984. On the validity of the complement-adjunct distinction in valency grammar. *Linguistics* 22:507–530.
- Stenson, Nancy. 1989. Irish autonomous impersonals. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 7:379–406.
- Stepanov, Arthur. 2007. On the absence of long-distance A-movement in Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 15 (1): 81–108.
- Stjepanovic, Sandra, and Shoichi Takahashi. 2001. Eliminating the Phase Impenetrability Condition. Paper presented at the workshop Motivating movement: Explaining the displacement property of natural language, University of Ulster.
- Stowell, Tim. 1991. The alignment of arguments in adjective phrases. In *Perspectives on phrase structure: heads and licensing*, edited by S. Rothstein, 105–135. Syntax and Semantics 25. San Diego and London: Academic Press.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya, and Thomas McFadden. 2009. Subject distribution and finiteness in tamil and other languages: selection vs. case. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 2 (1).
- Svenonius, Peter, ed. 2004. *Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP*. Tromsø: CASTL.
- . 2006. Case alternations in icelandic passive and middle. Ms. University of Trømsø.
- Takeuchi, Hajime. 2010. Exceptional case marking in Japanese and optional feature transmission. *Nanzan Linguistics* 6:101–128.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2002. Raising to object out of CP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:637–652.
- Terzi, Arhonto. 1992. PRO in finite clauses: a study of the inflectional heads of the Balkan languages. PhD diss., CUNY.
- Torrego, Esther. 1998. Nominative subjects and pro-drop INFL. *Syntax* 1.
- Townsend, Charles. 1975. *Russian word formation*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 2007. Long-distance case assignment in Japanese and its dialectal variation. *Gengo Kenkyu* 131:1–43.
- van Urk, Coppe. 2011. Visser’s generalization: a window into the syntax of control. Ms. MIT.

- van Urk, Coppe. 2015. A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: a case study of Dinka Bor. PhD diss., MIT.
- Varlokosta, Spyridoula. 1994. Issues on modern Greek sentential complementation. PhD diss., University of Maryland.
- Vasmer, Max. 2009. *Etimologicheskiy slovar russkogo yazyka v 4 tomax*. Moscow: AST.
- Veyrenc, Jacques. 1979. *Les propositions infinitives en russe*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 1985. Lexical subjects in French infinitives. In *Selected Papers from 13th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, edited by L. D. King and C. A. Malay, 407–423. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- von Fintel, Kai, and Sabine Iatridou. 2007. Anatomy of a modal construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38 (3): 445–483.
- Wilkinson, Robert W. 1971. Complement subject deletion and subset relations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2 (4): 575–584.
- . 1976. Modes of predication and implied adverbial complements. *Foundations of Language* 14 (2): 153–194.
- Williams, Edwin. 1987. Implicit arguments, the binding theory, and control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 5 (2): 151–180.
- Wood, Jim. 2010. Case marking and transitivity alternations. Qualifying paper, NYU.
- . 2012. Against the Movement Theory of Control: another argument from Icelandic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:322–330.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 1999. Modal verbs must be raising verbs. In *Proceedings of the 18th west coast conference on formal linguistics (WCCFL18)*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- . 2001. *Infinitives: restructuring and clause structure*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2002. Syntactic versus semantic control. In *Linguistik aktuell/linguistics today*, edited by C. J.-W. Zwart and W. Abraham, 53:93–127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2014. Tense and aspect in english infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45 (3): 403–447.
- . 2016. Semantic and formal agreement features—evidence from nominal ellipsis in German. Talk presented at the 49th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Naples, Italy.

- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2017. Formal and semantic agreement in syntax: a dual feature approach. In *Language use and linguistic structure: proceedings of the Olomouc linguistics colloquium 2016*, edited by J. Emonds and M. Janebová, 19–36. Olomouc: Palacký University.
- . 2018. Cross-clausal a-dependencies. In *Papers from the 54th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS 54)*. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, Ill.
- Wyngaerd, Guido J. vanden. 1994. *Pro-legomena: distribution and reference of infinitival subjects*. Linguistic models 19. Berlin ; New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Yanovich, Igor. 2005. Choice-functional series of indefinite pronouns and Hamblin semantics. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 15 (0): 309–326.
- Yoon, James H. 2007. Raising of major arguments in Korean and Japanese. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25 (3): 615–653.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. 2002. *Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2012. There is only one way to agree. *The Linguistic Review* 29:491–539.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2006. Raising out of finite CP in Nguni: the case of Fanele. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24:255–275.
- Zimmerling, Anton. 2003. Predikativy i kačestvennye narečija: klassy slov i napravlenija derivacii. In *Rusistika na poroge XXI veka: problemy i perspektivy*, 54–59. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- . 2007. Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke. In *Tekst. Struktura i Semantika. Doklady XI Meždunarodnoj Konferencii*, 138–151. Moskva.
- Zimmerling, Anton, and Maria Trubitsina. 2015. Dativnye i sentencial'nye podležaščie v russkom jazyke: ot vnutrennix sostojanij k obščim suždenijam. *Rhema*, no. 4: 71–104.
- Zolotova, G. A. 1982. O kategorii ocenki v russkom jazyke. In *Kommunikativnye aspekty russkogo jazyka*, 274–281. Moscow: Nauka.