## Dative case with infinitives in Russian

Evgenii Efremov, University of Western Ontario

Dative infinitive constructions (1) have been analyzed from different perspectives: the subjectlike status of the dative argument, the clausal structure of the construction and the nature of the dative case. In this talk I address the last issue. I argue that dative here can be best accounted for as one of the unmarked cases within the dependent case family of approaches (Marantz 1991, McFadden 2004, Baker 2015).

(1) *Ivanu* Ø//bylo/budet ne postupit' v universitet. Ivan.DAT is / was / will.be NEG enter.INF into university 'It is / was / will be impossible for Ivan to enter university.'

Dative cannot be lexically assigned here or linked to a  $\theta$ -role since it is not selected by a particular verb. It cannot simply come from T<sub>INF</sub> either: controlled infinitives never have a dative PRO in Russian: in (2a) *odin* 'alone' is always nominative, while in (2b) it has to be dative. Thus, it shows agreement with the subject of the main clause by virtue of its being coindexed with PRO which is controlled by *ja* or *mne* 'I'.

(2)	a.	$Ja_i$	xoču	$[PRO_i]$	rabotat'	odin <sub>i</sub> /*odnomu <sub>i</sub> ]
		I.NOM	want		work.INF	alone.NOM/*alone.DAT
	b.	$Mne_i$	xočetsa [PRO <sub>i</sub>		rabotat'	*odin <sub>i</sub> /odnomu <sub>i</sub> ]
		I.DAT	want		work.INF	*alone.NOM/alone.DAT
		'I want	to work	alone'		

I adopt the monoclausal analysis of the construction: the dative argument and the infinitive are in the same clause. Fleisher (2006) and Jung (2009) provide some arguments for biclausality but I show some counterevidence. I propose that dative is assigned to a DP in [Spec, TP] as an unmarked case under the following conditions:

(3) i. it is c-commanded by C<sub>INF</sub>; ii. [Spec, TP] is overt or *pro* but not PRO. The derivation of (1) would then proceed as follows:

- (4) i. Merge {v, VP}, where  $VP = postupit' v universitet \longrightarrow Spell out VP$ 
  - ii. Merge {DP Ivan, v'}; Merge {Neg, vP}; Merge {T, NegP};

iii. Copy DP Ivan; Merge {DP Ivan, T'}

iv. Merge  $\{C_{INF}, TP\}$   $\longrightarrow$  Spell out TP: assign DAT to DP Ivan – Ivanu

There is no evidence that PRO in Russian can get any case, so I assume that it is inherently caseless, which conforms to the traditional notion of PRO dating back to Chomsky (1981). Thus, when PRO enters a derivation, there is simply nothing to be assigned case, hence the ungrammaticality of (2a) with *odnomu* 'alone.DAT' and the restriction in (3ii).

This model has the advantage of unifying all the possible dative infinitive constructions despite their differences in meaning and without resorting to multiple functional heads responsible for these differences. It also explains why this dative looks just as structural as nominative does in finite clauses (Germain 2017). Another option entertained in Tsedryk (2017) is an Appl head between CP and TP where the external argument moves to get DAT. The modal semantics result from the interaction of functional heads (C<sub>INF</sub>, T, Neg). Though I agree with this compositional view, I do not think that ApplP is well justified here because it is unusually high in the structure and there is no independent evidence for positing it other than the dative case itself. Besides, the infinitival dative has very little in common with the applicative/indirect object datives, for which this head was initially proposed (see e.g. Marantz 1993, Pylkkänen 2008).

This study has certain implications for the theory of case. The results show that dependent case approaches need to be further incorporated into syntactic theory because they can better

account for some facts than the more traditional functional head based approaches to case. They can also be used to evaluate syntactic vs. postsyntactic approaches to case.

## **Selected references**

- Fleisher, N. 2006. Russian Dative Subjects, Case, and Control. Ms., University of California, Berkeley.
- Jung, H. 2009. Null Prepositional Complementizers and the Dative of Obligation in Russian. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 17, 64-80. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Marantz, A. 1991. Case and Licensing. In G.Westphal, B. Ao, and H.-R. Chae, eds., *Proceedings* of ESCOL 91, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, Cornell Linguistics Club: 234–253.
- Marantz, A. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In Sam A. Mchombo, ed., *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar* 1, 113–151. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Moore, J. and D. M. Perlmutter. 2000. What Does It Take to Be a Dative Subject? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 373–416.

Pylkkanen, L. 2008. Introducing Arguments. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Sigurðsson, H. Á. 2008. The case of PRO. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 26: 403–450.

Tsedryk, E. 2017. Dative-Infinitive Constructions in Russian: Are They Really Biclausal? *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 25. Edited by Wayles Browne, Miloje Despic, Naomi Enzinna, Simone Harmath-de Lemos, Robin Karlin, and Draga Zec. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.