# Licensing of DP/PRO embedded subjects in Russian

Irina Burukina

DELG, Eötvös Loránd University

**Overview**. The paper contributes to the ongoing discussion of DP / PRO alternation. I examine properties of Russian evaluative adjectival predicatives that embed a non-finite clause (i.e. *važno* 'important') and argue that (i) sentences with these predicates and an embedded non-finite clause are ambiguous between obligatory control / overt embedded subject analyses, (ii) the DP/PRO alternation does not correlate with the TAM specification or the structural size of an embedded clause, (iii) the alternation is not free and can be formally accounted for by an analysis in terms of cross-clausal licensing of embedded overt DP subjects. The novel data from Russia challenge existing approaches to DP / PRO distribution and non-finite subordination in Slavic languages.

**DP/PRO alternation**. Evaluative adjectival predicatives in Russian similar to *važno* 'important' select a non-finite or a finite (indicative or subjunctive) clausal argument, exhibiting default Neut.Sg agreement; they usually co-occur with an optional dative DP alternating with a *dlja* 'for' PP, which is often interpreted as an Attitude Holder (AH) (1).

(1) (Maše / dlja Maši) važno ujti / čtoby Anna ušla.
 Maša.DAT for Maša.GEN important.N.SG leave.INF so that Anna.NOM leave.SUBJ

 'For Maša it is important to leave / that Anna would leave.'

I argue that constructions with an evaluative adjectival predicative and an embedded non-finite clause are ambiguous in a sense that the dative DP that we see on the surface corresponds to either a matrix Attitude holder, obligatorily controlling embedded PRO, or the overt embedded subject itself. On the one hand, although the dative DP and the understood subject of the embedded non-finite clause must be coreferent (2a), the coreference can be partial (2), which suggests an obligatory control analysis.

(2) a. [Drugu Maši$_i$]$_k$ važno PRO$_{*i/k}$ pojti v kino vmeste.
 friend.DAT Maša.GEN important.N.SG go.INF into cinema together

 Only: 'For Maša's friend it is important to go to the cinema together.'

 b. Maše$_i$ važno PRO$_i$+ sobrat'sja (vmeste) v sem'.
 Maša.DAT important.N.SG gather.INF together at seven

 'For Maša it was important to gather at seven.'

On the other hand, the dative DP can pass the standard diagnostics for being base-generated as the embedded subject rather than a matrix constituent: the inanimateness, embedded passivization and idiom chunk tests. Sentences with a non-sentient dative DP, which cannot be interpreted as a matrix AH and is related thematically to the embedded predicate, are grammatical (3a), and embedded parallel passive and active constructions can receive the same reading suggesting that the sets of participants are the same (3). Furthermore, the dative DP can be interpreted as a part of the embedded idiom (examples are not here given because of the limitations of space).

(3) a. Važno [stroitil'stvu byt' zakončennym / zakončit'sja kak možno bystree]
 important.N.SG construction.DAT be.INF complete.PTCP complete.PAS.INF as soon as possible

 'It is important that the construction be complete as soon as possible.' (= b)

 b. Važno [zakončit' stroitel'stvo kak možno bystree]
 important.N.SG complete.INF construction.ACC as soon as possible

 'It is important that the construction be complete as soon as possible.' (= a)

The results for movement diagnostics further demonstrate that the embedded overt subject does not have to raise out of its clause: (i) it gets under the scope of embedded negation (4a), (ii) a QP subject can scope below another embedded QP, which is normally impossible for matrix constituents (4b), (iii) adjuncts inserted between an overt embedded subject and the rest of its clause cannot modify the matrix predicate; however, adjuncts immediately preceding the dative subject can be interpreted as either matrix or embedded.

(4) a. Važno nikomu ne vstavat'.
 important.N.SG nobody.DAT NEG stand.up.INF

 'It is important so that nobody would stand up.'

b. Važno      kak minimum odnoj knige    ponravit'sja každomu učeniku.
important.N.SG at   least     one   book.DAT be.liked.INF every    student.DAT

'It is important that at least one book would be liked by every student.'
at least one > every, every > at least one

I propose the following structural representation for sentences with a matrix predicative and an embedded non-finite clause (5) (see Grashchenkov & Graschenkova (2007), Geist (2010), Borik (2014), a.o., for discussions of evaluative adjectives being unaccusative).

(5)   $[_{ApplP}[$ Attitude holder $][_{Appl}$ Appl$^0[_{AdjP}$ Adj$^0[_{CP}$ DP/PRO Subject ... $]]]]$

There is no difference between non-finite clausal complements with PRO and DP subjects in terms of agreement, time reference, modality and structural size (for example, both types of constructions allow left-edge focus (6) and topicalization and are, apparently, larger than IPs, although they do not allow overt complementizers in C$^0$).

(6)   a. Važno       stroitel'stvu    IMENNO K MARTU zakončit'sja.
important.N.SG construction.DAT precisely by March complete.INF

'It is important that the construction be complete BY MARCH.'

b. Maše     važno       IMENNO ZAVTRA pojti vmeste v    kino.
Maša.DAT important.N.SG precisely tomorrow go.INF together into cinema

'For Maša it is important to go to the cinema together TOMORROW.'

The DP / PRO alternation within a non-finite clause is not free: the subject of an infinitive cannot be overt if a matrix AH is present (7a), even though, in general, two dative DPs in Russian can co-occur in a sentence (7b) and an overt AH is allowed to appear together with an embedded finite clause (1).

(7)   a. *Maše     važno       [stroitel'stvu    zakončit'sja k  martu].
Maša.DAT important.N.SG construction.DAT complete.INF by March

Intended: 'For Maša it is important for construction to complete by March.'

b. Maše$_k$     važno       [Anne$_i$     PRO$_k$ pomoč' t$_i$].
Maša.DAT important.N.SG Anna.DAT       help.INF

'For Maša it is important to help Anna.'

**Cross-clausal licensing analysis and its implications**. I propose that cases of evaluative adjectives embedding non-finite clauses with overt subjects should be analyzed in terms of cross-clausal Case licensing: matrix Appl$^0$ licenses either an overt AH in Spec,ApplP or the embedded DP subject, dislocated to the left edge of its clause. Adopting the distinction between weak and strong implicit arguments (IAs) proposed by Landau (2010), I argue that a covert AH is a syntactically present weak IA, a case-less $\phi$P, which justifies the presence of ApplP.

The data under discussion challenge the generally accepted assumption that Russian prohibits long-distance subject raising and ECM-like phenomena. Furthermore, the proposed analysis implies that no syntactic Case is assigned to overt DP subjects in infinitival clauses. However, based on the behavior of case-concord secondary predicates, it has been widely assumed that non-finite C$^0$/I$^0$ in Russian assigns dative case to the embedded PRO subject (Greenberg and Franks 1991; Moore and Perlmutter 2000; Fleisher 2006; Landau 2006, 2008, a.o.). I argue that this discrepancy can be accounted for if we draw a line between morphological case and syntactic Case (Marantz 1991; Harley 1995; McFadden 2004, a.o.), and I discuss the issue in more detail arguing that there is no compelling evidence that an embedded subject is itself assigned structural dative case from within the non-finite clause.

Finally, the paper contributes to the general discussion of the mutual DP/PRO distribution: although the constructions described above resemble *want*-sentences in English, which are often considered to be ambiguous between two distinct underlying structures (Landau 2013), there is no detectable difference between obligatory control and no-control complements of evaluative predicatives in Russian, aside from the status of the subject, that would justify a double structure analysis. It might be suggested that I$^0$ in non-finite complements with an overt subject is 'defective' (Agr-less (Landau 2004), or EPP exempt (Chomsky 2001)), but this would remain merely a stipulation, leading to a circular explanation. The data from Russian suggest that DP and PRO can appear in the same context, thus challenging existing proposals that advocate their obligatorily complementary distribution (Landau 2004, 2014).