

# Embedded Complementizers and the Russian Dative of Obligation

Hakyung Jung

hjung@fas.harvard.edu

Harvard University

**1. Synopsis.** The syntactic mapping of directed deontic modality (obligation) has been discussed in the context of raising (Bhatt 1997, Wurmbrand 1999 among others) and control (Brennan 1993). The Russian deontic modal construction consisting of a DAT subject, a *be*-auxiliary *byt'*, and an infinitive (1) shows properties of both raising and control structures at the same time.

- (1) Gde mne bylo spat'  
where me.DAT be.Past sleep.Inf  
'Where was there for me to sleep?'

This paper argues in favor of the raising analysis (*contra* Sigurdsson 2002, Fleisher 2006), by proposing that the dative case marking of the subject comes from an embedded C, on the basis of the structural parallel between possessive (2a) and possessive obligation constructions (2b), which are schematically represented as in (3a-b) (*à la* Kayne 1993, built on Freeze 1992). The proposed structure not only resolves the problem of an apparent control property of the construction but accounts for the limited distribution of the dative subject.

- (2) a. U menja budet kniga                      b. Mne bylo uxodit'  
at me.PP<sub>GEN</sub> be.Fut book.Nom                      me.DAT be.Past leave.Inf.  
'I will have a book'.                                      'I had to leave'.
- (3) a. [<sub>TP</sub> T [<sub>BEP</sub> BE [<sub>PP</sub> P [<sub>NP</sub> Subj [ n NP]]]]]      b. [<sub>TP</sub> T [<sub>BEP</sub> BE [<sub>PP</sub> P [<sub>VP</sub> Subj [ v VP]]]]]

**2. Problems.** The Russian obligation construction, on the one hand, appears to be a raising construction in that (i) the interpretation of the subject is ambiguous in terms of specificity as shown in (4) (*à la* Wurmbrand 1999); (ii) the bearer of obligation is not necessarily the dative subject (5); (iii) the embedded verb may be passivized (6). On the other hand, the given construction is incompatible with a (covert) expletive (7), which is argued by Fleisher (2006) as evidence for a control structure.

- (4) 2 studentam iz Bostona budet privesti Ivana  
students.DAT from Boston be.Fut bring.Inf Ivan.ACC  
a. 'There are specific 2 students from Boston who have to bring Ivan'.                      2 > *be*  
b. 'It is necessary that Ivan is brought by 2 students from Boston'.                      *be* > 2
- (5) Toj rukopisi ne byt' opublikovanoj  
that manuscript.DAT.F.SG NEG be.Inf. published.INST.F.SG.  
'It is not (in the cards) for that manuscript to be published'. [Moore and Perlmutter 2000]
- (6) a. Vam ne opublikovat' etu stat'ju zdes'  
you.DAT NEG publish.Inf this article.ACC here  
'It is not (in the cards) for you to publish this article here'.  
b. Etoj stat'je ne byt' opublikovanoj zdes' (vami)  
this article:DAT NEG be.Inf. published.PassPart here you.INST  
'It is not (in the cards) for this article to be published here (by you)'.
- (7) Menja<sub>i</sub> [ *expl* tošnit t<sub>i</sub> ] vs. \*Menja ne tošnit'  
me.ACC sicken.3SG me.ACC (be.Prs) NEG sicken.Inf.  
'I feel nauseous'.                                      Intended: 'It is not for me to feel nauseous'.

Another peculiarity pertaining to the underlying structure of this construction is that the dative subject cannot be embedded as a PRO (8). When compared to Icelandic quirky subject which may be embedded as PRO bearing a quirky case (Sigurdsson 1991), the lack of PRO in (8) indicates that the case marking

mechanism of the Russian dative of obligation must be distinct from that of Icelandic quirky cases, the latter which depend on lexical verb properties.

- (8) \*Ja<sub>i</sub> ne xoču [PRO<sub>i</sub> byt' uxodit']  
 I.NOM NEG want.Prs be.Inf. leave.Inf.  
 Intended: 'I don't want to have to leave'.

**3. Proposal.** In the structure in Kayne (1993) and Bhatt (1997), the subject in Spec,*n*P or Spec,*v*P moves to Spec,PP, is assigned the dative case by P (=D in Kayne's framework), and further moves to the Spec of the matrix TP (EPP). I adopt the structures in (3) with an adaptation that P in the obligation-infinitival construction is a prepositional complementizer, which assigns Case to the embedded subject over the TP boundary, as shown in (10). In (10) the whole embedded predicate (T') with its complement moves to Spec,LowFocP (à la Belletti 2004). Subsequently, the PP containing the subject undergoes a remnant movement to Spec,TP (EPP). This PP movement to Spec,TP is independently justified by the fact that the whole PP (*u* 'at' + Genitive) with an overt preposition appears in Spec,TP in the Russian possessive construction (2a).

The case-marking strategy in (10) accounts for the incompatibility of covert expletives with this construction. As shown in (11), in Russian covert expletive cannot be case-marked, and is therefore incompatible with the P in the proposed structure. In this line of analysis, the lack of expletive in the given construction cannot be evidence of a control structure.

- (10) [<sub>TP</sub> Spec T [<sub>ModP</sub> [<sub>BE</sub> BE [<sub>LowFocP</sub> Spec LowFoc [<sub>PP(CP)</sub> P(C)<sub>DAT</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Subj<sub>i</sub> T [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> V...]]]]]]]]]]

- (11) \*Ja sčitaju *expl* xolodnym Cf. Ja sčitaju ego umnym  
 I.NOM consider cold.INST I.NOM consider him.ACC wise.INST  
 Intended: 'I consider it cold' 'I consider him wise'.

The unembeddability of the dative subject as a PRO in (8) is also accounted for by this structure. In structure (10), the subject of the embedded clause is case-marked by P (=C) which properly head-governs it, and therefore must be overtly realized (à la Sigurdsson 1991). If the subject were case-marked in Spec,PP or Spec,ModP it could appear as a PRO.

Given that the structure in (10) resolves why the construction is incompatible with covert expletive and PRO subjects, the raising analysis of this construction remains on solid ground.

**4. Extensions.** The proposal of this paper that there is an embedded P(=C) as an oblique case assigner to the embedded subject, predicts that any construction containing structures (3) will experience the lack of PRO subjects as in (8). This prediction is borne out by the Russian possessive construction (12), and the North Russian perfect construction (13), both of which contain the possessive PP subject and the *be*-auxiliary. It also accounts for the unembeddability of the oblique subject as a PRO in the Hindi possessive obligation construction (14).

- (12) Ja<sub>i</sub> xoču [PRO<sub>i</sub> byt' sestra] (13) \*Ja<sub>i</sub> xoču [PRO<sub>i</sub> byt' zakončeno eto] k 5  
 I.NOM want be.Inf. sister I.NOM want be.Inf. finished.Part. it by  
 Intended: \*'I want to have a sister.' Intended: 'I want to have finished it by 5.'

- (14) \*Ram yeh kitaabpaRh-naa ho-naa caah-taa hai  
 Ram this book read-Inf be-Inf want-Hab be.Prs.Sg  
 Intended: 'Ram wants to have to read this book'. [pers.comm. R. Bhatt]

**REFERENCES.** Belletti, A. 2004. "Aspects of the Low IP Area," *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Vol. 2, 16–51. Oxford University Press. Bhatt, R. 1997. "Obligation and Possession", *MITWPL* 32: 21–40. Brennan, V. 1993. "Root and Epistemic Modal Auxiliary Verbs", Ph.D. Diss. UMass Amherst. Fleisher, N. 2006. "The Syntax of Possession-Obligation Modals: Evidence from Expletives", Handout from the Talk at LSA Annual Meeting, Albuquerque, NM. Freeze, R. "Existentials and Other Locatives", *Language*, 68 (3): 553–95., Kayne, R. 1993. "Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection", *Studia Linguistica*, 47, 3–31. Moore, J. and D. Perlmutter. 2000. "What Does It Take to Be a Dative Subject?", *NLLT* 18, 373–416. Sigurdsson, H. A. 1991. "Icelandic Case-marked PRO and the Licensing of Lexical Arguments", *NLLT* 9, 327–64. Sigurdsson, H. A. 2002. "To be and Oblique Subject: Russian vs. Icelandic", *NLLT* 20, 691–650. Wurmbbrand, S. 1999. "Modal Verbs Must be Raising Verbs", *Proceedings of WCCFL* 18. Somerville, Mass: Cascadilla Press.