# Case on floating quantifiers in Russian infinitival clauses:
# A configurational analysis

F. Baykov                                         Moscow State University, Moscow

**Problem.** The distribution of floating quantifiers (FQ) in Russian infinitival clauses and their case patterns have been at the forefront of generative theorizing (Comrie 1974, Babby 1998, Landau 2008, *i. a.*). The FQ contained within an infinitival clause and pertaining to its unpronounced subject has two robustly cross-linguistically attested means to get a case value (van Urk 2010 on Polish, Czech, Icelandic, Greek etc.). It either surfaces in the same case as the controller in the matrix clause (henceforth 'case transmittion/concord'), or somehow gets a case value distinct from that of the controller (so-called 'case independence').

Nearly all existing works – with the notable exception of Fortuin (2003) – state that either all subject control indiscriminately demands that the FQ be nominative (that is, agree with the controller nominal; Comrie 1974; Babby 1998) or, alternatively, that it is only exhaustive subject control that does so (Landau 2008). This paper demonstrates that such a description of the facts is inaccurate. In addition, a range of other possible control configurations have been left unaddressed in existing works. They include accusative control with verbs such as *ugorazdit'* 'end up' (when the accusative DP seems to have some semantic subject characteristics) and with matrix idioms such as *zhaba dushit* 'not want to'.

**Data.** My own work with Internet data reveals ample evidence of the use of case independence strategy (i. e. dative FQs) even under subject control (*contra* Comrie 1974, Babby 1998, *inter alia*), including exhaustive (as opposed to partial) subject control (*contra* Landau 2008). Note, that the verb *izbegat'* 'avoid' in example (1b) is an exhaustive control predicate, that is, it never admits partial control readings.

(1) a. ***Хочу***      ***самому***      ***поменять***    *замок на*     *двери…*
     want.PRS.1SG      self.DAT.SG   change.INF    lock    on      door
     'I want to change door lock myself.'

     b. *…до этого* ***избегал***      ***самому***      ***сортировать***     ***массив…***
     until    that    avoid.PST.M.SG    self.DAT.SG   sort.INF        array
     'until then (I) avoided to sort an array myself.'

Verbs such as *ugorazdit'* 'end up' taking an accusative argument and an infinitival clause admit accusative and dative FQs inside infinitival clauses.

(2) *a. Как* ***тебя***  ***угораздило***  *вообще*      *ходить*      ***самому***     *по улице?*
     How    you.ACC   ended.up   in.general     go.around     self.DAT     by street
     'How come you decided to walk the streets yourself?'

     b. ***Платона…***  ***угораздило***    ***самого***      *в Елену Фоминишну* ***влюбиться!***
     Platon.ACC    ended.up      self.ACC      in E. F.             be.in.love.INF
     'Platon ended up having fallen in love with Elena Fominishna'

Idioms such as *zhaba dushit* 'not want to', however, require that the FQ be in dative form; examples with accusative FQs were not found and are rejected by native speakers.

(3) ***меня***      ***жаба***      ***душит***      ***самому***     *все*        *делать.*
     me.ACC      frog.NOM    strangles    self.DAT.SG   all.ACC      do.INF
     'I feel jealous do it all myself'

**Analysis & Main results.** My analysis will be cast in terms of Dependent Case Theory (DCT; see Marantz 1991; Baker 2014) supplemented with some ideas from Phase Theory (Chomsky 2000). Following Marantz (1991), I assume that the exact morphological form of unmarked case assigned to a nominal may vary according to the domain where it is located. Thus, I propose to treat dative as the unmarked case in infinitival clauses (i. e. under m-command by an infinitival $T^0$). However, as in Baker (2014), I argue that both the unmarked and the dependent case are assigned only when a CP phase is considered, and all

the c-command relationships already considered at the vP stage are not taken into account anymore.

I propose that infinitival clauses can vary in the amount of functional projections they include, i. e. some are CPs and others mere TPs. Then, if an infinitival clause is a CP, its TP complement is considered with respect to unmarked (dative) case assignment and the floating quantifier receives dative. Otherwise, an infinitival clause is a TP, it does not form an unmarked case assignment domain separate from the main clause, on its own. Then, the floating quantifier agrees in case with its controller (since PRO cannot in this case take another case than the controller).

Let us now proceed to consider a derivation of case concord under subject control (direct object control can be dealt with comparably).

[$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ DP$_{nom}$ T [$_{vP2}$ ~~DP$_{nom}$~~ v [$_{VP2}$ V$_{matrix}$ [$_{TPnon\text{-}finite}$ PRO T [$_{vP1}$ ~~PRO~~ v [$_{VP1}$ V DP$_{acc}$]

1) Embedded vP1 phase is considered, VP1 is sent to the interfaces, nothing happens.

2) Matrix vP2 phase is considered, VP2 is sent to the interfaces, there are two caseless DPs (PRO and DPacc, PRO c-commands DPacc,), nothing happens (both nominative and accusative are assigned when a CP phase is considered only).

2) Matrix CP phase is considered, only new c-command relations count: DPnom c-commands both PRO and DPacc. DPnom receives unmarked nominative, DPacc dependent accusative. PRO receives the same case as its controller, namely, nominative (which is thereafter transferred to FQ if there is one).

Since in many cases case control and case independence are, as I have argued, equally acceptable variants, my analysis naturally leads to the adoption of the notion of disjunctive selection proposed by Bruening (2019). Namely, modal predicates such as *mozhet* 'may' and *dolzhen* 'must', for which no examples with dative FQs were found, strictly subcategorize for TP infinitivals only, while other subject control verbs equally permitting nominative and dative FQs and direct object control verbs (including *ugorazdit'* 'end up') which allow both accusative and dative FQs admit both infinitival TPs and CPs as their arguments. In fact, allowing for at least some degree of subcategorizational underspecification (i. e., disjunctive selection) is unavoidable since many (though by no means all) control predicates can take DP or PP arguments instead of infinitival clauses (cf. *nadeyus' pobedit'* hope.PRS.1SG win.INF vs. *nadeyus' na pobedu* hope.PRS.1SG on winning.ACC 'I hope to win').

**OUTLOOK & IMPLICATIONS.** Thus, the domain of optionality of both case transmittion and case independence of FQs in Russian is much larger than previously thought, while the configurations where only one strategy is possible are relatively few in number – the fact that any adequate theory of Russian syntax must take into account. Moreover, the "size" of infinitival clauses (i. e. whether they are TPs or CPs) is not so rigidly determined by the matrix predicate and/or type of control (*viz.* subject vs. object control) as has sometimes been claimed (e.g. Babby 1998 argued that all subject control in Russian involves restructuring the embedded clause to a VP). Finally, the DCT can easily accommodate the facts concerning possible case characteristics of FQs in Russian infinitival clauses (by no means does that mean that other generative theories of Case can't do that), thereby offering an excellent illustration of the dependency of the morphological realization of unmarked case on the domain in which the nominal in question is situated.

**REFERENCES.** Babby, L. (1998). Subject control as direct predication: Evidence from Russian. ♦ Baker, M. C. (2014). On dependent ergative case (in Shipibo) and its derivation by phase. ♦ Bruening, B. (2019). Disjunctive selection is necessary for "Hierarchy of Projections" and it accounts for transitivity failures. ♦ Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. ♦ Comrie, B. (1974). The second dative: A transformational approach. ♦ Fortuin, E. (2003). The conceptual basis of syntactic rules: a semantic motivation for the second dative in Russian. ♦ Landau, I. (2008). Two routes of control: Evidence from

case transmission in Russian. ♦ Marantz, A. (1991). Case and licensing. ♦ van Urk, C. (2010). On obligatory control: a movement and PRO approach.