

## Object control predicates select small clauses: evidence from Russian

I investigate Russian object control verbs (OCVs) with a dative IO: desideratives *velet* ('order'), *razrešit* (allow), etc. I argue that object control verbs select not two separate arguments but a small clause complement (Hoekstra 2004) that consists of a dative subject and a complex predicate that includes a clausal proposition and a silent modal head (2). Therefore, it is the modal head that restricts the properties of an embedded clause.

- (1) Petja            razrešil            Maše<sub>i</sub>            PRO<sub>i</sub>    vzjat'            kuklu.  
Peter.NOM    allow.3SG.PST    Mary.DAT            take.INF    doll  
'Peter allowed Mary to take a doll.'
- (2) [<sub>VP</sub> Petja [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>V</sub> razrešil] [<sub>SC</sub> [Maše<sub>i</sub>] R<sup>0</sup> [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>X'</sub> [<sub>X</sub> modal] [<sub>CP</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> vzjat' kuklu]]]]]]].

**First**, I argue that the dative and clausal arguments form a single constituent, a small clause (SC), in the complement position of an OCV. This idea is supported by the constituency tests (3) and phasal diagnostics (4).

- (3) čto    ja            razrešil,            tak eto    [Pete<sub>i</sub>            PRO<sub>i</sub>    pojti            v kino].  
what    I.NOM    allow.PST    so that    Peter.DAT            go.INF    to cinema  
'What I allowed is that Peter would go to the cinema.'
- (4) Kto            razrešil            [kuda    emu<sub>i</sub>            PRO<sub>i</sub>    pojti]?  
who.NOM    allow.PST    where    he.DAT            go.INF  
'Who did allow him to go where?'

The control relations are established locally within a SC, which predicts the ungrammaticality of partial control. It should be also noticed that the raising analysis is not supported by the results of standard diagnostics: idiom chunks (5) and embedded passivization.

- (5) Ya            razrešil            černoj    koške<sub>i</sub>            PRO<sub>i</sub>    probežat'            meždu    nami.  
I.NOM    allow.PST    black    cat.DAT            run.INF    between    we  
Only lit. 'I allowed a black cat to run between us.'  
Intended idiomatic reading: 'I allowed us to quarrel.'

**Second**, I believe that the dative argument and the embedded clause cannot establish immediate predication relations: the results of raising tests suggest that the embedded clause is a fully saturated proposition. Furthermore, neither the matrix predicate nor the functional relator can assign theta-roles to SC arguments (Den Dikken 2006; Hoekstra 2004). Therefore, I argue that there is an intermediate embedded head forming the SC predicate.

- (6) [<sub>VP</sub> Petja [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>V</sub> razrešil] [<sub>SC</sub> [Maše<sub>i</sub>] R<sup>0</sup> [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>X'</sub> [<sub>X</sub> HEAD] [<sub>CP</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> vzjat' kuklu ]]]]]]]]

**Finally**, I suggest that this head is a modal-like element. Notice the striking similarity between modal predicative constructions common in Russian (7) and OCVs: they require [+Animate] NPs, which are assigned dative case and the Experiencer theta-role, and can take either a non-finite clause with object control or a finite subjunctive clause (for modal predicatives, the results of idiom chunks and embedded passivization tests support the control analysis; cf. also (Zimmerling 2008) for further discussion). The structure from (6), thus, can be specified as (2).

- (7) a. Petja            velel            Maše<sub>i</sub>            PRO<sub>i</sub>    ostat'sja /    čtoby    ona<sub>i</sub>            ostalas'.  
Peter.NOM    order.PST    Mary.DAT            stay.INF /    so.that    she.NOM    stay.SUBJ  
'Peter ordered Mary to stay.'
- b. Maše<sub>i</sub>            nužno            PRO<sub>i</sub>    ostat'sja /    čtoby    ona<sub>i</sub>            ostalas'.  
Mary.DAT    necessary            stay.INF /    so.that    she.NOM    stay.SUBJ  
'Mary should stay.'

The proposed idea corresponds to the general semantic intuition: to permit or to order something means to state that something is possible or necessary for someone. It could be suggested that modality is not 'added' structurally but that it is inherently encoded into an

OCV itself. However, this hypothesis is questioned by the possibility of ambiguous scope interpretation, exemplified in (8). Only by separating the main predicate and the modal component can we get both possible readings, with the optional raising of the modal head.

- (8) a. Petja ne razrešal Maše<sub>i</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> ostat'sja.  
 Peter.NOM not allow.PST Mary.DAT stay.INF  
 'Peter didn't said that for Mary it is possible to stay.'  
 'Peter said that for Mary it is not possible to stay.'

The present analysis can capture another peculiar property of Russian OCVs. At least some of them allow an embedded indicative finite clause, but in this case a dative NP is optional and adjunct-like. It can alternate with a PP and does not form an immediate constituent with an embedded clause. Most strikingly, the modal semantics vanishes (notice that modal predicates prohibit indicative clausal complements). The assumption that modality is inherently encoded into OCVs would require stipulating the unnecessary homonymy between the predicates in (9).

- (9) a. Petja skazal Maše<sub>i</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> pomyt' posudu.  
 Peter.NOM say.PST Mary.DAT wash.INF dishes  
 'Peter said that Mary should wash the dishes.'  
 b. Petja skazal Maše, čto Vanja pomyl posudu.  
 Peter.NOM say.PST Mary.DAT that Vanja.NOM wash.PST dishes  
 'Peter told Mary that John had washed the dishes.'

Furthermore, (9b) and the additional set of examples in (10) suggest that OCVs themselves do not necessarily require a particular Time reference of an embedded clause. I assume that the future irrealis requirement is imposed by the silent modal.

- (10) a. Ja obeš'aju tebe<sub>i</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> polučit' mjač na den' roždenja.  
 I.NOM promise.PRES you.DAT get.INF ball on birthday  
 'I promise you that you could get a ball for your birthday.'  
 b. Ja obeš'aju tebe, čto Petja polučil mjač na den' roždenja.  
 I.NOM promise.PRES you.DAT that Peter.NOM get.PST ball on birthday  
 'I promise you that Peter has got a ball on his birthday.'

To conclude, I examine the behavior of the Russian OCVs with a dative IO and propose that they select a SC complement which consists of a dative subject and a complex modal + proposition predicate. In the full version of the present talk I also provide the comparison of the proposed approach with the currently existing theories (Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes 2010; Landau 2015; Wurmbrand 2003), which cannot capture the relevant properties of Russian OCVs.

## References

- Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein, & J. Nunes. 2010.** *Control as Movement*. Cambridge University Press. **Dikken, M. den. 2006.** *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion, and Copulas*. MIT Press. **Hoekstra, T. 2004.** *Arguments and Structure: Studies on the Architecture of the Sentence*. Mouton de Gruyter. **Landau, I. 2015.** *A Two-Tiered Theory of Control*. MIT Press. **Wurmbrand, S. 2003.** *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. **Zimmerling, A. 2008.** *Dative Subjects and Semi-Expletive Pronouns in Russian*.