ПАДЕЖ ПЛАВАЮЩИХ ОПРЕДЕЛИТЕЛЕЙ В ИНФИНИТИВНЫХ КЛАУЗАХ В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ: КОНФИГУРАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ[*]

Ф. В. Байков
МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова

Работа посвящена исследованию поведения плавающих определителей (ПО) в инфинитивных клаузах русского языка на основе примеров их употребления в Интернете. В ней описано поведение ПО в двух прежде не рассматривавшихся подтипах прямообъектного контроля: при матричных предикатах вроде *угораздить* или *подмывать*, которые берут один именной аргумент и приписывают ему падеж, отличный от именительного, и при идиомах вроде *жаба душит* или *черт дернул*. Кроме того, приводятся примеры употребления дативных ПО при полном субъектном контроле, что существующие подходы считают невозможным. Предлагаемый анализ сформулирован в рамках Теории зависимого падежа.

Ключевые слова: русский язык, контроль, плавающие определители, Теория зависимого падежа.

CASE ON FLOATING QUANTIFIERS IN RUSSIAN INFINITIVAL CLAUSES: A CONFIGURATIONAL ANALYSIS[*]

Fyodor Baykov
Lomonosov Moscow State University

The paper is devoted to a reassessment of the syntax of floating quantifiers in Russian infinitival clauses based on real examples from Internet usage. Two previously ignored subtypes of direct object control are described: matrix predicates taking a single nominal argument which receives accusative case (rather than nominative) and idiomatic expressions with direct object control. It is also demonstrated that many examples can be found with dative floating quantifiers even under exhaustive subject control, which is considered impossible by most existing approaches. The analysis is formulated in terms of a variant of the Dependent Case Theory.

Keywords: Russian syntax, control, floating quantifiers, Dependent Case Theory (DCT).

1. Introduction

The topic of Russian floating quantifiers (henceforth FQ) in control constructions and their case patterns has been extensively studied within the generative tradition, beginning with the pioneering work [Comrie 1974] and followed by [Neidle 1988; Franks 1990; Babby 1998; Landau 2008, *i. a.*], which revealed much interesting facts.

FQs are pronominal words such as *sam* 'self' or *odin* 'alone', which are usually contained within the DP they modify, but which sometimes can be dislocated from it (cf. [Testelets 2001: 295]).

(1)   *On   ezdit   tuda   sam   / odin.*
      he.NOM   goes   there   self.NOM / alone.NOM
      'He goes there himself / alone.' [ibid.: 297, (119)]

The FQ which is contained within an infinitival clause and pertains to its unpronounced subject has two robustly cross-linguistically attested ([van Urk 2010] and the references therein) means to get its case feature valued. It either surfaces in the same case as the controller nominal in the matrix clause (this scenario is henceforth called case transmittion/concord; see (2a)), or somehow gets case feature value distinct from that of the controller (so-called case independence; see (2b)).

(2)   a. [matrix verb $DP_{i[Case:\ \mathbf{val1}]}$ [$PRO_{i[Case:\ val1]}$ $FQ_{i[Case:\ \mathbf{val1}]}$ infinitival verb]]

     b. [matrix verb $DP_{i[Case:\ \mathbf{val1}]}$ [$PRO_{i[Case:\ val2]}$ $FQ_{i[Case:\ \mathbf{val2}]}$ infinitival verb]]

The present paper aims to shed some new light on previously established generalizations and results by means of a corpus analysis. The main data source for my investigation has become not the Russian National Corpora (RNC), but the Internet, because the relevant examples are extremely sparse, and only with the aid of the Internet has it become possible to collect the amount of data sufficient to draw more or less reliable conclusions from the absence of certain types of patterns. The choice of corpus methodology as opposed to an acceptability judgment experiment is warranted by the fact that native speakers' judgments, firstly, vary enormously with respect to many crucial examples (cf. fn. 2) and, secondly, may be subconsciously influenced by prescriptive rules (cf. [Pereltsvaig 2008]) and so not be representative of real language usage[1].

---

[1] All the examples below, unless indicated otherwise, are taken from the Internet.

My assessment of the conclusions drawn in the existing literature will proceed in two different directions: firstly, the behavior of FQs in previously unstudied subtypes of direct object control will be described in section 2, and then some data challenging the established unavailability of non-nominative FQs under exhaustive subject control will be cited in section 3. Section 4 contains one possible way of analyzing the data, cast in terms of the Dependent Case Theory [Marantz 1991; Baker 2014, *i. a.*]. The final section 5 summarizes the main results of the present paper.

2. FQs in some subtypes of direct object control

This section deals with the behavior of FQs in some previously unaddressed subtypes of control of the silent subject of an infinitival clause by a nominal bearing accusative case. Firstly, I will concentrate on the cases when the matrix predicate (e.g. *ugorazdit'* 'end up') takes the controller DP as its sole nominal argument but assigns to it accusative rather than nominative. Secondly, I will scrutinize another subtype of direct object control — namely, the situations in which the matrix subject and the matrix predicate form an idiom (to the exclusion of the matrix direct object) such as *zhaba dushit* 'to feel jealous'. Neither of these cases, to the best of my knowledge, has ever been described in the existing literature on control in Russian.

As the already existing literature reveals [Babby 1998; Landau 2008, *i. a.*], under usual direct object control both accusative and dative FQs in the infinitival clause are acceptable[2]:

(3) a. *On   poprosil   menya$_i$ [PRO$_i$ **samomu$_i$**   oplatit'   poezdku].*
      he   asked   me.ACC   self.DAT   pay.INF   journey
      'He asked me to pay the journey myself.'

     b. *Irena   poprosila   Igorya$_i$ [PRO$_i$ idti   **odnogo$_i$**].*
        Irene   asked   Igor.ACC   go.INF   alone.ACC
        'Irene asked Igor to go alone.'

---

[2] There exist, nevertheless, complex and intricate idiolectal variations in native speakers' judgments. Some of those I have informally consulted consistently insisted on FQ having to match the controller in case value, rejecting examples such as (3a), others did not allow for accusative case transmittion to the FQ, refusing to accept (3b), while yet others (including the author himself) found both (3a) and (3b) equally perfect. Hereafter I rely on the most liberal interpretation of the data, considering an example possible if it is accepted by at least some native speakers, especially provided that it is attested in the Internet usage.

One subtype of previously neglected control configurations is instantiated by sentences with verbs such as *ugorazdit'* 'end up', *dostat'* 'drive crazy', and *tyanut'/podmyvat'* 'be tempted' which take an accusative nominal argument[3] and an infinitival clause whose unexpressed subject is construed as coreferential with the accusative DP[4].

(4) ***Menya*_i *tak i podmyvalo*** [PRO_i *s nimi*   *o chem-nibud'*   *potolkovat'*].
me.ACC   just   be.tempted   with them   about something   talk.INF
'I was just tempted to talk to them about something.' (RNC)

As the corpus data presented immediately below reveal, such predicates readily admit both accusative (5b) and dative (5a) FQs inside infinitival clauses. For example, in (5a) the dative FQ *samomu* 'self.DAT' refers to the unpronounced subject of the infinitival clause, which is, in its turn, understood to be coreferential with the accusative second person singular pronoun *tebya* in the matrix clause. In (5b), in a similar structure, the FQ *samogo* 'self.ACC' bears accusative case and refers to the accusative controller DP *Platona*[5].

---

[3] Russian also has verbs which take a single dative nominal argument and an infinitival clause, such as *prispichit'* 'got to do sth' and *(ne) ulybaetsya* 'have no desire to do sth'. In these cases, however, as in dative control more generally, the options of case transmittion and case independence cannot be teased apart (since they can be distinguished only when the case of the controller is other than dative), so that examples with such predicates are uninformative.

[4] The reason why such sentences deserve to be mentioned separately from usual direct object control is that it is not obvious that the accusative controller occupies the direct object position in the matrix clause (as opposed to being a quirky-Case-marked subject), since a nominative DP is usually absent from such structures and the results obtained by using standard subjecthood diagnostics [Testelets 2001: ch. 6] do not give an unequivocal outcome.

In some cases, however, a nominative subject DP is overtly expressed without any accompanying alternations of syntactic structure, which may be taken as an argument in favor of the accusative nominals having the status of direct object in the matrix clause (provided that sentences both with a nominative subject and without it do instantiate the same construction):

(i) *ne   poymu,   kak   menya_i chert   ugorazdil* [PRO_i *togda ot tebya   uexat'*].
NEG   understand.1SG how   me.ACC   devil.NOM   made   then   from you   go.INF
'(I) can't understand why the hell I left you then.' (RNC)

[5] If the accusative arguments in the matrix clause in these examples are quirky subjects marked with inherent accusative case (and not direct objects, the remarks in fn. 4 notwithstanding), the analysis of possible strategies of FQ case marking proposed in [Boeckx et al. 2010] will not extend to Russian data. Based on Icelandic, the auhors claim impossible transmittion of an inherent case value received by the controller in the matrix clause to the FQ in the infinitival clause (according to their analysis, only structural case can be thus transmitted).

One another caveat is that in all the examples I was able to find accusative FQs occur on the left periphery of the infinitival clause (in contrast to dative ones, cf. (5a)), so that another analysis taking them to be located in the matrix clause cannot be excluded.

(5) a. *Kak   tebya$_i$ ugorazdilo* [PRO$_i$ *xodit'*   **samomu$_i$**   *po   ulice*]*?*
      how   you.ACC   ended.up   go.around self.DAT   by   street
   'How come you decided to walk the streets yourself?'

   b. *Platona   ugorazdilo* [PRO$_i$ **samogo$_i$**   *v Elenu Fominishnu   vlyubit'sya*]*!*
      Platon.ACC ended.up   self.ACC   in Elena Fominishna   fall.in.love.INF
   'Platon ended up having fallen in love with Elena Fominishna!'

Similar examples can be found with other predicates of this type, e. g. *podmyvat'* 'be tempted':

(6) a. *Loginova   tak i podmyvalo*
      Loginov.ACC   just   was.tempted

   [PRO$_i$ *samomu$_i$*   *proytis'*   *po   etazham*].
            self.DAT   stroll.INF   around   floors
   'Loginov was just tempted to stroll around the floors himself.'

   b. *Ego$_i$ podmyvalo* [PRO$_i$ *samogo$_i$*   *vzyat'sya za   dopros*].
      he.ACC   was.tempted   self.ACC   take.INF   for   interrogation
   'He was tempted to take the interrogation himself.'

Therefore, the range of case forms FQs can take on in this subtype of control is no different from that they can surface in under usual direct object control with predicates such as *poprosit'* 'ask', cf. (3).

However, FQs in infinitival clauses embedded under idioms such as *zhaba dushit* 'not want to; *lit.* a toad strangles (someone)' and *chert dernul* 'to inadvertently do (sth unwise); *lit.* the devil pulled (someone)' behave differently. Both of them take an accusative direct object and an infinitival clause whose unpronounced subject is obligatorily understood to be coreferential with the accusative DP.

(7)   *Odnix$_i$ «zhaba   dushit»* [PRO$_i$ *za benzin   platit'*]…
      some.ACC   toad.NOM   strangles   for petrol   pay.INF
   'Some feel jealous to pay the petrol…' (RNC)

In such constructions, however, the FQ inside the infinitival clause has to take on obligatorily dative form[6] (8a); examples with accusative FQs such as (8b) were not found (and are considered severely degraded by the native speakers I have consulted).

---

[6] I owe this interesting observation to an anonymous reviewer of [Baykov 2020], to whom I express my deepest gratitude for generously pointing out this fact to me.

(8) a. *Menya$_i$ zhaba   dushit   [PRO$_i$ **samomu$_i$** vse   delat'].
        me.ACC   toad.NOM   strangles   self.DAT   all.ACC   do.INF
        'I feel jealous to do it all myself.'

     b. *Menya$_i$ zhaba   dushit   [PRO$_i$ **samogo$_i$** vse   oplachivat']
        me.ACC   toad.NOM   strangles   self.ACC   all.ACC   pay.INF
        'I feel jealous to pay it all myself.'

(9)   Chert   dernul   Serezhu$_i$ [PRO$_i$ **samomu$_i$** zalezt' v Internet].
        devil   pulled   Seryozha.ACC   self.DAT   go   in Internet
        'It was unwise of Seryozha to surf the Internet himself.'

Therefore, the similarity of syntactic structures notwithstanding, if the subject and the verb of the main clause form an idiom, a FQ should obligatorily take on dative, while in usual direct object control both accusative and dative FQs are possible.

3. Case independence under exhaustive subject control

Ever since [Comrie 1974] it has been believed — with the notable exception of [Fortuin 2003], though — that under subject control only nominative FQs are acceptable in infinitival clauses, the position also supported by [Neidle 1988; Franks 1990; Babby 1998] etc.

(10)   Vanya$_i$ xochet [PRO$_i$ priyti   odin].
        Vanya   wants   come   alone.NOM
        'Vanya wants to come alone.' [Comrie 1974: (24)]

[Landau 2008] made an important qualification by pointing out that under partial (as opposed to exhaustive, (11a)) subject control dative FQs are acceptable (11b).

(11) a. *My   predpochli   sobrat'sya vse   / $^{??}$vsem   v shest'.
        we   preferred   gather.INF all.NOM all.DAT   at six
        'We preferred to gather all at six.'

     b. *Predsedatel' predpochel   sobrat'sya *vse / ^{OK}vsem   v shest'.
        chair   preferred   gather.INF all.NOM all.DAT   at six
        'The chair preferred to gather all at six.' [ibid.: (53)]

My own work with Internet data, however, unequivocally reveals that there exists ample evidence of use of case independence strategy (i. e. dative FQs) even under subject control (*contra* [Comrie 1974; Babby 1998], *i. a.*), including exhaustive (as opposed to partial) subject control (*contra* [Landau 2008]). Such structures can be exemplified by (12):

(12) *Xochu*   [PRO **samomu** *pomenyat'*   *zamok* *na dveri…*]
      want.PRS.1SG   self.DAT.SG change.INF   lock   on door
      'I want to change door lock myself.'

Such examples were found with verbs belonging to different classes of control predicates according to the classification used in [Landau 2015: 6-7], such as the desiderative verbs *xotet'* 'want' (12), *nadeyat'sya* 'hope' (13a), *poboyat'sya* 'be afraid' (13b), *dumat'* 'think' (13c), *predpochitat'* 'prefer', *reshit'* 'decide', *otkazat'sya* 'refuse' and the factive verb *nenavidet'* 'hate' (13d). Both these classes of predicates are partial control predicates, i.e. they admit partial control readings. In all these examples, however, the controller DP is both grammatically and semantically singular (having a single person as its referent), which absolutely excludes the possibility of partial control. Therefore, all these examples instantiate dative FQs under exhaustive subject control and present a serious challenge for [Landau 2008], not to speak of even stricter approaches such as [Comrie 1974; Babby 1998].

(13) a. *Nadeyus' samomu popast'   syuda eshche raz!*
       hope.1SG self.DAT get   hither more   time
       'And I hope to get here myself once again.'

    b. *ne   poboyalsya odnomu ezdit' po   Latinskoy Amerike!*
       not   be.afraid.PST self.DAT   drive   around Latin America
       'And he dared to drive around Latin Amerika alone!'

    c. *uzhe   dumal samomu nabrat'   ee   nomer…*
       already thought self.DAT   dial.INF   her   number
       '(He) was already thinking about calling her himself.'

    d. *ya   nenavizhu   samomu takoe motat'*
       I   hate   self.DAT   such   rewind.INF
       'I hate to rewind such things myself.'

Moreover, examples containing dative FQs can be found even with exhaustive control predicates, which never admit partial control readings at all. Such are the implicative verb *izbegat'* 'avoid' in (14a) and aspectual verb *nachat'* in (14b).

(14) a. *izbegal   samomu   sortirovat' massiv...*
        avoided self.DAT.SG sort.INF   array
        '(until then I) avoided to sort an array myself.'

    b. *...i   nachal samomu   uchitsya*
        and began   self.DAT   learn.INF
        '(I had such a friend, a cheater who deleted cheats) and began to learn himself.'

It seems so as if almost any subject control predicate could co-occur with dative FQs. The only exception is modal predicates such as *moch'* 'can, be able to' and *dolzhen* 'must', for which no examples with dative FQs were found, while sentences with dative FQs under aspectual predicates such as *nachat'* 'begin' are admittedly rare.

The admissibility of dative FQs therefore does not correlate with any of the semantic properties distinguishing different control predicates which were explored in I. Landau's work [Landau 2000, 2015], such as the availability of independent (i.e. separate from that of the main clause) semantic tense for the infinitival clause, being an attitude predicate or belonging to the class of partial control verbs.

The claim that subject control predicates sometimes admit non-nominative FQs, however controversial it may seem at first glance, is not unprecedented. Firstly, already [Landau 2008] pointed out that such a restriction does not hold of partial subject control. Secondly, [Foruin 2003], working within a cognitive linguistic framework, has cited many examples from published sources where dative FQs were used inside infinitival clauses embedded under two subject control predicates, namely *reshit'* 'decide' and *norovit'* 'strive'. Therefore, the results of my examination of the Internet usage lead to further relaxing of nominative-only restriction under subject control — a restriction already substantially weakened by [Landau 2008] and [Fortuin 2003].

4. Analysis

The emergent picture of possible case values for FQs in control structures can be summarized as follows. In most cases, both case transmittion and case inde-

pendence as alternative strategies of valuing FQ's Case feature are possible[7]. This is so in the following environments:

- under subject control, including exhaustive subject control (*contra* [Comrie 1974; Babby 1998; Landau 2008], *i. a.*);
- under direct object control, including sentences with matrix predicates such as *ugorazdit'* 'end up' and *podmyvat'* 'be tempted';
- and (vacuously, since both strategies lead to FQ receiving dative) indirect object control.

However, accusative case transmittion is prohibited when the controller is a direct object and the matrix subject and the matrix predicate form together an idiom chunk such as *zhaba dushit* 'to feel jealous'. A FQ also cannot agree in case with the controller DP (15) if the latter is complement of a preposition (so-called oblique control configuration); this restriction has been described for the first time by [Landau 2008: 893-894] and corpus data supporting it were provided in [Baykov, Rudnev 2020].

(15) *Èmir   potreboval* [$_{PP}$*ot* [$_{DP}$*sultana$_i$*]] *ili* [PRO$_i$ ***samomu   /   *samogo***
       emir   demanded   from sultan.GEN   or   self.DAT   self.GEN

     raspravit'sya   s migrantami], *ili   dat' emu sdelat' èto.*
     massacre   with migrants   or   give him do.INF   this
     'The emir required that the sultan either massacre the migrants himself or let him do it.' [Baykov, Rudnev 2020: (20)] (originally from Internet)

Having established the empirical generalizations we will try to derive, we can now proceed to formulating the details of our proposal.

My analysis will use a variant of the Dependent Case Theory [Marantz 1991] developed in [Baker 2014] and some ideas of Phase Theory ([Chomsky 2000] and much subsequent work). In no way, however, do I want to claim hereby that it is the only way to accommodate the empirical data provided above or that other generative theories of Case (e.g. that developed in [Chomsky 2000]) are incapable of dealing with them.

---

[7] A reviewer remarks that the ensuing analysis is too unrestrictive. However, in view of the diversity of patterns attested in the Internet data, one has to stick either to a more restrictive theory which runs afoul of some examples (dismissing with them somehow, e.g. by claiming them to be marginal) or a more liberal one encompassing almost all attested patterns. It is the second approach that will be pursued here.

Following [Marantz 1991], I assume that the concrete morphological form of unmarked case assigned to a nominal may vary according to the domain where it is located[8]. Thus, I propose to treat dative as the unmarked case in infinitival clauses (e.g. under m-command by an infinitival T^0). An argument in favor of treating dative on infinitival clause subjects as an instance of unmarked case is that a FQ can take on dative irrespective of the concrete infinitival predicate whose silent subject it modifies.

Taking CP and vP to be phases and their complements (IP and VP respectively) to form Spell-Out domains, I argue, following [Baker 2014: 355], that both the unmarked and the dependent cases are assigned only when a CP phase is considered with respect to case assignment at Spell-Out, and all the c-command relationships already considered at the vP stage are not taken into account anymore.

I also suppose that in Russian, the following statement taken from [Baker 2014] is true:

(16) If NP_x c-commands NP_y at the Spell-Out of TP, value the case feature of NP_y accusative. [Baker 2014: 357, (29d)]

In addition, I assume that PRO cannot receive a case value different from that of the controller when assigned case in the same phase the controller is. The last assumption that will be used is that infinitival clauses can vary in the amount of functional projections they include, *viz.* 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 FQ (if there is one) receives the dative. This situation, therefore, is not that different from regular case assignment in a finite clause, the only difference being that the subject receives dative instead of nominative.

A more tricky case is instantiated by situations when FQ agrees in case with the controller DP. The infinitival clause is then a TP, hence it does not form on its own an unmarked case assignment domain separate from the main clause. In that case, the FQ agrees in case with its controller.

Let us now consider in more detail the derivational mechanics of how this overall system deals with case concord under subject control:

---

[8] The morphological form corresponding to dependent case in Russian obviously does not depend on the finiteness of the clause and is spelled out as accusative in all types of clauses, including infinitival ones.

(17) [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ NP$_{NOM}$ T [$_{vP2}$ NP$_{NOM}$ v [$_{VP2}$ V$_{matrix}$ [$_{TPnon\text{-}finite}$ PRO T [$_{vP1}$ PRO v [$_{VP1}$ V NP$_{ACC}$]]]]]]]]

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 NPs (PRO and NP$_{ACC}$, PRO c-commands NP$_{ACC}$), nothing happens (both nominative and accusative are assigned when a CP phase is considered only).

3) Matrix CP phase is considered, only new c-command relations count: NP$_{NOM}$ c-commands both PRO and NP$_{ACC}$. NP$_{NOM}$ receives unmarked nominative, NP$_{ACC}$ dependent accusative[9]. PRO receives the same case as its controller, namely, nominative (which is thereafter transferred to FQ if there is one).

Case concord under direct object control can be dealt with comparably:

(18) [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ NP$_{NOM}$ T [$_{vP2}$ NP$_{NOM}$ v [$_{VP2}$ NP$_{ACC2}$ V$_{matrix}$ [$_{TPnon\text{-}finite}$ PRO T [$_{vP1}$ ~~PRO~~ v [$_{VP1}$ V NP$_{ACC1}$]]]]]]]]

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 three caseless NPs (NP$_{ACC2}$, PRO and NP$_{ACC1}$, NP$_{ACC2}$ c-commands both PRO and NP$_{ACC1}$, PRO c-commands NP$_{ACC1}$,), nothing happens (both nominative and accusative are assigned when a CP phase is considered only).

3) Matrix CP phase is considered, only new c-command relations count: NP$_{NOM}$ c-commands NP$_{ACC2}$, PRO and NP$_{ACC1}$. NP$_{NOM}$ receives unmarked nominative, all the others get dependent accusative[10]. PRO receives the same case as its controller, i. e. accusative (transferred to FQ if there is one)[11].

---

[9] A reviewer remarks that the dependence of embedded clause direct object case marking on the material in the main clause is undesirable, since verbs in Russian can always case-mark their object, even when in infinitival form. It is doubtful, though, that this may lead to incorrect empirical predictions, since embedded clause direct object is always c-commanded by PRO and so will eventually receive accusative.

[10] It may look strange that absolutely unrelated nominals (matrix and embedded direct objects) receive the same case value by the very same process. Such a supposition is not unprecedented, though, and was argued for in an analysis of Korean ditransitives by [Baker 2014].

[11] As for the question as to how the sole nominal argument of verbs such as *ugorazdit'* 'end up' receives its accusative, two options are readily available. Firstly, it may be inherent case assigned by concrete lexical items, e.g. *ugorazdit'* (a solution especially pertinent if these nominals are quirky subjects). Secondly, it may be dependent case assigned to the DP in presence of a silent c-commanding nominal, e. g. *pro* occupying subject position (if this accusative argument is a direct object, cf. fn. 4).

Postulating that infinitival clauses hosting dative FQs differ in the amount of functional projections they contain from those hosting nominative or accusative FQs, of course, needs empirical support[12]. A hint that my analysis may be on the right track is that dative FQs under subject control give rise to a certain modal flavor of the infinitival clause absent from sentences with nominative FQs (a fact noted also by [Fortuin 2003]) and reminiscent of modal semantics of independent infinitival sentences.

Thus, sentences such as (13a) and (13c) can be paraphrased as in (19a) and (19b) respectively:

(19) a. *nadeyus', chto* **mne** **udastsya** *samomu popast' syuda*
     hope.1SG   that me.DAT will.manage self.DAT get.INF hither
     'I hope that I will manage to get here myself once again.'

   b. *dumal, chto emu* **pridetsya** *samomu nabrat' ee nomer…*
     thought that him.DAT will.have.to self.DAT dial.INF her number
     '[He] was already thinking that he would have to call her himself.'

If this modal flavor is contributed by some functional head (say, Mod[0]) located somewhere in between TP and CP, we can explain this fact: the relevant projection, *viz.* ModP, is present only when the infinitival clause is a CP, in which case FQs necessarily surface in the dative form.

A related, though different, point is made by [Miller 1986] who treats dative FQs under direct object control as vestiges of gradual evolution of parataxis into hypotaxis as exemplified in (20):

(20) a. Initial stage (parataxis):
     My poprosili Ivana. (Ivanu) poyti odnomu.
     we asked Ivan.ACC Ivan.DAT go.INF alone.DAT
     'We asked Ivan. [Now he has] to go alone.'

   b. Intermediate stage:
     My poprosili Ivana poyti odnomu.
     we asked Ivan.ACC go.INF alone.DAT
     'We asked Ivan to go alone.' {b=c}

---

[12] An anonymous reviewer has pointed out that independent diagnostics of the categorial status of the infinitival clause based on locality phenomena is desirable and the results achieved by [Gerasimova 2015] are potentially relevant. Fully agreeing with the reviewer, I admit that, though establishing any correlations between Gerasimova's [2015] generalizations and my own would be very welcome, at present the data do not allow me to draw such conclusions.

c. Final stage (hypotaxis):

My	*poprosili*	*Ivana*	*poyti*	*odnogo.*
we	asked	Ivan.ACC	go.INF	alone.ACC

That is, an independent infinitival sentence (which, I presume, had the status of a full-fledged CP) with an overt dative subject and modal (necessitive) semantics (20a) was gradually integrated into another erstwhile independent sentence with a transitive verb such as *poprosit'* 'ask'. Thereupon the infinitival clause was reanalyzed as an argument of *poprosit'*. This integration was at first partial, and the use of dative FQs under direct object control (20b), according to this analysis, reflects the stage where this construction has already ceased to be purely paratactic but has not yet taken on all the properties of hypotaxis and was therefore somewhere in between. After the process of integration of previously independent clauses reached its completion (presumably accompanied by the change of the status of the infinitival clause from a CP to a TP), FQs started to agree in case with the controllers (20c).

Finally, examples with dative FQs under subject control ameliorate if the infinitival clause is separated from the main clause by a pause or when it is extraposed and the main clause contains a pronominal-like element referring to it (21) [Alexander Letuchiy, p. c.]:

(21) *Xochu   odnogo:* [PRO$_i$ *samomu$_i$ pomenyat' zamok na dveri…*]
    want.PRS.1SG   one   self.DAT.SG change.INF   lock   on door
    'I want only that: to change door lock myself.' (constructed example)

In both these situations the infinitival clause is, informally speaking, less tightly connected with the main and may include more functional projections, being a full-fledged CP. Moreover, propositions (i.e. CPs) can be turned into nominals and serve as antecedents for proforms (such as *odnogo* 'one (thing)' in (21)), while TPs cannot [Pavel Rudnev, p. c.].

Since in many cases both dative and nominative/accusative FQs are, as I have argued, acceptable, it has to be postulated that most control predicates can take as their arguments both CP- and TP-infinitivals. Such indeterminacy in subcategorizational properties of many matrix predicates naturally leads to 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 which allow both accusative and dative FQs admit both infinitival TPs and CPs as their arguments. Idioms such as *zhaba dushit,* used in structures with direct object control, and oblique control predicates such as *potrebovat' u/ot* 'demand from', which permit only dative FQs in infinitival clauses, can take only CP-infinitivals.

Unattractive though such subcategorizational indeterminacy may seem, we have some argument in favor of allowing for it (also mentioned by [Bruening 2019]): many control predicates can take not only infinitival clauses as their arguments, but also finite ones (as well as nominals and PPs), which necessitates permitting some optionality in the categorial status of their arguments.

(22) *Vasya   dumal   postupit' / o postuplenii   v magistraturu.*
       Vasya   thought enter.INF   about entering   in M.A.program
       'Vasya was thinking to enter / about entering an M.A. program.' (constructed example)

5. Conclusion

The present paper attempted to examine case properties of FQs in control constructions on the basis of corpus data, first and foremost in the Internet usage. Some previously ignored types of configurations were described, such as sentences with verbs *ugorazdit'* 'end up' and *tyanut'/podmyvat'* 'be tempted' and examples with idioms *zhaba dushit* 'feel jealous' in the matrix clause. While in the first case both dative and accusative FQs are possible (as in typical examples of direct object control), in the second one dative remains the only possibility. In addition, some data challenging the prohibition against dative FQs under subject control (especially exhaustive subject control) were mentioned. As the corpus materials reveal, dative FQs can occur even in infinitival clauses embedded under exclusively exhaustive subject control predicates, including aspectual ones. A possible analysis was proposed, which is formulated in the framework of a variant of the Dependent Case Theory developed by [Baker 2014].

Abbreviations

1 — 1st person; ACC — accusative; DAT — dative; INF — infinitive; NEG — negation; NOM — nominative; PRS — present; PST — past; SG — singular.

References

Baykov 2020 — Байков Ф.В. Косвенный контроль в русском языке // Rhema. Рема. 2020. № 1. С. 106–125. [Baykov F.V. Oblique control in Russian. Rhema. Rema. 2020. № 1. P. 106–125.]

Gerasimova 2015 — Герасимова А.А. Лицензирование отрицательных местоимений через границу инфинитивного оборота в русском языке // Лютикова Е.А., Циммерлинг А.В., Коношенко М.Б. (ред.). Типология морфосинтаксических параметров. Материалы международной конференции «ТМП-2015» Вып. 2. М.: МПГУ, 2015. С. 47–61. [Gerasimova A.A. Licensing negative pronouns in Russian infinitives. // Lyutikova E.A., Zimmerling A.V., Konoshenko M.B. (eds.). Proceedings of the international conference "Typology of morphosyntactic parameters 2015". Moscow: Moscow State University of Education, 2015. Iss. 2. P. 47–61.]

Testelets 2001 — Тестелец Я.Г. Введение в общий синтаксис. М.: РГГУ, 2001. [Testelets Ya.G. Vvedenie v obshchii sintaksis [Introduction to general syntax]. Moscow: RGGU, 2001.]

Babby 1998 — Babby L.H. Subject control as direct predication: Evidence from Russian. Bošković Ž., Franks S., Snyder W. (eds.). Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 6: The Connecticut Meeting. Michigan Slavic Publications, 1998. P. 17–37.

Baker 2014 — Baker M.C. On dependent ergative case (in Shipibo) and its derivation by phase. Linguistic Inquiry 45(3), 2014. P. 341–379.

Baykov, Rudnev 2020 — Baykov F., Rudnev P. Not all obligatory control is movement. Journal of Linguistics. 2020. Vol. 56. No. 4. P. 893–906.

Bhatt 2006 — Bhatt R. Covert modality in non-finite contexts. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006.

Boeckx et al. 2010 — Boeckx C., Hornstein N., Nunes J.. Icelandic control really is A-movement: Reply to Bobaljik and Landau. Linguistic Inquiry 41(1), 2010. P. 111–130.

Bruening 2019 — Bruening B. Disjunctive selection is necessary for "Hierarchy of Projections" and it accounts for transitivity failures. Unpublished ms, 2019. Available at https://udel.edu/~bruening/Downloads/DisjunctiveSelection1.pdf.

Chomsky 2000 — Chomsky N. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. Martin R., Michels D., Uriagereka J. (eds.). Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000. P. 89–155.

Comrie 1974 — Comrie B. The second dative: A transformational approach. Brecht R., Chvany C. (eds.). Slavic transformational syntax, Michigan Slavic materials, 10. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1974. P. 123–150.

Fortuin 2003 — Fortuin E. The conceptual basis of syntactic rules: a semantic motivation for the second dative in Russian. Lingua 113(1), 2003. P. 49–92.

Franks 1990 — Franks S. Case, configuration and argumenthood: Reflections on the second dative. Russian Linguistics 14(3), 1990. P. 231–254.

Landau 2000 — Landau I. Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions. Springer, 2000.

Landau 2008 — Landau I. Two routes of control: Evidence from case transmission in Russian. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 26(4), 2008. P. 877–924.

Landau 2015 — Landau I. A two-tiered theory of control. The MIT Press, 2015.

Marantz 1991 — Marantz A. Case and licensing. Paper presented at the 8th Eastern States Conference on Linguistics. University of Maryland, Baltimore, 1991.

Miller 1986 — Miller J.E. A third look at the second dative. Brecht R.D., Levine J.D. (eds.). Case in Slavic. Columbus: Slavica, 1986. P. 296–311.

Neidle 1988 — Neidle C.J. The role of case in Russian syntax. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1988.

Pereltsvaig 2008 — Pereltsvaig A. Split phrases in colloquial Russian. Studia Linguistica 62(1), 2008. P. 5–38.

van Urk 2010 — van Urk C. On obligatory control: a movement and PRO approach. Unpublished manuscript, 2010.

Appendix

Following an anonymous reviewer's suggestions, I include in the paper a corpus of examples which served as the basis for my analysis. The list below is meant to be just illustrative and not exhaustive, it is not intended to contain all the potentially relevant examples which may be found in the Internet, though I assume that all the acceptable patterns are instantiated by one or more sentences provided herein.

The examples are presented as they were found, in Cyrillic alphabet and preserving the authors' orthography and punctuation, and they were neither glossed nor translated into English due to space limitations.

(1) «У нас действительно надолго? Хочешь мучиться самой и мучить меня?.. У меня был один… ОПЫТ. [Л. В. Зайцева. Где прошлогодний снег (2002)] (НКРЯ)

(2) Тогда я решил быть внимательнее и попытаться самому разобраться в следах. [В. К. Арсеньев. По Уссурийскому краю (1917)] (НКРЯ)

(3) И Челентано оставил Богу — Богово, а себе — кесарево. Решил самому кино не снимать, только сниматься. И снялся — в «Укрощении строптивого» (1980). С Орнеллой Мути. [Анна Глебова. Раствор Челентано // «Домовой», 2002.02.04] (НКРЯ)

(4) А я никуда и не ходил. Решил остаться дома и самому подготовиться. [https://books.google.ru/books?id=ExKiDwAAQBAJ]

(5) Таким образом, Алан Тьюринг принял свое судьбоносное решение и предпочел самому выйти на связь с британским правительством. [https://books.google.ru/books?id=O1nmCgAAQBAJ]

(6) …предпочёл самому скакать верхом, обдумывая тот путь, где могло не оказаться твёрдой дороги. [https://books.google.ru/books?id=YYlNDgAAQBAJ]

(7) Честно говоря, я предпочел самому нарисовать новое древо с еще более проработанной структурой — мне легче, когда нет посторонних глаз. [https://n-dodonov.livejournal.com/262461.html]

(8) Писать много не буду) но если не хочешь самому менять антифриз, тогда машинка подскажет сама.
[https://www.drive2.ru/r/subaru/legacy/502261310688330481/logbook/]

(9) Если хочешь самому жить сыто и достойно, то необходимо дать другим тоже жить хорошо.
[http://saint-petersburg.china-consulate.org/rus/zlgxw/t794470.htm]

(10) Хочу самому поменять замок на двери, что для этого понадобиться?
[https://otvet.mail.ru/question/216947751]

(11) Настоятельно рекомендую всем этот отель, и надеюсь самому попасть сюда еще раз!
[https://www.hotels.ru/rus/hotels/spain/pineda_de_mar/merce/reviews]

(12) Попробую самому сделать пакеты из стопки бумаги, купленной ранее для "мемуаров", так как туалетная быстро разваливается.
[https://dxdy.ru/post605520.html]

(13) Я все таки попробую самому научиться, так как собираюсь менять форму каждый сезон... [https://fmfan.ru/profile/131260-fara_kz/]

(14) Спасибо, как-то до этого избегал самому сортировать массив, но с твоего комментария решил начать.
[https://javarush.ru/tasks/com.javarush.task.task08.task0826]

(15) Он избегал взгляда Стаса, избегал самому смотреть на него, пропихивал руки поглубже в карманы куртки и хмурился.
[https://ficbook.net/readfic/5587996/14566599]

(16) мы тут стоим с такой прекрасной арочке, фото которой у нас тоже нет. я совсем забыла самой что-то фототкать для истории хотя бы)
[https://amano.livejournal.com/421836.html]

(17) Мне устанавливали в конторе, т.к. я поостерегся самому разбирать почти всю панель.... [http://cr-v.su/forums/honda-cr-v-Multimediynye-GU-v-shtatnoe-mesto-t2140-st990]

(18) Смелый и креативный)) Придумал такой классный ресурс! И не побоялся одному ездить по Латинской Америке!
[https://www.adme.ru/svoboda-puteshestviya/avtor-admeru-proehal-pochti-vsyu-latinskuyu-ameriku-za-100-dnej-priznatsya-on-do-sih-por-v-shoke-1961965/comments/]

(19) Серега побоялся одному заходить внутрь и поэтому позвал Леху. [https://zen.yandex.ru/media/id/5d981e84fc69ab00ada57669/nashli-izbu-iz-proshlogo-5d98ac163639e600b082ab75]

(20) Ох как же я ненавижу одному в доме быть, так одиноко. [https://thesims.cc/threads/telefon-doverija.10288/page-47]

(21) Знал бы, так заказал бы тебе его намотать сразу, а то я ненавижу самому такое мотать :) [https://www.radiokot.ru/forum/viewtopic.php?f=51&t=144974]

(22) Когда закончился фильм, Сергей Сергеевич уже думал самому набрать ее номер, но в ту же минуту телефон зазвонил. Звонила она. [https://books.google.ru/books?id=OfybDwAAQBAJ]

(23) Я уж решил, что ты не придешь, думал самому за тобой ехать, ну, проходи, чего встал? [https://books.google.ru/books?id=LwFPDwAAQBAJ]

(24) Я бы не отказался самому там постоять... [https://alexmoskalyuk.livejournal.com/650274.html]

(25) Сын этой супружеской пары и внук строителя дома, предпочёл не жить самому во дворце, но отдавал его в пользование приезжим сановникам... [https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Дворец_Итурбиде]

(26) Правда, реально университет предпочел не выгонять, а самому отделиться от церкви. [https://machanaim.livejournal.com/247333.html]

(27) Поэтому я предпочел не делать это самому, а обратиться за помощью в соответствующую компанию. [https://www.uznai24.su/company/diplomgarant]

(28) Люди, меня жаба душит самому все делать. [https://forum.mista.ru/topic.php?id=339277]

(29) Эт всё мишура, на самом деле меня тоже жаба душит самому купить %). [http://diesel.elcat.kg/index.php?showtopic=596843&page=8]

(30) И дернул же его черт покинуть архив и самому пилить через весь город! [https://proza.ru/2013/10/18/486]

(31) Чёрт дёрнул Серёжу самому залезть в Интернет в поисках подтверждения небесплодности их самодеятельности. [https://ficbook.net/readfic/3527975]

(32) Черт дёрнул ещё и щиток самому собрать. Вроде несложно показалось. [https://mastergrad.com/forums/t270354-menyayu-provodku-nuzhna-konsultaciya/?page = 3]

(33) Вообщем, денег не было, проездил два года, и чёрт меня дёрнул попробовать самому вручную полирнуть, авось получится, гараж то без электричества, всё вручную приходится делать. [https://www.drive2.ru/l/7432584/]

(34) Все бы хорошо, но черт меня дернул полениться менять их самому(там 10 минут времени нужно) [https://www.drive2.com/l/151540/]

(35) 1 месяц вождения: из сервиса черт дернул выкатить авто самому… [https://teron.online/index.php?showtopic = 33875&st = 40]

(36) Черт меня дернул, недавно, самому его затронуть. [http://dibr.nnov.ru/hf1.php?n = 2718&d = hf1.html]

(37) к слову, я сам проверял качество звука у знакомой девченки. ну и черт меня дернул не просто самому проверить, а еще дать попробовать сравнить хозяйке смартфона. [https://www.iguides.ru/main/gadgets/airpods_phobias/?itape =]

(38) Черт меня дернул попытаться сделать самому(([https://javascript.ru/forum/showthread.php?s = f31c75f9bba088abc69cb 936e5112ec7&p = 509253#post509253]

(39) Сейчас без повестки черт дернул пойти самому без повестки. [https://povestka.by/question/10858/]

(40) Логинова так и подмывало самому пройтись по этажам, поговорить с людьми, опросить возможных свидетелей. [https://books.google.ru/books?id = vfG7Csiqhu0C]

(41) Его так и подмывало самому отправиться на место событий и выяснить, что же происходит на самом деле. [https://books.google.ru/books?id = GrLcDAAAQBAJ]

(42) Барни так и подмывало самому сойти на сушу и отправиться на поиски Беллы. [https://books.google.ru/books?id = DHpFDwAAQBAJ]

(43) Его так и подмывало самому сесть за штурвал и отправиться на поиски загадочного острова. [https://www.litmir.me/br/?b = 240310&p = 6]

(44) Сперва меня так и подмывало самому ей напомнить, но потом я отказался от этой идеи…
[https://books.google.ru/books?id=3_8RAgAAQBAJ]

(45) Расставаться же с замечательным сюжетом Ефремову не хотелось, так и подмывало написать самому — но где же взять время?
[http://www.i-efremov.ru/publikacii/eremina-smirnov-ivan-efremov66.html]

(46) Его подмывало самого взяться за допрос.
[https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=231787&p=37]

(47) Очень его подмывало самого съездить в этот < … > Я. и посмотреть, что к чему, но не хотелось наводить лишний шухер.
[https://www.proza.ru/2013/03/26/2376]

(48) Очень его подмывало и самому совершить воздушное это путешествие и покупаться в подземной «болотине».
[https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/belletrizovannaya-biografiya-i-a-novikova-pushkin-v-izgnanii-sopostavitelnyy-analiz-redaktsiy-teksta]

(49) Вас достало самому по утрам искать свои домашние тапочки.
[https://zen.yandex.ru/media/id/5c7784678964fb00b3c757b0/pravdivyi-goroskop-na-2021-marta-2019-5c922b520150d300b3d5d444]

(50) А меня если честно достало самому искать каталожные и\или кросскоды -> приходить в магаз -> говорить какой каталожный мне надо — > еще и бабки им платить.
[https://www.drive2.ru/l/551756926124294591/]

(51) Все, Вернера достало самому читать все анекдоты...
[https://www.anekdot.ru/id/-9997516/]

(52) Начал с малого, написал в УК, чтобы заменили лампы на 2 из 3 этажей в нашем доме, достало самому ползать и за своей счет менять.
[https://pikabu.ru/story/strannosti_zhkkh_i_uk_4691249]

(53) Просто уже меня достало постоянно одному кататься. [https://police-russia.com/showthread.php?t=22406&page=12]

(54) А отдел уже выздоровел зато, а то меня достало сидеть одному целую неделю, втроём веселее хоть. [https://juick.com/tag/Птз]

(55) Ничего выдающегося при комнатной акустике конешн, но меня уже достало самого громкость поднимать у трека при прослушивании
[https://vk.com/wall-8758628?own=1]

(56) Однако самого удачливого пиратского капитана угораздило самого пасть жертвой несчастной любви к пылкой рыжеволосой красавице-голландке. [https://books.google.ru/books?id=N2e2BgAAQBAJ]

(57) Меня угораздило самого написать подробное пособие. [http://forum.blf.ru/showthread.php?t=4458&page=3]

(58) Может быть, какие-то лаборатории, может быть -спецслужбы... может быть, Тиста угораздило самого попасть в качестве разрабатываемого объекта. [http://academymagic.ru/corner/user/1173]

(59) А Платона-то оказывается угораздило самого в Елену Фоминишну влюбиться! [http://adjutantilubvi.flybb.ru/topic389.html]

(60) Миша-Миша, как же тебя угораздило самому так бездарно влететь с тем халявным спиртом? [https://books.google.ru/books?id=3Za6CwAAQBAJ]

(61) Вот тогда меня впервые угораздило самому ощутить это чувство — влюблённость. [https://books.google.ru/books?id=fDrBDwAAQBAJ]

(62) Как вас угораздило самому вести «Ночной дожор»? [https://tricolortvmag.ru/article/canals/anton-arens-intervyu-s-generalnym-direktorom-kanala-telekafe-2018/]

(63) Хотел предостеречь от заказа двери в компании Крассталь, в которой угораздило самому заказать дверь. [https://www.zamkidveri.com/forum/40/thread33984.html]

(64) Как меня угораздило самому себя исключить из компании? [http://www.psychologies.ru/story/pochuvstvovat-sebya-odnim-iz-nih/]

(65) Вскоре, правда, меня угораздило самому написать плеер:) [http://www.klyachin.ru/forum/topic.php?forum=3&topic=1129&p=7&PHPSESSID=u814f74paa6ld20h8vum2lkrq6]

(66) Как тебя угораздило самому стать мотеро? [https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=278886&p=65]

(67) И вот, когда мне было около 19 лет, меня угораздило самому вля-паться в такую историю. [http://притяжениеростова.рф/2017/06/18/ул-советская-д-32/]

(68) И как это Вас угораздило самому принести на блюдечке против себя же разгромный аргумент, да еще Вашему заклятому другу Зафоду, ума не приложу. [http://www.conservator.ru/forums/telegraf/posts/20177.html]

(69) Как тебя угораздило вообще ходить самому по улице?
[https://4stor.ru/histori-for-not-life/22582-zastyvshaya-sekunda.html]

(70) я из Украины из Донецка, в виду сложившихся обстоятельств вынужден был бежать из родного города, и угораздило меня забраться одному в Питер. [https://pikabu.ru/story/ugorazdilo_zhe_tak_2780822]

(71) Раскройте, так сказать, глаза, раз уж вас угораздило здесь одному во всём белом оказаться, не ограничивайтесь лишь праведным негодованием. [https://bmpd.livejournal.com/3117001.html?page=2]

(72) Но если все же близнеца угораздило остаться одному в квартире, он легко может восполнить недостаток энергии…
[http://ierofanta.net/gde-cherpaut-sily-raznye-znaki-zodiaka.php]

(73) От странного ритма его так и тянуло затанцевать самому.
[http://newlit.ru/~vadimov/5063-5.html]

(74) Очень сильно тянуло переобуться самому, но что-то не давало это сделать. [https://www.drive2.ru/l/500354482647859398/]

(75) Володю очень тянуло сбегать самому на Митридат и узнать, что там произошло, [https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=13653&p=53]

Федор Владимирович Байков
МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова

Fyodor V. Baykov
Lomonosov Moscow State University

baykov3105@mail.ru