

Minor's puzzle revisited: On raising effects in Russian control verbs

The puzzle. It has been widely assumed since Rosenbaum 1965 that infinitival complement constructions fall into two classes involving raising and control. A number of diagnostics suggest that Russian infinitival complement constructions with directive predicates involve object control (Kozinskij 1985; Lasnik 1998; Stepanov 2007). However, Minor (2011, 2013) observes that object control constructions with speech act matrix verbs (*velet* 'order', *posovetovat* 'advise', etc.) allow for their dative object to be interpreted within the infinitival clause, (1), thus pointing towards a raising-to-object/ECM analysis. Minor's data include quantificational objects, *nibud'*-pronouns and *ni*-pronouns. Minor suggests a "mixed" structure where the object originates and stays in the embedded clause but receives case and thematic role from the matrix verb. Crucially, this analysis fails to restrict "mixed" constructions to speech act object control verbs. Yet, subject control verbs and the rest of object control verbs reject arguments which need embedded scope to be licensed, (2a-b).

New data and generalizations. Our contribution to the topic is twofold. First, we present new data on Russian object control constructions suggesting that *ni*-licensing and narrow scope phenomena have to be teased apart. Secondly, we propose analyses for both of them.

① *Ni*-pronouns are licensed in a wider range of control configurations than *nibud'*-pronouns, including causative verbs, (3a), and subject control verbs, (3b). ② Among *ni*-pronouns, only *nikto* 'nobody' and *ni odin* 'no one' are available; negative DPs headed by *nikakoj* 'no, none' are ungrammatical in control configurations, (4). ③ Configurations where *nibud'*-pronouns are licit license other narrow scope phenomena, e.g., quantificational DPs or disjunction, (5a-b). They are restricted to speech act object control verbs with non-implicative infinitival complements, (6a-b).

Analysis. We argue that *ni*-pronouns licensed in control configurations are negative floating quantifiers construed with PRO, which is controlled by an (implicit) argument in the matrix clause. The structure of (4) is therefore (7). (7) is supported by the following five facts. ❶ Only those *ni*-pronouns that can float are allowed in control configurations. ❷ Case options available for *ni*-pronouns are the same as those reported in Babby 1998 for garden-variety FQs. ❸ An infinitival clause with a *ni*-pronoun behaves like a constituent (e.g. wrt coordination). ❹ Floating *ni*-pronouns are licit with *rasporjadit'sja* 'order' that never realizes the addressee in the matrix clause. ❺ Constructions with an explicit controller DP AND a *ni*-pronoun are readily available.

Configurations licensing embedded scope phenomena involve speech act control verbs exclusively. The crucial observation we want to make sense of is that the same scope relations can be found in imperative constructions with indefinite vocatives, (8). Surfacing outside of the imperative clause (which is signaled by the prosodic boundary, as well as by imperative particle position), indefinite vocatives are nevertheless in the scope of the imperative; moreover, they are only licensed in imperative (and exhortative) utterances.

We propose that imperative and directive constructions share a substantial part of syntactic structure. In line with Speas & Tenny 2003, Hill 2007, 2014, Haegeman & Hill 2013, a.m.o., we assume that speech act coordinates, which comprise Author and Addressee, are syntactically represented within a dedicated saP/SAP layer. Building on Zanuttini 2008, Zanuttini, Pak & Portner 2012 and Alcazar & Saltarelli 2014, we propose that imperatives are extended verbal projections embedded under JUSSIVE head that introduces modality associated with imperatives, promissives etc. Imperative subjects are base-generated in Spec, vP as Performers; their optional raising to the Addressee position creates vocatives with embedded scope, (9a). Speech act verbs embed the structure in (9a) as a complement; the difference between imperative and directive constructions is that the former license (nominative) case on the subject whereas the latter do not. Consequently, the overt infinitival clause subject can only be case-licensed by matrix functional heads *v* or Appl via ECM (cf. Shehaan 2014); in this case, the matrix nominal argument has to be implicit, (9b). Alternatively, Performer can be realized as a logophorically controlled PRO (cf. Landau 2015); in this configuration, matrix argument position can host an overt DP (9c). Crucially, (9b) produces embedded scope configurations, since the DP construed

as the Addressee of the indirect speech act is generated under JUSSIVE head and in this way can be licensed.

Examples

- (1) Vrač posovetoval komu-nibud' sxodit' za lekarstvami. (Minor 2011)
 doctor advised anyone.DAT go.INF for medicine

'The doctor advised someone to go and get some medicine.' (* \exists >advise, advise> \exists)

- (2) a. *Udalos' komu-nibud' sxodit' za lekarstvami.
 succeeded anyone.DAT go.INF for medicine

- b. *Vrač vynudil kogo-nibud' sxodit' za lekarstvami.
 doctor forced anyone.ACC go.INF for medicine

- (3) a. ... goryačij čaj pomog nikomu ne zamerznut'. [Yandex hit]
 hot tea helped no_one.DAT NEG freeze.INF

'Hot tea helped for nobody to get cold.'

- b. Udalos' nikomu ne razbolet'sja. [Yandex hit]
 succeeded no_one.DAT NEG get_sick.INF

'(We) managed to avoid getting sick.'

- (4) Pet'a prikazal nikomu / *nikakomu klientu sjuda ne zaxodit'.
 Petya ordered no_one.DAT no.DAT client.DAT here NEG enter.INF

'Petya ordered that noone / *no customer should enter here.' (*NI>order, order>NI)

- (5) a. Nas dvoe brat'ev — ya i Gustav... Kogda otec ponyal, v kakuyu storonu duet veter,
 on prikazal [odnomu iz nas] stat' naci.
 he ordered one.DAT of us become nazi

Ya mladšij, xolostoj. Prišlos' podčinit'sya. [RNC]

'We were two brothers, Gustav and me. When our father saw where things would go, he ordered for one of us to become a nazi. I'm the youngest and I'm a bachelor. I had to obey.'

- b. Ya poprošu [sin'ora ili sin'or] vynut' odnu iz vilok... [RNC]
 I ask signor or signoras take one of forks

'Now I'm asking signor or signoras to take one of these forks...'

- (6) a. Ryžaya ten'yu metalas' u sten,
 gor'kim plačem umolyaya kogo-nibud' pomoč' ee Mal'čiku. [RNC]
 bitter.INS crying.INS imploring.IPF anyone.ACC help her Boy

'The red-haired woman was running back and forth at the wall, pleading for anyone to help her Boy.'

- b. *Ona umolila kogo-nibud' pomoč' ee Mal'čiku.
 she implored.PF anyone.ACC help her Boy

- (7) Pet'a prikazal *pro*_i [_{CP} PRO_i nikomu_i sjuda ne zaxodit'].
 Petya ordered no_one.DAT here NEG enter.INF

- (8) Kto-nibud', da pomogite uže emu! [Yandex hit]
 anyone IMP.PART help.IMP.2PL yet him

'Anyone help him after all!'

- (9) a. [_{saP} ... [_{SAP} Addressee_i [_{ForceP} JUSSIVE ... [_{vP} Performer_i v [_{VP} ...]]]]]]

- b. [_{vP} v [_{AppIP} Appl [_{VP} V [_{saP} ... [_{SAP} DP_i [_{ForceP} JUSSIVE ... [_{vP} DP_i v [_{VP} ...]]]]]]]]]]

- c. [_{vP} v [_{AppIP} (DP_i) Appl [_{VP} (DP_i) V [_{saP} ... [_{ForceP} JUSSIVE ... [_{vP} PRO_i v [_{VP} ...]]]]]]]]

Selected references

- Alcázar, A. and M. Saltarelli (2014) The syntax of imperatives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
 Haegeman, L. and V. Hill (2013) The syntactization of discourse. In: R. Folli et al., Syntax and its limits, OUP, 370-390. Hill, V. (2007) Vocatives and the Pragmatics–syntax Interface. *Lingua*, 2077–2105. Hill, V. (2014) Vocatives: How Syntax Meets with Pragmatics. Leiden, Boston: Brill. Kozinskij, I. (1985) Coreferential relations in Russian infinitives. In: V. Xrakovsky (ed.), *Tipologija konstrukcij s predikatnymi aktantami*. L.: Nauka, 112-116.
 Landau, I. (2015) A two-tiered theory of control. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press, 2015. Lasnik, H. (1998) Exceptional case marking: Perspectives old and new. In: *FASL 1997*, 187–211. Minor, S. (2011) Control and ECM combined: An unusual control pattern in Russian. Paper presented at CASTL Colloquium (Nov. 2011). Minor, S. (2013) Controlling the hidden restrictor: A puzzle with control in Russian. In: *Proceedings of NELS 42*. Speas, P., and C. Tenny (2003) Configurational properties of point of view roles. *Asymmetry in grammar*, 315-345.
 Zanuttini, R. (2008) Encoding the addressee in the syntax: Evidence from English imperative subjects. *NLLT* 26: 185–218. Zanuttini, R., M. Pak and P. Portner (2012) A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *NLLT* 30(4):1231–1274.