

NULL CASE, PRO, and the SECOND DATIVE (mostly Russian)

Steven Franks

Indiana University

Outline of presentation

- I. Presentation of Basic Facts and Issues
- II. A Direct Case Assignment Analysis
- III. A Null Case Agreement Approach
 - A. The Small VP (PRO-less) Analysis
 - B. The Generalized Null Case Analysis
- IV. Curious Correlations in Slavic
 - A. ECM and agreement with object controllers
 - B. Second datives and dative subjects

PART I: Presentation of Basic Facts and Issues

Predicate adjectives: either primary or secondary predicates

Two types of predicated adjectives: "ordinary" predicate adjectives and "semipredicatives" (*odin/sam*) Predicate adjectives in Russian exhibit three options (with respect to NP they predicate):

- (i) agree with NP in all pronominal features, including case
- (ii) agree with this NP in all features except case, receiving instead a "default" case
- (iii) agree with this NP in all features except case and appear instead in caseless "short form"

Ordinary PAs (simple clauses and "case transmission" subject control (3), not with object control (4))

- (1) Ivan prišel domoj p'janyj/p'janym/?p'jan
(m nom) came home drunk(m nom)/(pl inst)/(m)
- (2) a. ja vstretil svoego druga p'janogo/p'janym/*p'jan
I met my friend(m acc) drunk(m acc)/(m inst)/(m)
b. Vera boitsja Ivana p'janogo/p'janym/*p'jan
Vera fears (m gen) drunk(m gen)/(m inst)/(m)
c. Vera emu dala den'gi p'janomu/p'janym/*p'jan
Vera him(m dat) gave money drunk(m dat)/(m inst)/(m)
- (3) Ivan ne xočet [PRO prijti domoj p'janyj/p'janym]
(m nom) NEG wants to-come home drunk(m nom)/(m inst)
'Ivan doesn't want to come home drunk'
- (4) ja poprosil Ivana [PRO ne prixodit' *p'janogo/p'janym]
I asked (m acc) NEG to-come drunk(m acc)/(m inst)
'I asked Ivan not to come drunk'

Semipredicatives (simple clauses and subject control (7) vs. object control (8))

- (5) ja vernulsja odin
I(m nom) returned alone(m nom)
'I returned alone'
- (6) ja našel ego odnogo
I found him(m acc) alone(m acc)
'I found him alone'
- (7) ja xoču [PRO prijti odna]
I(f nom) want to-come alone(f nom)
'I want to come alone'

- (8) ja poprosil Veru [PRO pojti **odnoj**]
 I asked (f acc) to-go alone(f dat)
 'I asked Vera to go alone'

More examples with the default case (dative and instrumental)

- (9) a. Maša ugovorila Vanju [PRO prigotovit' obed**odnomu**].
 Masha persuaded Vanya.acc to-cook lunch alone.mdat
 'Masha persuaded Vanya to cook lunch by himself.'
- b. Dlja nas utomitel'no[PRO delat' èto**samim**].
 for us exhausting to-do this alone.pldat
 'It's exhausting for us to this on our own.'
- c. Nevozmožno[PRO perejti ètot most **samomu**].
 impossible to-cross this bridge alone.mdat
 'It is impossible to cross this bridge by oneself.'
- d. Ljuba priexala[čtoby [PRO pokupat' maslo **samoj**]].
 Lyuba.nom came in-order to-buy butter alone.fdat
 'Lyuba came in order to buy the butter herself.'
- e. Ivan ne znaet [kak [PRO tuda dobrat'sja **odnomu**]].
 Ivan not knows how there to-reach alone.mdat
 'Ivan doesn't know how to get there by himself/oneself.'
- f. Ivan ne imeet predstavlenija o tom [kak [PRO žit' **samomu**]]
 (m nom) NEG has idea about that how to-live alone(m dat)
 'Ivan doesn't have any idea how to live alone'
- g. Ivan думаet [čto [PRO pojti domoj **odnomu**]] važno
 (m nom) thinks that to-go home alone(m dat) important
 'Ivan thinks that it is important to go home alone'
- h. [PRO prijti **odnomu**] očen' trudno
 to-come alone(dat) very hard
 'to arrive alone is very difficult'
- i. [PRO pojti tuda **odnomu**] rasstroilo by menja
 to-go there alone(m dat) upset MOD me(acc)
 'to go there alone would upset me'
- k. [želanie Igorja [PRO pojti **odnomu**]] nas očen' rasstroilo
 desire(nom) (m gen) to-go alone(dat) us(acc) very upset
 'Igor's desire to go alone upset us very much'
- (10) a. [PRO spat' **golym**/*golomu/*golyj] mne nraivitsja
 to-sleep naked(m inst/dat/nom) me(dat) pleases
 'I like to sleep naked'
- b. važno dlja menja [PRO spat' **golym**/*gologo/*golyj]
 important for me(gen) to-sleep naked(m inst/gen/nom)
 'it is important for me to sleep naked'
- c. Lena ne znaet [počemu [nel'zja [PRO spat' **goloj**/*golaja]]]
 (f nom) NEG knows why must-not to-sleep naked(f inst/nom)
 'Lena doesn't know why she shouldn't sleep naked'

Some general questions

What is the correct generalization about when "default" case arises? What is going on here?

Why does "case transmission" (by putative PRO) only occur with subject control?

Why dative? Why instrumental?

Why is dative only possible where required (vs. instrumental)?

Part II: A Direct Case Assignment Analysis of the Second Dative

What is the source of the "second dative"?

Comrie's original 1974 insight about the second dative was that it arises through agreement with a dative subject subsequently deleted under Equi. This is my account in Part III below. However, in Franks (1995) and related work, I rejected this approach because, following the GB paradigm, I did not want PRO to have case when it could not be overt, and devised instead a mechanism for assigning dative to the semipredicative directly whenever it failed to agree with its overt antecedent

The parts of the idea

- PRO can be anaphoric *or* pronominal, not both. When "governed", it is an anaphor.
- When it is an anaphor it is bound (coindexed with antecedent) and therefore "transmits" case
- When it is a pronominal, the predicate adjective needs to get case some other way.
- There is a special mechanism for instrumental to mark predication (possibly Bailyn's "PredP_")
- Semipredicatives are more (morphologically) "nominal" than other ordinary adjectives, hence "accidentally" get assigned dative under the same configuration dative subjects (of infinitives) do.

NB: loss of the short declension for adjectives; some 18th century second datives:

- (11) a. Ja bojalsja odnogo: byt' ostavlenu na doroge
 I feared one(gen): to-be left(dat) on road
 'I feared one thing: to be left on the road'
- b. Prisudili ego byt' posaženomu na kol
 condemned him(acc) to-be impaled(dat) on stake
 'they condemned him to be impaled at the stake'

- Whereas dative subjects, as arguments, require Tns, semipredicatives, as adjuncts, do not.

This is connected with my general idea of "fertilization", where a case-valuing feature of a functional category needs to be fertilized by the feature of a lower head that moves up to it, but this is only required for arguments, not for adjuncts. (Recall from before (i) the Lithuanian shifted nominative (ECM) object, in AGR-less clauses or (ii) the case of time and distance phrases.)

Dative subjects and second datives

"Impersonal/category-of-state" predicates and infinitival predicates

- (12) a. emu žal' ètu devušku
 him(dat) sorry that(acc) girl(acc)
 'he feels sorry for that girl'
- b. mne legko govorit' po-russki
 me(dat) easy to-speak in Russian
 'it is easy for me to speak Russian'
- (13) a. gde mne spat'
 where me(dat) to-sleep
 'where am I me to sleep'
- b. mne uxodit'
 me(dat) to-leave
 'I have to leave'
- c. mne bol'sh tam ne rabotat'
 me(dat) more there NEG to-work
 'I can't work there anymore'
- d. kuda nam postavit' ètot jaščik
 where us(dat) to-put this box
- e. gruzoviku ne proexat'
 truck(dat) NEG to-drive-
 through
 'where are we to put this box?' 'the truck can't get through'

These are tensed:

- (14) a. emu **bylo** žal' ètu devušku
 him(dat) was(n) sorry that girl(acc)
 'he felt sorry for that girl'
- b. mne **bylo** legko govorit' po-russki
 me(dat) was(n) easy to-speak in Russian
 'it is easy for me to speak Russian'
- (15) a. gde mne **bylo** spat'
 where me(dat) was(n sg) to-sleep
 'where was there for me to sleep'
- b. mne **bylo** uxodit'
 me(dat) was(n) to-leave
 'I had to leave'

In infinitival constructions where no finite copula is possible, neither is a dative subject:

- (16) a. [(**Ivanu*) pljunut' v lico tovarišča] sostavjalo potrebnost' ego duši
 (dat) to-spit in face comrade comprised necessity his soul
 'for Ivan to spit in the face of his comrade was a necessity of his soul'
- b. ja poprosil Volodju [(**Maše*) polučit' premiju]
 I(nom) asked (acc) (dat) to-receive prize
 'I asked Volodya for Masha to get the prize'
- c. moe želanie [(**Maše*) polučit' premiju]
 my desire (dat) to-receive prize
 'my desire for Masha to get the prize'
- d. bogatym važno [(**bednym*) mnogo rabotat']
 rich(dat) important poor(dat) much to-work
 'it is important for the rich for the poor to work hard'

But this is where second datives appear. Second dative does not depend on overt dative subject:

- (17) a. mne važno [(**vam*) \it' **odnomu**]
 me(dat) important you(dat) to-live alone(dat)
 'it is important for me (for you) to live alone'
- b. rešenie [(**vam*) žit' **odnomu**] ...
 decision you(dat) to-live alone(dat)
 'the decision (for you) to live alone ...'

Hypothesis: arguments subject to more strict requirements for case licensing than are adjuncts, under identical structural conditions. Tense needed for dative on subject with [-Agr], but not on adjunct.

Restructuring in fixed verb-noun collocations

- (18) a. Ivan **prinjal rešenie** [PRO prijti na večerinku odin]
 (nom) took decision to-come to party (nom)
 'Ivan made a decision to come to the party alone'
- b. Ivan **vrazil želanie** [PRO prijti na večerinku odin]
 (nom) expressed desire to-come to party (nom)
 'Ivan expressed a desire to come to the party alone'
- c. Ivan **dal obeščanie** [PRO prijti na večerinku odin]
 (nom) gave promise to-come to party (nom)
 'Ivan made a promise to come to the party alone'
- d. Ivan **imel vozmožnost'** [PRO prijti na večerinku odin]
 (nom) had opportunity to-come to party (nom)
 'Ivan had a chance to come to the party alone'

If not a fixed collocation, or the noun is possessed, restructuring is blocked:

- (19) a. Ivan poprosil razrešenija [PRO prijti na večerinku *odin/odnomu]
 (nom) asked permission to-come to party alone(nom/dat)
 'Ivan asked permission to come to the party alone'
 b. Ivan vyrazil **svoe** želanie [PRO prijti na večerinku *odin/odnomu]
 (nom) expressed self's desire to-come to party alone(nom/dat)
 'Ivan expressed his desire to come to the party alone'

Parallel to *wh*-movement judgments:

- (20) a. *Čto_i Ivan vyrazil [DP *svoe* želanie [PRO kupit' e_i]]
 'what did Ivan express his desire to buy'
 b. Čto_i Ivan [V vyrazil želanie] [PRO kupit' e_i]
 'what did Ivan express a desire to buy'

Part III. A Null Case Agreement Approach

A. The Small VP (PRO-less) Analysis

PRO can have a “null case” which will resemble dative for purposes of access by the semipredicative but which will not suffice for PRO itself to be overt. The clinching argument that the PRO subject of infinitives has null dat case comes from facts about contrastive *samomu* in gerundive phrases:

- (21) a. **Ja** vse videl, [**sam**/**samomu* ostavajas' nezamečennym].
 I.nom everything saw self.nom/self.dat remaining unseen.inst
 'I saw everything, myself remaining unseen.'
 b. **Ja** staralsja [**PRO** vse videt',
 I.nom tried everything to-see
 [**sam**/**samomu* ostavajas' nezamečennym]].
 self.nom/self.dat remaining unseen.inst
 'I tried to see everything, myself remaining unseen.'
 c. **Ivan** žil v dovol'stve, [**sam**/**samomu*
 Ivan.nom lived in contentment self.nom/self.dat
 ne trevožas' o trude bednyx].
 nottroubling about burden poor.gen
 'Ivan lived in contentment, he himself untroubled by the
 plight of the poor.'
 d. **Ivan** xotel [**PRO** žit' v dovol'stve, [**sam**/
 Ivan.nom wanted to-live in contentment self.nom/
 **samomu* ne trevožas' o trude bednyx]].
 self.dat not troubling aboutburden poor.gen
 'Ivan wanted to live in contentment, himself untroubled
 by the plight of the poor.'
- (22) a. [**PRO** Žit' v dovol'stve, [**sam*/**samomu** ne
 to-live in contentment self.nom/self.dat not
 trevožas' o trude bednyx]] —užasno.
 troubling about burden poor.gen awful
 'To live in contentment, oneself untroubled by the plight of the poor, is awful.'
 b. Ščel' v doskax dala **mne** vozmožnost' [**PRO** vse videt',
 crack in boards gave me opportunity everything to-see
 [**sam*/**samomu** ostavajas' nezamečennym]].
 self.nom/self.dat r remaining unseen.inst
 'The crack in the boards gave me the opportunity to see
 everything, myself remaining unseen.'

c. što pozvoljalo **emu** [**PRO** razgljadet' togo, kto byl na drugom konce otseka, **samomu** (*sam) ostavajas' ploxo vidimym]
 'This allowed him₁ (dat) to see the person₂ who was at the other end of the compartment, himself_{1/*2} remaining barely visible.'

d. Mat' poprosila **ego** [**PRO** žit' v dovol'stve, **samomu** (*sam) ne trevožas' o sud'be bednyx].

'Mother asked him (acc) to live in contentment, himself (dat) untroubled by the plight of the poor.'

In (22), contrastive *samomu* only appears on gerundive phrases inside infinitival clauses **with dative PRO subjects**, i.e., non-obligatory control ones. Babby proposes they do not appear elsewhere because the PRO subject of infinitives is always dative in Ru, and that under obligatory control there is no PRO, just a bare VP. Thus, the adjective always agrees with its antecedent, which is either (dative) PRO, or the overt subject.

Hence, in all the examples with *samomu/odnomu*, there is a dative PRO, and in all the rest—i.e., the obligatory control onese, there is no PRO at all, just a small, subjectless VP. This approach fits in with other currently popular analyses of obligatory control. But there are some problems with this ...

B. The Generalized Null Case Analysis

There are various Null Cases

Assuming there is always be a PRO in infinitival clauses, and that predicate adjectives always agree locally, then PRO actually needs to come in a variety of null cases. In particular, **dative PRO** in (22) but we will also need **genitive PRO**, for Polish agreement with quantified subjects:

(23) a. **wielu studentów** jest **młodych**/*młodymi
 many students(gen pl) is young(gen pl/inst pl)
 'many students are young'

b. **wielu studentów** idzie **samych**/*samym
 many students(gen pl) goes alone(gen pl/dat pl)
 'many students go alone'

(24) a. **wielu studentów** chce [**PRO** być **młodych**/*młodymi]
 'many students(gen pl) want to-be young(gen pl/inst pl)'

b. **wielu studentów** chce [**PRO** iść **samych**/*samym]
 'many students(gen pl) want to-go alone(gen pl/dat pl)'

What about the instrumental for ordinary predicate adjectives? How do we (i) prevent dative and (ii) obtain instrumental? Proposal: they appear in small clauses with **instrumental PRO** subjects.

Given this, why not argue for a **nominative PRO** when the predicate adjective is nominative?

Icelandic requires Null Case even under obligatory control

A floated quantifier can agree in case with what the subject *would be* if it were overt (in a finite clause), rather than PRO. This suggests that PRO is always present and necessarily has null case, which is itself some silent version of an otherwise available full case. Icelandic has quirky case active subjects. Crucially, the case of a floated quantifier agrees with what the subject would be *if it were overt rather than PRO*. Subject control examples

from Sigurdsson (1991) are given in (25), with the potential case of an overt subject of these verbs indicated by subscripts on PRO.

- (25) a. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO_{nom} komast **allir** í skóla].
the-boys.nom hope for to get all.nom to school
‘The boys all hope to get to school.’
- b. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO_{acc} vanta ekki **alla** í skólann].
the-boys.nom hope for to lack not all.acc in school
‘The boys all hope not to be absent from school.’
- c. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO_{dat} leiðast ekki **öllum** í skóla].
the-boys.nom hope for to bore not all.dat in school
‘The boys all hope not to be bored in school.’
- d. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO_{gen} verða **allra** getiða í ræðunni].
the-boys.nom hope for to be all.gen mentioned in the-speech
‘The boys all hope to be mentioned in the speech.’

Observe also optionality for predicate adjectives under object control, as in (26).

- (26) a. Maria skipaði honum [að PRO_{nom} vera **godum/godur/*godan**].
Maria ordered him.dat to be good.dat/good.nom/good.acc
‘Maria ordered him to be good.’
- b. Maria badði hann [að PRO_{nom} vera ***godum/godur/godan**].
Maria asked him.acc to be good.dat/good.nom/good.acc
‘Maria asked him to be good.’

The predicate adjective either appears in the nominative, like an overt subject, or agrees with PRO’s controller. These data suggest that we want PRO to always be present and necessarily have null case, and that **Null Case is always some "silent" version of a full case in the system.**

For (26), two (very different) approaches:

- (i) PRO can either have nominative Null Case or receive the Null Case of its controller.
- (ii) PRO is either present (nominative, here) or absent (as in bare VP analysis).

General Hypothesis

Functional heads that value case need to be "fertilized" by (features of) some other head. Null Case is just an "unfertilized" regular case. Fertilization is required for arguments to have their case features valued, but is *not* necessary for adjuncts. (This is because the fertilizing head is one which enters into a theta-relationship with the NP having its features valued; non-arguments are not subject to this.)

IV. Curious Correlations in Slavic

A. ECM and agreement with object controllers

In Russian case transmission fails from object controllers. Polish is similar, but not all Slavic languages are like this. Czech, Slovak and Slovenian object controllers of PRO also induce case transmission, as in Czech (27a) or Slovak (27b), from Comrie (1974), or Slovenian (27c, d):

- (27) a. Donutil j sem ho [PRO_{acc} přijít **samotného/*samotnému**].
forced aux.1sg him.acc to-come alone.acc/alone.dat
‘I forced him to come alone.’

- b. Necháva ju [PRO_{acc} starat' sa o domácnost' **samu**].
 leaves her.acc to-look-after housework alone.acc
 'He leaves her to look after the housework herself.'
- c. Zdravnik jo je poslal [PRO_{acc} delat **bolno**].
 doctor her.acc aux.3sg sent work sick.acc
 'The doctor sent her to work sick'
- d. Janeza sem učil [PRO_{acc} voziti
 Janez.acc aux.1sg taught to-drive
pijanega/utrujenega/premladega].
 drunk.acc/tired.acc/too-young.acc
 'I was teaching Janez to drive drunk/tired/too young.'

Like Icelandic, the bare VP (PRO-less) account would claim no PRO with object control in (27).

The correlation

Although Russian and Polish have no ECM into infinitival clauses. Brecht (1974) points out that it is precisely Czech, Slovak and Slovenian differ in allowing this sort of ECM:

- (28) a. Vidím Pavla odchazét.
 see.1sg Pavel.acc to-leave
 'I see Pavel leaving.'
- b. Počul sam psa vyt'.
 heard aux.1sg dog.acc to-howl
 'I heard the dog howling.'
- c. Janeza sem videl delati.
 Janez.acc aux.1sg saw to-work
 'I saw Janez working.'

More Slovenian examples: note the ECM subject is a climbed clitic in (29a) and (29b) shows the genitive of negation is a structural case (note correction to first numerals handout, poor example)

- (29) a. Slišal sem jo peti prehlajeno.
 heard aux.1sg her.acc to-sing cold.acc
 'I heard her sing with a cold.'
- b. Še nikoli v življenju nisem videla
 still never in life neg-aux.1sg saw
 nobene ženske voziti pijane.
 not-any.gen woman.gento-drive drunk.gen
 'In all my life I never saw a single woman driving drunk.'

What do these two constructions, secondary predicate agreement with object controllers of PRO, and ECM into perception verb infinitivals, have in common? In order to answer this question, consider Brecht's observation that ECM is generally impossible into infinitivals in Slavic, because infinitivals in these languages have no morphological way of expressing tense. ECM is however in principle possible into perception verb infinitivals in Slavic precisely because their temporal interpretation is always simultaneous with that of the main clause. But this only occurs in Czech, Slovak and Slovenian, because one additional factor is necessary: ECM involves case valuation from matrix clause into the infinitival clause (be it by Probe or by Raising). This is allowed in Czech, Slovak and Slovenian (clearly under the influence of German), but not in Russian or Polish. Now back to PRO and Null Case: the ability of PRO to have its case features valued by the matrix object is precisely what is needed in order to handle case transmission from object

controllers, and it occurs in exactly the same three languages. Without null case PRO, this is left as a mysterious coincidence

B. Second datives and dative subjects

The second dative does not occur in all of the languages.

In Polish, the behavior of *sam* (and *jeden*) is similar to that of *sam* and *odin* in Russian:

- (30) a. Janek przyszedł sam/jeden
 (nom) came himself(nom)/alone(nom)
 'Janek came himself/alone'
- b. Zostawmy Jerzego samego/jednego
 let's-leave (acc) himself(acc)/alone(acc)
 'let's leave Jerzy on his own'
- (31) Maria lubi gotować sama
 (nom) likes to-cook herself(nom)
 'Maria likes to cook by herself'
- (32) a. Dziecko jest za małe, żeby zapiąć płaszcz samemu
 child(nom) is too small COMP to-button coat himself(dat)
 'the child is too small to button his coat himself'
- b. Ważne jest dla mnie iść samemu
 important is for me(gen) to-go myself(dat)
 'it is important for me to go myself'
- c. Dobrze jest iść samemu
 good is to-go himself(dat)
 'it is good to go alone'

The remaining West and South Slavic languages completely lack the second dative phenomenon. In South Slavic Slovenian and Serbian/Croatian and West Slavic Slovak the default case of the semipredicatives is not the dative, but rather the nominative, as summarized in (33):

(33)	<u>Language</u>	<u>Default case of semipredicative</u>
	Russian	DATIVE
	Polish	DATIVE
	Slovenian	NOMINATIVE
	Serbian/Croatian	NOMINATIVE
	Slovak	NOMINATIVE

Dative subjects of infinitives

Slavic languages exhibit variation with respect to the possibility of marking subjects of infinitives dative. Although much more restrictive than Russian, Polish does permit subjects of infinitives to appear in the dative, as in (34):

- (34) a. **Tobie** iść do klasztoru, nie wychodzić za mąż
 you(dat) to-go to nunnery NEG to-marry
 'you should go to a nunnery, not get married'
- b. Po co ci sobie zawracać tym głową
 for what you(dat) self to-turn that head
 'why fall in love with that one?'
- c. Choćbyś był Waligóra nie mierzyć ci się
 even-if-you were (a giant) NEG to-contend you(dat) REFL
 z tą górą
 with that mountain
 'even if you were very strong, you still couldn't contend with that mountain'

In Slovenian, dative subjects of infinitives are archaic and no longer used productively. Similarly, Serbian/Croatian and Slovak do not allow the dative with the infinitive, as summarized in (35):

(35)	<u>Language</u>	<u>Dative NP with Infinitive</u>
	Russian	YES
	Polish	YES
	Slovenian	NO
	Serbian/Croatian	NO
	Slovak	NO

Note that **all Slavic languages** have dative (Experiencer) subjects with impersonal verbs. Crucially, the correlation is between the existence of the second dative and of a dative overt subject.

This is in keeping with the hypothesis that Null Case dative PRO is parasitic on the potential for overt dative subjects of infinitives (which need the additional fertilizing factor of Tense).

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Babby, L. (1998) "Subject Control as Direct Predication". In Ž. Bošković, S. Franks and W. Snyder, eds., *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the Connecticut Meeting*, 17-37. Michigan Slavic Publications: Ann Arbor.
- Babby, L. & S. Franks "The Syntax of Adverbial Participles in Russian Revisited" 1998 *Slavic and East European Journal* 42.3, 117-149.
- Brecht, Richard. 1974. Tense and infinitive complements in Russian, Latin and English. In *Slavic transformational syntax*, ed Richard Brecht and Catherine Chvany, 193-218. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.
- Comrie, B. (1974) "The Second Dative: A Transformational Approach". In R. Brecht and C. Chvany (eds.), *Slavic Transformational Syntax*, Michigan Slavic Materials, No. 10, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, pp. 123-150.
- Franks, S. Chapter six of *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*
- Franks, S, and Hornstein, N, 1992. Secondary predication in Russian and proper government of PRO. In *Control and grammar*, ed. by R. Larson, S. Iatridou, U. Lahiri, and J. Higginbotham, 1-50. Dordrecht: Kluwer
- Greenberg, G. (1983) "Another Look at the Second Dative and Dative Subjects". *Linguistic Analysis* 11: 167-218.
- Greenberg, G. and S. Franks (1991) "A Parametric Approach to Dative Subjects and Second Datives in Slavic". *Slavic and East European Journal* 35: 71-97.
- Moore, J. and D. Perlmutter (2000) "What Does it Take to be a Dative Subject?". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 373-416.
- Neidle, C. (1982/1988) *The Role of Case in Russian Syntax*. MIT dissertation. Revised version published by Kluwer: Dordrecht.
- Schein, B. (1982) "Non-finite Complements in Russian". *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 4: 217-244.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór. 1991. Icelandic case-marked PRO and the licensing of lexical arguments. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9:327-363.