

## Locatives and datives in Russian: to be AT or to be TO, and how high can they be?

This paper investigates locative and dative applied arguments in Russian, focusing on their occurrence with the existential BE and the inflection. Our goal is to explore the applicative morphosyntax in its relation to possession and modality (see, e.g., Bjorkman and Cowper, in press). We show that datives, introduced by a directional applicative head, Appl-TO (Pylkkänen 2008), have a modal flavour, whereas locatives, introduced by a stative applicative head, Appl-AT (Cuervo 2003), do not. More generally, we claim that applicatives and BE-possession in Russian are related on both syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels. That is, Appl or ApplP can be merged with the existential BE (syntagmatic relationship), or Appl can be spelled out as a BE-form when it occurs in the inflectional domain of the clause (paradigmatic relationship). In the latter case, we propose the following distribution: Appl-TO occurs above TP, and Appl-AT occurs below TP, but above the viewpoint aspect, AspP.

As is well known, Russian is a BE-language that uses a locative predication to express possession (Freeze 1992). However, as far as we know, the literature did not explore the alternation between the locative possessor (*u*-DP) and the dative one (DP<sub>DAT</sub>), as in (1a-b). When *u*-DP in (1a) is replaced by DP<sub>DAT</sub> in (1b), there are two noticeable consequences: (i) (1b) has a modal flavour absent in (1a): Vanja is a prospective possessor (the use of *dlja Vani* ‘for Vanja’ is possible too, but the dative has a stronger entailment of possession); and (ii) the possessee has to be indefinite in (1b). Interestingly, both *u*-DP and DP<sub>DAT</sub> can co-occur; see (1c) and the structure in (2).

- (1) a. **U Vani** tože est’ eta konfeta. b. **Vane** tože est’ (\*eta) konfeta.  
       at Vanja.GEN also be this candy Vanja.DAT also be this candy  
       ‘Vanja also has this candy.’ ‘There is also a candy for Vanja.’  
   c. **U menja** tože est’ **Vane** konfeta.  
       at me.GEN also be Vanja.DAT candy  
       ‘I also have a candy for (that I intend to give to) Vanja.’

- (2) [ApplP *u*-DP Appl-AT [<sub>BE-P</sub> BE [ApplP DP<sub>DAT</sub> Appl-TO NP]]]

In (2), Appl-AT selects the existential phrase headed by BE, and the latter, in its turn, selects an ApplP headed by Appl-TO. The higher ApplP denotes an actual possession, and the lower one denotes a possibility of possession (possession-to-be). Note that we do not have a Part-Whole construal with DP<sub>DAT</sub> in (1b-c); therefore, we exclude a structure where *Vane* would be base-generated within NP (Boneh and Sichel 2010:31). This structure would be plausible for dative possessors occurring with predicate nominals, as in *On byl Vane xoroshim drugom* ‘He was a good friend to Vanja’ (a social relationship is involved here; see Grashchenkov and Markman 2008 for a possessor raising analysis using a high applicative structure).

In modal existential constructions, *u*-DP and DP<sub>DAT</sub> can also alternate, (3a-b), but they cannot co-occur, (3c) (cf. 1c).

- (3) a. **U Vani** est’ [s kem pogovorit’].  
       at Vanja.GEN be with whom to.talk  
   b. **Vane** est’ [s kem pogovorit’].  
       Vanja.DAT be with whom to.talk  
       ‘Vanja has somebody to talk with.’  
   c. \***U menja** est’ **Vane** [s kem pogovorit’].  
       at me.GEN be Vanja.DAT with whom to.talk  
       Intended: ‘I have somebody for Vanja that he can talk with.’

The bracketed infinitival clause in (3) is an existential free relative. Such free relatives are non-specific indefinites that can only be selected by a limited number of predicates (Caponigro 2003: ch. 3). Appl-TO is not among the possible selectors of these clauses (otherwise, we would expect (3c) to be possible). Following Livitz (2012), we analyze (3b) as a raising structure, in which dative case is assigned within the infinitival clause: *Vane<sub>i</sub> est’ [s kem t<sub>i</sub> pogovorit’]*. In

(3a), *u*-DP is introduced by Appl-AT that takes BE-P as its complement, just like in (1a) or (1c). That is, (3a) is a control structure: *u Vani<sub>i</sub> est' [s kem PRO<sub>i</sub> pogovorit']*.

We extend our analysis of Appl-TO and Appl-AT to the inflectional domain, showing that both heads can be merged higher than the peripheral position just above VoiceP (Kim 2011).

The highest projection that Appl-AT can be merged with is AspP, as in (4) (V does not raise to T in Russian; the nominative *Vanja* is in Spec,TP, and the adverb *uže* is presumably in Spec,AspP). Note that *u*-DP cannot be replaced by DP<sub>DAT</sub> in (4). This example is different from those cases in which an argument is introduced by Appl below VoiceP, as discussed in Markman 2009 (e.g., *Vanja vzjal u nas mašinu* 'Vanja took a car from us' / 'Vanja took our car' or *Vanja s'jel nam ves' sup* 'Vanja ate all soup on us').

- (4) *Vanja u nas / \*nam uže postupil v universitet.*  
*Vanja.NOM at us.GEN / us.DAT already got.PERF into university*  
 'We have Vanja already accepted to the university.'

As for Appl-TO, it can be merged with an infinitival TP, contributing to the modal meaning, along with the imperfective operator or negation, as in (5) (note: occurrence of *u*-DP is precluded). High Appl above TP was proposed by Rivero (2009) in her analysis of involuntary state constructions in Bulgarian and Slovenian. Maintaining a monoclausal view of (5) (contra Fleisher 2006), we analyze the tensed forms of BE in (5b) as a spell-out Appl-TO + T complex.

- (5) a. *\*U Vani / Vane postupat' v universitet.*  
*at Vanja.GEN / Vanja.DAT to.get.IMPF into university*  
 'Vanja has to get into university.'  
 b. *\*U Vani / Vane (bylo / budet) ne postupit' v universitet.*  
*at Vanja.GEN / Vanja.DAT was / will.be NEG to.get.PERF to university*  
 'Vanja is (was / will be) unable to get into university.'

In sum, applicatives are not restricted to the lexical domain of verbs. They do not only relate an individual to another individual or an individual to an event, but they can also relate an individual to a set of possible situations or worlds. According to our analysis, only Appl-TO is capable of creating a relationship of this latter type.

## References:

- Bjorkman, Bronwyn, and Elizabeth Cowper. In press. Possession and necessity: From individuals to worlds. *Lingua*.
- Boneh, Norah, and Ivy Sichel. 2010. Deconstructing possession. *NLLT* 28:1-40.
- Caponigro, Ivano. 2003. Free not to ask: On the semantics of free relatives and wh-words cross-linguistically. Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.
- Cuervo, María Cristina. 2003. Datives at large. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Fleisher, Nicholas. 2006. Russian dative subjects, case, and control. Ms., University of California, Berkeley.
- Freeze, Ray. 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68:553-595.
- Grashchenkov, Pavel, and Vita Markman. 2008. Non-core arguments in verbal and nominal predication: High and low applicatives and possessor raising. *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Natasha Abner and Jason Bishop, 185-193. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Kim, Kyumin. 2011. External argument introducers. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Toronto.
- Livitz, Inna. 2012. Modal possessive constructions: Evidence from Russian. *Lingua* 122:714-747.
- Markman, Vita. 2009. Applicatives TO, FROM, and AT: On dative and locative possessors in Russian. *Proceedings of the 38th annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 2, ed. by Anisa Schardl, Martin Walkow, and Muhammad Abdurrahman, 123-134. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rivero, María Luisa. 2009. Intensionality, high applicatives, and aspect: Involuntary state constructions in Bulgarian and Slovenian. *NLLT* 27:151-196.