

Anton Zimmerling,  
Moscow State University for Humanities  
meinmat@yahoo.com

## Dative Subjects and Semi-Expletive Pronouns in Russian\*

### 1. Introduction

The paper discusses syntactic properties and distribution of non-nominative subjects in Russian. I distinguish two types of Dative subjects: one of them interferes with clausal subjects and expletive pronouns and may be referred to as “weak”, the second one does not interfere with any other type of subject-like expressions and may be referred to as “strong”.

In the generative framework, ‘grammatical subject’ is typically defined as a functional notion, cf. (Partee 1979, 15-16), not as a categorical notion. Given standard assumptions on syntactic structure, grammatical subject fills the Spec position in its domain and has properties of an external argument. In Russian and in other languages with a Nominative Sentence Pattern (Keenan 1976; Kibrik 1997, 330), the default type of subject is overt nominative subject (Spec of an agreeing TP), taking on the same form in transitive and intransitive clauses<sup>1</sup>. Meanwhile, it is well known that many languages with a Nominative Sentence Pattern apply to different types of subject-like expressions, which may occasionally fill the subject slot depending on the choice of a predicate and/or syntactic configuration — clausal subjects (CPs, VP-infinitives etc), expletive forms (Eng. *It, there*, Ger. *Es*, Dan. *det, der*), zero subjects, cf. (Zimmerling 2007), oblique subjects, cf. (Faarlund 2001). The status of the latter is probably most controversial. Shoorlemmer (Shoorlemmer 1994) argues that dative NPs of Russian Dative-Impersonal clauses are subject-like, since they share (some) control-and-binding capacities with Russian nominative subjects, while Moore and Perlmutter treat them as fronted non-subject NPs, so called I-nominals (Perlmutter & Moore 2000, 379-381). Sigurðsson, who strongly relies on Perlmutter & Moore’s data, compares Russian and Icelandic and concludes that in Modern Icelandic dative subjects are structurally similar with nominative subjects, since subjects of both types enter in an ‘active relation with the PERSON/NUMBER of the finite complex of the clause’, while their Russian counterparts do not<sup>2</sup> (Sigurðsson 2002, 720-721). He nevertheless makes a reservation that despite Russian ‘I-nominals’ are not in the same class as Icelandic ‘quirky subjects’, they may prove subject-like, too, since criteria for subjecthood seem to be language-specific and the notion ‘the subject of the clause’ may be a taxonomic artifact rather than a universal of language (Sigurðsson 2002, 719)<sup>3</sup>. I am not sure, whether such a pessimistic vision is necessary. Sigurðsson’s own approach to the subjecthood problem is very rigid: he seems to acknowledge oblique NPs as regular grammatical subjects only when they have all features relevant for nominative subjects. This is certainly a methodological requirement and not a typologically valid generalization. Russian data beg a different approach — to postulate

---

\* Research is a part of the project “The typology of free word order languages and models of inversion” funded by the Russian Foundation for Humanities (grant RGNF 06-04-00203a), whose support is gratefully acknowledged. I am grateful to Ora Matushansky, Luka Szucsic and to the anonymous reviewers of the FDSL-7 conference for the criticism of the previous versions of this paper and for discussion. I am indebted to the anonymous editing reviewer for a number of valuable corrections and proposals. All mistakes are mine.

<sup>1</sup> However, Kozinskij (Kozinskij 1983, 12-26) shows that nominative subjects of Russian transitive, intransitive and passive clauses have different control and binding properties.

<sup>2</sup> This issue needs checking, since 3d. person Sg. in the so called impersonal sentence patterns in Russian and Icelandic may be interpreted both as a non-agreeing form or a default agreeing form: Sigurðsson seems to choose the second option.

<sup>3</sup> It is interesting that Sigurðsson who is exploiting the apparatus of the Minimalist Program associates here with extremist proponents of linguistic typology, who claim that neither grammatical relations like subject, object etc. nor constituent structure and phrasal categories are universal, cf. the approach of Alexander Kibrik (Kibrik 1997, 287).

different types of non-standard subjects sharing different sets of features with standard nominative agreeing subjects. In order to account for a situation, where different types of non-nominative subjects may be opposed to each other, a functional hierarchy of grammatical subjects will be proposed. I present a hypothesis that Russian subject-like expressions may be ordered in terms of feature ‘strength’.

(i) ‘Strong’ subjects have control-and-binding capacity and block other types of subject-like expressions, while ‘weak’ subjects may compete with each other. Control-and-binding capacities of a ‘weak’ subject depends on its syntactic type.

More specifically, our analysis supports the claim made by (Franks 1995, 255) that two major types of Russian impersonal clauses — Dative-Infinitive-Structures (DIS) and Dative-Predicative-Structures (DPS) — exemplify two different uses of the Dative Case, structural and lexical case, respectively. Finally, I am going to provide an argument in favor of the claim recently made by (Kondrashova 2007), that a subtype of Russian DIS, namely, DIS-VP-infinitives, are monoclausal, not biclausal, contrary to claims made in the previous research.

## 2. Analyzing Russian data: the main claims and the main problems

Modern Russian has a wide variety of grammatical subjects. Apart from overt nominative subjects which trigger agreement (Specs of agreeing TPs), it has clausal subjects (both CPs and VP-infinitives), oblique subjects (Specs of non-agreeing TPs), semi-expletive pronoun *eto* ‘it’, ‘this one’ and, finally, case-marked zero subjects in 3Sg. and 3Pl., cf. (Mel’čuk 1995, 180-185). Russian zero subjects are pronouns, which select for nominative case and [+ Sg.] or [+ Pl.] agreement feature. The two zero pronouns have different role and reference properties and are bound to two different sentence patterns, see examples (1) and (2) below.

$\emptyset^{\text{people}}$ [[Vf.3.Pl]; + intentional action]	$\emptyset^{\text{elements}}$ [[Vf.3.Sg]; -intentional action]
(1) <i>Ulic-u zasypal-i pesk-om.</i> Street <sub>Acc:Sg</sub> strewed <sub>Pret: 3Pl</sub> sand <sub>Instr:Sg</sub>	(2) <i>Ulic-u zasypal-o pesk-om street<sub>Acc:Sg</sub></i> strewed <sub>Pret: 3Sg:N</sub> sand <sub>Instr:Sg</sub>
‘[People] strewed the street with sand’.	‘The street got strewed with sand’, lit. ‘[It] strewed the street with sand’.

Fig 1: Two types of Russian zero pronouns:  $\emptyset^{\text{people}}$  vz.  $\emptyset^{\text{elements}}$

Russian zero subjects control into gerunds and bind anaphors, cf. (Mel’čuk 1995, 185; Zimmerling 2007). They must be classified with “strong” subjects, together with overt nominative subjects.

Anaphoric binding	Control into gerundival complements
(3) <i>V svoëm dome <math>\emptyset^{\text{people}}</math> obyčno ne gad-jat.</i> In Pron. <sub>REFL</sub> .Loc <sub>Sg:M</sub> house <sub>Loc:Sg:M</sub> usually not make.dirty <sub>Pres: 3Pl</sub>	(4) <i>Piratskimi diskami <math>\emptyset^{\text{people}}</math> torgu-jut v</i> <i>Lužnikah, <b>obespečivaja</b> vseh moskvičej.</i> Illegal <sub>Instr:Pl</sub> CD <sub>Instr:Pl</sub> sell <sub>Pres:3Pl</sub> in Luzhniki <sub>Loc:Pl</sub> <b>provide</b> <sub>GER</sub> all Moscovites <sub>Acc:Pl</sub>
‘One usually doesn’t make [it] dirty in one’s [own] house’.	‘[They] sell illegal CDs in Luzhniki providing all Moscovites [with them]’.

Fig 2: Russian zero pronoun  $\emptyset^{\text{people}}$ : anaphoric binding (3) and control into gerunds (4)

Russian zero pronouns have specific role-and-reference features: they can only be generic Agents. They also have specific syntactic features: they are tied up to the subject position, cannot be grammatical objects, occur only in 3d. person and are not used in embedded infinite clauses. A combination of relevant features characteristic of Russian zero subject pronouns is given below in (5):

(5) {+ Nominative Case; -Actual; + Generic; + Agent; - Experiencer; 3d. person only: 3 Pl. √ 3 Sg.; ± Animate; + Finite}.

Overt nominative subjects in Russian are not specified in any semantic role, may be both [+Generic] and [+Actual], they may stand in all persons and occur in clauses of all types.

Clausal subjects and semi-expletive non-agreeing *èto* are “weak” subjects: they can neither control into gerunds nor bind anaphors. Meanwhile, it is impossible to rule out CPs, VP-infinitive and semi-expletive *èto* by analyzing them as internal arguments: they occur in positions, which are not predicted by valency frames of the predicate. No extraction from subject CPs / VP- and CP-infinitives is possible either<sup>4</sup>.

As for Dative subjects, they can — to some extent — control into gerunds and bind anaphors, as shown in (Testelets 2001, 332; Szucsic 2007). Control capacity is a more salient criterion for Russian than binding capacity of subjects: binding of reflexive pronouns *svoj*, *-ja*, *-ë*, *sebja*, *sebe* is hampered in Russian, if their antecedent has a feature [-Animate]<sup>5</sup> or almost blocked, if has a combination of features [-Animate; -Nominative]<sup>6</sup>. With this specification, one may state that Dative subjects are good controllers and binding licensors. In order to show that control-and-binding capacities of Dative subjects in Russian normally do not depend on their relative placement to the left/to the right of the gerund/reflexive, we provide three pairs of examples, see (6a-b), (7a-b) and (8a-b).

- (6) a. *Mne<sub>i</sub> stydno<sup>7</sup> za igru svoej<sub>i</sub> komandy.*  
 I<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> ashamed<sub>Pred</sub> for play<sub>Acc:Sg:F</sub> my<sub>Refl:Gen:Sg</sub> team<sub>Gen:Sg</sub>  
 ‘I am ashamed of the play of my team’.
- b. *Za igru svoej<sub>i</sub> komandy mne<sub>i</sub> stydno.*  
 For play<sub>Acc:Sg:F</sub> my<sub>Refl:Gen:Sg</sub> team<sub>Gen:Sg</sub> I<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> ashamed<sub>Pred</sub>  
 ‘the same’.
- (7) a. *Mne<sub>i</sub> stydno, [PRO<sub>i</sub> gljadja na igru komandy].*  
 I<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> ashamed<sub>Pred</sub> look<sub>Ger</sub> on play<sub>Acc:Sg</sub> team<sub>Gen:Sg</sub>  
 ‘I feel ashamed when looking at the play of the team’.

<sup>4</sup> One can deny the existence of clausal subjects on theory-internal reasons and introduce null expletives instead. However, the analysis outlined here does not change much if one claims that real subjects are null categories coindexed with CPs/VP- and CP-infinitives and not CPs/VP- and CP-infinitives themselves.

<sup>5</sup> This may be illustrated by passive clauses like [*Prošenie*<sub>Nom:Sg,N</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *bylo*<sub>Aux:3Sg:N</sub> *podpisano*<sub>Part.Pass:Sg:N</sub> [*direktorom*<sub>Instr:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>j</sub> √ [*svoëm*<sub>Refl.oc:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>\*i/j</sub> *kabinetel*<sub>Loc:Sg:M</sub>. ‘[The petition]<sub>i</sub> has been signed by the [director]<sub>j</sub> in [his]<sub>\*i/j</sub> office’ (note that this Russian sentence, unlike its English translation, has a reflexive possessive pronoun). ‘Control obviation’ in such contexts is regular in Russian, if a passive clause has an NP/DP with features [+ Agent; + Animate]. Cf. (Kozinskij 1983, 14-16; Testelets 2001, 325).

<sup>6</sup> It is difficult to decide, whether obsolete examples, where seemingly inanimate Dative subjects nevertheless bind reflexives, cf. [*Poezdu*<sub>Dat:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *ne proehatj*<sub>Inf</sub> *po* [*svoej*<sub>Refl:Dat:Sg:F</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *kolee*<sub>Dat:Sg:F</sub> *iz-za avarii*<sub>Gen:Sg:F</sub> ‘The train cannot pass trough on his track because of a crash’ are real exceptions from this rule, or the Dative subject *Poezdu* ‘to-the-train’ is reinterpreted here as [+Animate] due to some metonymic or metaphoric usage.

<sup>7</sup> In this paper, I consistently gloss all non-agreeing nominal predicates, which occur in the Dative-impersonal-structures, as ‘Predicatives’, irrespective of the fact, whether they retain some agreeing correlates in Russian, cf. *grustno* ‘sad’, or not, cf. *stydno* ‘ashamed’.

- b. [PRO<sub>i</sub> *gljadja na igru komandy*] *mne*<sub>i</sub> *stydno*.  
 look<sub>Ger</sub> on play<sub>Acc:Sg</sub> team<sub>Gen:Sg</sub> I<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> ashamed<sub>Pred</sub>  
 ‘the same’.
- (8) a. *Vase*<sub>i</sub> *ne sdelat’ kar’ery*, [PRO<sub>i</sub> *ostavajas’ v svojem<sub>i</sub> gorode*].  
 Vasja<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> not make<sub>Inf</sub> career<sub>Gen:Sg</sub> on remain<sub>Ger</sub> in his<sub>Refl:Loc:Sg</sub> town<sub>Loc:Sg</sub>  
 ‘Vasja cannot make career remaining in his home town’.
- b. [PRO<sub>i</sub> *ostavajas’ v svojem<sub>i</sub> gorode*], *Vase*<sub>i</sub> *ne sdelat’ kar’ery*.  
 On remain<sub>Ger</sub> in their<sub>Refl:Loc:Sg</sub> town<sub>Loc:Sg</sub> Vasja<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> not make<sub>Inf</sub> career<sub>Gen:Sg</sub>  
 ‘the same’.

I argue that there is a crucial difference between two types of sentences, where subject-like Datives are attested, namely — Dative-Infinitive Structures (DIS), see (8a-b) above and Dative-Predicative-Structures (DPS), see (6) and (7) above. The claim that DIS and DPS are structures of different type is lacking in the last academic grammar of Russian (Švedova et alii 1982): the latter disregards oblique subjects in Russian. Remarkably, two authors who have studied subject-like Russian Datives in the recent years most thoroughly (Grišina 2002; Bonč-Osmolovskaja 2003), do not treat DIS and DPS as contrasting structures either: instead, they include DIS and DPS into a rather heterogeneous bulk of different structures called ‘dativnye konstrukcii’ on the assumption that all of them share some role and reference features<sup>8</sup>. I hope that this paper can contribute to clarifying this issue in Russian grammar.

There are about 150-160 Russian nominal predicatives (most of them with *-o*-final), which select for Dative subjects with a combination of features [+ Experiencer; + Animate]: *mne stydno/grustno/protivno*, lit. ‘to-me-Dat.1Sg. is a shame/is sad/is disgusting’ (Cimmerling 1997, 514; Zimmerling 1998, 72). DPS-clauses may be expanded with a NP/DP in an oblique case, if a predicative has a valency slot for a corresponding internal argument. In (9a) this slot is filled by an accusative form, in (9b) it is filled by a genitive form.

- (9) a. *Vase*<sub>i</sub> *žalko ženuj*.  
 Vasja<sub>i</sub>Dat pity<sub>Pred</sub> wife<sub>j</sub>Acc  
 ‘Vasja feels sorry for his wife.’
- b. *Vase*<sub>i</sub> *žalko bol’ših deneg na sapožk dlja ženyj*.  
 Vasja<sub>i</sub>Dat pity<sub>Pred</sub> big<sub>Gen:Pl</sub> money<sub>Gen:Pl</sub> on boots<sub>Acc:Pl</sub> for wife<sub>j</sub> Acc:Sg  
 ‘Vasja does not feel like consuming much money for his wife’s boots.’

DPS-clauses may be also expanded with a CP/IP argument, if a predicative has a corresponding valency slot, see (10a) and (10b), where [PRO<sub>i</sub> *pokupat’ ženej sapožki*] ‘to buy boots for one’s wife’ is an internal argument of nominal predicatives *možno* ‘may’ / *nado* ‘must’ / *nel’zja* ‘cannot’ / *nužno* ‘necessary’ / *žalko* ‘pity’ / *protivno* ‘disgusting’.

- (10) a. [Vase]<sub>i</sub> *možno/nado/nel’zja* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *pokupat’ ženej sapožki*].  
 [Vasja]<sub>i</sub>Dat:Sg may<sub>Pred</sub>/must<sub>Pred</sub>/cannot<sub>Pred</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> buy<sub>Inf</sub> wife<sub>j</sub> Dat:Sg] boots<sub>Acc:Pl</sub>  
 ‘Vasja may/must/cannot buy boots for his wife’.

<sup>8</sup> I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer who has drawn my attention to one of these excellent studies in Russian grammar: unfortunately, Bonč-Osmolovskaja’s dissertation still remains unpublished and Grišina’s monograph has a very limited circulation. For some reasons, Grišina and Bonč-Osmolovskaja do not refer to each other, though their approaches are similar. For both authors *dativnye konstrukcii* is a term covering at least 4-5 different structures with a dative NP/DP: 1) DIS, 2) DPS, 3) Dative with experiential verbs, cf. *mne hočetsya pit’* ‘I want drink’ 4) Dative-Nominative structures, cf. *mne ponadobilas’ kniga* ‘I got to need a book’ 5) Dative with modal predicates, cf. *mne ne udalos’ uehat’* ‘I did not manage to leave’, 6) Dative with deagentive predicates, cf. *emu sejchas ikaetsja* ‘His ears must be burning’, lit. ‘to-him hiccups now’.

- b. [*Vase*]<sub>i</sub> *nužno/žalko/protivno* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *pokupat' žene; sapožki*].  
 [Vasja<sub>Dat:Sg</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *necessary/pity/disgusting*<sub>Pred</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> *buy*<sub>Inf</sub> *wife*<sub>Dat:Sg</sub> *boots*<sub>Acc:Pl</sub>]  
 'It is necessary/a pity/disgusting for **Vasja** to buy boots for his wife'.

Russian DPS-clauses always have experiential animate subjects and can only denote States, not Activities. Russian DIS-clauses express a wider spectrum of modal semantics. E.g., (11a) contains an order or wish explicating deontic modality 'X has an obligation to buy boots', (11b) explicates alethic modality 'External circumstances do not make it possible for X to buy boots', while (11c) adds to it a prognosis about the probability of the situation 'X will buy boots', i.e. expresses a combination of alethic and epistemic modalities.

- (11) a. [[*Pete*]<sub>i</sub> — *bežat' za pivom*], a [[*Vase*]<sub>j</sub> — *pokupat' žene sapožki!*].  
 [[*Petja*<sub>Dat</sub>]<sub>I</sub> *run*<sub>Inf</sub> *for beer*<sub>Instr:Sg</sub>], and [*Vasja*<sub>Dat</sub>]<sub>j</sub> *buy*<sub>Inf</sub> *wife*<sub>Dat:Sg</sub> *boots*<sub>Acc:Pl</sub>!]  
 'Pete must run for beer, and **Vasja** must buy boots for his wife'.
- b. *Uvolili Vasju; s raboty: [bol'se ne kupat' emu; žene; sapožki!]*.  
 Dismiss<sub>Pret:3Pl</sub> *Vasja*<sub>i</sub> *Acc:Sg* from job<sub>Gen:Sg</sub> [henceforth not buy<sub>Inf</sub> **him**<sub>Dat:3Sg:M</sub>]<sub>I</sub>  
*wife*<sub>Dat:Sg:F</sub> *boots*<sub>Acc:Pl</sub>]  
 'They sacked Vasja. **He** is from now on unable to buy boots for his wife'.
- c. [*Čto [Vase]*<sub>I</sub> *bol'se ne kupat' žene; sapožki*], *bystro ponjali vse bol'nye v palate*.  
 [That [*Vasja*<sub>Dat</sub>]<sub>I</sub> henceforth not buy<sub>Inf</sub> *wife*<sub>Dat:Sg</sub> *boots*<sub>Acc:Pl</sub>], quickly  
 realize<sub>Pret:3Pl</sub> all<sub>Nom:Pl</sub> patient<sub>Nom:Pl</sub> in bed ward<sub>Loc:Sg</sub>]  
 'Everybody in the bedward quickly realized that **Vasja** henceforth would be unable to buy boots for his wife'.

A remarkable feature of Russian DIS-clauses is that they allow for secondary agreement with quantifying semi-predicatives *sam* 'alone' and *odin* 'one', taking structural dative case (Franks 1995, 259-267). In (12a) *samomu/odnomu* are linked to a dative antecedent in the main DPS clause, while in (12b) and (12c) *samomu/odnomu* lack overt dative antecedents.

- (12) a. [<sub>S</sub> *Vase*]<sub>i</sub> *bylo trudno* [<sub>IP</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> *rešit' ètu zadaču [samomu;/odnomu]*]<sub>i</sub>.  
**Vasja**<sub>i</sub> *Dat:Sg:M* be<sub>Pret:3Sg:N</sub> difficult<sub>Pred</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> *solve*<sub>Inf</sub> *this*<sub>Acc</sub> *problem*<sub>Acc</sub> **himself/alone**<sub>Quant:Dat:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>i</sub>  
 'It was difficult for **Vasja** to solve this problem **alone**'.
- b. [<sub>S</sub> *Mysl' o tom*, [<sub>IP</sub> *čtoby* PRO<sub>i</sub> *rešit' ètu zadaču [samomu;/odnomu]*]<sub>i</sub>, *privodila [Vasju]*<sub>I</sub> *v užas*].  
 [Idea<sub>Nom:Sg:F</sub>] about it<sub>Dat</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> that to solve<sub>Inf</sub> *this*<sub>Acc:Sg:F</sub> *problem*<sub>Acc:Sg:F</sub> **himself/alone**<sub>Quant:Dat:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>i</sub>, drive<sub>Pret:3Sg:F</sub> [*Vasja*<sub>Acc</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *in horror*<sub>Acc:Sg</sub>].  
 'Vasja was horrified by the idea to solve this problem **alone**'.
- c. [[<sub>S</sub> *Ego*]<sub>i</sub> *besila mysl' o tom*, [<sub>IP</sub> *čtoby* PRO<sub>i</sub> *samomu;* *pokupat' žene; sapožki*]].  
 [**Him**<sub>Acc</sub>]<sub>i</sub> madden<sub>Pret:3Sg:F</sub> idea<sub>Nom:Sg:F</sub> about it<sub>Loc:Sg</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> that-to **himself**<sub>Quant:Dat:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *buy*<sub>Inf</sub> *wife*<sub>Dat</sub> *j sapožki*<sub>Acc:Pl</sub>]]  
 'The idea that he **himself** should buy boots for his wife, drove him mad'.

There is general consent that the dative argument of Russian DIS gets structural Dative case, while in Russian DPS Dative case is lexical and assigned locally by verbal heads (more precisely, by nominal predicatives). Russian DPS may be used with infinitives, see (13), but

not in generic contexts. This probably explains their inability to build subject infinitivals, cf. the ungrammatical examples (14a) and (14b).

- (13) *mne<sub>i</sub> načalo* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *stanovit'sja tošno*].  
 I<sub>Dat:1.Sg</sub> *i* start<sub>Pret:3Sg:N</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> get<sub>Inf</sub> nauseous<sub>Pred</sub>]  
 'I was getting to feel sick', lit. 'to-me started to get nauseous'.
- (14) a. \* [PRO *byt'stanovit'sja tošno*] — *ne opasno*.<sup>9</sup>  
 [PRO be/get<sub>Inf</sub> nauseous<sub>Pred</sub>] not dangerous<sub>Pred</sub>  
 'It is dangerous to feel/to get to feel sick'.
- b. \* [PRO *byt'stanovit'sja mne<sub>i</sub> tošno*] — *ne opasno*.  
 [PRO be/get<sub>Inf</sub> nauseous to-me] not dangerous<sub>Pred</sub>  
 lit. 'It is dangerous to feel/to get to feel sick to-me'.

A combination of features [+ Animated] & [+ Actual] & [- Generic], attested by Russian predicatives like *tošno* 'X feels sick', *žalko* 'X feels sorry', is not trivial. There exist languages, where lexical predicatives are not excluded from generic contexts and may be used in subject infinitivals, see the well-formed Modern Icelandic example (15b), which is an exact parallel to the ungrammatical Russian example (14b). However, (15c), which is expanded by a position of the Dative subject, proves ungrammatical in Icelandic, just as its Russian counterpart (11b). This fact proves that the incompatibility of Icelandic Dative Subjects with generic meanings is not an inherent lexical feature of predicatives like Icel. *flökurt* 'nauseous' — they can be used in subject infinitivals, as shown in (15b), but a configurational feature of Icelandic DPS.

- (15) a. *mér varð flökurt*.  
 I<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> get<sub>Pret:3Sg</sub> nauseous<sub>Pred</sub>  
 'I felt nauseous'.
- b. [IP PRO<sub>i</sub> *að verða flökurt*] *er ekki hættulegt*.  
 [IP PRO to get<sub>Inf</sub> nauseous<sub>Pred</sub>] be<sub>Aux:Pres:3Sg</sub> not dangerous<sub>Pred</sub>  
 'To feel sick is not dangerous', lit. 'to get nauseous is not dangerous'.
- c. \* [IP PRO<sub>\*i</sub> *að verða mér<sub>i</sub> flökurt*] *er ekki hættulegt*.  
 [IP PRO to get<sub>Inf</sub> I<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> nauseous<sub>Pred</sub>] be<sub>Aux:Pres:3Sg</sub> not dangerous<sub>Pred</sub>  
 Lit. 'to get to-me nauseous is not dangerous'.

<sup>9</sup> The absence of subject infinitivals with predicatives in Modern Russian and German may be due to two different factors. We assume that this effect is triggered by lexical semantics: the predicatives have a feature {+ Actual} and therefore cannot be used with generic meaning. Ora Matushansky (p.c.) suggested that this effect is due to the absence of a nominative argument, since verbal impersonal predicates (cf., e.g. Rus. *Morosit'* 'drizzle' or *svetat'* 'dawn') do not build subject infinitivals either: \*[[ PRO\_\_*morosit'*] *slučaetsja často /slučilos' včera*] lit. 'to drizzle happens often/took place yesterday'. Possibly these explanations are compatible: meteorological verbs like SNOW, DRIZZLE, DAWN typically denote actual, not generic, states of affairs. Unfortunately, this issue is difficult to check. For the first, subject infinitivals are often barred by the absence of an external argument: \**tošnit' slučaetsja často*, \**tošnit' mne slučaetsja redko* etc. For the second, we are left with marginal examples accepted only by a part of native speakers. Cf. Rus. *morosit'* — *tak, vidno, velel Gospod' Bog* lit. 'to drizzle – so probably ordered God the Lord'. German example [PRO *Viel regnen-Inf*] *ist gut für die Ernte* (colloquial), lit. 'to rain much is good for the harvest' is better, but a sentence like *Viel schneien-Inf im November ist seltsam*. Lit. 'to snow much in November is strange' is bad, unless one adds an expletive subject *es* 'it': [[PRO *Viel schneien-Inf im November*] *ist es-Exp seltsam*].

There are reasons to expand this analysis to Russian data and associate the feature [-Generic] with Dative subjects of DPS, and not just with Russian predicatives as a lexical class<sup>10</sup>.

Dative subjects of Russian DIS are not specified as [+ Animate], see (16a) and (16b), where Dative subjects are inanimate. (16a) expresses the speaker's wish that the event *p* take place: it is not implied that the speaker has an influence on this process. On the contrary, (16b) expresses the speaker's intention to cause *p* or at least create the necessary preconditions that *p* can take place.

- (16) a. *Universitetu — rasti i procvetat'!*  
 University<sub>Dat:Sg</sub> grow<sub>Inf</sub> and thrive<sub>Inf</sub>  
 'The university has to grow and thrive' (a wish).
- b. *Volleybol'noj komande v nashem universitete — byt'!*  
 Volleyball<sub>Adj:Dat:Sg:F</sub> team<sub>Dat:Sg:F</sub> in our<sub>Poss:Loc:Sg</sub> university<sub>Loc:Sg</sub> be<sub>Inf</sub>  
 'The volleyball team of our university must persist' or: 'X guarantees that our university will get a volleyball team' (a declaration, order or promise).

Two types of Dative subjects behave differently with clausal subjects and expletives: Dative subjects of DIS cannot interfere with any other type of subjects, whereas Dative subjects of DPS can: some predicatives, which select Dative subjects in DPS, also take clausal subjects, cf. *stydno/grustno/protivno*, [<sub>CP</sub> *čto P*], '(it) is a shame/is sad/is disgusting [that *P*]'. All these facts suggest that DIS and DPS should be treated differently, despite the same overt case marking of the subject argument. In order to remove an obstacle, I will discuss the problems with the so called silent copula analysis, which aims at juxtaposing DIS and DPS by postulating a copular position in DIS<sup>11</sup>. Many authors, cf. (Franks 1995, 250; Sigurðsson 2002, 701) argue that Russian DIS are biclausal and postulate a silent copula in configurations like [<sub>Dat<sub>i</sub></sub> [<sub>∅</sub>-BE-AUX<sub>Present-Tense</sub>] PRO<sub>i</sub> Inf]. DPS is a real copular structure, which can be expanded by an infinitival complement if a predicative has a slot for it, cf. *nado* 'must' in (17a) and (17b).

- (17) a. *Vase<sub>i</sub> nado* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *bežat' za pivom*].  
 Vasja<sub>i</sub> Dat **must**<sub>Pred</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> run<sub>Inf</sub> for beer<sub>Instr:Sg</sub>]  
 'Vasja has to run for beer'.
- b. *Vase<sub>i</sub> bylo/budet nado* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *bežat' za pivom*].  
 Vasja<sub>i</sub> Dat be<sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N/be<sub>Aux:Fut:3Sg</sub></sub> **must**<sub>Pred</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> run<sub>Inf</sub> for beer<sub>Instr:Sg</sub>]  
 'Vasja had/ will have to run for beer'.

<sup>10</sup> Predicatives with features {+ Actual; - Generic} roughly correspond to the class of Stage-Level-predicates (cf. *X is hungry, X is angry etc.*), but the semantic opposition of features {± Actual vs ± Generic} doesn't coincide with the opposition of Stage-Level predicates and Individual-Level predicates introduced by Greg Carlson in the 1970-s. Most verbal predicates allowing for the value {+ Generic} are neither Individual-Level predicates nor Kind-Level-predicates in terms of Carlson. It is plausible that in languages with a dominating Nominative-Accusative sentence pattern all or most non-nominative predicates, as. e.g. Rus. *mne grustno, menja mutit, flagi kačacet na vetru, morosit* etc. denote actual events and have to be classified with Stage-Level-predicates. However, this does not mean that only predicates lacking an overt nominative argument may be Stage-Level predicates in languages with a Nominative-Accusative sentence pattern.

<sup>11</sup> Note that silent copula analysis does not rely on the assumption that Dative NPs/DPs in DIS are grammatical subjects. The last academic grammar of Russian which disregards oblique subjects avoids stating that DIS is a copular structure, although it treats *bylo* and *budet* as overt temporal copulas when they occur in DIS (Švedova et al 1982, 373-378). (Grišina 2002) tends to unify DIS and DPS, which is only possible under silent copula analysis. (Bonč-Osmolovskaja 2003) does not specify her position, though she seems to adopt Moore & Perlmutter's version of copula analysis.

Since Russian DIS is strongly associated with modal semantics, it would be tempting to treat the alleged silent BE-copula as a hidden predicative like *nado* ‘must’ in (17a-c). Such a straightforward move, would, however, be fallacious, since no Russian predicative can paraphrase the meaning of a DIS clause: the examples (17a-c) with overt *nado* ‘must’ simply describe a state of affairs ‘X has not done p & X has to do p’, while example (18) with a silent modal operator adds to it the speaker’s attitude to the situation where ‘X cannot avoid doing p & p is inevitable’.

- (18) *Oj, {∅} bežat’ Vase za pivom!*  
 Oh, {Silent modal operator} run<sub>Inf</sub> Vasja<sub>Dat</sub> for beer<sub>Instr:Sg</sub>  
 ‘Oh, <I am afraid> Vasja cannot escape running for beer’.

I adopt the recent proposal of Kondrashova and distinguish two subtypes of Russian DIS — VP-infinitives and CP-infinitives. VP-infinitives can not be headed by any functional category, except for Negation (NegP); they lack modal semantics and may be used either as imperatives or as subject infinitivals (Kondrashova 2007, 5). CP-infinitives are headed by a raised modal operator and express alethic meanings as (im)possibility or difficulty in realizing an action. VP-infinitives disallow both Tense auxiliaries and modals, while CP-infinitives allow both. In Russian, zero copula ∅-BE-AUX<sub>Present-Tense</sub> alternates with overt copula BE in the Past and Future tenses, as well as with habitual *byvaet* and emphatic *est’*. As Kondrashova correctly observes, Russian overt copulas do not match with non-zero modal operators *nado*, *možno*, *nel’zja*, see the ill-formed examples (19b) and (20b). The non-zero modal operators, referred to by Kondrashova, are lexical predicatives, which can build well-formed DPS clauses<sup>12</sup>, cf. examples (21) and (22):

- (19) a. Gde nam **bylo** spat’?  
 Where we<sub>Dat:1Pl</sub> be<sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N</sub> sleep<sub>Inf</sub>  
 ‘Where **could** we sleep?’.
- b. \*Nam **nado bylo** gde spat’.  
 We<sub>Dat:1Pl</sub> must<sub>Pred</sub> be<sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N</sub> where sleep<sub>Inf</sub>
- (20) a. Maše **est’** s kem guljat’.  
 Masha<sub>Dat</sub> be<sub>Aux:Emphatic:Pres</sub> with who<sub>Instr</sub> walk<sub>Inf</sub>  
 ‘Masha indeed has someone to go for a walk/to make merry with’.
- b. \*Maše **est’** s kem **možno** guljat’.  
 Masha<sub>Dat</sub> be<sub>Aux:Emphatic:Pres</sub> with who<sub>Instr</sub> **may**<sub>Pred</sub> walk<sub>Inf</sub><sup>13</sup>

Meanwhile, there is no such a restriction in DPS, cf. well-formed examples (21) and (22):

- (21) Nam<sub>i</sub> **nado bylo** [PRO<sub>i</sub> spat’].  
 We<sub>Dat:1Pl</sub> **must**<sub>Pred</sub> be<sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> sleep<sub>Inf</sub>].  
 ‘We had to sleep’.
- (22) Maše<sub>i</sub> uže **možno bylo** [PRO<sub>i</sub> guljat’].  
 Masha<sub>Dat</sub> already may<sub>Pred</sub> be<sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> walk<sub>Inf</sub>]  
 ‘Masha was already allowed to go for a walk’.

<sup>12</sup> (Bonč-Osmolovskaja 2003) excludes nominal modal operators like *nado*, *možno*, *nel’zja* from the class of lexical predicatives and unifies them with impersonal modal verbs like *nadležit*. It is difficult to ground this classification on pure syntactic reasons.

<sup>13</sup> Examples (19a-b) and (20a-b) are taken from (Kondrashova 2007).



This distribution proves that Russian infinitives take different positions in DPS and DIS. In DPS, they are complements of those nominal predicatives, which have a corresponding valency slot, cf. *nado*, *možno*, *žalko*<sup>14</sup>. In DIS, they act as main predicates: one may still believe in invisible syntactic heads responsible for introducing non-finite clauses (Sigurðsson 2002, 722) and generating their modal semantics, but these invisible heads can be identical neither with Russian nominal predicatives, nor with zero BE-copula — at least, given standard assumptions that there is only one zero BE-copula in Modern Russian.

Kondrashova leaves the question about monoclausality/biclausality of Russian DIS open. I am arguing here that the distinction of VP-infinitives and CP-infinitives is crucial for the clausal status of DIS. I claim that Russian DIS-VP-infinitives are monoclausal: it is impossible to insert the thematic argument twice and attach it both to the infinitive and to the finite verb, see (23). Note that example (23a) cannot be saved even if one replaces the dative form *Vase* ‘to Vasja’ with a prepositional genitive form *dlja Vasi* ‘for Vasja’ in order to avoid complete morphological pleonasm.

- (23) a. \* $[_{VP-I} [Vase / dlja Vasi]_i pit' \check{c}aj] ozna\check{c}alo smert' dlja Vasi_i]$ .  
 [[**Vasja**<sub>Dat:Sg:M/for Vasja</sub><sub>Gen.Prep:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>i</sub>, drink<sub>Inf</sub> Qtea<sub>Acc:Sg:M</sub>] mean<sub>Pret:3Sg:N</sub> death  
 [**for Vasja**<sub>Gen.Prep:Sg:M</sub>]<sub>i</sub>].  
 ‘To drink tea meant death for Vasja’.
- b.  $[_{VP-I} [Vase / dlja Vasi]_i pit' \check{c}aj] ozna\check{c}alo smert'$ .
- c.  $[_{VP-I} pit' \check{c}aj] ozna\check{c}alo smert' dlja Vasi_i]$ .

Headed CP-infinitives are biclausal and don't obey this restriction, see the well-formed example (24):

- (24) [*to*, [<sub>CP-I</sub> *čto Vase uezžjat'*] *bylo jasno Vase*].  
 [That<sub>Det:Sg:N</sub>, [Vasja<sub>Dat</sub> leave<sub>Inf</sub> be<sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N</sub> clear<sub>Pred</sub> Vasja<sub>Dat</sub>]  
 ‘That **Vasja** had to leave, was clear **to Vasja**’, lit. ‘[that [<sub>CP-I</sub> that **for Vasja** to leave] was clear **to Vasja**’.

Thus, “strong” Dative subjects of DIS can even delete co-referent NPs in a DIS-VP-clause: this feature is not attested with other types of Russian subjects. To sum up this section: both structural and semantic considerations indicate that Russian DPS and Russian DIS are two different sentence patterns, requiring grammatical subjects of different type. There are no independent reasons to unify them, as fig.3 shows:

	DIS	DPS
Minimal pattern	$[N_{dat} \text{ — } V_{inf}]$	$[N_{dat} \text{ — } V_{link} \text{ — } Pred]$
Expanded pattern	$[N_{dat} \text{ — } Pred \text{ — } V_{inf}]$	$[N_{dat} \text{ — } V_{link} \text{ — } Pred] \text{ — } V_{inf}$
{+ Animate}	No	Yes
Semantic Role (CASE role) of the subject	Modal subject (specified as subject of modal alethic predicates)	Experiencer
Interference with clausal subjects (CPs)	No	Yes
Volume	Open Class	150-160 nominal predicatives

<sup>14</sup> This slot is absent in another subclass of predicatives, cf. *tošno* ‘nauseous’, *veselo* ‘merry’: *mne tošno* ‘I am sick’, *mne veselo* ‘I am enjoying myself’, but \**tošno, čto P* ‘nauseous/sick that P’, \**veselo čto P* ‘merry, that P’.

**Fig 3:** Two types of Dative Structures in Russian

The last section of the paper is devoted to a unique syntactic feature of Dative subjects of DPS, namely, their capacity to interfere with clausal subjects and semi-expletive pronouns. This issue can be checked only on those predicatives, which have a slot for a CP-complement, cf. *protivno* ‘disgusting’, *smešno* ‘funny’: *mne protivno* ‘I find it disgusting’, lit. ‘to-me disgusting’ ~ *protivno*, [čto P] ‘It is disgusting [that P]’, lit. ‘disgusting [that P]’, *mne smešno* ‘funny’ ‘I find it funny’, lit. ‘to-me funny’ ~ *smešno*, [čto P] ‘It is funny [that P]’, lit. ‘funny [that P]’. Another group of Russian lexical predicatives do not take CP-complements, cf. *tošno* ‘nauseous’, *veselo* ‘merry’: *mne tošno*, ‘I feel sick’ ~ \**tošno*, [čto P] ‘It is sick [that P]’, \**veselo*, [čto P] ‘merry, [that P]’.

### 3. Semi-expletive pronouns and weak grammatical subjects in Russian

Dative subjects of DPS interfere both with clausal subjects and with semi-expletive *èto*. Russian grammatical tradition says fairly little about the nature of this interference. Apresyan (Apresyan 1985, 304) mentions that some Russian predicatives both form DPS clauses and have valency slots for CPs, IPs and *èto*, cf. *protivno*, [čto P] ‘(it) is disgusting [that P]’ ~ *èto protivno* ‘It is disgusting’. He calls such predicatives ‘personal’ i.e. displaying some kind of person-and-number agreement and claims that CPs/ IPs/ *èto* take the vacant subject position. It is unclear whether he ascribes the feature [+ Syntactic Nominative Case] to Russian CPs/IPs/ *èto* when they act as subjects of Russian predicatives, but from his description follows that he treats DPS clauses as impersonal only if they lack expressions, which he believes are agreement controllers<sup>15</sup>. It can be added that semi-expletive *èto* (genetically — Nom/Acc:Sg of the demonstrative pronoun *ètot/èta/èto/ èti*) shows up in the same group of predicatives, which have a CP-slot. In configurations like ...*èto* ... [CP] and [CP] ... *èto* unstressed *èto* is a correlative pronoun, which refers to the content of CP, both when it precedes CP or follows it. There also exists stressed ÈTO which is a pronoun with different syntactic properties. The main problem with unstressed *èto* is that *èto* is nowhere obligatory in the subject position: it freely correlates with zero subjects (or *pro*), cf. Ø<sub>SUB</sub> -*bylo protivno*, lit. ‘it was disgusting’ ~ Èto *bylo protivno*. ‘the same’. Nearly the same variation is found in structures, where Rus. *èto* acts as a copula: in most contexts, where copular *èto* is possible in the present tense indicative, zero copula ‘BE’ can be used as well, see fig. 4.

	Grammatical Subject	Copula
<i>Èto</i> -forms	(25) Èto <i>bylo protivno</i> . Èto <sub>be</sub> <sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N</sub> disgusting <sub>Pred</sub> ‘It was disgusting’.	(27) <i>Vasja èto zanuda</i> . Vasja <sub>Nom:Sg:M</sub> èto <sub>Aux:Pres</sub> bore <sub>Nom:Sg:M/F</sub> ‘Vasja is a bore’.
Zero forms	(26) Ø <sub>SUB</sub> <i>bylo protivno</i> . Èto <sub>be</sub> <sub>Aux:Pret:3Sg:N</sub> disgusting <sub>Pred</sub> ‘It was disgusting’.	(28) <i>Vasja Ø-BE-AUX<sub>Present-Tense</sub> zanuda</i> . Vasja <sub>Nom:Sg:M</sub> bore <sub>Nom:Sg:M/F</sub> ‘Vasja is a bore’. <sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Modern Russian does not have Nominative Objects: the latter are characteristic of e.g. Old Russian and Modern Icelandic. NPs/DPs with overt morphological Nominative Case are not permitted in Russian DPS clauses.

<sup>16</sup> It can be maintained that (27) and (28) involve slightly different pragmatic effects: example (27) with overt copular *èto* sounds more emphatic than (28) with a zero BE-copula. Examples (25) and (26) seem to be free variants. An anonymous reviewer correctly points out that in certain contexts, especially with metaphoric identity, cf. *Stil’ - ??(èto) čelovek* ‘Style is the man’ and in copular structures with adverbs, cf. *Očered’ - \*(èto) nadolgo* ‘A queue is for a long time’ *èto* is obligatory and does not alternate with a zero BE-copula.

**Fig4:** Alternation of Russian *èto* with zero forms

Unlike English *it*, German *es*, unstressed *èto* is not a formal subject, since Russian both lacks verbs, which cannot be construed without *èto* (cf. Eng. *it rains*, *it snows*) and syntactic configurations, where *èto* were not replaceable with zero forms. I nevertheless argue that *èto* is weak grammatical subject and propose the following test for subjecthood:

(ii) If a lexical predicative takes a weak Dative Subject, it cannot be used both with a CP and semi-expletive *èto* simultaneously.

This prediction is borne out in codified Russian<sup>17</sup>. Structures like [*Èto* — Pred [<sub>CP</sub> *čto* P]] are well-formed, irrespective of the fact whether CP follows the main clause, see (29a) or extraposes, see (29b). If *èto* is dropped, we get well-formed structures, too: see (30a) and (30b). A plausible explanation is that (29a) and (29b) have a clausal subject [<sub>CP</sub> *čto* P], while *èto* is not in an argument position: since unstressed *èto* is a topical element correlating with CP, this non-argument position available for *èto* may be tentatively called Spec TopicP or Spec Ante-FocusP. However, in the presence of a Dative Subject *èto* is completely excluded: the structure [Dative—*Èto* — Pred [<sub>CP</sub> *čto* P]] is bad, see (31) and (32).

- (29) a. *Èto<sub>i</sub> grustno*, [<sub>CP</sub> *čto ona opazdyvaet*]<sub>i</sub>.  
*Èto<sub>i</sub> sad<sub>Pred</sub>* [that she<sub>Nom:3Sg:F</sub> come.late<sub>Pres:3Sg</sub>]<sub>i</sub>  
 ‘It is sad that she comes late’.
- b. [<sub>CP</sub> *Čto ona opazdyvaet*]<sub>i</sub>, *èto<sub>i</sub> grustno*.  
 [that she<sub>Nom:3Sg:F</sub> come.late<sub>Pres:3Sg</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *èto<sub>i</sub> sad<sub>Pred</sub>*  
 ‘that she comes late is sad’.
- (30) a.  $\emptyset$  *grustno*, [<sub>CP</sub> *čto ona opazdyvaet*].  
 $\emptyset$  *sad<sub>Pred</sub>* [that she<sub>Nom:3Sg:F</sub> come.late<sub>Pres:3Sg</sub>]  
 ‘It is sad that she comes late’.
- b. [<sub>CP</sub> *Čto ona opazdyvaet*],  $\emptyset$  *grustno*.  
 [that she<sub>Nom:3Sg:F</sub> come.late<sub>Pres:3Sg</sub>]  $\emptyset$  *sad<sub>Pred</sub>*  
 ‘that she comes late is sad’.
- (31) a. \**Èto<sub>i</sub> mne grustno*, [*čto ona opazdyvaet*]<sub>i</sub>.  
*èto<sub>i</sub> Dat:1Sg sad<sub>Pred</sub>* [that she<sub>Nom:3Sg:F</sub> come.late<sub>Pres:3Sg</sub>]<sub>i</sub>
- b. \*[[*čto ona opazdyvaet*]<sub>i</sub> *èto<sub>i</sub> mne grustno*.  
 [that she<sub>Nom:3Sg:F</sub> come.late<sub>Pres:3Sg</sub>]<sub>i</sub> *èto<sub>i</sub> I<sub>Dat:1Sg</sub> sad<sub>Pred</sub>*

Remarkably, one may drop either *èto* or *that*-clause, if a Dative argument is present: both *mne èto grustno* ‘It is sad **to-me**’ and *mne grustno, čto ona opazdyvaet* lit. ‘**to-me** sad that P’ are well-formed. This falsifies Apresyan’s claim that Russian predicatives always take clausal

<sup>17</sup> An anonymous reviewer raises some doubts whether this distribution holds in oral speech and provides colloquial examples like *Mne èto i udivitel’no*, [<sub>CP</sub> *čto vy ne ponimaete*] ‘I am astonished exactly because you don’t understand’, where *èto* is unstressed. If one accepts such sentences, codified and colloquial Russian must be described as systems with different parameters, as weak dative subjects are concerned. The nature of this variation is not entirely clear. One possible explanation is that in colloquial Russian semi-expletive *èto* stands higher (or weak datives stand lower) in the subject hierarchy than in codified Russian. An alternative explanation is that the expletive and the CP can form one constituent [*èto* [CP]] in colloquial, but not in codified Russian. In any case, I agree with the reviewer that colloquial examples of this kind cannot be an effect of unplanned speech and must be explained in syntactic terms.

complements or *èto* as grammatical subjects. We arrive at the opposite conclusion: in Russian CPs act as subjects only if Dative Subjects are absent; semi-expletive pronouns have subject properties only in structures where neither (weak) Dative Subject nor CP is present.

The generalization (ii) cannot be challenged by examples like *ÈTO mne grustno, èto on opazdyvaet*, where capitalized *ÈTO* has strong emphatic stress: this *ÈTO* is a non-correlative emphatic pronoun. There are reasons to treat emphatic *ÈTO* and semi-expletive *èto* as homonyms, along the same lines semi-expletive *èto* and copular *èto* have been treated in the previous research.

We have shown that ‘weak’ i.e. interfering grammatical subjects constitute a hierarchal system: Dative subjects have a priority over CP-subjects, and CP-subjects have a priority over *èto*. That means that if some syntactic structure leaves a choice of **two** subject-like expressions, a subject of higher rank will be chosen. We have also shown that structures with **three** interfering weak subjects are absent from Russian grammar, hence the ungrammaticality of (31a) and (31b). These results urge us to postulate a functional hierarchy of grammatical subjects, which accounts for all subject-like expressions discussed in this paper, both ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ subjects. See fig. 5 below:

(iii) Nominative Subjects > Zero pronouns in the nominative case > Strong Dative Subjects > Weak Dative Subjects > Clausal subjects > Semi-expletive subjects.						
	Strong subjects			Weak Subjects		
	Overt Nominative subjects	Zero subject pronouns	Strong Dative subjects	Weak Dative Subjects	Clausal subjects	Semi-expletive <i>èmo</i>
Case	+ Nom	+ Nom	+ Dat2=Structural	+ Dat1=Lexical	-	- (??Nom)
Semantic role	Not specified	+Agent	+ Modal Subject	+ Experiencer	-	-
+ Finite	Not specified	Yes	No	Yes	Not specified	Yes
Referential type	Not specified	+ Generic	Not specified	+ Actual	-	+ Topical
+ Anaphoric	Not specified	No	Not specified	Not specified	-	Yes

**Fig 5:** Functional hierarchy of grammatical subjects in Russian

I am grateful to the anonymous FDSL-7 reviewer who has offered an elegant alternative explanation in terms of Merge. One may reinterpret (ii) in the following way:

- 1) CP can be merged internal to VP, in which case Dative subject (Spec of non-agreeing TP) is possible: therefore, both *grustno, èto P* and *mne grustno, èto P* are grammatical.
- 2) CP can be merged as subject, in which case no Dative subject is possible. At the same time CP can be merged as subject only if weak Dative subject is absent.
- 3) If CP merged as subject extraposes, semi-expletive *èto* is possible.
- 4) Stressed non-correlative *ÈTO* is not in SpecTP, but in Spec of some other projection, linked with Topic-Focus bi-partition. *ÈTO* is not in SpecTP and does not interfere with weak Dative subject.

The only problem with this reinterpretation is that Dative subject blocks the constituent *èto* + [CP] both when CP is preposed and when it is postposed: \* *èto mne grustno*, [*čto P*], \*[ *čto CP*], *èto mne grustno*. This indicates that in addition to parametric approach to Merge, we need some kind of Movement/Raising analysis, which will explain why Dative arguments of DPS have a priority over other types of 'weak subjects'.

## References

- Apresjan Yu.D. (1985). Sintaksičeskie Priznaki Leksem. *Russian Linguistics*, vol. 9. N. 2-3, 280-315.
- Babby L. H. and S.Franks (1998). The Syntax of Adverbial Participles in Russian Revisited. *Slavic and East European Journal* 42.3, 117-149.
- Bonč-Osmolovskaya A. (2003). *Konstrukcii s dativnym subjektom v russkom jazyke*. Phd dissertation. Moscow: MGU.
- Cimmerling, A. (1997). Semantika Russkih Predikativov s Final'ju –o. *Formale Slavistik /U*. Junghanns, G.Zybatow, eds., 513-522. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert.
- Faarlund J.T. (2001). The Notion of Oblique Subject and its Status in the History of Icelandic. *Grammatical Relations in Change / J.T.Faarlund (ed)*. Benjamins, 101-135.
- Franks, S. (1995). *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. Oxford: OUP.
- Grišina N.I. (2002). *Dativnye predloženiya v paradigmatičeskom aspekte*. Moscow.
- Keenan E.L. (1976). Towards a Universal Definition of "Subject". *Subject and topic / Ed. Ch. Li*, New York, 1976, 303 -333.
- Kibrik A.E. (1997) Beyond Subject and Object: Toward a Comprehensive Relational Typology. *Linguistic Typology / Frans Plank, ed*. Vol. 1, 279-346.
- Kondrashova N. (2007). The Source of Modality in Russian Dative-Infinitive Structures. SLS-2 Meeting, Berlin, August 22-26, 2007.
- Kozinskij I.Š. (1983) *O Kategorii "Podležaščee" v Russkom Jazyke*. Institut Russkogo Yazyka AN SSSR, Problemnaja Gruppa po Eksperimental'noj i prikladnoj lingvistike. Predvaritel'nye publikacii, vyp. 156. M.
- Mel'čuk, I. (1995). Syntactic, or Lexical Zero in Natural Language. *The Russian Language in the Meaning-Text Perspective*,. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. Sonderband 39. Moskau-Wien, 169-205.
- Moore, J. and D. Perlmutter (2000). What Does it Take to Be a Dative Subject? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18, 373-416.
- Partee B.H. (1979). Subject and Object in Modern English. (Outstanding dissertations in linguistics). N.Y & London: Garland P.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. (2002). To be an Oblique Subject: Russian vs. Icelandic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20, 691-724.
- Schoorlemmer, M. (1994). Dative Subjects in Russian. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, vol. 1 /J.Toman (ed.), 249-270. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Szucsic, L. (2007). Dative Experiencer-like NPs and Subjecthood in Slavonic Languages. BASEES Conference 31 March- 2 April 2007.
- Švedova et alii (1982). Grammatika russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Tom II / N.Yu.Švedova. Moscow, 1982.
- Testeleť, Y.G. (2001). Vvedenie v Obščij Sintaksis. M.:RGGU.
- Zimmerling, A.V. (1998). Istorija Odnog Polemiki. *Jazyk i Rečevaja Dejatel'nost'*. Vol. 1, 65-87.
- Zimmerling, A. (2007). Zero Lexemes and Derived Sentence Patterns. *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 69.