



account for some facts than the more traditional functional head based approaches to case. They can also be used to evaluate syntactic vs. postsyntactic approaches to case.

### **Selected references**

- Fleisher, N. 2006. Russian Dative Subjects, Case, and Control. Ms., University of California, Berkeley.
- Jung, H. 2009. Null Prepositional Complementizers and the Dative of Obligation in Russian. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 17*, 64-80. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Marantz, A. 1991. Case and Licensing. In G. Westphal, B. Ao, and H.-R. Chae, eds., *Proceedings of ESCOL 91*, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, Cornell Linguistics Club: 234–253.
- Marantz, A. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In Sam A. Mchombo, ed., *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar 1*, 113–151. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Moore, J. and D. M. Perlmutter. 2000. What Does It Take to Be a Dative Subject? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 373–416.
- Pylkkanen, L. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Sigurðsson, H. Á. 2008. The case of PRO. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26: 403–450.
- Tsedryk, E. 2017. Dative-Infinitive Constructions in Russian: Are They Really Biclausal? *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 25*. Edited by Wayles Browne, Miloje Despic, Naomi Enzina, Simone Harmath-de Lemos, Robin Karlin, and Draga Zec. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.