1. Introduction

(1) Semi-predicatives in Russian are a small class of lexical elements that have mixed adjectival and quantificational nature: *odin* (‘alone’), *sam* (‘by.oneself’), *vse* (‘all’) and *kazhdyj* (‘each’).

(2) When in the position of a secondary predicate in the sentence, i.e. adjoined to the VP, semi-predicatives can receive case as a result of agreement with their antecedent.

(a) Masha sidela odna. Masha. NOM sat alone. NOM

‘Masha was sitting alone.’

(b) Masha hochet pojti v les odna. Masha. NOM wants go.INF in forest alone. NOM

‘Masha wants to go to the forest alone.’

(3) Case patterns observed on semi-predicatives in the position of a secondary predicate in an infinitival clause suggest a possibility of a non-local case-assignment.

(4) Proposal:

(a) Secondary agreement in Russian is non-local: semi-predicative in the infinitival clause can agree in case with its ultimate antecedent, the NP in the matrix clause.

(b) Secondary agreement with the matrix clause antecedent necessarily requires simultaneous c-commanding and full control relationship between the matrix clause antecedent NP and PRO.

(c) When either one of those conditions is not met, the semi-predicative has to agree in case with its local antecedent –PRO, which bears Dative Case in Russian.

(d) The configuration where the matrix clause antecedent fully controls and c-commands the subject of the infinitive allows for the matrix verb create a chain with the subject position of the infinitival clause and override Dative Case characteristic for PRO in this position.

(e) Russian does not have default Nominative Case: previously observed phenomena can be explained by the proposed non-local secondary agreement.
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2. Data: Complement and Adjunct Infinitives

(5) In subject-controlled infinitival complements, semi-predicatives can only agree with the matrix clause antecedent NP.

(a) Masha 
Masha.NOM wants
hochet pojti v kino odna.
Masha.NOM wants go.INF in movies alone.NOM
'Masha wants to go to the movies alone.'

(b) Masha
Masha.NOM wants
hochet pojti v kino odnoi.
Masha.NOM wants go.INF in movies alone.DAT

(6) In object-controlled infinitival complements, semi-predicatives can agree either with the matrix clause antecedent NP, or with Dative PRO.

(a) My poprosili Misha 
We.NOM asked Misha.ACC
poiti v kino odnomu / odnogo.
go.INF to movies alone.DAT / alone.ACC
'We asked Misha to go to the movies alone.'

(7) All adjunct infinitival clauses are subject controlled; and semi-predicatives can agree either with the matrix clause antecedent NP, or with Dative PRO.

(a) Masha priehala, chtoby sdelat' vs'e sama / samoi.
Masha.NOM came so.that do.INF everything self.NOM / DAT
'Masha came to do everything by herself.'

3. Adjunct Infinitives: Non-local Case-Assignment, Not Default Nominative

(8) Remarkably, in adjunct infinitival clauses semi-predicative can agree with the subject of the matrix clause in case in the presence of an overt complementizer.

(a) Masha priehala, [CP chtoby sdelat' vs'e sama / samoi].
Masha.NOM came so.that do.INF everything self.NOM / DAT
'Masha came to do everything by herself.'

(9) Traditionally, this has been interpreted as default Nominative Case, since no local Nominative antecedent was available in the structure (Babby 2009; Kozinsky 1983).

(10) However, data with quirky Dative subject argues against default Nominative: Nominative on semi-predicatives become ungrammatical.

(a) Masha priehala, chtoby sdelat' vse samoii / *sama.
Masha.DAT want.NEUT come.INF so.that do.INF all self.DAT / *NOM
'Masha wanted to come in order to do everything by herself.'

(11) The contrast between (10)(a) and (10)(b) is a strong support for the claim that the source of Nominative case on the semi-predicative is the matrix NP subject.
Consequently, taking into account the non-reduced biclausal structure, I use this data as evidence for the possibility of a non-local case assignment on secondary predicates in the infinitival clause.

The notion of default Nominative in Russian has also been referred to in connection with certain comparative constructions (Babby 2009; Glovinskaya 1996).

(a) Nuzhny ljudy [s kotorymi mozhno
Needed people.NOM.PL [cp with which.PL possible
[razgovarivat’ kak hozjain / hozjainu]]
[IP PRO DAT speak.INF as boss.NOM.SG/DAT.SG]]

‘People are needed with whom it is possible to speak as a boss would.’

I propose to eliminate the notion of default Nominative completely: the nominative on the standard of comparison in (13)(a) is assigned by the elided finite T head.

(a) ... [razgovarivat’ kak govoril [by hozjain / hozjainu]]
... [IP PRO DAT speak.INF as spoke SUBJ boss.NOM/DAT]]
... ‘to speak as the boss would speak’

Summing up: semi-predicative in a position of a secondary predicate in the adjunct infinitival clause with an overt complementizer can receive their case non-locally from the matrix clause antecedent.

4. Non-Local Secondary Agreement: Evidence from Icelandic

Sigurdsson (2002) observes similar variation in case assignment on Icelandic complement infinitives. NB: in Icelandic infinitives, PRO is marked for Nominative Case.

(a) NOM – [PRO – NOM]:
Hún, vonaðist til [að PRO1 verða
she(N.FSG) hoped for to. PRO(N) be
fyrst/*fyrsta/*fyrstri]
first(N.FSG/A.FSG/D.FSG)

She hoped to be number one.

(b) ACC – [PRO – NOM/ACC]:
Hana, lægaði til [að PRO1 verða fyrst/*fyrsta/*fyrstri]
her(A.FSG) longed for to PRO(N) be first(N.FSG/A.FSG/D.FSG)

She wanted to be number one.
I propose that Russian secondary predicate agreement is analogous to that of Icelandic: it crosses predication boundaries, establishing agreement between the matrix clause antecedent and a remote fully co-indexed c-commanded adjective or semi-predicative (Sigurđsson 2002).

5. Complement Infinitives: C-Command and Full Control

Subject vs. object control: recall the different case assignment pattern.

(a) Masha hochet pojti v kino odna.
   Masha.NOM wants go.INF in movies alone.NOM
   ‘Masha wants to go to the movies alone.’

(b) *Masha hochet pojti v kino odnoi.
   Masha.NOM wants go.INF in movies alone.DAT

(c) My poprosili Mishu poiti v kino odnomu / odnogo.
   We.NOM asked Misha.ACC go.INF to movies alone.DAT / alone.ACC
   ‘We asked Misha to go to the movies alone.’

Case agreement between the subject of the matrix clause and the semi-predicative in the controlled infinitival clause has been traditionally interpreted as evidence for reduced structure of such sentences (Babby 2009).

Adjunct infinitives have provided us with evidence for the possibility of non-local case assignment, so Babby’s argument for reduced clausal structure is no longer relevant.

However, the crucial piece of evidence is the absence of Dative Case in subject-controlled infinitive (18)(b).

I propose that in such cases Dative PRO is not present in the structure.
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(23) **Passivization:** when passivized, semi-predicatives in subject-controlled infinitives can only be assigned Dative Case, even if the agent is overtly present in the matrix clause.

(a) My reshili zaplatit’ za korovu vse vmeste.
    we.NOM decided pay.INF for cow.ACC all.NOM together
    ‘We decided to pay for the cow all together.’

(b) Za korovu bylo resheno zaplatit’ vsem/*vse vmeste.
    For cow was decide.PART pay.INF all.DAT/*NOM together
    ‘It was decided to pay for a cow all together.’

(c) Nami bylo resheno zaplatit’ za korovu vsem vmeste.
    we.INSTR was decide.pay.INF for cow.ACC all.DAT/*INST/*NOM
    ‘It was decided by us to pay for the cow all together.’

(24) As soon as there’s no c-commanding relationship between the matrix antecedent NP and the subject of the infinitive, Dative PRO is the source of case on the semi-predicative.

(25) **Partial Control:** (Landau 2003) suggests that partial control constructions are considered to be strong evidence for the presence of PRO in the structure, since otherwise there is no possibility to interpret the sentence correctly.

(a) Masha hotela pojti na prazdnik odna.
    Masha.NOM wanted go.INF to party alone.NOM
    ‘Masha wanted to go the party alone.’

(b) *Masha hotela pojti na prazdnik odnoi.
    Masha.NOM wanted go.INF to party self.DAT

(c) Masha hotela pojti na prazdnik vsem vmeste.
    Masha.NOM wanted [PRODAT/I go.INF to party all.DAT_I together]
    ‘Masha wanted to go to the party all together.’

(d) *Masha hotela pojti na prazdnik vse vmeste.
    Masha.NOM wanted [PRODAT/I go.INF to party all.NOM_I together]
    ‘Masha wanted to bake the pie all together.’

(26) The data above shows that in case of partial control, the semi-predicative element has to be Dative and not Nominative; in case of full subject control Nominative is obligatory, Dative is not allowed.

(27) I propose that a configuration where there is a simultaneous c-commanding and full control relationship between the matrix subject and infinitival Spec TP, the matrix NP forms a chain with the subject of the infinitive. Dative PRO does not get realized.
(28) Mechanism: Movement Theory of Control (Hornstein 1999) vs. Theta Role Percolation (Babby 2009).

(a) **Masha** hotela [pojti na prazdnik *odna*]
Masha.NOM wanted [IP t1 go.INF to party alone.NOM]
‘Masha wanted to go the party alone.’

(b) **Masha** hotela [pojti na prazdnik *odna*]
Masha.NOM wanted [IP<it> go.INF to party alone.NOM]
‘Masha wanted to go the party alone.’

(29) Movement Theory of Control: In obligatory control environments PRO behaves like an NP-trace.

(30) Theta Role Percolation: the infinitival does not have a subject NP, V’s delinked external theta-role passes up to the IP’s root node.

6. Conclusions

(31) Secondary agreement in Russian, as in Icelandic, can be non-local: semi-predicative in adjunct infinitival clause can agree in case with its ultimate antecedent, the NP in the matrix clause.

(32) Russian does not have default Nominative Case: previously observed phenomena can be explained by the proposed non-local secondary agreement.

(33) Secondary agreement with the matrix clause antecedent necessarily requires simultaneous c-commanding and full control relationship between the matrix clause antecedent NP and PRO.

(34) When either one of those conditions is not met, the semi-predicative has to agree in case with its local antecedent – PRO, which bears Dative Case in Russian.

(35) The configuration where the matrix clause antecedent fully controls and c-commands the subject of the infinitive allows for the matrix verb create a chain with the subject position of the infinitival clause, either via the Movement Theory of Control mechanism, or via percolation of the infinitive’s external theta-role. Thus, Dative Case PRO characteristic for this position is overridden.
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