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Abstract

There is abundant evidence cross-linguistically that certain syntactic phenomena that have been traditionally analyzed as clause-bounded, are subject to clausal transparency effects when considered within the boundaries of a non-finite clause. Specifically, in Russian the semi-predicative in the secondary predicate position of an infinitival clause can agree in case with either the ultimate matrix clause antecedent NP or the local PRO subject of the infinitival. This paper examines the structural properties of Russian infinitival clauses and shows that all Russian non-finite clauses have non-reduced clausal structure, which still allows for the abovementioned transparency effects. The analysis is based on the examination of the case properties of the PRO subject of the infinitival clause in their relation to various characteristics of the infinitival clause itself including its structural position vis-à-vis the matrix verb and the type of control relationship between the matrix antecedent and the PRO.

1. Introduction

In the past years a number of proposals have been suggested to explain why certain syntactic phenomena that have been traditionally analyzed as clause-bounded (e.g., clitic climbing, quantifier climbing, scrambling, predicative agreement, etc.) in some languages appear to be able to overcome at least one clausal boundary when the complement of the matrix verb is non-finite. These phenomena have been widely studied on the basis of the data from a number of Romance languages (including Italian and Spanish), as well as German and many others, where those clause transparency effects are observed when the matrix verb is either a modal, an aspectual or a motion verb (Burzio 1981; Burzio 1986; Cinque 2002; Cinque 2006; Rizzi 1978; Wurmbrand 2001; 2004).

The proposed analyses capture different theoretical aspects related to restructuring, however, only very few of them aim at answering questions that the very existence of such phenomenon raises: particularly, why should restructuring exist at all and why should it be limited only to specific verb classes listed above. Indeed, the fact that clitic/quantifier climbing is observed in a number of languages with the more or less the same set of matrix verbs suggests that this phenomenon is in some way universal and should follow from some general property of universal grammar (Cinque 2006).

At the same time, it has been also argued that not all languages allow for restructuring infinitivals. Particularly, this paper provides evidence that in Russian the verbs (including modals, aspectuals and motion verbs) reveal no variation in terms of their syntactic behavior with respect to the possible structural type of non-
finite complement that they select for. In other words, all the verbs display similar syntactic patterns; and such patterns can be successfully accounted for by claiming that the non-finite complements are non-restructured, i.e. they have a non-reduced CP-over-IP structure at all times.

Specifically, this paper will present arguments to support the following proposals:

1. Uniformity of the Structure:
   Russian does not allow for infinitival restructuring. All the non-finite clauses have non-reduced CP-over-TP structure regardless of the semantic class of the matrix verb. Specifically, all the infinitival clauses in Russian include a CP projection with a C head associated with a [+Dative] case feature; and in all the cases the TP has a PRO subject projected in its specifier position.

2. Strong phases and Weaker PIC:
   Russian CPs, both finite and non-finite, are strong phases, in accordance with the universal claim made in Chomsky (2000; 2001). Further, as strong phases, they are subject to the weaker version of the Phase-Impenetrability Condition (PIC), as proposed in Chomsky (2001).

3. Case Assignment:
   Since a [-Tense] C head has a [+Dative] case feature, it assigns Dative Case structurally to the PRO subject of the infinitival clause. In the case of a possible conflict of roles associated with case assignment, specifically, when the [-Tense] C head is in the case-receiving complement position of a [+Accusative] matrix verb, its [+Dative] case-assigning feature is blocked. As a result, the [-Tense] C head can no longer be a case assigner for the PRO; and the PRO has to receive case from its c-commanding matrix clause antecedent.

4. Case Agreement:
   Case agreement is only licensed when the antecedent and the case-receiving element are simultaneously found in the required structural and semantic relationship: specifically, there has to be a c-commanding relationship and full co-indexation between them.

As this paper shows, the current proposal is supported by the abundant evidence coming from case marking observed on semi-predicative elements embedded in the infinitival clauses. Semi-predicatives in Russian are a very limited class of lexical elements that have both adjectival and quantificational properties. The mixed
nature of semi-predicatives is reflected in their peculiar syntactic behavior, where they function differently from both adjectives and quantifiers.

According to Madariaga (2006), semi-predicatives are the head of a QP inserted as an apposition adjoined to either V’/Asp’ or to Pred’. It is their nature as quantifiers that prevents them from being selected by a Predication head, i.e. placed in the complement position of the PredP, the usual place for regular predicatives NPs and APs, where they receive Instrumental Case from the head Pred [+Instr]. Thus, unlike regular NP and AP predicatives, semi-predicatives cannot receive Instrumental Case and must undergo a different mechanism of case assignment (Bailyn 1995; Bailyn & Citko 1998; Madariaga 2006).

In the data under consideration, the semi-predicatives in the secondary predicate position of a Russian infinitival clause show variation in their case assignment properties: they can either agree with their local antecedent, the PRO subject of the infinitival clause, or with their ultimate matrix clause antecedent, given the compliance with the Case agreement properties presented in (4) above.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the arguments for the non-reduced clausal structures in all the cases of non-finite clause complements and adjuncts in Russian. Specific subsections provide independent argumentation for the necessity of syntactic realization of both TP and CP projections, as well as for the presence of the PRO subject of the non-finite clause in the structure. Another subsection covers the crucial arguments regarding the compatibility of the restructuring approach with Russian infinitivals in general. Section 3 of the paper elaborates on the case-related details relevant to the proposed analysis, showing how the preservation of the non-reduced clausal structure does not interfere with the possibility of the agreement between the semi-predicative and its matrix clause antecedent NP, and why in some cases variation in this case assignment is observed. Section 4 concludes the current paper.

2. CP over IP: Evidence for Non-Reduced Clausal Structure

It has been a matter of extended debate whether infinitival clauses in Russian have reduced or full clausal structure. The suggested degree of possible structural reduction varied from functional restructuring (where the infinitive becomes the main predicate of the matrix clause, while the matrix verb is more of a functional/auxiliary head, and where the thematic properties are determined by the embedded predicate) to partially reduced but non-restructured infinitivals (where only the CP projection is missing, while the TP projection is realized without the PRO subject). In this section the evidence will be provided that neither of these proposals is acceptable for Russian. The data from the case marking observed on semi-predicatives conclusively supports the proposal that Russian infinitivals have
full clausal structure with both the CP and the TP and their heads projected and syntactically active.

2.1 Dative PRO and the Evidence for the TP Projection

As stated in (1) above, this paper argues for the uniformity of the structure of Russian infinitivals. Particularly, the approach adopted here is such that, unless the evidence suggests otherwise, I will take it that the structure of Russian non-finite clauses is uniform and non-reduced, and I will show that at no point in the analysis such evidence arises.

Just as syntactic structures are merged from the bottom to the top, in the same way I will first provide evidence for the presence of the TP projection in the structure of the Russian infinitival clause, and then move on further to provide support for the presence of the CP projection. In this section I will show that not only is the TP projected at all times with all semantic classes of matrix verbs, but it is also the case that its specifier position is not empty: the PRO subject of the infinitival is present in the structure and has a significant influence on the case assignment within the infinitival.

At this point it is important to take into account the fact that Russian allows Dative NPs to co-occur with infinitives (Bailyn 2011; Franks 1990; Madariaga 2006; Sigurdsson 2002). The supporting data for this claim comes from a number of different structural configurations including non-controlled infinitives (5), some instances of object-controlled infinitives (6), adverbial adjunct clauses (7) and some others.

(5) Poiti v les odnomu bylo glupo.
go.INF in forest alone.DAT was stupid
‘It was stupid to go into the forest alone.’

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

(7) Viktor priehal, chtoby vse uvidet’ samomu.
Viktor.NOM came so.that all see by.himself.DAT
‘Victor came in order to see everything with his own eyes.’

In the earlier principles and parameters literature the distribution of PRO was traditionally characterized by a null case approach (Boškovic 1995; 1997; Chomsky 1993; Chomsky & Lasnik 1993). However, evidence for case-marked PRO has been accumulating ever since. In particular, the case of PRO can be seen on predicative
elements in languages like Ancient Greek (Andrews 1971; Quicoli 1982), Icelandic (Sigurdsson 1991; 2002) and Russian (Babby 2009; Bailyn 2011; Comrie 1974; Franks 1990; Madariaga 2006).

This is exactly what is observed in the data presented in (5)-(7). There is no overt NP in the structure of those sentences that bears Dative case and could serve as a source of Dative for the semi-predicative in the secondary predicate position in the infinitival clause. In fact, the standard account is that the Dative case on the semi-predicative is the result of agreement with the covert subject of the non-finite clause: PRO in Russian can bear Dative case, which can be seen on the secondary predicate in the infinitival (Babby 2009; Babby 1987; Comrie 1974; Franks 1990; Greenberg & Franks 1991; Madariaga 2006; Sigurdsson 2002). This is also in full concordance with the Case agreement properties presented in (4) above: both the c-command relationship and full co-indexation are in place. Consequently, the structures for (5)-(7) should be represented as follows:

(8) Poiti v les odnomu bylo glupo.
TP PRO DAT go.INF in forest alone.DAT was stupid
'It was stupid to go into the forest alone.'

(9) My poprosili Mishu poiti v kino odnomu.
We.NOM asked Misha.ACC TP PRO DAT go.INF to movies alone.DAT
'We asked Misha to go to the movies alone.'

(10) Viktor priehal, chtoby vse uvidet’ samomu.
Viktor.NOM came [CP so.that TP PRO DAT all see by.self.DAT]
‘Victor came in order to see everything with his own eyes.’

This way, the Dative case on the semi-predicatives, as in (8)-(10), shows that the PRO subject of the non-finite clause has to be present in the structures where the semi-predicative is marked for Dative case without an overt Dative antecedent. This data provides evidence for the obligatory presence of the TP projection as well as its PRO subject in the structure, which can be summarized as follows:

(11) Dative PRO:
PRO subject of the infinitival is the source of the Dative case on the semi-predicative and has to be projected to serve as such. The agreement between the semi-predicative and the PRO is possible, given the c-commanding and the full co-indexation relationship between the two.

The particular syntactic configurations considered above were a non-controlled infinitival (8), an object-control infinitival complement (9) and a subject-controlled infinitival adjunct (10). Interestingly, with the last two types it is not always the case that the semi-predicative displays the agreement in the Dative case. Data in (12)-
(15) below presents the structures where the semi-predicative displays case agreement with its matrix clause antecedent. This can be observed in complement infinitives (subject-controlled (12)-(13) and object-controlled (14)), as well as in adjunct infinitives (15). Remarkably, different patterns of case assignment variation are observed in each of these distinct syntactic environments.

In subject-controlled infinitival complements, semi-predicatives can only agree with the matrix clause antecedent NP. Agreement with the Dative PRO is not a grammatical option in this structure.

(12) **Masha**  
    wants  
    go.INF  
    in movies  
    **odna**.  

'Masha wants to go to the movies alone.'

(13) * **Masha**  
    wants  
    go.INF  
    in movies  
    **odnoi**.  

In object-controlled infinitival complements, semi-predicatives show free variation in terms of their case: they can agree either with the matrix clause antecedent NP, or with the Dative PRO subject of the infinitival clause.

(14) **We.** asked  
    Misha.  
    go.INF  
    to movies  
    **odnomu / odnogo**.  

'We asked Misha to go to the movies alone.'

As for adjunct infinitival clauses, it is important to keep in mind that they can only be subject-controlled, i.e. the PRO subject of the infinitive can only be co-referential with the subject of the matrix clause. At the same time, the case patterns observed on semi-predicatives in this syntactic configuration are not parallel to those of subject-controlled complement infinitives (12)-(13). In adjunct infinitivals semi-predicatives can agree either with the matrix clause antecedent NP, or with the Dative PRO, just as in the case of an object-control infinitival complement.

(15) **Masha**  
    came  
    so.that  
    do.INF  
    everything  
    **sama / samoi**.  

'Masha came to do everything by herself.'

Case agreement between the subject of the matrix clause and the semi-predicative in the controlled infinitival clause has been previously interpreted as the evidence for reduced structure of such sentences. As suggested in Babby (2009), obligatory Nominative case agreement between the matrix subject and **odin** 'alone' or **sam** 'by.himself' demonstrates that the correct structure for subject-control sentences like (12) is such that it includes neither a CP projection, nor a PRO (Babby 2009).

More specifically, Babby (2009) argues that in Russian infinitival complements are not all full infinitival clauses. Babby claims that the complement and adjunct
infinitives can project to syntax in two different syntactic forms: (i) the infinitive s(mall) clause in (16), where V’s external theta-role i is assigned to its dedicated (c-selected) dative subject nP in Spec InfP, which is canonically null (headed by PROi), when InfP is controlled; (ii) the infinitive s(secondary)-predicate in (17), where, in the absence of a subject nP, V’s delinked external theta-role i passes up to the InfP’s root node, creating an InfPi s-predicate.

(16) Infinitive s-clause

(17) Infinitive s-predicate

Thus, for Russian subject-controlled sentences like (12), Babby suggests the structure presented in (17), i.e. the infinitival secondary predicate that has no CP projection and no subject. The matrix clause subject NP in such a configuration then becomes the head of a TBC (theta binding chain) in which the semi-predicate is V-bound (Babby 2009).

In fact, what is missing from this proposal is the reasoning for the variation in case assignment observed in object-control non-finite complements and in subject-control adjuncts. Specifically, it is not clear why presumably subject-control matrix verbs only take reduced infinitival complements, but allow for non-restructured adjuncts, while object-control matrix verbs can take both reduced and non-reduced complements. Thus, this proposal appears to be data-driven: it suggests that, whenever the Dative case is observed on the semi-predicative, the structure of the infinitival is CP-over-IP and the PRO is projected, while, when the Dative case is not a grammatical option, the non-finite complement has a reduced clausal structure and its subject is not projected. Clearly, this logic lacks explanatory and predictive power.
As I have stated it earlier, my goal in this paper is to avoid postulating structure variability unless it is strongly suggested by the observed syntactic behavior. This section has shown that Dative case on the semi-predicatives observed in non-controlled infinitivals, object control infinitival complements and infinitival adjuncts is the result of the case agreement between the semi-predicative and the PRO subject of the infinitival, for this very reason PRO and the TP projection have to be present in the structure to serve as a source of Dative case for the semi-predicative. I will further show that the observed variation in case assignment is fully compatible with the proposal regarding the uniformity of the infinitival structure (1).

2.2 Non-reduced Structures in Passives and Partial Control

Further support for the uniform structure of non-finite clauses in Russian comes from the case-assignment patterns observed in passive voice constructions and in partial control infinitivals. As has been shown by the contrast between (12) and (13) above, in subject control sentences the only grammatical option for the semi-predicative is to agree with its matrix clause Nominative antecedent; and Dative is ungrammatical. However, when sentences with subject control are passivized, semi-predicatives in the infinitivals can only be assigned Dative Case: cf. (18) and (19).

(18) My reshili zaplatit' za korovu vse/*vsem vimeste.
we.NOM decided pay.INF for cow.ACC all.NOM/*DAT together
'We decided to pay for the cow all together.'

(19) Za korovu bylo resheno zaplatit' vsem/*vse vimeste.
For cow was decide.PART pay.INF all.DAT/*NOM together
'It was decided [to pay for a cow all together].' 

Thus, in the active subject control sentence Nominative is the only grammatical option, as shown in (12) and (18), while in a passivized sentence with the same matrix verb and the same infinitival complement grammatical judgments are reversed: Nominative is unacceptable, while Dative turns out to be the only grammatical option (19).

Similar case assignment patterns are observed in sentences with Partial Control, which is attested whenever the reference of the PRO need not be exhausted by the reference of the controller. Such cases are perfectly natural when the speaker has some salient group in mind. At the same time, Exhaustive Control is attested whenever the controller and the lower agent must be referentially identical. Both Partial Control and Exhaustive Control are instances of obligatory control and in other respects show similar characteristics such as: the controller must be local, cannot be arbitrary, PRO is interpreted de se, etc. (Landau 2003; 2004)

First of all, according to multiple publications by Landau (2000; 2003; 2004; 2006), the very possibility of partially controlled infinitival clauses with certain matrix
verbs presents strong evidence for the presence of PRO in such structures, since otherwise it is rather problematic to interpret the sentence correctly with the meaning intended by the speaker. Thus, the fact that Russian allows for Partial Control with a number of subject control matrix verbs provides additional support to the claim that such infinitivals have non-reduced clausal structure that at least includes a TP projection and a PRO. It should be specifically noted here that such subject control matrix verbs that allow for Partial Control still only allow for the Nominative case on the semi-predicative in the case of Exhaustive control; and yet PRO has to be present in the structure. The crucial contrasts are presented below in (20)-(23): Exhaustive Control is shown by fully matching \(i\) co-indexation, while Partial Control is indicated by \(i/I\) indices.

(20) **Reb’ata** hoteli pojti na prazdnik vse v mestे.
Guys.NOM\(_i\) wanted go.INF to party all.NOM\(_i\) together
‘The guys wanted to go the party all together.’

(21) * **Reb’ata** hoteli pojti na prazdnik vsem v mestе.
Guys.NOM\(_i\) wanted go.INF to party all.DAT\(_i\) together

(22) **Masha** hotela pojti na prazdnik vsem v mestе.
Masha.NOM\(_i\) wanted [PRO\(_{DAT/i}\) go.INF to party all.DAT\(_i\) together]
‘Masha wanted to go to the party all together.’

(23) * **Masha** hotela pojti na prazdnik vse v mestе.
Masha.NOM\(_i\) wanted [PRO\(_{DAT/i}\) go.INF to party all.NOM\(_i\) together]
‘Masha wanted to bake the pie all together.’

The data in (20)-(23) shows that in case of Partial Control, the semi-predicative element has to be Dative and not Nominative; in case of Exhaustive subject control Nominative is obligatory, Dative is not allowed. These contrasts provide two very important pieces of evidence. Since the Dative case on the semi-predicative is the result of the case agreement with the PRO subject of the infinitival clause, (22) shows that the matrix verb under consideration (in this case hotet’‘want’) allows for a partially controlled complement and can select for a non-reduced infinitival complement with the projected covert subject, so it is not the intrinsic property of this particular subject control verb to select for a reduced clausal complement. Further, it is crucial that the data in (20)-(23) only differs in terms of the type of the control relationship between the matrix clause antecedent and the PRO subject of the infinitival, i.e. full vs. partial co-indexation. Given the same matrix verb and the same infinitival complement, one would expect the selectional restrictions in terms of the structural type of the complement to be maintained, and not to change as a result of the shift in the type of control.
(24) **Verb Selectional Restrictions:**

Russian subject-control verbs can select for a non-reduced clausal complement, and no syntactic motivation for the alternation in the structural type of the complement can be observed.

Eventually, this data poses a question to any theory that would require an inventory of structurally different types of infinitivals to exist within a language and to be used interchangeably with the same matrix verb, since the motivation for the change in the structural type of the complement is missing in such cases.

Thus, this section provided evidence that Russian infinitivals include the TP projection and itsspecifier position is occupied by the PRO subject. Dative case observed on semi-predicatives in the secondary predicate position of the infinitival clause is a result of the agreement with the PRO marked for Dative case, which has to be present in the structure to be the source of this case for the semi-predicative. Crucially, it has been shown that it is not the property of subject-control verbs to require a reduced clausal complement: they are perfectly capable of taking a non-reduced infinitival clause with the fully-projected TP when it comes to passive voice and partial control. Consequently, it is reasonable to think that they are able to do so in other syntactic environments as well.

### 2.3 CP projection: Strong Phase and Weaker PIC

This section will provide evidence that the CP projection is also an essential part of the Russian infinitival clause in all the syntactic configurations, and it does not create a barrier for the long-distance agreement observed between the nominal element in the infinitival clause and its antecedent in the matrix clause.

For this purpose, it is important to first of all consider adjunct infinitival clauses, since they present the most peculiar behavior in terms of case assignment observed on semi-predicatives. Particularly, adjunct infinitives are subject-controlled; however, they do not pattern with subject-controlled complement infinitivals, since the latter do not normally allow for case variation on the semi-predicative. On the contrary, adjuncts pattern similarly to object-controlled infinitives allowing for the semi-predicative to agree with either the Dative PRO subject of the infinitive or the matrix clause antecedent NP, which is illustrated by the examples in (25)-(26).

(25) **Masha** priehala, chtoby podpisat’ dokumenty **sama.**

Masha.NOM came so.that sign.INF documents by.herself.NOM

‘Masha came in order to sign the documents herself.’

(26) **Masha** priehala, chtoby podpisat’ dokumenty **samoi.**

Masha.NOM came so.that sign.INF documents by.herself.DAT

12
‘Masha came in order to sign the documents herself.’

An important piece of evidence that comes from sentences similar to (25) and (26) has to do with an overt complementizer present in the structure. This means that in this case there is no structure reduction: an overt complementizer *chtoby ‘so.that’* strongly suggests that the adjunct infinitival clause includes both CP and TP projections. Thus, the source of Dative case on the semi-predicative in (26) can be accounted for rather straightforwardly: it is the PRO subject of the infinitival clause, marked for Dative case. The question that needs to be addressed now is the source of Nominative case that can be also found on the semi-predicative in this syntactic position: technically, the CP would have to pose a problem for the agreement between the semi-predicative and matrix clause antecedent NP.

However, a rather simple contrast can be used to show that, indeed, it is the Nominative subject NP in the matrix clause that is (in some sense – directly or indirectly) the source of case on the semi-predicative. To see this, one should consider the minimal pair of sentences with adjunct infinitivals that only differ in the case observed on the matrix subject: a quirky Dative (27) vs. a structural Nominative (28).

(27)  Mashe hotelos’ priehat’, chtoby sdelat’ vse samoi / *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.’

(28)  Masha hotela priehat’, chtoby sdelat’ vse samoi / sama.
    Masha.NOM wanted come.INF so.that do.INF all self.DAT / NOM
    ‘Masha wanted to come in order to do everything by herself.’

The contrast between (27) and (28) shows that as soon as the Nominative subject is absent from the matrix clause and is replaced by a quirky Dative subject, the semi-predicative loses the ability to bear Nominative case, and such output is perceived as ungrammatical by the native speakers. From this it is possible to conclude that it

---

2 Here it is important to note that both sentences have the same reading and can be used interchangeably in identical contexts. None of the native speakers of Russian I have been eliciting data from, including myself, have been able to determine any significant difference in meaning or emphasis between the two structures. Both sentences have the reading where the semi-predicative is interpreted as a manner in which the action is carried out, not the contrastive reading that is at times observed with semi-predicatives, as illustrated in the example below.

On sam reshil, ego nikto ne zastav’al.
He.NOM himself.NOM decided, he.ACC no.one.NOM not made

“He made the decision himself, nobody made him do it.”

Having said that, it is assumed from now on in the current paper that the data in (25) - (26) presents a free variation of one and the same sentence in terms of case assignment.
is the matrix subject NP that is the source of Nominative case on the semi-predicative in the secondary predicate position of the infinitival clause.

Taking into consideration the two facts presented above: the non-reduced clausal structure of sentences under consideration and the possibility of case agreement between the matrix clause antecedent and the semi-predicative in the infinitival, it is possible to conclude that in this case the observed agreement appears to be in some way non-local. It crosses at least one phase boundary, i.e. the CP boundary.

Earlier in the literature, the possibility of a non-local agreement was completely discarded: the observed case assignment pattern was interpreted as the default Nominative Case, since no local Nominative antecedent was available locally in the structure (Babby 2009; Kozinsky 1983). However, the very definition of default case does not seem to be met here: the default setting is supposed to come into play once there is no other source of case available. In both (28) Nominative is only one of the two possible grammatical options, since the Dative antecedent is available in the structure, so technically the very need for the default case assignment should not arise. And again, the contrast between (27) and (28) provides evidence for the non-local agreement and against the default Nominative.

In this way, it is possible to account for the same number of syntactic phenomena using one theoretical assumption fewer. The analysis presented above has

3 Additionally, the notion of default Nominative in Russian has also been referred to in connection with certain comparative constructions, where Nominative case was one of the grammatical options on the standard of comparison (Babby 2009; Glovinskaya 1996).

Nuzhnyj | ljudi [s kotorymi mozhno razgovarivat’ kak hozjain / hozjainu]
---|---
needed | people.NOM.PL [cp with which.PL possible speak.INF as boss.NOM.SG/DAT.SG]

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

Such comparatives can also be accounted for without the default case assumption. In fact, Nominative on the standard of comparison can be fully accounted for by proposing an underlying clausal comparison: this Nominative case was assigned to the NP by the finite T head, which further was elided from the structure. Thus, Nominative is observed when the underlying structure is that of a clausal comparative with a complementizer kak ‘as’, while Dative results from the phrasal comparative where kak is a preposition: cf. below.

... [razgovarivat’ kak gverit by hozjain]
... [PRO DAT speak.INF as spoke SUBJ boss.NOM]
... ‘to speak as the boss would speak’

Additionally, if the elided clause is constructed in such a way that it only allows to be reconstructed with a Dative quirky subject, then Dative is the only grammatical option for the NP in the standard of comparison:

Byl moroz, ot kotorogo bylo holodno kak sobake/*sobaka [bylo holodno].
was frost from which was cold as dog.DAT/*NOM [was cold]
‘There was such a frost, that I was cold as ice (lit. that to me it was as cold as to the dog)’.
eliminated the need to introduce default case into the argument; moreover, the default Nominative approach obviously overgenerates, which is not the case with the analysis proposed in the current study.

As it turns out, agreement across a CP boundary is observed not only in the Russian language. Andrews (1990) and Sigurdsson (2002) both report similar variation in case assignment in Icelandic complement infinitives. Studying Icelandic secondary agreement, Sigurdsson (2002) states that the agreement of a secondary (adjectival or participial) predicate with an antecedent, unlike primary agreement, can occur irrespective of the antecedent’s case, Nominative or quirky, and the agreeing features are number, gender, and case. It is further suggested that secondary agreement can cross a prediction boundary (Andrews 1990; Sigurdsson 1991; 2002; Thráinsson 2007), whereas primary agreement cannot.

In order to correctly interpret the parallel data from Icelandic, one should take into consideration the fact that PRO in the examples below inherits number and gender features from its matrix clause antecedent, while it gets Nominative case from within its own predicate (Sigurdsson 2002). Thus, in Icelandic, just as in Russian, the secondary predicate has two antecedents with possibly conflicting cases: PRO and the matrix subject. The difference is that in Russian PRO is marked for Dative, while in Icelandic it bears Nominative case. The examples below are taken from Sigurdsson (2002) and show case variation on secondary predicates in case of control by Nominative (29) and quirky subjects (30)-(31), and Accusative (32) and Dative (33) objects.

(29)

NOM – [PRO – NOM]:

Hún, vanaðist til [að PRO, verða
she(NF.SG) hoped for to. PRO(N) be
fyrst/ fyrista/ fyristri]
first(NF.SG* A.F.SG* D.F.SG)
She hoped to be number one.

(30)

ACC – [PRO – NOM/ACC]:

Hána, langaði til [að PRO, verða fyrist/ fyrista/ fyristri]
her(A.F.SG) longed for to PRO(N) be first(NF.SG/A.F.SG* D.F.SG)
She wanted to be number one.
The data above shows that in Icelandic, given two case-conflicting antecedents – Nominative PRO and the matrix clause NP in a quirky case, a secondary predicate can freely agree with either one of them. Though the structures above all involve infinitival complements, not adjuncts, parallelism with Russian is still valid: Icelandic infinitival complements have non-reduced structures (again, the complementizer is overt), so the agreement that is observed in (29)-(33) occurs across a CP, just as it does in Russian adjunct infinitivals presented earlier\(^4\).

Thus, it has been shown that Russian is not the only language allowing for the agreement to occur across a CP boundary; and CPs are strong phases, in accordance with the universal claim made in Chomsky (2000; 2001). Still, it has been conclusively shown that the semi-predicative in the secondary predicate position of

\(^4\) An important point should be made here: there is general agreement in the literature on the fact that Icelandic offers impressive evidence that PRO can be case-marked structurally as well as inherently (Sigurdsson 1991, 2002; Thrainsson 2007). This goes in line with the fact that in Icelandic secondary agreement into infinitivals occurs with either Nominative or quirky case matrix predicate. Russian only allows for Dative quirky subjects, and since that is also the case associated with the PRO subject of the infinitive, it is a significant challenge to show whether the same is or is not fair for Russian.
the infinitival can agree with its ultimate matrix clause antecedent NP. Thus, it still remains to be explained how this is theoretically possible: specifically, why the strong phase does not pose a barrier for such agreement.

At this point a crucial distinction has to be made: as strong phases, CPs are subject to Phase-Impenetrability Condition (PIC), as proposed in Chomsky (2000; 2001). However, those two papers introduce two different versions of the PIC. According to the first version of PIC (Chomsky 2000), which is the stronger one, no operation outside the phase can affect the complement of the phase head; consider (34):

\[(34)\hspace{1cm} \text{Strong version of PIC:} \]
\[\text{In phase } \alpha \text{ with head } H, \text{ the domain of } H \text{ is not accessible to operations outside } \alpha; \text{ only } H \text{ and its edge are accessible to such operations (Chomsky 2000).} \]

However, in a later work Chomsky recognizes that this condition is too strong. Specifically, in this form it was unable to account for certain cases that also had to do with Icelandic and its dative-nominative constructions (35) (Biskup 2012; Sigurðsson 2004). There, a probe in the next higher phase can access a goal in the complement of the lower phase head. More specifically, in (35), the probing T in the matrix clause agrees with object which occurs in the complement of the lower phase head v.

\[(35)\hspace{1cm} \text{Henni höfðu ekki líkað hestarnir her.DAT had.3PL not liked horses.the.NOM} \]
\[\text{‘She had not liked the horses.’} \]

This suggests that the Agree relation crosses one phase boundary here. Therefore, Chomsky (2001) proposed a weaker version of the PIC, according to which the operations outside the phase could still access the complement of the phase head, but only till the next higher phase head was merged into the structure. It is crucial that this version of the PIC allows operations to cross maximally one phase boundary: cf. (34) and (36).

\[(36)\hspace{1cm} \text{Weaker version of PIC:} \]
\[\text{For strong phase } HP \text{ with head } H..., \text{ H and its edge are acceptable only up to the next strong phase, under the PIC: elements of } HP \text{ are accessible to operations within the smallest strong ZP phase, but not beyond } [ZP Z ... [HP } α [HYP“One.ZP \text{ (Chomsky 2001).} \]

For this very reason, the application of weaker PIC to Russian is such that the complement of one CP is visible until the next strong phase (another CP) has been projected.
An important distinction between Icelandic and Russian here is that in Russian vP can be a weak phase (Harves 2002). Using the data from Genitive Negation in Russian, Harves shows that this long-distance phenomenon is only licensed given a weak vP phase: in the examples below the object values its Genitive Case via feature-matching with the Negation head (NB the same case pattern with the verbs contrastive in their restructuring properties according to Wurmbrand (2001): a typical restructuring verb ‘want’ vs. a typical non-restructuring verb ‘plan’):

(37) Masha ne [vP hotela [CP [vP chitat’ knig]]]
    Masha.NOM NEG want read.INF books.GEN
    ‘Masha did not want to read any books.’

(38) Masha ne [vP planirovala [CP [vP chitat’ knig]]]
    Masha.NOM NEG planned read.INF books.GEN
    ‘Masha did not plan to read any books.’

Taking this distinction into account, it is possible to sum up the phasal properties of Russian clauses as follows:

(39) Russian Phases and PIC:
    CPs, both finite and non-finite, are strong phases in Russian, while vPs are weak phases. As such they are subject to a weaker version of the Phase Impenetrability Condition, as proposed by Chomsky (2001).

This is exactly the piece of theory needed to account for the seemingly non-local agreement patterns observed in Russian infinitivals. Given the weaker version of the Phase Impenetrability Condition, it becomes quite clear how the semi-predicative in the secondary predicate position of the infinitival clause can agree in case with its ultimate matrix clause antecedent: the goal in the complement of the non-finite CP is still accessible to the probe in the matrix clause.

At the same time, the weaker version of the PIC predicts that the agreement should be allowed to cross maximally one phase boundary. And indeed, building the structure up does alter the judgments that native speakers have about the sentences with adjunct infinitivals. Considering a structure with more than one adjunct clause, one can see that native speakers of Russian strongly prefer Dative case to Nominative, the latter being perceived either as highly marked or completely ungrammatical.

(40) On kupil bilety, chtoby poehat’ v Moskvu, samomu/*??sam.
    he.NOM bought tickets [CP so.that PRODAT go.INF in Moscow
    chtoby [CP so.that PRODAT podpisat dokumenty by.himself.DAT/*??NOM]]

    ‘He bought tickets in order to go to Moscow in order to sign the papers himself.’
As shown in (40), when the structure of the sentence becomes more complex than two clauses, i.e. when another adjunct infinitival clause is embedded inside the first one, the option of agreeing with the matrix clause antecedent becomes unavailable. This is in accordance with the weaker version of the PIC.

So far the arguments for the presence of the CP projection in the Russian non-finite clause have been mostly structural. However, there is also evidence from the case theory that suggests that such a projection has to be present in order to fulfill a case assigning role crucial for the formation of the a grammatical sentence.

Up to this point, when discussing the case properties of PRO in Russian, it has been suggested that PRO is associated with the Dative case. Now it is necessary to elaborate on what is meant by that, and exactly what the nature and the source of this case is. The first claim about the Dative case of PRO is that it is a structural case. This is deduced from the contrast between adjunct and subject controlled infinitivals given in (41)-(42) below. It has been suggested that in both syntactic positions infinitivals are strong phases and have non-reduced clausal structure, i.e. in both adjuncts and complements the CP and the TP projections are realized; and the subject of the infinitival is projected. Still, only in adjuncts the semi-predicative is allowed to be Dative.

Suppose PRO was marked for Dative inherently, i.e. it had this case feature on it at all times originating from the lexicon. Then in both contexts, in adjuncts and in subject controlled complements, variation was expected, since in both cases PRO was equally accessible for the semi-predicative, cf. sentences in (41)-(42) and the respective structures below. The one on the left shows subject control infinitival complement, the one on the right illustrates an adjunct infinitival: in both cases PRO is equally distant from the semi-predicative, so it should be marked for case in the lexicon, Dative should be an option in both cases.

(41)  Masha  hotela poest'  odna/*odnoi.  
Masha.NOM wanted  eat.INF  alone.NOM/*DAT  
‘Masha wanted to eat alone.’

(42)  Masha  ushla, chtoby poest'  odna/odnoi.  
Masha.NOM left  so.that  eat.INF  alone.NOM/DAT  
‘Masha left in order to eat alone.’
Thus, the assumption that PRO is marked for Dative inherently in all syntactic environments overgenerates and predicts the grammaticality of the Dative case on the semi-predicative in subject-control sentences, which contradicts the actual data. The two sentences under consideration are structurally different only in terms of the projections that are above the infinitival TP: this is where the distinction in case assignment is rooted. Thus, I claim that PRO receives Dative structurally from the C head (this has been suggested earlier in the literature including (Bailyn 2004; 2011; Comrie 1974)); and certain limitations are imposed on this structural procedure in subject-controlled infinitivals.

Thus, additional crucial piece of evidence for the non-reduced clausal structure of the infinitivals is obtained. Since the C head is the c-commanding head and serves as the source of Dative, not the PRO on its own, the structure of the infinitival necessarily has to include the CP projection.

Summing up this section, it has been shown that a CP with both an overt and a covert C head is not a barrier for the agreement relationship. In fact, in accordance with Chomsky’s universal proposal Russian CPs are strong phases; and at the same time a weaker version of the Phase Impenetrability condition is in force: the agreement can penetrate exactly one strong phase boundary (CP). As a result, in Russian a secondary predicate can agree with the matrix clause antecedent NP across a CP in both adjuncts and complement infinitival clauses, while vP, being a weak phase, does not count for the PIC. Thus, the reasoning for the elimination of the CP projection from the structure of Russian complement infinitivals, as presented in Babby (2009), is no longer valid. Following the abovementioned
guideline on the uniformity of the structure, it is again possible to conclude that at all times the structure of an infinitival clause in Russian is the same: it includes a TP, and now also a CP projection. The Dative case on the PRO is not inherent: it is structural and the C head, which has a [+Dative] feature on it, serves as a case assigner for the PRO subject of the infinitival.

2.4 Incompatibility with the Restructuring Approach

In the previous two sections evidence has been provided to show that Russian infinitival clauses do necessarily include both the TP and the CP projections in their structure, and that they may all have their PRO subject projected in the specifier position of their TPs. At this point I would like to reinforce the argument for the non-reduced clausal structure of Russian infinitivals by providing some additional remarks regarding why a functional restructuring approach, where the infinitival lacks both CP and TP projections, as suggested in Wurmbrand (2001; 2004), should not be applied to the Russian language.

The theory of restructuring is essential for the explanation of why different semantic classes of verbs display different syntactic behaviors in terms of the structural type of complement that they select for. Specifically, this theory provided a very convincing account for why specific classes of matrix verbs (modals, aspectuals and verbs of motion) select for a reduced infinitival complement, which results in a very peculiar syntactic behavior distinct from that of other verbs of the given language. Particularly, Wurmbrand distinguishes four classes of verb distinct in terms of their restructuring properties: (a) lexical restructuring verbs, which combine with "syntactically and semantically very "small" predicates (VP complements)"; (b) functional restructuring verbs, which act as a type of auxiliaries or as functional heads and combine with the restructuring infinitive which is the main predicate of the clause; (c) reduced non-restructuring verbs, which take a TP complement; and (d) full non-restructuring verbs, which take a CP complement (Wurmbrand 2001). Consequently, each of these verb classes in languages that allow for restructuring infinitives displays a very specific set of syntactic properties in terms of locality conditions imposed on their infinitival complement.

This is not at all similar to the syntactic behavior of Russian infinitival clauses. In fact, those are characterized by a significant amount of uniformity of their behavior in terms of locality, regardless of the semantic class that the matrix verb belongs to. For example, if one compares the behavior of some of the most typical lexical restructuring verbs - 'try', 'begin' and 'refuse' (Wurmbrand 2001, 2004); and some of the most typical full non-restructuring verbs - 'decide', 'plan' and 'promise' in Russian, one will see that the properties of case assignment are identical: the semi-predicative in the non-finite complement agrees with the matrix clause antecedent in case, number and gender in both cases.
As one can easily see from the data in (45)-(50), in both cases – with typical ‘restructuring’ and typical ‘non-restructuring’ verbs in Wurmbrand’s terms – the agreement pattern is the same, and the matrix antecedent can reach down into the infinitival clause and be a source of case on the semi-predicative. Additionally, a similar pattern is observed in terms of locality of binding: both verbs allow for the same local binding domains.

From this it is possible to conclude that Russian, unlike Italian, German and some other languages, does not display the restructuring verb paradigm reported in multiple publications on the topic (Burzio 1981; Burzio 1986; Cinque 2002; Cinque 2006; Pereltsvaig 2004; Rizzi 1978; Wurmbrand 2001; 2004). The verbs that are
expected to occupy two opposite positions on the restructuring scale in this language reveal similar behavior in terms of locality conditions. This leads us to the conclusion that this classification is not revealed in Russian and should not be applied to it, since locality conditions observed are uniform for different semantic classes of verbs.

3. Matrix Antecedent vs. PRO: Case Conflict

So far it has been shown that Russian infinitival clauses are uniform in terms of their syntactic structure and are strong phases subject to a weaker version of the Phase Impenetrability Condition. This way the preservation of the non-reduced clausal structure does not prevent the semi-predicative from agreeing with its matrix clause antecedent, which is a grammatical possibility in all the cases when a fully co-indexed c-commanding antecedent is overtly expressed in the matrix clause. At the same time, in order to make this argument complete, it has to be explained why in some cases variation is observed, i.e. why subject control complements strongly prefer the agreement with the matrix antecedent, while object control complement and adjuncts allow for the semi-predicative to agree with either the ultimate or the local antecedent.

The account I offer here is case-related:

(53) Case Assignment Conflict:
Whenever the infinitival occurs in a case-receiving position, the [+Dative] feature of the C head is blocked, and the semi-predicative has only the option of agreeing with the matrix clause antecedent NP in the Nominative case.

This is exactly the case observed with subject controlled infinitivals, where the CP is assigned Accusative Case by the matrix verb. In this syntactic environment, the C head, which is the source of the Dative case on the PRO, is supposed to enter two case checking relations with two distinct elements: firstly, it is in the case-assigning position serving as the probe for the PRO subject of the infinitival; secondly, the CP as a whole is in the case-receiving position being the goal for the v assigning Accusative to it. Since the weaker version of the PIC is in force, the complement of C is still visible to the elements in the next strong phase, and the case feature of the PRO has not been valued before the nature of the relationship between the CP and the matrix verb has been established. Thus, it is the case, that one case relation is blocking the other one: having received the Accusative case from the v head in the matrix clause, i.e. being the case receiver, the C head loses its ability to be a case.

---

5 The exceptions are limited to the cases of arbitrary control, passives, and partial control, where no c-commanding fully co-indexed antecedent is available in the sentence. In those cases the semi-predicative has the only option to agree with the PRO subject of the infinitival in the Dative case.
assigner for the PRO, since it cannot bear conflicting goal-probe features. In this section of the paper I will show how this approach accounts for the variation in case assignment observed in Russian infinitivals.

First of all, let us consider the contrast already discussed earlier in this paper, i.e. the one between the subject control complement and the adjunct infinitival.

(54)  **Masha**  hotela  poest’  **odna/**odnoi.  
Masha.NOM wanted  eat.INF  alone.NOM/**DAT  
‘Masha wanted to eat alone.’

(55)  **Masha**  ushla,  chtoby  poest’  **odna/odnoi.**  
Masha.NOM left  so.that  eat.INF  alone.NOM/DAT  
‘Masha left in order to eat alone.’

How the proposed approach applies to the sentences contrasted in (54)-(55) is shown in the respective structures below.

(56)

Thus, PRO can either bear the Dative case assigned by the functional [-Tense] C head, or it can receive its case feature from the matrix antecedent, which is exactly what happens in the case of subject control. Then the semi-predicative has to bear the Nominative case, since no Dative antecedent is available in the structure. On the contrary, in the adjunct infinitival the semi-predictive has two case conflicting antecedents, and can agree with either of them, since no locality condition prevents
it from doing so and the Case Agreement requirement (4) is observed in respect to both: the matrix antecedent and the PRO both c-command and are fully co-indexed with the semi-predicative.

Further support for the proposed case feature blocking comes from the following: this proposal predicts a distinction in case assignment in the infinitival complements of the verbs that take DP vs. PP complements, cf. (57)-(58).

(57) Masha _hotela_ yabloko.
Masha.NOM wanted apple.ACC
‘Masha wanted an apple.’

(58) Masha _dumala_ o lete.
Masha.NOM thought about summer.INSTR
‘Masha was thinking about the summer.’

Those two sentences distinct are distinct, since only in the former the verb assigns Accusative to its complement, while the latter selects a PP. The infinitivals in parallel positions do behave differently, as expected.

(59) Masha _hotela_ poehat’ v gorod _odna/*odnoi_.
Masha.NOM wanted go.iNF in town alone.NOM/*DAT
‘Masha wanted to go the town alone.’

(60) Masha _dumala_ poehat’ v gorod _odna/odnoi_.
Masha.NOM thought go.iNF in town alone.NOM/DAT
‘Masha considered going the town alone.’

The infinitivals in the respective positions reveal distinct case assignment patterns: in the position where the CP receives structural Accusative from the verb, the [+Dative] case feature of the C head is omitted; and, as a result, the PRO copies all of its features including number, gender and case from the matrix clause antecedent. These are the features that are also observed on the semi-predicative (59). In the latter example (60), the infinitival is not in the cased position; so C assigns Dative to the PRO, and the semi-predicative can agree with either antecedent in case.

Until now subject control sentences considered in this paper, with both adjunct and complement infinitivals, included only one- and two-place predicates in the matrix cause. However, the argument cannot be an exhaustive one, until all the structural options sentences have been accounted for. Particularly, one has to consider ditransitive matrix verbs: the case assignment patterns observed in that case also agree with the case-blocking approach suggested in the beginning of the current section. Consider the following sentence with a double-object verb _predlozhit’_ ‘offer, propose’.

(61) Ya _predlozhila_ tebei sdelat’ vse _sama/*samoi_.
I.NOMi offered you.DATi do.iNF all by.myselfi.NOM/DAT
‘I offer you that I would do everything by myself.’
When presented with a choice between Nominative and Dative on the semi-predicative in a construction like (61), my informants have responded that both Dative and Nominative were the acceptable options on the semi-predicative. Thus, for some reason, the presence of an interfering NP in the matrix clause alters the set of case options that are available for the semi-predicative.

Note that the object NP in the matrix clause in (61) is in the Dative. In fact, this NP is the goal, i.e. the indirect object, while the infinitival CP occupies the position of the theme. This can be confirmed by a minimal pair simple sentence with both arguments expressed by NPs, cf. (62).

(62) Ya predlozhila tebe yabloko.
    I.NOM offered you.DAT apple.ACC
    'I offered you an apple.'

Thus, the infinitival CP in (61) occurs in the position governed by the Applicative head. According to Low Applicatives approach (Pylkkänen 2002), Dative appears in the specifier position of the Applicative Phrase, which itself is the complement of the verb which assigns/checks Dative case. Accusative case, then, is assigned to the lower NP by the empty functional Applicative head, as illustrated by (63).

(63)

However, the difference between the (61) and (62) lies crucially in the fact that in the former the complement of the lower applicative head is the CP, while in the latter it is an NP; and the requirements for the Case Filter for the CPs in Russian do not have to be identical to those of NPs. The Applicative head is a functional head; and, consequently, the condition of lexical case assignment required for the overriding of the [+Dative] feature of the C head is not fulfilled in this configuration. Thus, the case-blocking approach still makes the correct prediction: the C head preserves its [+Dative] case feature in the structures with double-object subject control verbs, and, as a result, the semi-predicative has two case conflicting accessible antecedents and can agree with either one of them.

Let us now consider the type of syntactic configuration that has not been discussed in detail in this paper yet: object-controlled infinitives. In this syntactic context, a
semipredicative can take the case of either the matrix clause antecedent (Accusative) or the Dative case of PRO. This is shown in data in (64)-(65).

(64) My poprosili Tarasa poiti v les odnogo.
we.NOM asked Taras.ACC go.INF in forest alone.ACC
‘We asked Taras to go into the forest alone.’

(65) My poprosili Tarasa poiti v les odnomu.
we.NOM asked Taras.ACC go.INF in forest alone.DAT
‘We asked Taras to go into the forest alone.’

It is easy to show, should a question arise, that Accusative case on the semi-predicative in (64) is indeed the result of agreement with the matrix object NP. Considering sentences where the matrix verb takes a Dative complement, one can see that Accusative is no longer a grammatical option on the semi-predicative.

(66) My prikazali Tarasu poiti v les odnomu/*odnogo.
we.NOM ordered Taras.DAT go.INF in forest alone.DAT/*ACC
‘We asked Taras to go into the forest alone.’

The proposal presented above fully accounts for the data and judgments in (64)-(65): in the case of object control, the CP is not in the position where it receives structural case from a lexical head. This position is taken by the matrix clause direct object, i.e. the controller of the PRO subject of the infinitival. Consequently, the [+DAT] case feature of the C head remains active; and PRO receives the Dative case structurally. As a result, the semi-predicative has two accessible antecedents it can possibly agree with: the matrix clause controller and the PRO are equally accessible. The outcome is the variation observed: both Accusative and Dative are grammatical options on the semi-predicative.

Passives of object control constructions fit well into the paradigm, too. Although such constructions are not very frequent and even considered rather marked in Russian (given the choice, native speakers would overwhelmingly prefer a construction with a pro-dropped subject and an active verb in neutral agreement), it is still possible to test the suggested principle constructing a sentence with the desired structure.

(67) Masha byla poproszena imi poiti v les odna/odnoi.
Masha.NOM was asked they.INSTR go.INF in forest alone.NOM/DAT
‘Masha was asked by them to go into the forest alone.’

As one can see from the data in (67), in the case of passivized object control construction, the semi-predicative can agree with either the Dative PRO subject of the infinitival or with its ultimate antecedent, the matrix clause object NP, which has moved to the Spec TP of the matrix clause to receive Nominative Case and agree with the matrix verb. Technically, the analysis here is no different from the one
suggested for active object control infinitivals. The infinitival CP in (67) is structurally in the same position as the infinitival CP in (64)-(65), i.e. is the complement of Applicative head; and it is still in the position that does not receive structural case from the matrix verb, so the same logic applies, and the same variation is predicted.

As for the passives of subject control – the expected case agreement pattern is observed as well. When the agent NP is not present in the structure and the Nominative case is not available, the semi-predicative can only agree with the PRO subject of the infinitival clause.

\[(68)\] 
\text{Za korovu bylo resheno zaplatit' vsem/\text{*vse} v mestе.}  
\text{\quad For cow was decide.PART pay.INF all.DAT/\text{*NOM} together}  
\text{\quad \quad 'It was decided to pay for the cow altogether.'}

Finally, a remark should be made about the partial control sentences.

\[(69)\] 
\text{Masha wanted} \text{[PRO_{DAT/I} go.INF to party all.DAT; together]}  
\text{\quad Masha. NOM_{i} wanted [PRO_{DAT/I} go.INF to party all.DAT; together]}  
\text{\quad \quad 'Masha wanted to go to the party all together.'}

\[(70)\] 
\text{\text{*Masha wanted} [PRO_{DAT/I} go.INF to party all.NOM_{i} together]}  
\text{\quad \quad 'Masha wanted to bake the pie all together.'}

The data in (69)-(70) shows that in case of Partial Control, the semi-predicative element has to be Dative and not Nominative; in case of Exhaustive subject control Nominative is obligatory, Dative is not allowed. This is quite remarkable, since, again, it is in compliance with the case agreement requirement (4): the case agreement between the semi-predicative and its antecedent can only be established when there is full co-indexation (or co-reference) between the two. Thus, in case of Partial Control in (69)-(70), the semi-predicative can only agree in case with the PRO subject of the infinitival, since it is the one that denotes the salient group. The ultimate antecedent, i.e. the matrix clause subject, denotes an individual: there is no Exhaustive Control relationship between the matrix subject and the semi-predicative, and the possibility of the agreement in the Nominative is lost.

Another crucial fact that has to be taken into consideration is that the Dative case remains a grammatical option in the case of Partial Control. It looks like the assignment of structural case by a lexical head on its own is not enough to block the [+Dative] feature of the C head in the infinitival clause. In order for the verb to fully suppress the case feature of its complement, the volumes of the external arguments of the matrix and the infinitival verbs have to fully coincide, in other words, there, again, has to be an Exhaustive Control relationship between the two.
Thus it has been shown that the case blocking approach can account for all the cases of embedded infinitival clauses, including their different structural positions, contrasts between active and passive voice constructions, two- and three-place predicates and exhaustive and partial control environments.

At this point, having discussed all the components of the proposal in detail, it is finally possible to bring together the arguments regarding the status of the CP as of a strong phase and the weaker PIC, and the case blocking of the C’s [+Dative] feature and see what prediction those components make for the multiple embedding sentences when put together. Particularly, the prediction is that in the case of multiple embedding with subject control complementation and in the case of subject control adjunction the semi-predicatives should be subject to two distinct patterns of case assignment. With multiple subject control complements, each of the infinitivals is found in the case-receiving position governed by the lexical verb: this is the syntactic environment, where the [+Dative] feature of the C head is blocked, and each of the PROs in each of the infinitival complements will not be able to receive the Dative case from C, and, consequently, will have to agree with the matrix clause antecedent in the Nominative case, since it is the only source of case remaining in the structure. As a result, the semi-predicative will also have no other option but to bear Nominative. However, this will not be the case with multiple adjuncts: for each of the infinitivals in that configuration the CP will not occur in the case-receiving position. For this very reason the [+Dative] case feature of C will remain active, and each of the PROs will be assigned Dative case. At the same time, the Nominative controller NP in the matrix clause will be separated from the co-indexed semi-predicative by more than two phase boundaries. That is why, unlike in single adjunct sentences, the semi-predicative should only be able to agree in case with the PRO, while the agreement with the matrix controller NP is not allowed due to PIC. This is exactly what is observed in the Russian data: cf.

(71) On reshil poprobovat’ poehat’
He.NOM decided try.INF go.INF
v Moskvo odin/*odnomu.
in Moscow alone.NOM/*DAT]]

‘He decided to try to go to Moscow alone.’

(72) On kupil bilety, chtoby poehat’ v Moskву,
he.NOM bought tickets so.that go.INF in Moscow
chtoby podpisat dokumenty samomu/*?sam.
[cp so.that PRODAT sign.INF documents by.himself.DAT/*?NOM]]
‘He bought tickets in order to go to Moscow in order to sign the papers himself.’

Thus, it has become possible to bring together all the arguments presented in this paper and conclude the analysis of the data in hand. This section has shown that the variation observed in case assignment on the semi-predicative can be accounted for within the framework of the uniformity-of-the-structure proposal. Particularly, it has been argued that, while the infinitival CP is projected at all times, it is not always the case that the C head is able to exercise its [+Dative] case feature and assign Dative to the PRO subject of the infinitival. In a certain syntactic configuration, where the CP is in the case receiving position governed by the matrix verb and receiving Accusative case from it, its own role as a case assigner comes into conflict with its role as a case receiver. As a result, [+Dative] feature is blocked, and the PRO has to agree in case with its matrix clause antecedent, and so has the semi-predictive. This situation is only observed in subject control complements with a two-place matrix predicate. In all the other environments the case assigning power of the C head remains intact; and the PRO receives Dative, this way providing the semi-predicative with two possible antecedents to agree with. This account provides correct predictions for subject and object control sentences, and crucially – also for the contrasts observed in multiple embedding sentences.

4. Conclusions and Further Questions

In this paper I have presented the analysis of the syntactic structure of Russian infinitival clauses based on the case assignment patterns observed on the semi-predicatives in the secondary predicate position on the non-finite clause. It has been a matter of a long-standing debate whether all the instances of the Russian infinitivals are the same in terms of their structure or not, and if not – how this variation can be accounted for. Previously suggested approaches inevitably had to sacrifice either the uniformity of the structure, or the uniformity of the locality conditions. The proposal presented in the current paper has retained both, and has attributed the observed syntactic properties of Russian infinitives to the known parametric variation attested earlier in the literature.

This paper provided evidence for the uniformity of the structure of the Russian infinitivals: all Russian non-finite clauses include the CP and the TP projection and their specifier positions are occupied by the PRO subject. A [-Tense] C head has a [+Dative] case feature, it assigns Dative Case structurally to the PRO subject of the infinitival clause. At the same time, it has been shown that a CP with both an overt and a covert C head is not a barrier for the agreement relationship. In fact, in accordance with Chomsky’s universal proposal Russian CPs are strong phases; and at the same time a weaker version of the Phase Impenetrability condition is in force: the agreement can penetrate exactly one phase boundary. As a result, in Russian a
secondary predicate can agree with the matrix clause antecedent NP across a CP in both adjuncts and complement infinitival clauses.

It has been shown that the variation observed in case assignment on the semi-predicative can be also accounted for under within the proposal regarding the uniform non-reduced infinitival structures. Particularly, it has been argued that, while the infinitival CP is projected at all times, it is not always the case that the C head is able to exercise its [+Dative] case feature and assign Dative to the PRO subject of the infinitival. In a certain syntactic configuration, where the CP is in the case receiving position governed by the matrix verb and receiving Accusative case from it, its own role as a case assigner comes into conflict with its role as a case receiver. As a result, [+Dative] feature is blocked, and the PRO has to agree in case with its matrix clause antecedent, and so has the semi-predictive.

In this way, this paper showed that in Russian the verbs (including modals, aspectuals and motion verbs) reveal similar syntactic behavior in terms of the structural type of the complement that they select for, and, consequently restructuring analysis is not suitable for the Russian language. Further, this leads to the claim that restructuring is a parameter that some languages (like Italian or Spanish) activate, while others (like Russian or English) do not. From this the question arises: why should restructuring exist only in some languages, but not in others?

In the earlier literature it has been repeatedly suggested that restructuring is merely a lexical property that is assigned arbitrarily to certain verbs and parametrically restricted to certain languages; however, this view seems to be theoretically inadequate and largely data-driven. In either case, accounting for restructuring existing as a syntactic phenomenon in some languages, but not others, requires sacrificing either the uniformity of phrase structure, or the uniformity of locality conditions as a component of the Universal Grammar. However, my suggestion is that it might be possible to preserve both, if restructuring is not considered as a random parameter, but as a consequence of another higher-level parameter being active (or passive) in the grammar of the given language.

Following Cinque (2006), restructuring verbs always occupy the position of functional verbs in what behaves as a monoclausal configuration, which implies that they have no other option but to take a reduced vP complement. This proposal is closely connected with Cinque’s earlier work on the hierarchy of functional heads (Cinque 1999). There Cinque suggested that, on the basis of the relative order of functional morphemes in head positions and of the corresponding classes of AdvPs, the functional portion of the clause is constituted by the same, richly articulated and rigidly ordered hierarchy of functional projections, which spans from the upper boundary of vP up to CP (Cinque 1999; 2006). The verbs that enter the restructuring
construction appear to correspond to distinct heads of this hierarchy, in the sense that each seems to lexicalize the content of one or the other functional head. According to Cinque, this is obvious for the various modal and aspectual verbs, but is also true for motion verbs as well (Cinque 2006).

At the same time it is crucial to remember that languages do differ in terms of the value of the verb raising parameter, where some languages allow for the verb to raise to Infl, while others go the opposite way, and the Infl lowers to V. In this respect Russian and English are both non-verb-raising SVO languages, while French, Italian and German provide clear evidence for V-to-I movement. In more general terms there exists a thoroughly studied parameter regulating how high the verb in a given language can raise above the level of the VP. And indeed, the ability of any verb in a specific language to reveal its potential restructuring properties is crucially dependent on its ability to occupy a higher functional head position above the VP level: this is allowed in languages like French, Italian and German that do reveal restructuring patterns, but not in Russian and English that have their non-finite clauses uniformly non-reduced. In other words, I want to suggest that, although certain verbs can be universally marked for potential restructuring ability in the lexicon, they can only possibly exercise this ability in the languages that allow for V-to-I movement. In any case, the question of such parametric variation still presents a significant challenge and raises multiple questions for future research.
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