The Case of Predicates: Questions of Control and Binding

The case marking of secondary predicates in modern Russian presents interesting problems for a Government and Binding account of Case in Russian. Secondary predicates in Russian are adjectives which must be case-marked. Unlike nouns, they do not move to receive Case by government; unlike many other adjectives, they do not necessarily inherit Case from a noun. In order to extend GB to account for the case-marking of secondary predicates in Russian, we must allow the possibility of APs agreeing in case with more distant NPs and for the possibility of APs receiving default case-marking. In this paper, I will show that the statement of these mechanisms is far from straightforward. In fact, none of the analyses that I present are entirely successful. {The most successful analyses of the data suggest that we may need to revise the theory.}

In sections 1 and 2 I will present basic case marking in Russian and the case marking of secondary predicates in Russian, respectively. Sections 3, 4 and 5 will discuss three types of analyses of the case marking of secondary predicates. The analyses in section 3 are the most conservative; section 4 presents an argument for case-marked PRO, while section 5 addresses a possible connection between the secondary predicates and anaphora.

1. Case Marking in Russian

Every NP and AP in Russian must be marked with one of six (morphological) cases. Typically, subjects are nominative, direct objects are accusative, and indirect/oblique objects are dative, as shown in (1-3) below.

shown in (1-3) below.
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This is hardly an unusual pattern of case marking; as with numerous other languages, it is generally accepted that case is assigned in sentences like (1-3) by structural case assignment. I[+agr] assigns nominative case to its specifier; V assigns accusative and dative case to the sisters of V and V', respectively.

Particular V's and Ps can also assign idiosyncratic cases to their complements in Russian; this is known as lexical or “quirky” case, and overrides any structural case assignment that might otherwise occur. Example (4) below shows a verb which assigns genitive to its complement, while in (5), the verb assigns instrumental to its complement. Example (6) shows one of a small class of verbs with no arguments. Example (7) shows one of a small class of verbs with one argument that takes accusative case. Whether this argument should be analyzed as a subject or an object is unclear, but I will not address that issue here. Prepositions always assign lexical case to their complements; they may assign any of the five cases we have seen so far except nominative. Prepositions may also assign a sixth case, known as prepositional case. Prepositions with noun complements in various cases are shown in (8).

(1) Ivan umer
Ivan(N) died(m.sg)
‘Ivan died’

(2) Ivan čital knigu
Ivan(N) read(m.sg) book(A)
‘Ivan read a/the book’

(3) Ivan dal knigu Irine
Ivan(N) gave(m.sg) book(A) Irina(D)
‘Ivan gave a/the book to Irina’

(4) my vsegda dostigaem xorosix resultatov
we(N) always achieve(1pl) good(G) results(G)
‘We always achieve good results’

(5) Ivan boleet gripom
Ivan(N) be-ill(3sg) flu(l)
‘We always achieve good results’

(5) Ivan boleet gripom
Ivan(N) be-ill(3sg) flu(l)
‘Ivan is ill with the flu’
(examples 4, 5 from Davis & Oprendek 1972, p. 102, 196)

1 The following abbreviations will be used in the glosses in this paper: N = Nominative, A = Accusative, D = Dative, G = Genitive, I = Instrumental, P = Prepositional, m = masculine, f = feminine, n = neuter, sg = singular, pl = plural; 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person, respectively; INF = infinitive.

2 Note that Russian verbs agree with their subjects in gender and number in the past tense. In the present and future tenses, verbs agree with their subjects in person and number.
(6) temneet
get-dark(3sg)
'It is getting dark'

(7) menja tošnit
me(A) be-nauseous(3sg)
'I feel ill'

(8) (a) posle obeda
after lunch(G)
(b) čerez čas
in/after hour(A)
    'in an hour'
(c) s bratom
with brother (I)
    'with my brother'
(d) po televizoru
on television(D)
(e) o muzyke
about music(P)

There are many complications to this basic picture, of course. Case is often correlated with semantics. Instruments, not surprisingly, take instrumental case. Likewise, adjunct modifiers which are time expressions (i.e. which form a semantic class) all take accusative case. The examples in this section have all been simple declarative sentences, and different types of constructions show different patterns of case marking. For instance, the agent argument in a passive construction (i.e. the subject of the corresponding declarative construction) takes instrumental case. Each of these quirks is worthy of its own paper, but I will not pursue them here. Instead, I will focus on the assignment of case to predicative adjectives.

2. Secondary Predication and Case

In Russian, an adjective can function as a secondary predicate in a sentence. According to the literature on this issue, most adjectives follow the pattern of case marking shown in (9-15) below. (Similar examples are cited in Greenberg and Franks 1991). I have used the same verb, *prijti* 'come,' in most sentences to emphasize the fact that the form of the secondary predicate depends on the structure of the sentence, not on the choice of the verb that is closest to the

---

3 At least one of my informants finds some additional cases acceptable on some of the predicative adjectives in (9-15); see section 2.1.
It appears that the typical predicative adjective appears in a default case (instrumental) and can also optionally agree in case with its argument when the argument is a nominative subject in the same clause. Note that secondary predicates always agree in number and gender with their logical arguments, regardless of the syntactic position of the arguments. Clearly, case agreement and number/gender agreement are governed by different principles; I will discuss only case agreement in this paper.

Two adjectives, _odin_ ‘alone’ and _sam_ ‘oneself’ show a different pattern of case marking agreement in this paper.

Two adjectives, _odin_ ‘alone’ and _sam_ ‘oneself’ show a different pattern of case marking when they are used as predicates. Although Russian grammarians traditionally analyzed the case

---

4 Out of context, the choice of case in sentences like this does not appear to correlate to any difference in the meaning of the sentence. However, Timberlake (1986) shows that, in context, there is a subtle difference in meaning between the two forms. According to Timberlake, “The two cases differ ... in that the nominative signals that the state does not represent a departure from the expected state of affairs, the instrumental that the state does represent a departure” (1986: 137).
of these adjectives as a historical relic, Comrie (1974) argues that the pattern of case marking is still productive in Russian syntax. Comrie points out that in Old Russian and early modern Russian this pattern of case marking was far more productive, applying to adjectives as diverse in meaning as *пуст* ‘empty,’ *жив* ‘alive’ and *посажен* ‘impaled.’ Since this pattern was once productive, a theory of grammar should be able to account for the pattern in a principled matter. Other American linguists have followed Comrie’s lead on this issue.

The exceptional secondary predicates agree in case with the argument they are predicated of, so long as it is in the same clause. In (16) and (18) below the predicate agrees in case with the subject, while in (17) the predicate agrees in case with the direct object. Example (19) demonstrates that case agreement also occurs within an embedded (tensed) clause, as we expect.

(16)  
Ivan(N) *пришёл* (*came*)  
*один* (N) alone(N)  
‘Ivan came alone’

(17)  
Ivan(N) *нашёл* (*found*)  
*Олега* (A) Oleg(A) odnogo  
‘Ivan found Oleg alone’

(18)  
Ivan(N) *нашёл* (*found*)  
*Олега* (A) Oleg(A) alone(N)  
‘Ivan found Oleg alone’

(19)  
Ivan(N) *хочет*, *чтобы* *Олег* *пришёл* (*came*)  
*один* (A) alone(A)  
‘Ivan wants Oleg to come alone’

When an exceptional secondary predicate is in an infinitival clause, it often takes dative case, regardless of the case marking of the overt NPs in the sentence. The (apparently) non-agreeing dative case is shown in (20-22) below.

(20)  
*важно* (*important*) *прийти* (*come*)  
*одному* (D) alone(D)  
‘It’s important to come alone’

(21)  
*mне* *важно* (*important*) *прийти* (*come*)  
*одному* (D) alone(D)  
‘It’s important for me to come alone’

For simplicity, I will use *один* throughout this discussion. The adjective *сам* follows the same pattern.
However, an exceptional secondary predicate in an infinitival clause sometimes agrees with the nominative subject of the higher clause, as shown in (23) and (24):

(23) ja poprosil Ivanu prijeti odin
'I asked Ivan to come alone' (= 'I asked Ivan if I could come alone')

(24) ja xoču žiti odin
'I want to live alone'

Interestingly, the presence of an overt complementizer appears to block agreement between the secondary predicate in an infinitival clause and the nominative subject in a higher clause, as shown in (25):

(25) ja pereexal, čtoby žiti odnomu
'I moved in order to live alone'

My discussion of the exceptional secondary predicates will necessarily include assumptions about the structure of infinitival clauses in Russian. In keeping with standard GB theory, I assume that every clause has a subject. The infinitival clauses in (20-25) obviously do not have overt subjects. According to GB, the subject of each infinitival clause must be trace or PRO. That is, either the subject of the infinitival has moved to subject position in the higher clause, or it is PRO, an abstract noun phrase that can be assigned a theta-role by the main verb, but is not governed or assigned case. The interpretation of PRO is controlled by a noun phrase in the matrix clause, and in the absence of a controller takes an arbitrary interpretation.

I also assume the Theta Criterion, which states that a predicate must assign a theta-role to each of its arguments, and that each argument noun phrase must receive exactly one theta role.

Clearly, an embedded subject – which is an argument – will receive a theta-role from the predicate of the embedded clause, and therefore can only move to the subject position of the higher clause if the predicate of the higher clause does not have an external argument. For convenience, I will refer to a predicate which does not have an external argument, and allows
NP-movement to its subject position, by the traditional term “raising predicate.” We can see that the higher predicates of (22-25) have external arguments, and are therefore not raising predicates; the embedded subject in each of these must be PRO. On the other hand, it appears that važno ‘important’, in (20-21), does not have an external argument, since ‘me’ is optional in the examples. If važno had an external argument, then we would expect (20), in which there is no NP to receive a theta-role from važno, to be ungrammatical. Therefore, in (20-21) it is possible that the subject of the embedded clause moved to the subject position of the higher clause. However, evidence from idiom chunks indicates that such movement has not taken place.

One of the classic arguments that seem is a raising predicate is that an idiomatic reading is possible with a sentence like “The cat seems to be out of the bag.” That is, the apparent subject of “seem” is licensed by the lower clause. If we try similar constructions in Russian, we find that važno ‘important’ does not act like a raising predicate in this regard:

(26) medved’ na uxo nastupil
    bear(N) on ear stepped(m.sg)
    ‘X is tone deaf’

(27) medved’u važno na uxo nastupit’
    bear(D) important on ear step(INF)
    literal reading only: ‘It is important to a bear to step on X’s ear.’

In fact, not even kažet’sja ‘seem’ acts like a raising verb with idiom chunks:
(28) *medved’ kažetsja na uxo nastupit’
    bear(N) seems(3sg) on ear stepped(INF)
    ‘X seems to be tone deaf’

Arguably, there are no raising constructions in Russian. Therefore we need only to account for the distribution of predicative adjectives with respect to PRO.

The case of predicative adjectives in infinitival clauses – that is, secondary predicates whose argument is PRO – appears to depend on the controller of PRO. If PRO is uncontrolled, as in (20), or controlled by something other than a nominative subject, as in (21-22), the secondary predicate has dative case. If PRO is controlled by a nominative subject, as in (23-24), the secondary predicate has nominative case; as we saw above, this long-distance case agreement is blocked by an overt complementizer, as in (25). Incidentally, the apparently non-agreeing dative predicative adjective (seen in examples (20-22) and (25)) has been called the Second Dative, a convention I will adopt here.

2.1. Additional Data

My informants found a number of forms to be fully or marginally acceptable in addition to the forms that are usually cited in the literature. Specifically, many younger informants accept the

Example (28) is grammatical if the verb ‘step’ is tensed:

(i) medved’ kažetsja na uxo nastupil
    bear(N) seems(3sg) on ear stepped(m.sg)
    ‘It seems that X is tone-deaf.’

Here, medved’ ‘bear’ receives Case from the tensed verb nastupil ‘stepped,’ so there is no motivation for ‘bear’ to move. The same pattern holds for non-idiomatic sentences: ‘seems’ can appear with a tensed but not with an untensed verb, as shown in (ii-iv). Note that in (ii), the only grammatical example, ‘seems’ does not agree with the nominative NP, but the lower verb does, which is consistent with the claim that the nominative NP is the subject of the lower clause.

(ii) oni kažetsja učatsja v universitete
    they(N) seems(3sg) study(3pl) at university(P)
    ‘It seems that they study at the university.’

(iii) *oni kažetsja učatsja v universitete
    they(N) seems(3sg) study(3pl) at university(P)
    ‘It seems that they study at the university.’

(iv) oni kažetsja učitsja v universitete
    they(N) seem(3pl) study(INF) at university(P)
    ‘It seems that they study at the university.’

It appears that kažetsja ‘seems’ is not a raising verb. In these sentences, it is possible that ‘seems’ is a parenthetical, or alternatively that the lower subject has been fronted into a topic position.

Schein (1981) argues that subjects of small clauses raise in Russian. For the purposes of this discussion, I will disregard raising from small clauses.
default instrumental with nearly all instances of the exceptional predicative adjectives. They also appear to allow case agreement in a wider range of environments. However, much of this apparent case agreement is due to homophony between true secondary predicates and floated quantifiers.

2.1.1. The Default Instrumental

Recall that the instrumental case is the “default case” for regular predicative adjectives. Several of my younger informants almost always allow this default case with the exceptional predicative adjectives as well, as shown in (29-34) below; the instrumental was rejected only in (29). Note that these sentences are acceptable *in addition* to the standard paradigm given in Section 2. Generally, the forms in (29-34) are considered more colloquial than those in the standard paradigm.

(29) ja živy odin/*odnim
     I(N) live(1sg) alone(N/*I)
     ‘I live alone’

(30) ja našel ego odnim
     I(N) found(m.sg) him(A) alone(1)
     ‘I found him alone’

(31) (mne) važno žit’ odnim
     me(D) important live(INF) alone(1)
     ‘It’s important (for me) to live alone’

(32) ja poprosil Ivana žit’ odnim
     I(N) asked(m.sg) Ivan(A) live(INF) alone(1)
     ‘I asked Ivan to live alone’

(33) ja xoču žit’ odnim
     I(N) want(1sg) live(INF) alone(1)
     ‘I want to live alone’

(34) ja pereexal, čtoby žit’ odnim
     I(N) moved(m.sg). in-order-to live(INF) alone(1)
     ‘I moved in order to live alone’

In (29), the example in which the instrumental is rejected, the secondary predicate’s argument is
the nominative subject of the same (simple) clause. This is the same environment in which regular predicative adjectives optionally agree with their subjects. There is clearly something about local subjects which is conducive to case agreement. Other than the peculiarity of (29), we can say that for younger speakers the "default instrumental case" has generalized from regular to exceptional predicative adjectives.

2.1.2. More on Case Agreement

My informants often appear to allow or require case agreement between a secondary predicate and its argument when that argument is the direct object of the primary predicate. One speaker found (35) acceptable:

(35) ja našel ego veselogo
'I found him cheerful'

In (35), a regular predicative adjective agrees in case with an accusative direct object in the same clause. We only need a minor revision of the descriptive generalization to account for this. We can now say that, for some speakers, regular predicative adjectives agree in case with any argument in their own clause – not just a nominative argument. The default instrumental case is still always acceptable for regular predicative adjectives. The next section will discuss another apparent occurrence of case agreement between a secondary predicate and its argument; however, I will argue that these "secondary predicates" are, in fact, floated quantifiers.

2.1.3. Floated Quantifiers

An intriguing pattern of results from my informants is shown in (36-38):

(36) ja velel emu žit' odnomu
'I ordered him to live alone'

(37) ja ugovoril ego žit' odnogo
'I persuaded him to live alone'
At first glance, these sentences appear to show more long-distance case agreement. Each of these sentences contains an embedded infinitival clause; the secondary predicate's argument in each sentence is PRO, which is controlled by a direct or indirect object. According to the literature, the secondary predicate should be dative in each of these sentences. But notice that my informants consistently prefer the accusative case for the secondary predicate in (37). Example (38) is more problematic; both accusative and dative are marginally acceptable. However, not all speakers accept (36-38). Speakers who do accept (36-38) sometimes indicate that the secondary predicate is in a strange position, and that they would prefer to put it earlier in the sentence, next to the antecedent. But when Odin and sam occur next to a noun, they function as quantifiers rather than predicates. This is especially clear with Odin. As Comrie (1974) points out, Odin translates as ‘only’ when it is used as a quantifier and ‘alone’ when it is used as a secondary predicate, as shown in (39-40) below. Note that this difference in meaning is similar to the English ‘I, alone, was sitting’ versus ‘I was sitting alone.’

\[
\begin{align*}
(39)\quad &\text{ja} \quad \text{odin} \quad \text{ja} \\
&\text{only(N)} \quad \text{I(N)} \quad \text{sat(m.sg)} \\
&\text{‘Only I was sitting’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(40)\quad &\text{ja} \quad \text{odin} \\
&\text{I(N)} \quad \text{sat(m.sg)} \quad \text{alone(N)} \\
&\text{‘I was sitting alone’}
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, we can conclude that Odin in (36-38) is an (incorrectly translated) floated quantifier, rather than a predicate. I will not consider the forms in (36-38) in the remainder of the paper, but will assume that, in each of these sentences, a true exceptional secondary predicate must occur in the dative case.

\footnote{Schein (1982) apparently reached a similar conclusion.}
2.2. Summary

The tables below summarize the case marking of predicative adjectives. In each schema, the predicative adjective and its argument are boldfaced, and relevant examples are cited to the right. Note that in (41c), (42d) and (43d) I have not indicated the grammatical function of the dative noun phrase at the beginning of the sentence. The grammatical function of these dative NPs is the subject of some controversy; I will address this issue in section 4.1.2.

(41) Schematic table of case-marking of regular predicative adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>structure</th>
<th>cf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) PRED(N/I) (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) SUBJ(N) V OBJ(A) PRED(I)³ (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) (NP[D]) ADV [PROi V PRED(I)] (11,12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) [PROi V PRED(I)] (13,14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) [C PROi V PRED(I)] (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) SUBJ(N) V OBJ (A) [PROi V PRED(I)] (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(42) Schematic table of case-marking of exceptional predicative adjectives for 2 informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>structure</th>
<th>cf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) PRED(N) (16,18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) SUBJ(N) V OBJ(A) PRED(A) (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) SUBJ(N) V [C SUBJ(N) V PRED(N)] (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) (NP[D]) ADV [PROi V PRED(D)] (20,21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) [PROi V PRED(N)] (23,24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) [C PROi V PRED(D)] (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) [PROi V PRED(N)] (23,24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) SUBJ(N) V (OBJ) [C PROi V PRED(D)] (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) SUBJ(N) V OBJ (D/A) [PROi V PRED(D)] (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³Or, for one informant:
SUBJ(N) V OBJ(A) PRED(A/I) cf. (35)
(43) Schematic table of case-marking of exceptional predicative adjectives for 3 informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>cf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>SUBJ(N)</td>
<td>(OBJ)</td>
<td>PRED(N)</td>
<td>(16,18,29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>SUBJ(N)</td>
<td>OBJ(A)</td>
<td>PRED(A/I)</td>
<td>(17,30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>SUBJ(N)</td>
<td>[C SUBJ(N) V PRED(N)]</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(NP[D])</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>[PROi V PRED(D/I)]</td>
<td>(20,21,30,31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>SUBJ(N)</td>
<td>(OBJ)</td>
<td>[PROi V PRED(N/I)]</td>
<td>(23,24,33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>SUBJ(N)</td>
<td>(OBJ)</td>
<td>[C PROi V PRED(D/I)]</td>
<td>(25,34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>SUBJ(N)</td>
<td>OBJ(D/A)</td>
<td>[PROi V PRED(D/I)]</td>
<td>(22,32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (41), we see that regular predicative adjectives are always acceptable in the default instrumental case. These predicative adjectives also optionally agree with their argument when that argument is the nominative subject of the same clause. One informant has apparently extended this case agreement, and accepts predicative adjectives that agree in case with their argument even when the argument is a direct object in the same clause.

(42) shows the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates as given in the literature and by two of my informants. Note that in (42a-b) an exceptional secondary predicate must agree with its argument if they are both in the same clause. When the exceptional secondary predicates occur in infinitival clauses, their case marking is more complicated. In (42e) we see that when PRO is controlled by a nominative subject and there is no intervening complementizer, the secondary predicate takes nominative case. (42f) shows that when PRO is controlled by a nominative subject but there is an overt complementizer, the secondary predicate takes dative case. The secondary predicate also takes dative case when PRO is uncontrolled or controlled by a direct or oblique object, as in (42d) and (42g).

(43) shows the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates as given by three of my informants. Note that (42) is nearly identical to (43): these informants accept all of the standard forms. However, they also accept the default instrumental case with nearly all instances of exceptional secondary predicates. The default instrumental case is only rejected when the secondary predicate’s argument is a nominative subject and both occur in the same clause.
In the following several sections I will explore different analyses which might account for the case marking of exceptional predicative adjectives. A successful analysis must be able to account for the instances of case agreement, as well as for the appearance of the Second Dative (the non-agreeing dative case in, e.g., (42f-g)). We prefer an analysis that includes as little revision of standard theory as possible. However, as I show in section 3, several analyses that do not require revisions of the theory are unsuccessful. In section 4 I present an analysis that requires PRO to be case-marked. In section 5 I outline a different analysis, based on Binding Theory.

3. Initial Accounts: Structural Case, Default Case and Restructuring

3.1 Accounting for the Second Dative

In this section I will consider two ways to account for the Second Dative that do not require PRO to be case-marked. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the Second Dative occurs only when long-distance case agreement is blocked, and that we can account for the blockage of long-distance case agreement. This leaves us the somewhat more manageable task of accounting for just the occurrence of the (apparently) non-agreeing dative case on secondary predicates. Linguists have proposed several different analyses of the Second Dative within a Government and Binding framework. Some argue that the Second Dative arises when a structural case assignment rule – motivated by other data – applies to secondary predicates. Another possibility is that the Second Dative is a default case, similar (but not identical) to the default instrumental that we saw with the regular predicative adjectives. I will explore each of these proposals in more detail here.


Greenberg and Franks (1991) argue that the Second Dative is the result of a rule of structural case assignment. This rule is motivated by the occurrence of the dative case on argument noun phrases, but can apply elsewhere in the absence of other case-assigning mechanisms. The rule is always available to secondary predicates, but can be overridden by case agreement, just as
structural case assignment to nominal arguments can be overridden by lexical case assignment.

Greenberg and Franks (1991) propose that dative case is structurally assigned to any (NP or AP) sister of X'. Given the standard assumption that indirect/oblique objects are sisters of V' (see 44), this rule accounts for the assignment of dative case to indirect/oblique objects.

(44)

Furthermore, the rule accounts for the so-called "dative subjects." These are dative NPs which appear in canonical subject position in terms of linear word order, but with which the verb does not agree. According to Greenberg and Franks' (1991) analysis, these subjects - sisters of I' - are not assigned nominative case by I[+agr] and dative case can therefore be assigned. This is shown in (45).

(45)

Finally, Greenberg and Franks (1991) argue that predicative adjectives are sisters of I' as well, by ternary branching, as shown in (46a) below. Franks (1995) pursues essentially the same analysis, but argues that predicative adjectives are Chomsky-adjoined to I', as shown in (46b) below. Given either structure, predicative adjectives are assigned dative case by the structural case assignment rule. Thus, one structural case assignment rule accounts for several instances of
case assignment, and an analysis of the Second Dative requires no further additions to the theory.

\[(46a)\]

\[(46b)\]

Unfortunately, Greenberg and Franks' case assignment rule is far too productive. Note that PRO is also a sister of \(1'\), and of course no standard case-assignment mechanism will apply to PRO. By Greenberg and Franks' account, PRO should also be assigned dative case. But this violates our standard assumption that PRO is ungoverned and does not receive case. Greenberg and Franks (1991) do recognize this problem, but are forced to stipulate that their case-assignment rule is governed by the tense feature of I when it applies to arguments, but not when it applies to non-arguments. That is, the rule can apply to non-arguments at any time, but to arguments only in tensed clauses. Although arguments and non-arguments certainly do behave differently with respect to case assignment, there is no independent motivation for the claim that a rule of structural case assignment is more general when it applies to non-arguments than when it applies to arguments. Alternative stipulations (e.g. that the dative rule simply does not apply to PRO) are equally unsatisfying. In fact, it is tempting to take Greenberg and Franks' (1991) analysis as evidence that PRO is case-marked in Russian. I will discuss this possibility in section 4 below.

3.1.2. Dative as an Exceptional Default

Let us now briefly consider the possibility that the Second Dative is a kind of default case for exceptional predicative adjectives, similar to the instrumental default case of regular predicative adjectives. Clearly, the Second Dative cannot be exactly the same kind of default as the instrumental default. As we have seen, the instrumental default is always acceptable with regular predicative adjectives, even when case agreement is allowed:
The Second Dative, on the other hand, is not accepted when case agreement is possible. Therefore, we cannot simply state that the exceptional secondary predicates have an exceptional default case. However, a more plausible alternative remains. Schein (1982) argues that dative is an “elsewhere” case for exceptional secondary predicates. He also argues that the Second Dative must occur when an exceptional secondary predicate does not agree in case with a nominative antecedent, a generalization that is contradicted by data such as (17), repeated here as (48):

(48) Ivan našel Olega odnogo
'Ivan found Oleg alone'

Nevertheless, if we can account for all occurrences of case agreement in the data without introducing major revisions to the theory, it may be sufficient to stipulate that the dative is an “elsewhere” case that occurs on secondary predicates if and only if case agreement is not possible.

3.2 Accounting for Long-Distance Case Agreement: Restructuring

In this section, I will explore one possible account for the long-distance case agreement in sentences like (23) and (24), repeated here as (49) and (50).

(49) ja poprosil Ivana priči odin
'I asked Ivan to come alone'

(50) ja xoču žit' odin
'I want to live alone'

In section 3.2.1 I will outline evidence for a special transformation called Restructuring in Italian. Restructuring essentially converts two verbs from adjacent clauses into a single complex verb, thus converting a complex sentence into a single clause. The transformation was proposed in the 1970’s to account for certain complexities of Romance syntax. In section 3.2.2 I show how
Restructuring may be able to account for the long-distance case agreement in Russian, and what problems arise under such an analysis.

3.2.1 Restructuring in Italian

Restructuring has been proposed in order to account for a number of constructions in Italian and other Romance languages in which elements of an embedded clause move to or affect the higher clause. For example, in Italian, clitic complements of an embedded clause are sometimes allowed to attach to a higher verb. In (51) below, \textit{mi}, the clitic complement of 'see,' is attached to 'see,' while in (52) the same clitic is attached to the higher verb 'want' (examples from Napoli 1981):

(51) \textit{voleva veder-mi}

(52) \textit{mi voleva vedere}

'She wanted to see me'

Researchers have argued that in a sentence like (52), the two verbs are reanalyzed as a single complex verb, or an auxiliary and a main verb. Thus, although the clitic in (52) has apparently "climbed" to a higher clause, there is really only one clause. In (51), on the other hand,Restructuring has not occurred, and the clitic is placed in the lower clause. There are a number of other arguments for a Restructuring transformation in Italian, which need not concern us here (but see Napoli [1981] for an overview). The relevant point is that researchers have used Restructuring in order to retain conditions on locality. Can Restructuring account for long-distance case agreement in Russian, and allow us to make the generalization that case agreement is local?

3.2.2. Restructuring in Russian

The essence of the argument for Restructuring in Russian is that it will allow us to say that all case agreement is local. Let us first look at a concrete example of this analysis. Example (53) below shows a sentence in which the secondary predicate apparently agrees with a NP in a higher clause.
The application of Restructuring to (53) will result in a single clause with a complex verb:

(54) ja [v xoču žit’ ] odin
l(N) want(1sg) live(INF) alone(N)
'I want to live alone'

Notice that the argument of the predicate is now the nominative NP in the same clause. What we would like to do is argue that Restructuring occurs in just those sentences which have apparent long-distance agreement, and in no others.

Our original description of the distribution of long-distance case agreement was that it occurs when the embedded clause is an infinitival, PRO is controlled by a nominative subject, and there is no overt complementizer. As Restructuring in Italian can only apply to two verbs that are linearly adjacent, the blocking effect of complementizers is not surprising. It is fairly straightforward to rephrase these conditions in terms of Restructuring:

(55) Conditions on Restructuring in Russian

(a) Restructuring is obligatory in subject-control sentences without an overt complementizer.
(b) Restructuring is blocked by an overt complementizer.

Unfortunately, this analysis raises two immediate problems. First, if Restructuring can only occur when two verbs are linearly adjacent, then it should not occur in a sentence like (50), in which a direct object intervenes between the two verbs. A Restructuring analysis, then, cannot account for all occurrences of long-distance case agreement in Russian.

Secondly, (55a) predicts that Restructuring should depend on the verbs in a sentence, and not on a secondary predicate. We expect, based on (54) and (55), that (56) will be grammatical, but it is not.

(56) *ja [vxoču žit’ ] veselyj
l(N) want(1sg) live(INF) cheerful(N)
'I want to live cheerfully'

Note that in Romance languages, Restructuring does depend on the meaning of the verbs that are reanalyzed, so lexical dependence per se should not cause us to abandon this analysis. However,
we certainly do not expect a secondary predicate, whose projections are not affected by Restructuring, to govern the occurrence of the transformation.

4. Case-Marked PRO

In section 3, we saw that attempts to account for the case marking of exceptional predicative adjectives in Russian without introducing major revisions to GB theory were not entirely successful. The structural case assignment rule proposed by Greenberg and Franks (1991) is too productive, and should also assign dative case to PRO. In fact, it is not clear what kind of structural case assignment rule could account for the data without assigning case to PRO, given that the I that governs PRO also governs the Second Dative. A Restructuring account of long-distance case agreement was even less successful, as we saw in section 3.2.

At this point, we could certainly fall back on stipulation; given that we are dealing with only two lexical items, it is not unreasonable to propose that the case marking of these items is entirely specified in the lexicon. However, by doing this we risk missing generalizations about case marking in Russian; I will set aside a stipulative account for now as a "last resort."

In this section, I will pursue a different analysis of the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates, one which requires PRO to be case-marked. In section 4.1 I will discuss an analysis of the Second Dative along these lines. In section 4.2 I discuss long-distance case agreement. Section 4.3 is concerned with the implications of case-marked PRO.

4.1 Accounting for the Second Dative with Case-Marked PRO

4.1.1 Case-Marked PRO in Icelandic and Russian

Sigurdsson (1991) proposes that PRO is case-marked in modern Icelandic. He provides several arguments in favor of this position, but I will summarize only the argument which is most relevant to the Russian data under consideration here.

Sigurdsson proposes that PRO is case-marked in modern Icelandic. He provides several arguments in favor of this position, but I will summarize only the argument which is most relevant to the Russian data under consideration here.

Sigurdsson argues that in Icelandic, floating quantifiers and secondary predicates are assigned case by belonging to "morphological case chains" headed by NPs. For example, the
floating quantifiers in (57) and (58) agree in case with the subjects of the sentences:

(57) \[=6a\] strákarnir komust allir í skóla
the boys(N) got all(Npl.m.) to school
'The boys all managed to get to school'

(58) \[=6b\] strákana vantaði alla í skólann
the boys(A) lacked all(Apl.m.) in the school
'The boys were all absent from school'

When the same floating quantifiers appear in embedded infinitival clauses, they appear to agree in case with the case that each verb would assign to its subject, if PRO could be case marked.

Compare (57) and (58) to (59) and (60):

(59) \[=8a\] strákarnir vonast til [að PRO komast allir í skóla]
the boys(N) hope for to (N) get all(N) to school

(60) \[=8b\] strákarnir vonast til [að PRO vanta ekki alla í skólann]
the boys(N) hope for to (A) lack not all(A) in the school

These Icelandic data suggest that we may want to allow lexical case assignment to apply to PRO. By the same logic, we may be able to argue that structural case assignment applies to PRO in Russian. Exceptional secondary predicates in Russian often agree in case with a noun phrase elsewhere in the sentence. Whenever exceptional secondary predicates do not agree with any overt noun phrase, they occur in a clause with PRO. Therefore, we might argue that PRO is marked with dative case in Russian, and that exceptional secondary predicates always agree in case with an antecedent.

Unfortunately, the Russian data are not as clear as the Icelandic data. Note that, in the Icelandic data, every "morphological case chain" appears to be confined to a single clause. That is, whenever a quantifier appears in a clause with PRO, it will agree in case with PRO, assuming

Icelandic data, every "morphological case chain" appears to be confined to a single clause. That is, whenever a quantifier appears in a clause with PRO, it will agree in case with PRO, assuming

that Sigurdsson’s proposal is correct. On the other hand, Russian secondary predicates do not always show dative case when they appear with PRO. As we have seen, there are some instances

\footnote{This analysis also assumes that Icelandic verbs assign "quirky" case to their subjects. For a discussion of quirky subjects, see Sigurdsson (1992).}

\footnote{Sentence glosses were not provided for these sentences.}

\footnote{Sigurdsson (1991) also argues that PRO can be assigned structural case in Icelandic, based on data having to do with verb agreement.}
in which a predicate appears to have a long-distance agreement relationship with an NP in a higher clause. An analysis based on case-marked PRO must also provide some account for the long-distance case agreement, a problem I will address in section 4.3.

If we argue that PRO is case-marked, we must also explain how PRO can receive dative case by structural case assignment. In fact, there is some motivation for this. Many researchers have pointed out that dative NPs are the apparent subjects of an interesting construction in Russian containing an infinitival. As I mentioned in section 3.1.1, the “dative subjects” are relevant to Greenberg and Franks’ (1991) analysis; I will now discuss in more detail how the “dative subjects” are relevant to an analysis involving case-marked PRO.

4.1.2. The “Dative Subject” in Russian

One of the more puzzling and controversial issues in Russian case marking is the problem of dative NPs which, based on linear word order, appear to be in the subject position of sentences. Examples of these “dative subjects” are given in (61) and (62) below.

(61) mne (bylo) uxdit'
    me(D) was(n.sg) leave(INF)
    'I have/had to leave'

(62) mne (bylo) nado uxdit'
    me(D) was(n.sg) necessary leave(INF)
    'I have/had to leave'

Note that there is no subject-verb agreement in these sentences – the verb, if any, takes a default form, neuter singular. There is, however, tense, as indicated by the presence of the copula in the past tense. Since the copula is null in the present tense, we must rely on the past tense to show the presence or absence of tense and agreement. Note also that there are two constructions with “dative subjects,” In (61) the construction consists of a dative NP, a copula, and an infinitival. In (62) there is also an adverb; when the adverb nado ‘necessary’ is used, the two constructions are semantically very similar.

The grammatical function of the dative NPs in (61) and (62) is by no means clear. Researchers have argued that they are subjects; that they are indirect objects; and that they are indirect objects. However, the morphological identity of the dative NPs in (61) and (62) as adverbs is not clear.

\(^{11}\) Nado is morphologically identifiable as an adverb, but conventionally translated as “necessary.”
some of each. But note that if we assume that these dative NPs are true subjects, then we can give a simple explanation of the (possible) dative case-marking of PRO. Note that, like PRO, the “dative subjects” appear in a clause without subject-verb agreement. We assume that [+agr] assigns nominative case; now we need only add that in Russian, [-agr] assigns dative case. Thus, both the “dative subjects” and PRO will receive dative case.

4.2. Accounting for Long-Distance Case Agreement with Case-Marked PRO

In the previous section I presented an argument that PRO is structurally assigned dative case in Russian. The Second Dative is then the result of local case agreement: a secondary predicate agrees in case with PRO in the same clause. However, we have seen that secondary predicates do not always take the dative case when they occur in infinitival clauses. Recall that when PRO is subject-controlled and there is no overt complementizer, long-distance case agreement is possible (cf. 42). In order to extend this analysis to cover the long-distance case agreement, we must make one of two possible revisions: we must provide a way for the secondary predicate to agree in case with a higher subject when necessary, or we must provide a way for PRO to receive cases other than dative.

Suppose that the dative secondary predicate agrees in case with PRO and the nominative secondary predicate agrees in case with a higher subject. This suggests that the secondary predicate chooses the “best” antecedent from among its argument and the NPs that are coindexed with the argument. A fully referential subject is better than PRO, but PRO – a subject – is preferable to a fully referential object. This suggests that a more detailed investigation of the data in an optimality theoretic framework might be worthwhile in the future. An analysis involving Optimality Theory is beyond the scope of this study, however.

On the other hand, if we want to extend our analysis without introducing Optimality Theory, we could argue that the exceptional secondary predicates agree in case with a local argument, and that PRO actually is assigned nominative as well as dative case. Under this

---

14 See Bachman (1980) for a summary of the positions of Russian linguists on this issue. Bachman later argues, working within the theory that preceded GB, that dative subjects are, in fact, subjects. In more recent work, Preslar (1995) argues that “dative subjects” are actually indirect objects, while Greenberg and Franks (1977) take the position that some apparent “dative subjects” are subjects, while others are indirect objects.
analysis, PRO is assigned dative case unless its controller is a nominative subject and there is no overt complementizer. This implies that PRO inherits case from its subject controller. The conditions on the case-marking of PRO are then as follows:

(63) Case-marking of PRO

(a) PRO agrees in case with a subject controller.

(b) Case agreement between PRO and its controller is blocked by an overt complementizer.

(c) Case agreement overrides structural case assignment.

We can now account for all of the case-marking of exceptional secondary predicates. PRO is structurally assigned dative case by $I[-agr]$. When the secondary predicate's argument is PRO, the secondary predicate will agree in case with PRO. In addition, under the conditions outlined above, the secondary predicate agrees with a higher subject instead of PRO or PRO inherits nominative case from its controller. Unfortunately, this successful analysis only comes at the expense of disposing with the PRO Theorem. We can account for the case marking of predicative adjectives only by losing our explanation of the complementary distribution of PRO and lexical NPs. The next section will address this problem.

4.3. The Implications of Case-Marked PRO

If we allow PRO to be case-marked, and assigned case by $I[-agr]$, we essentially destroy the PRO Theorem, which states that PRO is ungoverned and not assigned Case. Therefore, PRO appears in exactly those positions where lexical NPs are not licensed, since lexical NPs must receive Case. In this section I have presented an argument which states that PRO is governed and assigned Case, at least in Russian and Icelandic. If we accept this argument, we must find a new way to account for the distribution of PRO and lexical NPs.

Some researchers have made arguments about the Russian data which are very similar to mine but avoid assigning Case to PRO in the syntactic derivation proper. Comrie (1974) presents an argument that is essentially the same as mine but which predates Control Theory. Clearly, an analysis which involves deleting lexical NPs from infinitival is no longer useful. Bouchard (1984) proposes that PRO is case-marked - but only at LF. One would prefer a more principled
analysis than one which relegates case marking to LF, especially since case marking is generally associated with PF.

Sigurdsson (1991), addressing this problem for Icelandic, proposes that lexical NPs must be licensed by "proper head government." That is, a lexical NP must be governed by one of a list of "proper head governors;" the list of such governors may be a parameter of universal grammar. Crucially, I[-tense], which governs PRO, is not a proper head governor. This amounts to a stipulation that lexical NPs cannot appear in the subject position of tenseless clauses; this is probably the best we can do, because once we allow PRO to be governed and assigned case, there is little else to differentiate PRO and lexical NPs.

We seem to be faced with a choice between two stipulations. If we accept the only working analysis of the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates that we have seen so far, then we must stipulate the distribution of PRO and lexical NPs. If we retain the PRO Theorem, then we seem to have no way to account for the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates other than by specifying it in the lexicon. This unsatisfying conclusion suggests that it may be worthwhile to reexamine our assumptions. Recall that we assumed that the exceptional case-marking pattern is productive in modern Russian, even though it only applies to two words. In the next section, I discuss the possibility that these two words have in fact been reanalyzed as anaphors in modern Russian.

5. Predicative Adjectives and Binding Theory

It may not be a coincidence that the only two exceptional predicative adjectives in modern Russian, *odin* 'alone' and *sam* 'self,' are semantically similar to reflexives. There are interesting similarities between anaphors and exceptional predicative adjectives in Russian, which I will discuss in this section. The similarities suggest that the binding of reflexives and the case-similarities between anaphors and exceptional predicative adjectives in Russian, which I will discuss in this section. The similarities suggest that the binding of reflexives and the case-marking of exceptional secondary predicates result from the same or similar mechanisms. In this section, I will first discuss typological generalizations about two kinds of anaphors. I will then relate the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates to the binding of anaphors, and argue that the exceptional secondary predicates are, in fact, a kind of anaphor. Although the details of the mechanism of binding of these "predicate anaphors" remains to be defined, this conclusion
brings together a number of generalizations about the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates without contradicting standard theory.

5.1. Local and Long-Distance Anaphora

Although standard Binding Theory states that an anaphor must be locally bound, numerous researchers have noted that there are actually two kinds of anaphors, each with different conditions on binding. Standard Binding Theory accounts for morphologically complex anaphors; a number of recent studies have attempted to revise or extend Binding Theory to account for the behavior of morphologically simple anaphors as well. Let us first look at each kind of anaphor in more detail.

Morphologically complex anaphors, such as English *himself*, must be locally bound. Although anaphors such as *himself* are usually bound by a subject, noun phrases with other grammatical functions are also acceptable as antecedents to morphologically complex anaphors. Thus, we have:

(64) John saw himself.
(65) They showed John himself in the mirror.

Morphologically simple (monomorphemic) anaphors, on the other hand, are not always locally bound. In Chinese, the monomorphemic anaphor *ziji* 'self' can be bound by an antecedent at any distance, as shown in (66) below (from Cole and Sung, 1994).

(66) Zhangsan renwei Lisi zhidaow Wangwu xihuan ziji j/k
    'Zhangsan thinks Lisi knows Wangwu likes himself.'

In other languages, including Russian, the domain of a monomorphemic anaphor is the first finite clause. In (67), below, we see that the monomorphemic anaphor *svoj* 'self's' can be bound outside an infinitival clause. (68) shows that *svoj* cannot be bound outside of a finite clause ((67) and (68) from Progovac, 1993)

(67) professor po poprosil assistentaj [PROj čitat' svoj/j doklad]
    'The professor asked the assistant to read self's report.'
Some researchers have proposed that the domain of monomorphemic anaphors is closed off by the first morphologically realized Agr. In Russian, this corresponds to the first finite clause; in Chinese, there is effectively no limit on the domain of monomorphemic anaphors, because Chinese has no morphological Agr (see, e.g., Progovac 1993).

Morphologically simple anaphors, as opposed to anaphors such as *himself*, are subject-oriented. That is, whenever a monomorphemic anaphor is bound outside of its local clause, it is bound by a subject. In some languages, a monomorphemic anaphor is subject-oriented only when it is long-distance bound. (68) and (69) below (from Cole and Sung 1994) show that Italian *proprio* ‘one’s own’ is subject-oriented when it is long-distance bound in (69), but not when it is locally bound in (68):

(68)[=12a] Gianni ha ricondotto Maria alla propria famiglia
Gianni has returned Maria to the *self family*
‘Gianni has brought back Maria to her own/his own family’

(69)[=12b] Gianni ha convinto Osvaldo del fatto che la
Gianni has convinced Osvaldo of the fact that the
propria casa è la più bella del paese
self house is the most beautiful of the village
‘Gianni convinced Osvaldo that his own house is nicest in the village.’

In other languages, including Russian, monomorphemic anaphors are subject-oriented even when they are locally bound. (70) below (from Progovac 1993) shows that the Russian monomorphemic anaphor *sebja* ‘self’ is subject-oriented even when it is locally bound.

(70)[=24] milicjoner; rassprašival arestovanog o sebej*
policeman questioned suspect about self
‘The policeman questioned the suspect about himself’

In summary, morphologically complex anaphors are locally bound and allow antecedents of various grammatical functions. The domain of morphologically simple anaphors is the closest finite clause in Russian, and is unbounded in Chinese. Morphologically simple anaphors are subject-oriented when they are long-distance bound. In some languages, including Russian, morphologically *simple* anaphors are subject-oriented when they are locally bound as well.
5.2. Predicate Anaphora

Consider the similarities between the binding of the morphologically simple anaphors, as discussed above, and the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates.

The exceptional secondary predicates, *odin* ‘alone’ and *sam* ‘self,’ are morphologically simple. As summarized in the tables in (42) and (43), we saw that an exceptional secondary predicate can agree in case with a noun phrase in the nearest finite clause. Thus we have long-distance case agreement between a secondary predicate in an infinitival clause and a noun phrase in the higher finite clause, as in (42e). On the other hand, an exceptional secondary predicate in a subordinate finite clause agrees in case with a local antecedent, as in (42c). We can therefore say that the domain of case agreement for exceptional secondary predicates is the nearest finite clause. This is identical to the domain of binding for monomorphemic anaphors in Russian.

Furthermore, when an exceptional secondary predicate shows long-distance case agreement, it always agrees in case with a subject; compare (42e), which shows that a secondary predicate agrees in case with a nonlocal subject, to (42g), which shows that a secondary predicate does not agree in case with a nonlocal object. When an exceptional secondary predicate shows local case agreement, on the other hand, it is not subject oriented; (42a-b) show that an exceptional secondary predicate agrees in case with its argument when that argument is in the same clause, regardless of the grammatical function of that argument. Thus, the exceptional secondary predicates are subject-oriented for long-distance case agreement, but not for local case-agreement. Note that this pattern is similar to the subject-orientation of monomorphemic anaphors in languages such as Italian. The Russian monomorphemic anaphors *svoj* ‘self’ s’ and *sebja* ‘self,’ in contrast, are always subject-oriented.

The similarities between the binding of anaphors and the case agreement of exceptional secondary predicates, as well as the semantic similarity between the anaphors and exceptional secondary predicates, suggest that the exceptional secondary predicates are, in fact, a type of anaphor. Let us call them “predicate anaphors” for convenience. We have already seen that secondary predicates can agree in case with an antecedent. Now we can make the generalization that exceptional secondary predicates are bound by an antecedent, and therefore agree in case with that antecedent. The “predicate anaphors” are monomorphemic, and therefore their domain
is the closest finite clause. Note that this conclusion suggests that the degree of subject-orientation, so to speak, is lexically determined. Russian predicate anaphors, in this analysis, are subject-oriented only when they are long-distance bound, while other Russian monomorphemic anaphors are always subject-oriented.

Of course, we still need to account for the occurrence of the Second Dative. Recall that exceptional secondary predicates are accepted in environments in which they are not in a binding relationship, either long-distance or local, with a (fully referential) antecedent. In (42d) and (42g) we see that the argument of a secondary predicate can be PRO, even when PRO is uncontrolled or controlled by a direct or oblique object. But note that in these environments, the secondary predicate takes the dative case and does not appear to agree in case with any antecedent. In terms of a binding analysis, these non-agreeing secondary predicates are logophors.

Many researchers have pointed out that anaphors are sometimes acceptable even when they are not bound, as in (71-72) below (from Reinhart and Reuland, 1991).

(71)=55a] This paper was written by (Ann and) myself.
(72)=56a] Physicists like yourself are a godsend.

In examples such as (71-72), the anaphors are syntactically unbound, but the antecedent of each anaphor can be inferred from the discourse context; these “anaphors” are called logophors.

Anaphors can be used as logophors in many languages, and Reinhart and Reuland (1991) note that the distribution of monomorphemic anaphors used as logophors is especially free. It is not entirely unmotivated, then, to conclude that predicate anaphors can be used as logophors whenever a binding relationship is not available. Since case agreement is not possible when a predicate anaphor is not bound by an antecedent, the predicate anaphor arbitrarily takes the dative case.

Two unresolved questions remain in this analysis. First, recall that long-distance case agreement between a secondary predicate and a nominative subject is blocked by an overt complementizer. It is not clear why the presence of a complementizer should affect binding.

agreement between a secondary predicate and a nominative subject is blocked by an overt complementizer. It is not clear why the presence of a complementizer should affect binding. Presumably, this question is related to the more general problem of defining the mechanism for the binding of secondary predicates.

Some researchers (e.g. Cole and Sung 1994) have argued that long-distance binding is a covertly local relationship, accomplished by head movement of an anaphor to successive verbal
projections at LF. Clearly, this cannot apply to the binding of predicate anaphors. Even if we argue that, as single morphemes, predicate anaphors are heads and can move to I – a dubious proposal – this leads to the undesirable conclusion that case marking takes place at LF.

Other researchers (e.g. Progovac 1993) have argued that we should account for long-distance binding by parametrizing the domain of binding. That is, while morphologically complex anaphors are locally bound, the binding of morphologically simple anaphors is truly a long-distance relationship; the domain appears to depend on the presence of a morphologically realized A'gr. Clearly, this kind of analysis must also provide some way to limit the possible antecedents of each anaphor. Progovac (1993) argues that this can be accomplished by parametrized the choice of the anaphor's Subject based on whether the anaphor is a head or an XP. Of course, it is premature to argue that Progovac's (1993) analysis can or cannot account for the binding of predicate anaphors. However, it is to be hoped that future work will provide a binding mechanism that accounts for the binding of predicate anaphors as well as other anaphors, and it appears that an account which involves parametrizing the binding domain could be successful with this task.

6. Conclusion

We have seen that it is not straightforward to account for the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates in Russian. Accounts which assume that the case marking of secondary predicates is productive and which avoid major revisions to GB Theory are unsuccessful. We saw that an account which requires PRO to be case-marked is mechanically successful, but loses a standard generalization about the complementary distribution of PRO and lexical NPs. Finally, I outlined a new analysis in which exceptional secondary predicates in Russian are taken to be a kind of anaphor. The details of this analysis remain to be worked out. However, the analysis appears to be quite promising. It captures an interesting generalization about the similarities between the binding of morphologically complex anaphors and the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates. Furthermore, the analysis suggests one way in which we may be able to account for the case marking of exceptional secondary predicates without introducing major revisions to GB. It is to be hoped that future work will pursue this analysis in more detail.
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