

Cyclic agree, feature-relativized locality and case-marked secondary predicates

A careful comparative syntactic study of case-marked secondary predicates in some morphologically rich languages reveals that they fall at least in three different classes. While the case-transmission vs. case independence account (Landau 2006, 2008) may fare well in *TYPE 1* languages (Icelandic, Slovak) with strict case-agreement with the subject on secondary predicates, it has fairly limited explanatory power in *TYPE 2* languages, where the case of the secondary predicate is mostly semantically conditioned (Hungarian, Finnish). Furthermore, it cannot predict why the PRO subject of adjunct predicates can agree either with the matrix subject or object even in Russian, *TYPE 3*:

- (1) Maša našla Ivan-a [PRO odn-ogo].
 Maša-NOM(F) found Ivan-ACC(M) alone-ACC(M)
 ‘Maša found Ivan (when) alone.’
- (2) Maša našla Ivan-a [PRO odn-a].
 Maša-NOM(F) found Ivan-ACC(M) alone-NOM(F)
 ‘Maša, alone, found Ivan.’

In the agreement theory of control (Landau 2006, 2008), the dative case appearing on Russian adjunct predicates is the “elsewhere option”, and is introduced as an optional intrinsic property of the infinitival C:

- (3) T [-Fin] → no case
 C [-Fin] → [DAT] (optional)

This leaves the dative experiencer subject of Russian Dative Control constructions and their agreeing dative secondary predicates without explanation:

- (4) Mari-ju ne udalos’ [PRO pokazat’ gorad drug-u
 Maria-DAT(F) not succeed DAT to show town friend-DAT

PRO odn-oj].
 alone-DAT(F)
 ‘Maria, alone, did not manage to show the town to her friend.’

If (4) falls under PRO-control, then T is unable to probe the dative case of PRO. If it falls under C-control, it would wrongly predict case-independence.

Dative experiencer subjects in Icelandic are also found with verbs selecting an infinitival clause:

- (5) Strákun-um gramdist [að PRO vera hent út
 the boys-DAT.PL resent-DFT to DAT be thrown out

[PRO ódrukkn-um]].
 DAT sober-DAT

- (6) Strákun-um gramdist [að PRO vera handtekn-ir
 the boys-DAT.PL resent-DFT to NOM be arrested-NOM.PL

[PRO ódrukkn-ir]].
 sober-NOM.PL

‘The boys resented being arrested sober.’

(5) is problematic for the same reason as (4). If (6) is assumed to display case-independence, then the nominative case of PRO must be probed by the infinitival C head, an undesirable complication.

The present proposal adopts an extended “rich structure” model of small clauses (Citko 2007, 2008), where oblique case-marked secondary predicates have a PiP functional projection, nominative case-marked secondary predicates have a PiP and PsiP functional projection. The Pi and Psi functional heads probe the relevant features of the subject of the secondary predicate *via* cyclic agree (Bejar&Rezac 2009). This mechanism accounts for cross-linguistic variation in terms of feature-relativized locality.

APPENDIX: DATA TO BE ACCOUNTED FOR

TYPE 1: ICELANDIC (Jónsson 1991, 1997, Sigurðsson 2008)

- (1) Strákarn-ir óttast [að PRO vera hent út [PRO ódrukn-um]].
 boys-NOM.PL fear to DAT be thrown out sober-DAT.PL
 ‘The boys fear to be thrown out sober.’
- (2) Strákun-um gramdist [að PRO vera handtekn-ir [PRO ódrukn-ir]].
 the boys-D.PL resent-DFT to NOM be arrested-N.PL NOM sober-N.PL
 ‘The boys resented being arrested sober.’
- (3) Ólaf-i hefur sýnst [Jón-i hafa gefnir myndir ódrukn-um].
 Olaf-DAT has seemed John-DAT has been given pictures sober-DAT
 ‘John_j seemed to Olaf_k (sober_k) to have been given pictures (sober_j)’

TYPE 2 HUNGARIAN (Dalmi 2005, Toth 2000)

- (4) Mari-nak_j nem sikerült [PRO megmutat-ni a várost a fiúk-nak_k]
 Mary-DAT not succeeded show-to the city the boys-DAT
 [PRO_{j/k} részeg-en].
 drunk-ESS
 ‘Mary did not manage to show the city to the boys (when) drunk.’
- (5) Lát-t-am [a lány-ok-at boldog-0-nak].
 see-PAST-1SG the girl-PL-ACC happy-SG-DAT
 ‘I saw the girls happy.’
- (6) Lát-t-am a lány-ok-at [PRO boldog-0-an].
 see-PAST-1SG the girl-PL-ACC happy-SG-ESS
 ‘I saw the girls happy.’

RUSSIAN (Landau 2008, Neidle 1982, 1988, Schoorlemmer 1995)

- (7) Ona_j našla jego_k [PRO_k odnogo/pjann-ym].
 she found he-ACC NOM(M) alone-ACC(M)/drunk-INST(M)
 ‘She found him (while he was) alone/drank.’
- (8) Ona_j našla jego_k [PRO_j odna/pjannaja].
 she found he NOM(F) alone-NOM(F)/drunk-NOM(F)
 ‘She found him (while she was) alone/drank.’
- (9) Jemu bylo važno [PRO kupit’ maslo [PRO odn-omu]].
 he-DAT was important DAT to buy butter DAT alone-DAT
 ‘It was important for him to buy the butter alone.’

References

- Bejar, S, & M. Rezac 2009. “Cyclic agree”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35-73.
- Citko, B. 2007. “Small clauses reconsidered: not so small and not all alike” <http://ling.auf.net>
- Citko, B. 2008. “Small clauses: not so small and not all alike”. *Lingua* 118:261-295
- Dalmi, G. 2005. *The role of agreement in non-finite predication*. *Linguistik Aktuell* 90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jónsson, J. 1993. “On case and agreement in Icelandic”. *UMass. Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 17:87-101.
- Jónsson, J. 1997. “Clausal architecture and case in Icelandic”. Ph.D. dissertation. Amherst.
- Landau, I. 2006. “Severing the distribution of PRO from case”. *Syntax* 9:153-170.
- Landau, I. 2008. “Two routes of control: evidence from case-transmission in Russian”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 877-924.
- Neidle, 1988. *The role of case in Russian syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Schoorlemmer, M. 1995. “Participial passive and aspect in Russian”. Ph.D. diss. Utrecht.
- Sigurðsson, H. 2008. “The case of PRO”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26:403-450.
- Tóth I. 2000. “Hungarian inflected infinitives”. Ph.D. diss. Tilburg.