

## **Non-finite subordination and DP / PRO alternation – what can be an embedded subject**

The talk addresses the problem of DP licensing in non-finite clauses and the common assumption that overt DPs and PRO should be in complementary distribution (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993; Bošković 1997; Landau 2004, 2015, a.o.). I provide novel data from Russian and demonstrate that a certain group of predicates in Russian – evaluative predicatives – allow DP/PRO alternation in embedded non-finite clauses in the same syntactic environment.

The alternation, however, is not free and can be described by the following generalization: an embedded overt referential subject is allowed only when there is no potential overt DP controller available within a higher clause. I account for this by proposing an ECM-style analysis, as I argue that the embedded subject can be licensed by the same matrix functional head that normally licenses an overt matrix Attitude Holder. I further discuss the fact that the ECM-style mechanism is required even though a structural subject case is arguably available in Russian non-finite clauses (Moore and Perlmutter 2000; Fleisher 2006; Landau 2008, a.o.); I consider Sigurðsson's (2008) proposal to substitute the notion of syntactic Case with *Person* as a licensing factor for overt DP arguments. In closing, I outline directions for future research and cross-linguistic comparison.