

Научная статья / Original article

УДК 81-114.2

doi:10.37632/PI.2025.90.51.006

А-ЗАВИСИМОСТИ И ПАРАМЕТРИЗАЦИЯ КОНСТРУКЦИЙ ПОДЪЕМА^{*}

А.В. Циммерлинг

*Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина /
Институт языкоznания РАН*

Аннотация: В первой части статьи обсуждаются понятия подъема аргумента и А-зависимости и показывается, что лицензирование падежа в главной клаузе не является ни необходимой предпосылкой подъема аргумента, ни его главной структурной мотивацией. Существуют языки с конструкциями подъема, где падеж лицензируется в зависимой клаузе. Подъем аргумента из финитной зависимой клаузы широко распространен за пределами языков Среднеевропейского Стандарта и встречается в некоторых языках Европы. Во второй части статьи предлагается параметризация шести языков Европы, где были ранее выделены конструкции подъема. Показывается, что эти языки не представляют единый тип по большинству параметров: некоторые из них, включая английский язык, преимущественно кодируют противопоставление контроля и подъема лексическими средствами, в то время как другие языки, включая русский и датский, грамматикализовали продуктивные конструкции подъема, содержащие особые морфосинтаксические маркеры в виде специализированных падежных или залоговых форм.

Ключевые слова: подъем, контроль, А-зависимости, параметризация, германские языки, славянские языки

Для цитирования: Циммерлинг А.В. А-зависимости и параметризация конструкций подъема // Типология морфосинтаксических параметров. 2025. Том 8, вып. 2. С. 139–177. (На английском.)
doi:10.37632/PI.2025.90.51.006

^{*} Статья написана при поддержке Российского Научного Фонда, проект РНФ 25-18-00222 «Контроль и подъем в языках Евразии», реализуемый в Государственном институте русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина. Я благодарю анонимных рецензентов за ценные замечания и Е.А. Лютикову, Е.Ю. Иванову, Хельге Лёдрупа, Бъярне Эрнесеса, Тияну Балек, А.Н. Матрусову, И.И. Челышеву и Диего Лейте де Оливейра за консультацию. Ответственность за все ошибки лежит на авторе.

A-DEPENDENCIES AND THE PARAMETRIZATION OF RAISING CONSTRUCTIONS^{*}

Anton Zimmerling

Pushkin State Russian Language Institute / Institute of Linguistics RAS

Abstract: In the first part of my paper, I render the notions of argument raising and A-dependencies and show that case licensing in the upper clause is neither a necessary precondition of raising nor its universal trigger. There are languages with raising constructions, where case is licensed in the complement clause. Hyperraising, i.e. raising out of embedded complement clauses is widespread outside the languages of the Standard Average European type and is attested in some European languages including Bulgarian. In the second part of the paper, I offer a parametrization of six European languages with raising constructions and show that these languages are not uniform: some of them including English primarily encode the control versus raising distinction lexically, while other including Russian and Danish are mixed raising languages that developed productive raising constructions with added morphosyntactic markers.

Keywords: raising, control, A-dependencies, parametrization, Germanic languages, Slavic languages

For citation: Zimmerling A. A-dependencies and the parametrization of raising constructions. *Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters*. 2025. Vol. 8, iss. 2. Pp. 139–177. doi:10.37632/PI.2025.90.51.006

1. Raising and its triggers

1.1. Raising and A-dependencies

Argument raising has been identified as a rule or principle of English and general grammar on the basis of sentences like *John seems to be a scoundrel* ~ *It seems that John is a scoundrel*, where the syntactic argument of the matrix verb is not its semantic (in other terms — thematic) argument, hence the hypothesis

^{*} This paper has been written with support from the Russian Science Foundation, research project RSCI 25-18-00222 “Control and raising in the languages of Eurasia” realized at Pushkin State Russian Language Institute. I am indebted to the anonymous reviewers for the valuable comments and to Ekaterina Lyutikova, Elena Ivanova, Helge Lødrup, Bjarne Ørsnes, Tijana Balek, Alexandra Matrusova, Irina Chelysheva, and Diego Leite de Oliveira for the consultation. All disclaimers follow.

that this argument is taken from the embedded clause, i.e. ‘raised’ into the matrix clause [Postal 1970; 1974]. The raising metaphor explores the intuition that cross-clausal transfers promote the argument in the syntactic hierarchy. Later on, [Polinsky, Potsdam 2006; Potsdam, Polinsky 2012] assumed that cross-clausal dependencies involve a form-copy mechanism, when either the higher copy is pronounced in the matrix clause (forward raising) or the low copy is pronounced in the embedded clause, while the matrix clause contains a silent representation of the raised argument. The latter option has been dubbed ‘backward raising’. The backward raising analysis has been proposed for some language-specific constructions in a number of the world’s languages including Adyghe and Arabic [Haddad 2012], but the constructions in question can also be explained differently, cf. the discussion of Adyghe data in [Testelets 2009].

In the following, I leave out the challenge with verifying the existence of backward raising and focus on standard forward raising, i.e. argument promotion in Argument-dependencies (hence — *A-dependencies*), when the raised argument is spelled-out in the matrix clause. *A-dependencies* across clausal boundaries include raising and *control* (in earlier versions — *equi deletion*) of overt subjects in parts of a poly predicate structure [Rosenbaum 1967], cf. sentences like *John_i wanted [PRO_i to sell the house]*, where the zero subject of the infinitive clause (PRO) is coreferential with the matrix subject. The control terminology implies that equi deletion of clausal subjects is triggered by some clause-external argument. In the configuration of forward subject or object control, the controller is located in the matrix clause, and the argument shared by both clauses is interpreted as a matrix clause element. In the configuration of backward control postulated in [Polinsky, Potsdam 2002], the controller is located in the embedded clause. Raising sentences lack controllers and PRO, as PRO is defined as a controlled empty category [Landau 2008; 2025; Lyutikova 2024b; 2025: 106], cf. [Krapova 2025: 13], while the shared argument originally belongs to the complement clause.

The notions of control and raising were first introduced within the early versions of the generative frameworks calling the formalism of constituency trees (Chomsky’s Extended Standard Theory) but can be modeled in the competing frameworks that do not stick to the notion of clause, e.g. Lexical Functional Grammar [Bresnan 1982; 2001], cf. also the rendering of argument raising in the dependency formalism of the Meaning-Text Theory [Mel’čuk 2025: 164]. For an overview of *A-dependencies* see [Wurmbrand 2019].

1.2. Lexical versus mixed raising

The default hypothesis shared by most theorists from different camps is that control and raising constructions are licensed by different groups of matrix verbs, cf. [Davis, Dubinsky 2004; Abeille 2021; Vincent 2023]. This intuition underlies the descriptions, whose authors implement semi-formal tags like ‘raising verbs’, ‘forward control verbs’, ‘backward control verbs’, ‘strict control verbs’, ‘quasi control verbs’, cf. [Osenova 2022: 73]¹, ‘partial control verbs’, cf. [Bondaruk 2010: 90]², etc. referring to some lists of lexical items. At the same time, some languages develop special predicate constructions with raising characteristics. E.g., Modern Russian makes use of two productive dative sentences patterns, where the dative arguments originate in the embedded infinitival clauses — root dative-infinitive structures (DIS) expressing external necessity, cf. *mne_{DAT} ne_{NEG} vyjti_{INF.PFV} otsjuda* ‘It is not in the cards for me to get out from here’ or contingency, cf. *mne_{DAT} esčo ne_{NEG} vyhodit’_{INF.IPFV}* ‘It is not yet my turn to get out’ [Mitrenina 2017; Zimmerling 2022; 2025a] and modal existentials with syntactic idioms consisting of *wh*-words merged with the general negation, cf. *mne_{DAT} negde_{NEG-WH} spat’_{INF}* ‘I have no place to sleep’, lit. ‘nowhere to sleep for me’ [Apresjan, Iomdin 1989; Zimmerling 2024]. These two classes of infinitive sentences exhibit raising diagnostics based on such tests as preservation of idiom chunks, passivization of the embedded predicate and availability of the narrow scope reading [Zimmerling 2025a: 42]³. The same tests give positive results for lexical raising / restructuring constructions with modal and phasal verbs [Lyutikova 2022a: 32], but while these classes are strictly limited and contain few items, the dative patterns, especially root dative-infinitive structures, are productive in Russian.

¹ Osenova applies this tag to those Bulgarian verbs that both license same-subject and different-subject complement *da*-clauses.

² Bondaruk applies this tag to those Polish and Irish verbs that license sentences, where the reference of PRO covers the reference of its antecedent but is not identical with it. Exhaustive control excludes this kind of mismatch per definition. The distinction of exhaustive versus partial control goes back to [Landau 2008].

³ Let us show the narrow scope diagnostics for Russian DIS sentences like $\nearrow Vsem \ tut \ ne$ [$\searrow vyjti$], which under the default reading have the focal accent on the infinitive *vyjti* ‘go out’ and the topic accent on the dative quantifier $\nearrow vsem$ ‘to everybody’. The expressed meaning is then ‘It is not true that everyone can get out from here’ = ‘someone won’t be able to get out’ ($\forall > NEG$). The inverse scope ($NEG > \forall$) arises under the marked reading with the focal accent on the dative quantifier: $\searrow \searrow Vsem \ tut \ ne$ [*vyjti*] ‘No one will get out’ = ‘It is not true that anyone will get out’.

Mainland Scandinavian languages developed a biclausal *s*-passive construction labeled ‘reported passive’ or ‘raising passive’ [Ørsnes 2006; 2013; Lødrup 2008a; 2008b; 2014; 2022; Engdahl 2022]. The *s*-suffix is a mediopassive morpheme reanalyzed as raising marker when attached to speech, putative and even factive verbs, sporadically also to phasal and modal verbs [Julien, Lødrup 2013]. The reported passive construction is especially characteristic of Danish, which has a large class of morphologically mediopassive verbs like *mene-s_{REFL}* ‘be meant’, *tænke-s_{REFL}* ‘be thought’, *sige-s_{REFL}* ‘be said’. They take infinitival complements, passivize them and raise the infinitival arguments into the matrix clause, while the corresponding active verbs without *-s* do not take infinitival complements at all [Ørsnes 2006; 2013]. Thus, Danish has a potentially open class of derived subject raising verbs, or, in traditional terms, *Nominativus cum Infinitivo* (NCI) predicates, but almost no object raising verbs (in traditional terms, *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* (ACI) predicates).

Russian and Polish use special morphological cues for encoding the nominal⁴ predicate (nouns, adjectives and participles) in small clause constructions — the predicative instrumental case (hence — *PRED_{INSTR}*). While it cannot be claimed that *PRED_{INSTR}* is only triggered by raising — there is also a class of control predicates assigning it, which is shown for Polish in [Przepiórkowski, Rosen 2005] — there is a class of sentences, where *PRED_{INSTR}* is licensed by the raised small clause subjects, cf. [Lyutikova 2022b; Zimmerling 2025b] for Russian⁵. Along similar lines, biclausal *s*-passives are also attested in Danish, Swedish and Norwegian with some matrix clause control verbs, cf. Da. *forsøge* ‘try’, ‘attempt’, and Sw. *begäre* ‘request’ [Engdahl 2022]. Despite it, the conditions of

⁴ Russian and Polish apparently do not license *PRED_{INSTR}* on pronouns, cf. (i) and (ii):

Russian

(i) Vor *okaza-l-sja* [SC [NP *nek-im*] *Ivan-om* *Petrov-ym*].
 thief turn.out-PST.SG-REFL some-INSTR.SG.M Ivan-INSTR.SG.M Petrov-INSTR.SG.M
 ‘The thief turned out to be a certain Ivan Petrov.’

(ii)* Vor *okaza-l-sja* [SC *imeno* *im*].
 thief turn.out-PST.SG-REFL exactly he.INSTR.SG
 Int.: ‘The thief turned out to be exactly him.’

⁵ A plausible analysis of the Russian data, as an anonymous reviewer suggests is to assume that *PRED_{INSTR}* is not licensed by the matrix clause verbs directly but via an intervening functional head *PRED* above the VP [Lyutikova 2024b]. I take this point and hypothesize that a similar account can be proposed for the Scandinavian *s*-passive, albeit with a different functional head, e.g. *Voice*.

licensing the Slavic $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ and the Mainland Scandinavian mediopassive s -morpheme in raising constructions nevertheless give the ground to identify them as special morphosyntactic cues marking the raising derivation in the corresponding classes of Slavic and Scandinavian sentences. The presence of the purported ‘raising morphemes’ can be used for the parametrization of raising languages. If such morphemes are available or the class of special raising constructions is productive, while the number of verbs specified as raising predicates in the lexicon is small, I classify language L as a *mixed raising language* otherwise it is classified as a *lexical raising language*. Below in section 4, I test this parameter on the sample of six European languages with raising and show that their characteristics differ.

1.3. Raising verbs and sentential complements

The verbs like Eng. *seem* or *consider* are raising predicates par excellence since they have just one internal argument — the proposition itself. It can be realized in a number of ways within one and the same language, e.g. by a finite *vs* a non-finite clause as in English or by a finite *vs* small clause as in Russian or Bulgarian.

(1) Russian (Indo-European>East Slavic)

- a. $\text{Vas-ja}^{\text{TOP}} \quad \text{sčitaet-sja} \quad [\text{sc} \text{èkspert-om} \quad \text{po} \quad \text{sintaksis-u}]$.
 Vasja-NOM.SG[M] count.INF-REFL expert-INSTR.SG.M on syntax-DAT.SG.M
- b. $\text{Sčitaet-sja}, \quad [\text{cp} \text{čto} \quad \text{Vas-ja}^{\text{TOP}} \quad \emptyset \quad \text{èkspert-}\emptyset$
 count.INF-REFL COMP Vasja-NOM.SG[M] be.PRES expert-NOM.SG.M
 $\text{po} \quad \text{sintaksis-u}]$.
 on syntax-DAT.SG.M
 ‘Vasja is considered an expert in syntax.’ {a = b}

1.4. Communicative status and Differential Argument Marking

The coexistence of pairs like (1a–b) prompts the question on the motivation of raising. The optionality of raising is apparently captured by the insight that despite the DP *Vasja* taking an A-position, notably the clausal subject position both in (1a) and (1b), it also gets a topical feature in the course of derivation, cf. the state-of-the art observations in [Serdobolskaya 2008: 261-262]. Communicative (information-structural) mechanisms are optional in the sense that well-formed syntactic structures normally do not require that some dedicated

communicative status is assigned to subjects, objects or parts of the predicate⁶. However, the DP *Vasja* is topical both in (1a) and (1b) under the default reading. Moreover, there is just one topical argument *Vasja* shared by the upper and lower clause in (1a–b). It is therefore unclear, why main clause topics should have a priority over subordinate clause topics provided that there are no other topical arguments competing with them in either clause⁷. Likewise, passive objects are frequently topical across the world's languages, but topicalization is neither the only one nor the main trigger of the European-type passive construction.

In some cases the variants with and without raising have different communicative values. Some varieties of Serbian (Indo-European>South Slavic) replaced complement infinitives with finite *da*-clause, notably in contexts with overt matrix subjects⁸. In Balkan Slavic *da*-clauses, normally only nominative subjects can be extraposed and placed to the left from the subordinator particle *da* [Krapova 2025: 16]⁹. In Serbian, the meaning 'must' is expressed by the pair of verbal lexemes *treba*₁ and *treba*₂ associated with different inflectional para-

⁶ Exceptions are attested or at least postulated for some world's languages. The idea underlying most proposals is that in some languages, topicalization goes parallel with argument promotion and triggers a shift in syntactic structure. Erlewine (2025) claims that Atayalic nominative subjects always exhibit topic properties but are morphologically reduced compared to non-nominative case-marked nominals. He proposes a model of Austronesian voice alternation, where subject promotion involves structure removal of an argument's K layer. A similar approach exploiting the nominative *vs* non-nominative asymmetry has been outlined by Zimmerling [2021: 407], who argues that most types of non-canonic subjects in Russian get a fixed communicative status in the course of derivation: raised sentential subjects and the expletive pronoun *eto* must be topical.

⁷ One can construe raising sentences with the second frame-setting topic, cf. (i), but the variant (ii) without raising with each clause having its own topic sounds artificial.

(i) {*V našem otdele*}^{TOP} *Vasju*^{TOP} *sčitajut* [_{SC} *èkspertom po sintaksisu*].

(ii) {*V našem otdele*}^{TOP} *sčitajut* [_{CP} *čto Vasja*^{TOP} — *èkspert po sintaksisu*].

'People from our department consider Vasja [an expert in syntax].' {i = ii}

⁸ In the Serbian idioms referred to, the complement infinitives like Croat. *Marko*_{NOM} *treba* [_{InfP} (*ot*)*putovati*_{INF}] 'Marko must leave' are generally replaced by finite *da*-clauses like Srb. *Marko*_{NOM} *treba* [_{Dap} *da* (*ot*)*putuje*_{PRES.3SG}]. The SRWAC corpus shows 2 hits with *treba oputovati* against 20 hits with *treba da oputuje*. In generic sentences without overt subjects, the infinitive remains an option, cf. Srb. \emptyset *Treba* [_{InfP} *govoriti*_{INF} *istinu*_{ACC}] 'one must tell the truth'. I am grateful to Tijana Balek (p.c.) for the provided data and consultation.

⁹ Non-subject arguments of Balkan Slavic *da*-clauses can optionally be fronted, if they get a focal or contrastive accent, cf. [Ivanova 2022: 95–96] for Bulgarian.

digms. *Treba*₁ selects nominative subjects and displays person-and-number agreement with the nominative DP, while *treba*₂ is an impersonal verb lacking agreement morphology. The normative grammars prescribe the orders *DP_{NOM} treba*₁ [da *v*₂] with *treba*₁ but *treba*₂ [da *DP_{NOM} v*₂] with *treba*₂. However, colloquial Serbian also has the construction *DP_{NOM} treba*₂ [da *v*₂], where the nominative DP can only be the subject of the embedded verb, since *treba*₂ lacks its own nominative argument [Tanasić 1995]. In other words, this construction exemplifies subject raising out of a finite *da*-clause, which is unusual for Standard Average European (SAE) languages but not typologically uncommon [Lohninger et. al. 2022; Greeson, Sundaresan 2025]. The purists frown on sentences like (2a) and recommend the variant (2b), where the *DP_{NOM}* remains in the embedded *da*-clause. However, for many speakers this is not an option, since the sentence (2b) is contrastive with the focus of contrast on *Marko*, while (2a) shows the unmarked communicative structure with a fronted topical subject¹⁰.

(2) Serbian (Tijana Balek, p.c.)

a. *Mark-o^{TOP}_i treba*₂ [_{DaP} da _i *otputu-j-e*].

Mark-NOM.SG must COMP leave.PRES-THEM-3SG

‘Marko must leave.’

b. *Treba*₂ [_{DaP} da *Mark-o^{FOC}* *otputu-j-e*] (ne *Milan*).

must COMP Mark-NOM.SG leave.PRES-THEM-3SG NEG Milan.NOM.SG

‘It is Marko who must leave, (and not Milan).’

The pair (2a–b) shows a mismatch between derived syntax and basic communicative structure with the topical subject. The option (2b) with the nominative subject in the embedded clause has base-generation syntax but does not fit the Topical Subject filter. Therefore, the subject must raise, which gives the variant (2a). The outlined scenario cannot serve as a universal motivation of raising, but Serbian data hints that the variants with raising might have some pragmatic priority over the base-generation variants, otherwise it is difficult to grasp, why the world’s languages exhibit a costly and redundant reordering mechanism.

¹⁰ In this paper, I assume an agnostic view on Balkan Slavic *da*-clauses and tag them as DaP without committing to any specific analysis of this type of clauses. Along the same line, I tag the infinitival clauses as InfP without specifying the volume of these complements (IP, TP or CP). In Bulgarian, the particle *da* is normally preverbal and clitic-like. I conventionally gloss it as COMP, despite theoretical concerns that its syntax is different [Krapova 2025: 16]. The same agnostic gloss is used for the Scandinavian infinitive marker *at/å*.

In some languages, raising is fed by Differential Argument Marking (DAM), i.e. the mechanism of assigning different morphological case depending on information-structural or referential properties of the argument [Aissen 2003; Lyutikova et. al. 2016]. In Tuvian (Altaic > Turkic) and in Turkic languages in general, the accusative tends to be used with definite and/or topical NPs while other NPs tend to be unmarked and stand in the nominative case [Serdobolskaya 2008: 252]. The exact DAM triggers must be checked for each language on a separate basis. The DAM perspective rather captures the possibility of raising with arguments of a certain type than the contrast between the variants with and without raising derivation.

1.5. Case licensing

A more popular explanation of raising triggers is based on case licensing. It has been argued that in SAE languages and languages with similar morphosyntax case is normally not licensed in non-finite complement clauses lacking the T(ense) feature. Therefore, the DP must undergo raising to the matrix clause to get its (syntactic) case licensed. This model applies both to languages like English, French, Danish, or Bulgarian, where only pronouns have morphological case and to languages with rich case systems like Polish or Russian, which have a special case form, $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$, reserved for the predicative complements [Patejuk, Przepiórkowski 2014; Lyutikova 2022b]. In Russian, $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ is licensed by clausal subjects in the presence of an overt verbal head expressing the T feature [Bailyn 2012: 194]. Zero present tense forms of the BE-copula do not assign $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ in Russian, cf. the ill-formedness of (3a), though they do not block the nominative case, cf. (3b).

(3) Russian

a. **Vasja-Ø* $\emptyset^{\text{BE.PRES}}$ *èkspert-om* *po* *sintaksis-u*.
 Vasja-NOM.SG.M be.PRES expert-INSTR.SG.M on syntax-DAT.SG.M
 Int.: ‘Vasja is (like) an expert in syntax.’

b. *Vasja-Ø* $\emptyset^{\text{BE.PRES}}$ *èkspert-Ø* *po* *sintaksis-u*.
 Vasja-NOM.SG.M be.PRES expert-NOM.SG.M on syntax-DAT.SG.M
 ‘Vasja is an expert in syntax.’

Since small clauses lack verbal elements with the T feature, the association with the matrix clause is crucial for the assignment and licensing of $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$. This association can be realized in a number of ways depending on the type of

the matrix verb (control versus raising predicate) and the external position (subject, object, or adjunct) taken by the small clause [Lyutikova 2022b: 64]. With true raising verbs like *sc̄itat'* ‘consider’, *sc̄itat'sja* ‘be considered’, which lack non-sentential complements altogether, the only option available is raising into an A-position, cf. (1a).

2. Cross-linguistic variation

The outlined mainstream approach to case licensing and raising is not compelling. For space limitations, I leave out the issues with modeling finiteness/infinity as a continuum [Kalinina, Sumbatova 2007] and assume that the contrast of finite *vs* infinite clauses is displayed by any language with polypredicate structures irrespective of the fact whether the forms identified as finite in the descriptions of this language actually originate from participles, gerunds, adjectives, etc.¹¹

2.1. Role-encoding languages

The main challenge comes from languages, where case is licensed in the complement clauses as in ergative Northeast Caucasian languages. According to Alexander Kibrik’s Relational Typology, these languages directly encode semantic roles and hyperroles such as Agent, Patent, Actor, Undergoer, Benefactor, Absolutive, etc. by morphological cues (case and agreement), so that the syntax of subject- predicate and subject – object relations is expected to be radically simplified, and there should not be any mismatch between semantic and syntactic arguments [Kibrik 1997; 2003: 130–131]. For the recent versions of the role-encoding hypothesis, cf. [Testelets 2021: 68]. The fine-grained mechanisms reordering polypredicate structures are predicted to be absent from role-encoding languages, but this prediction is not borne out. As Lyutikova [2024a; 2025a: 110–111; 2025b] points out, Khwarshi (Northeast Caucasian> Tsezic) displays a grammaticalized contrast of raising and control predi-

¹¹ The examples can be found in virtually all language groups. The past tense forms of Russian verbs originate from perfect *l*-participles and retain gender agreement which is a relic of their former non-finite status. The Russian modal verb *dolžen* ‘must’ is diachronically a short adjective and unlike its semantic counterpart *moc'*_{IPFV} ‘be able’~ *s-moc'*_{PFV} ‘be able’, ‘manage’ cannot get perfective aspect morphemes, cf. **s-dolžen*. The Bulgarian impersonal modal verb *tryabva* ‘must’ is diachronically a non-agreeing predicative and does not inflect for person and number [Ivanova 2025].

cates¹², despite being a canonic role-encoding ergative language, where case is licensed in the complement clauses and voice morphology is absent. The clausal predicate agrees by default with the absolutive argument. In (4a), which is the basic structure, the core agentive argument of the complement clause is encoded by the ergative case, while the experiential argument of the matrix verb *-isa* ‘find’, ‘find out’ is marked with the dative case. The embedded verb agrees with the core patientive argument *faλ* ‘village’ (class III) encoded by the absolutive case. In addition, the matrix verb exhibits long-distance agreement with the same embedded clause argument¹³. The complement clause is merged between the clause-initial experiential argument and the clause-final matrix verb. In (4b), the animate agentive argument *tušman* ‘enemy’ (class I) is extracted, i.e. raised into the matrix clause and gets absolutive case. As a result, the matrix verb must agree with it. The embedded clause is postposed. Finally, in (4c), the patientive argument *faλ* ‘village’ undergoes raising to the matrix clause, and the embedded clause is postposed.

(4) Khwarshi [Lyutikova 2025: 108]

a. *šamil-e-l* *[tušman-i* *faλ* *b-oλalna* *b-uλex-na]*
 Shamil-OBL-DAT enemy-ERG village(III)[ABS] III-around III-gather-CVB.PFV
b-is-a-na.
 III-find-CVB.PFV
 ‘Shamil discovered that the enemy has surrounded the village.’

b. *šamil-e-l* ***tušmani*** *isa-na*
 Shamil-OBL-DAT enemy(I)[ABS] I.find-CVB.PFV
*[_ i *faλ* *b-oλalna* *b-uλex-na].**
 ERG village(III)[ABS] III-around III-gather-CVB.PFV
 ‘Shamil discovered the enemy having surrounded the village.’

c. *šamil-e-l* ***faλi*** *b-is-a-na*
 Shamil-OBL-DAT village(III)[ABS] III-find-CVB.PFV
*[tušman-i — i *b-oλalna* *b-uλex-na].**
 enemy-ERG ABS III-around III-gather-CVB.PFV
 ‘Shamil discovered the village surrounded by the enemy.’

¹² Lyutikova lists *-isa* ‘find’, ‘find out’, *-q'uča* ‘want, need’, and *-akʷa* ‘see’ as raising verbs [Lyutikova 2025a: 107], while *-ekʷa* ‘manage’ and *-est'a* ‘let, force’ are analyzed by her as control verbs [Lyutikova 2024a: 16; Lyutikova 2025b: 413].

¹³ On long-distance agreement in other Northeast Causasian languages, cf. [Kalyakin 2025] for Muirin Dargwa.

The sentence (4b) is straightforwardly analyzed as raising, while (4c) can be analyzed as raising, if one assumes that Khwarshi only has clause-bound but not distant scrambling. Lyutikova also argues that raised absolutive DPs have some properties associated with the dependent clause regarding such diagnostics as scope, binding and preservation of idiom chunks, which is also typical of raised DPs in SAE languages [Lyutikova 2024: 12–14; 2025a: 108–109; 2025b: 416].

2.2. Case licensing and scrambling

Altaic and Uralic languages have scarcely even been discussed as languages without syntactic relations. However, they have several features in common with role-encoding languages: case is licensed in complement clauses, and scrambling is generally believed to be clause-bound¹⁴. The constructions similar to argument raising are nevertheless attested [Serdobolskaya 2008]. Kalmyk (Altaic>Mongolic) has accusative alignment and licenses accusative subjects in the complement clauses. Accusative subjects are optionally possible both in non-finite, cf. (5a) and finite, cf. (5b) clauses.

(5) Kalmyk [Serdobolskaya et al. 2016: 76]

- a. [Badma-*gə* *ir-s-i-n'*] *med-sən* *uga-v.*
Badma-ACC come-PTCP.PST-ACC-POSS3 know-PTCP.PST NEG.COP-1SG
'I did not know that Badma arrived.'
- b. [*Xuldač-igə* *iov-sən* *gi-ɣäd*] *sons-la-v.*
seller-ACC walk-PTCP.PST speak-CVB listen-PPERF-1SG
'I heard that the salesman left.'

Nominative embedded subjects are an option too. Serdobolskaya et al. consider the sentences (5a–b) similar to raising in SAE languages, since the embedded clause argument presumably gets the accusative case due to the association with the higher clause. They however reject the analysis of *Badma-gə* and *xuldač-igə* as raised objects, since the same pattern is attested with intransitive or semitransitive verbs like *durta* 'love', which assigns dative but not accusative case to its Stimulus argument [ibid., 78]. They conclude that accusative subjects are raised to the left periphery of the embedded clause but do not leave it. This analysis is fed by two assumptions: (i) languages like Kalmyk only have clause-bound but not distant scrambling; (ii) sentential arguments and DPs can take different positions by one and the same predicate. It is not clear

¹⁴ The claim that scrambling is always clause-bound in any language regardless of its morphosyntax is framework-internal.

whether the conditions (i) and (ii) are invariable met in SAE languages, for which the hypotheses on subject and object raising have been proved. Some of these languages, e.g. German both have raising and distant (in other terms — unbounded) scrambling, and the same holds for Russian.

It is unlikely that either local or distant scrambling constrain the raising syntax but they obscure the identification of raising constructions and telling them apart from overtly similar sentences, where the displaced element belongs to the complement clause, e.g. by virtue of the so called *prolepsis*, where a matrix clause DP obligatorily corresponds to the coreferent pronoun or gap in the embedded clause [Salzmann 2017]. These issues are addressed in [Wurmbrand 2019; Lohninger et al. 2022: 3–4], for the description of prolepsis in Russian subordinate clauses cf. [Fortuin, Davids 2013]. Bondarenko and Davies (2024) describe Balkar (Turkic) as a language with accusative and genitive subjects and distant scrambling. Like Serdobolskaya et. al. (2016) for Kalmyk, they argue that non-nominative subjects are derived in Balkar by movement to the left periphery of the embedded clause, but unlike them, they claim that “there is a correlation between the ability of an object to reach the edge of an embedded clause and its ability to scramble from it” [Bondarenko, Davis 2024: 619]. Cross-clausal subject scrambling is only possible in Balkar for accusative and genitive subjects, cf. (6a), while cross-clausal object scrambling is only possible out of embedded clauses with nominative subjects, cf. (6b). Finally, accusative subject scrambling feeds cross-clausal object scrambling, which means that is possible to extract Balkar objects if and only if the embedded clause has a non-nominative (more precisely — accusative) subject, cf. (6c)¹⁵.

(6) Balkar [Bondarenko, Davies 2024: 619–620]

a.	[Fatima-ni	bala-si-n/<u>ni</u>/*	∅]	_k	<i>ustaz</i> -∅	_{[t_k}	<i>alma-ni</i>
	Fatima-GEN	child-AGR-ACC/GEN/NOM			teacher-NOM		apple-ACC

aša-ukan-i-n] *ešt-gen-di.*
 eat-NFUT-AGR-ACC hear-NFUT-3SG

‘The teacher heard that Fatima’s child ate an apple.’

b.	Alma-ni	_k	<i>ustaz</i> -∅	[[Fatima-ni	sabij-i-∅/*n/*ni]	_{t_k}
	apple-ACC		teacher-NOM	Fatima-GEN	child-AGR-NOM/ACC/GEN	

aša-ukan-i-n] *ešit-ti.*
 eat-NFUT-AGR-ACC hear-PST

‘The teacher heard that Fatima’s child ate the apple.’

¹⁵ Multiple raising of arguments is also attested in other languages, including Cuzco Quechua [Serdobolskaya 2008: 250, 257].

c. [Fatima-ni *sabij-i-n*]_k (*tünene*) alma-ni_j ustaz-∅ [t_k, t_j
 Fatima-GEN child-AGR-ACC yesterday apple-ACC teacher-NOM
aša-ukan-i-n] ešit-ti.
 eat-NFUT-AGR-ACC hear-PST
 'The teacher heard (yesterday) that Fatima's child ate an apple.'

Bondarenko and Davis avoid the raising vs prolepsis terminology, but their diagnostics indicates that the scrambled DP takes an A-position provided the placement of the intervening matrix clause adverbial *tünene* 'yesterday' between the raised subject and raised object in (6c). Berkovich [2025: 26–29] outlines a similar approach to distant scrambling in a different Turkic idiom, Mishar Tatar and explicitly claims that extracted accusative subjects are raised and not proleptic. Her claim is supported by the diagnostic tests as NPI licensing. Mishar NPI are licensed by clausemate negation, while raised NPI items are licensed by the matrix clause negation. This test proves that they belong to the matrix clause.

(7) Mishar Tatar [Berkovich 2025]

Alsu-∅ **kem-ne** dä [(ul) kil-de diep] *ujla-m-yj*.
 Alsu-NOM who-ACC EMPH 3SG come-PST COMP think-NEG-IPFV
 'Alsu believes that nobody came.'

It is noteworthy that while Lyutikova (2024; 2025a; 2025b: 413) seeks support for her claim that the Khwarshi example (3c) contains a raised absolute DP in the assumption that Khwarshi lacks distant scrambling, Bondarenko and Davis's (2024) claim that Balkar has multiple raising and two raised accusative DP in sentences like (6c) is based on the opposite intuition that Balkar licenses distant scrambling in certain configurations.

2.3. Hyperraising

Raising out of finite clauses is occasionally called *hyperraising* [Salzmann 2017; Zyman 2023]. This label implies that raising out of finite complements should be more rare or more costly than raising out of non-finite complements. It is difficult to check this intuition, since the currently existing databases on raising constructions are small, e.g. Serdobolskaya (2008) discusses the data retrieved from a sample containing twenty six languages. There is a near consensus that SAE languages generally lack hyperraising, with the exception of Brazilian Portuguese (Indo-European > Romance)¹⁶.

¹⁶ For the dissident view cf. Greeson (2025), who claims that hyperraising is relatively common in substandard English.

(8) Brazilian Portuguese [Lohninger et al. 2022]

Os	menin-os	parece-m	[que	viaja-ram	ontem] ¹⁷
ART.PL.M	child-NOM.PL.M	seem-3PL	COMP	travel-PST.3PL	yesterday

‘The boys seem to have traveled yesterday.’

The condition on hyperraising holds in Russian as well. The Russian verb *ka-zat'sja* ‘seem’ licenses raising out of small clauses [Zimmerling 2025b] and agrees with the raised argument, cf. (9a), while raising out of finite CPs is blocked, cf. (9b).

(9) Russian

a. **[Mal'čik-i]**_i *kažut-sja* [SC _i *ustavš-im*].
 boy-NOM.PL seem.3PL-REFL tired-INSTR.PL
 ‘The boys seem to be tired.’

b. ***[Mal'čik-i]**_i *kažut-sja* [CP _i *usta-l-i*].
 boy-NOM.PL seem.3PL-REFL get_tired-PST.PL
 Int.: ‘The boys seem to be tired.’

The descriptions of non-Indo-European languages, where raising-type constructions like the Kalmyk examples (5a–b) are attested, do not hint that hyperraising is abnormal or less frequent than raising out of non-finite clauses, cf. the recent analysis of Nanai (Altaic> Tungusic) [Oskolskaya 2025: 91]. Hyperraising is also attested in finite clauses with overt complementizers as in Tatyshli Udmurt (Uralic>Finno-Ugric). This idiom both allows nominative and non-nominative raised arguments [Sinityna 2025]. Hyperraising is possible from CPs with the clause-final subordinators *kad'* and *šu(ö)sa*. According to Sinityna, *kad'* is a semi-grammaticalized equative morpheme turned into a

¹⁷ The plural agreement with the raised subject is optional in Brazilian Portuguese. As Diego Leite de Oliveira (p.c.) points out, the variant without agreement is more common:

(i) **Os** *menin-os* *parece-*Ø **[que** *viaja-ram* **ontem**].
 ART.PL.M child-NOM.PL.M seem-3SG COMP travel-PST.3PL yesterday
 ‘The boys seem to have traveled yesterday.’

The sentence (i) provides a close parallel to the Serbian example (2a), where the raised subject does not agree with the matrix impersonal verb. Brazilian Portuguese also preserves the variant without raising, cf. (ii).

(ii) *Parece-*Ø **[que** *os* *menin-os* *viaja-ram* **ontem**].
 seem-3SG COMP ART.PL.M child-NOM.PL.M travel-PST.3PL yesterday
 ‘It seems that the boys have traveled yesterday.’

preverbal raising marker in the construction X...[Y *kad' potâ nâ*] 'X seems like Y', cf. Eng. *seem like*¹⁸, while *šu(ð)sa* is a fully grammaticalized clause-final complementizer. Example (10a) shows raising of the nominative argument into the matrix clause with the verb (*kad'*) *potânâ* 'seem', the experiential argument of which is marked with the dative case. Example (10b) shows raising of the accusative argument out of the embedded finite clause with the complementizer *šusa* into the matrix clause with the verb *tode-* 'know', the experiential argument of which has nominative morphology.

(10) Tatyshli Udmurt [Sinitzyna 2025]

a. *pet'a-lð ton košk-i-d kad' pot-i-z.*
 Petja-DAT you.NOM leave-PST-2SG EQU get_out-PST-3SG
 'It seems to Peter that you left.'

b. *vas'a-∅ tod-e mon-e košk-i-z šusa.*
 Vasja-NOM know-PRS.3SG I-ACC leave-PST-3SG COMP
 'Vasja knows that I left', lit.: 'Vasja knows me that left.'

3. Cross-clausal A-dependencies

3.1. Control, raising, and movement

The notions of raising and control predated the versions of generative grammar (Government and Binding Theory, Minimalist Program) that incorporated a full-fledged theory of phrasal movement, cf. [Pesetsky 2013] for the overview. From the modern perspective, canonic raising patterns with phrasal movement from an A-position in the source clause to the A-position in the target clause. In the constituency formalisms implementing the structure preservation criterion according to which syntactic positions do not disappear in the course of derivation that means that raising leaves an A-trace in the source clause. However, as mentioned before, raising can be modeled in the frameworks that do not stick to the notions of clause and phrasal movement as in LFG [Bresnan 1982; 2001; Lødrup 2002; Vincent 2023] or MTT [Mel'čuk 2025], cf. also the HPSG approach

¹⁸ In Polinsky and Potsdam typology, English sentences of the type *It seems/looks like P*, cf. *It seems like(that) she is intelligent* are analyzed as instances of (hyper)raising out of finite clauses, when the lower copy is pronounced in the embedded clause. It is not quite clear how this idea should be formalized in the frameworks that do not implement the form-copy theory of cross-clausal dependencies. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for the discussion.

outlined in [Abeille 2021]. In this case, raising is interpreted as an A-dependency pertaining to the predicate-argument level. The framework-internal motivation to analyze raising as movement at the level of s-structure comes from the postulate that all syntactic structures are generated bottom-up by rules assembling the subtrees (external merge) and reordering them (movement aka internal merge), so that raising appears to be a special case of movement across the clausal boundary.

Control as a sort of cross-clausal A-dependencies can but not must be analyzed in the similar vein. There is a movement (or: ‘form-copy’) theory of control [Hornstein 1999; Boecks, Hornstein 2004] claiming that in forward control sentences like *X wants to do p* the shared argument originates in the complement clause just as in raising configurations and gets its first theta-role from the embedded predicate. Control verbs usually select experiential or animate subjects, while embedded predicates may have different semantics, and the shared argument must raise to the matrix clause to get the second theta-role from the matrix verb: in the sentence *Ann_i [vP wants [_{InfP} t_i to speak Chinese]]* it is the role of Experiencer. Finally, the raised DP *Ann* gets (syntactic) case from the T head in the matrix clause, which again revokes the analogy with raising constructions. Lyutikova [2025a: 106] illustrates this derivation schema in (11).

(11) Movement theory of control, after [Lyutikova 2025a: 106].

Ann_i T [vP t_i wants [_{TP} t_i to [vP t_i speak Chinese]]].

An advantage of the movement theory of control is that it captures the similarity between both major types of cross-clausal A-dependencies: control-under-movement looks like raising in disguise¹⁹. The competing PRO theory of control [Landau 2008; 2015] captures the asymmetry of control and raising predicates. The former have the ability to project the downward A-dependency and bind PRO ($\text{Arg}_x v_1 \rightarrow [\text{PRO}_x v_2 \dots]$), while the latter lack it since they do not have their own internal term arguments. Therefore they must borrow them from the embedded clause and raise: $\text{Arg}_x v_1 \leftarrow [\dots v_{2-x}]$. In more formal terms, the PRO theory of control is illustrated in (12) for the same English sentence:

(12) PRO theory of control, after [Lyutikova 2025a: 105].

Ann_i T [vP t_i wants [_{CP} PRO_i to_T [vP t_i speak Chinese]]].

¹⁹ With the proviso that raising verbs unlike control verbs do not assign a new theta-role to the embedded clause argument.

The PRO theory of control looks better adapted for modeling the interaction of grammar and lexicon, although this pre-theoretical intuition must be checked on language data. In this paper, I do not aim at refuting or approving the movement theory of control in general, cf. the discussion in [Culicover, Jackendoff 2001; Hornstein, Polinsky 2010; Landau 2024a] and just mention that it might be inconvenient for the description of some language-specific control constructions, cf. [Baykov 2020; Baykov, Rudnev 2020] for Russian object and oblique control.

One more type of cross-clausal A-dependencies is long-distance-agreement (LDA), when an argument of the embedded predicate controls the agreement of the matrix predicate, cf. the Khwarshi sentence (4c) above. Serdobolskaya (2008: 254) maintains that LDA displays cross-linguistically similar if not identical features with raising, but this hypothesis should be taken with caution. A modest statement would be that LDA occurs both in languages with raising as in Khwarshi [Lyutikova 2025: 108] and in languages, where raising has not been diagnosed yet as in Muirin Dargwa [Kalyakin 2025]²⁰. [Polinsky, Potsdam 2001] argue that in Tsez (Northeast Caucasian > Tsezic), LDA is only realized if the agreement goal in the lower clause is topical. If this generalization holds across the world's languages, it would bring LDA close to raising since the raised argument is most exclusively topical, cf. the section 1.4 above. However the preliminary data on LDA languages is not conclusive.

3.2. From control to raising

Syntactic control usually involves semantic control of the embedded clause situation, as control verbs select experiential or animate arguments and describe semantically controllable actions and processes that can be initiated or stopped deliberately. The class of control verbs taking sentential complements is in many languages larger than the class of raising verbs that do not impose the animacy condition on their subject arguments and describe uncontrollable events, e.g. natural processes, cf. Eng. *It started to rain* or external necessity, cf.

²⁰ This idiom on the one hand has distant phrasal movement [Kalyakin 2025: 66, 71], which might facilitate raising, on the other hand lacks bi-absolutive constructions like other Dargic languages, which indicates that even if raising is possible, the raised argument cannot get a case lying higher in Case Hierarchy. LDA is only possible in Muirin Dargwa if the embedded clause has an absolute NP, while the matrix clause lacks it [ibid., 63].

Eng. *It must rain*, Ru. *Byt' doždu*, Bg. *tryabva da vali* ‘the same’²¹. This disproportion is occasionally compensated by the development of new lexical meanings and eventually leads to regular polysemy or even complete reanalysis of a control verb or verbs from different groups as secondary raising predicates. The precedents are known from Scandinavian languages which have a relatively long written history. In Old Norse, the verb *byrja* only selected animate subjects and conveyed the meaning ‘start doing something’, while Modern Swedish *börja* ‘begin’, *sluta* ‘finish’, *fortsätta* ‘continue’ do not discriminate animacy and behave as standard raising/restructuring verbs [Engdahl 2022: 20-22]. The Swedish verb *försöka* ‘try’ displays features unusual for control verbs and licenses non-canonical biclausal passives but as Engdahl states [ibid.] cannot select inanimate subjects and is not yet reanalyzed as a raising verb. New raising/restructuring verbs also emerged from reanalyzed loan words: the verb *bliva* borrowed from Middle Low German in the 1300-s, shifted its meaning from ‘remain’ (cf. Ger. *bleiben*) to ‘become’ and was grammaticalized as marker of the analytical passive [Skrzypek, Engdahl 2025]. A similar development is attested in closely related languages, Danish and Norwegian, which borrowed the same Low German word around the same time.

A striking case of parallel semantic shift from the control meaning and syntax to the raising meaning and syntax concerns the evolution of the loan verb with the meaning ‘to risk’ in Mainland Scandinavian and Russian. In both cases one deals with a direct or indirect borrowing from German: No., Da., Sw. *risikere*, Ru. *riskovat'*. The first meaning of this verb and its reflexes seems to be ‘to expose oneself, something or somebody to a risk’. One can expose something to a risk by acting unconsciously. The sentences with *riskovat'* taking inanimate subjects show up in the Russian National Corpus (RNC) from the mid XIX century. The examples (14a–b) contain inanimate subjects in the active voice, while (14c) contains an attitudinal subject *poželanija* ‘wishes’ taking an active clause with an embedded passivized small clause *<uvidet' sebja> [sc razbitymi i rastoptannymi]* ‘<see oneself> [sc broken and trampled]’.

(13) Russian [RNC]

a. No ***risku-jut*** [Infp] *provalit'-sja* [CoP] ***obrazovani-e***
 but risk-PRES.3PL fall.through.INF-REFL education-NOM.SG.N

²¹ In these sentences, the modal operator lies above the complement clause. In English and Bulgarian finite examples, it is visualized in the matrix verb, while Russian root dative-infinite sentences are originally bi-clausal structures with a silent modal operator: \emptyset^{MOD} [Infp] *byt' doždu*, cf. [Mitrenina 2017] for the details.

i civiličaci-ja]].

and civilization-NOM.SG.F

‘But [education and civilization] **risk** to fail.’ (RNC; Pavel Annenkov, 1852–1902).

b. [_{DP}**Peregovor-y** **meždu** **bur-ami** *i* **angličan-ami**]
negotiation-NOM.PL between Boer-DAT.PL and Englishman-DAT.PL

risku-jut [_{NegP} **ne** [_{InfP} **privesti** *k želaem-ym* **rezul’tat-am**]].
risk-PRES.3PL NEG lead.INF to desired-PTCP.PRES result-DAT.PL

Lit.: ‘[The negotiations between the Boers and the Englishmen] **risk** not to produce the desired results.’ (RNC, 1902).

c. [_{DP}**Sam-ye** **niščensk-ie** **poželani-ja**_i — *i* **te_i** **risku-jut**
utmost-NOM.PL beggarly-NOM.PL wish-NOM.PL and they risk-PRES.3SG

[_{InfP} **uvidet’** **sebja**_i [_{SC}_i **razbit-ymi**, **rastoptann-ymi**]].
get.see.IMP REFL.ACC broken.PTCP.PST-INSTN.PL trampled-PTCP.PST-INSTN.PL

‘[Even the most beggarly wishes] **risk** seeing themselves broken and trampled.’ (RNC; Mikhail Saltykov-Ščedrin, 1875–1879).

Examples (13a–c) show that *riskovat’* was on the verge of splitting into the control lexeme and its raising counterpart already in the XIX century. Contemporary Russian media confirm that for one part of the speakers including some journalists, the pattern with raised inanimate infinitival objects is regular, cf. (14).

(14) Russian

K 2150 **god-u** [**odin** [_{PP} **iz** **sam-yx** **krasiv-yx**
to 2150 year-DAT.SG one.NOM.SG.M from utmost-GEN.PL beautiful-GEN.PL

i unikal’n-yx gorod-ov mir-a]], [_{DP}**Veneci-ja**],
and unique-GEN.PL city-GEN.PL world-GEN.SG Venice-NOM.SG.F

risku-et [_{InfP} **byt’** [_{SC} **polnostju zatoplenn-ym**]
risk-PRES.3SG be.IMP completely flooded.PTCP.PST-INSTN.SG.M

i izčeznut’ s lic-a zeml-i]
and disappear.IMP with face-GEN.SG earth-DAT.SG

Lit.: ‘By 2150, [one of the most beautiful and unique cities in the world], [Venice], **risks** being completely flooded and disappearing from the face of the Earth.’

(Rossijskaja Gazeta, <https://rg.ru/2025/03/31/gorod-tonet.html>)

The next step of reanalysis is reached in (15), where *riskovat'* is an impersonal verb and conveys the meaning ‘an undesirable event is possible’. The accusative DP *èti derevni* is the object of the embedded infinitive *zatopit'* ‘to flood’.

(15) Russian

[_{DP} **Èt-i** *derevn-i*] _i **risku-et** [_{InfP} *zatopit'* _{-i}].

this.ACC.PL village-ACC.PL risk-PRES.3SG flood.REFL

‘These villages are at the risk of flooding’, lit.: ‘It **risks** to flood [these villages]’. (Izvestija, 25.10.2025, <https://iz.ru/1978958/>)

Mainland Scandinavian languages both have a zero subject impersonal passive and an agreeing biclausal passive, so that an exact parallel of (15) is theoretically possible²². It has not been found with *risikere* yet, but [Julien, Lødrup 2013: 230–231] discuss another option — the biclausal passive with the parasitic marker *-s*. In standard Norwegian, Danish and Swedish, the verb *risikere* does not assume mediopassive morphology, but in substandard texts one can come across sentences like (16).

(16) Norwegian [Julien, Lødrup 2013: 230–231]

[_{DP} *Ting* [_{CP} *som ikke er fjern-et*]] **risikere-s**

thing.PL.N REL NEG be.PRES remove-PTCP.PST risk.REFL

[_{InfP} **å** *blive fjern-et* **til** *avfallsanlegg-et*].

COMP AUX.REFL remove-PTCP.PST to thrash_bin-DEF.SG.N

‘The items that are not put away will be thrown into the trash bin’, lit.: ‘...**risk themselves / are risked at being removed ...**’

The standard Norwegian variant of (16) without the parasitic *-s* would match Russian examples (14c) and (15). The sentence (16) stands one step further toward the reanalysis of *risikere* as a new raising modal, since the marker *-s* on *risikere* and other active verbs emerges either due to the percolation of the voice feature from the complement infinitival clause, cf. the passive infinitive *å blive fjernet* ‘to be removed’ or due to the analogy with deponent non-passive raising verbs like No. *tykkes* ‘seem’ [Julien, Lødrup 2013: 232].

²² According to Bjarne Ørsnes (p.c.), the impersonal passive with *risikere* is an option in Danish too (i). Substandard Danish also has impersonal passive with a parasitic *-s* form *risikeres* (ii).

(i) *Det risikere-r at blive glem-t.*
EXPL risk-PRES COMP AUX.REFL forget-PTCP.PST

(ii) *Det risikere-s at blive glem-t.*
EXPL risk-REFL COMP AUX.REFL forget-PTCP.PST
‘It risks being forgotten.’ {i = ii}

3.3. Proper raising versus raising constructions

There is a wide-spread sentiment in empirically-oriented research that while the raising hypothesis in the strict sense, i.e. the presence of sentences derived by raising has been proved for the limited number of SAE languages including English [Postal 1974], other world's languages may have sentences with similar structural, semantic and communicative properties. Such sentences are labeled 'raising constructions' or 'raising in the broad sense' [Serdobolskaya 2008: 246; Serdobolskaya et al. 2016]. The authors pursuing this path are either agnostic about the derivation of language-specific constructions resembling raising, cf. [Letuchiy, Viklova 2020: 57] on Russian or claim that they are derived differently, cf. [Koeva 2023: 154] on Bulgarian and [Serdobolskaya et. al. 2016: 90] on Kalmyk, Irish, and Lithuanian. Serdobolskaya (2008) basing on a sample of twenty six languages from different areas and families lists several features of raising-type constructions (hence — RC^+) that can be grouped into four clusters:

- (i) RC^+ are polypredicate structures with A-dependencies that do not pattern with syntactic control;
- (ii) The matrix clause verb does not assign case and theta-role to the shared argument, but this argument has some morphosyntactic and semantic matrix clause properties;
- (iii) The embedded argument does not necessarily leave its clause and can remain in situ or raise to the left periphery of the complement clause or the whole polypredicate complex;
- (iv) RC^+ are optional, and the variants without raising are predicted to co-exist parallel with RC^+ sentences.

It straightforwardly follows that proper raising (hence — PR) is a special case of RC^+ with the condition (iii) on overt cross-clausal movement reinforced. It is but unclear whether the gap between PR and RC^+ is an advantage for the language theory. I suggest instead that the theory of PR is extended by the condition (v) which is a modified version of (iii):

- (v) With PR , an embedded argument can raise to an edge position in the matrix clause without filling the syntactic subject and object slots by the matrix verb. In such cases, a mixed A/Ā-dependency is realized.

This revision allows to classify with PR the purported cases of RC^+ with argument promotion in sentences with intransitive and semi-transitive matrix verbs in Turkish, Irish, or Kashmiri [Serdobolskaya 2008: 254] as well as in Kalmyk [Serdobolskaya et al. 2016: 78]. It also helps to develop a plausible analysis of Balkan Slavic *da*-clauses like (2a–b). This type of complement clauses

does not discriminate the class of the matrix verb. Bulgarian, like Serbian, has a pair of modal verbs expressing the meaning ‘must’ with an alethic, deontic or epistemic flavour: the agreeing *tryabva*₁ and the impersonal *tryabva*₂, which lacks a slot for a nominative subject and slots for any non-sentential complements. Example (17) contains an extracted DP *panikata* ‘the panic’, which is the passive argument of the embedded verb *izbjagvam* ‘avoid’ raised into the matrix clause across the subordinator particle *da* and the main clause verb *tryabva*₂.

(17) Bulgarian (Indo-European>South Slavic), after [Ivanova 2025]

$[_{DP}Panika-ta]_i$	<i>tryabva</i> ₂	$[_{DaP} da __i$	<i>băde</i>	<i>izbegna-t-a</i> .
panic.F-DEF.SG.F	must	COMP	be.PRES.3SG	avoid-PTCP.PST-SG.F
Lit.: ‘The panic needs to be avoided.’				

[Koeva 2023: 149–150] considers sentences similar to (17) but refuses to analyze them as PR because impersonal modals from the class *tryabva*₂ do not select nominative subjects. She argues that embedded subjects are spelled-out in the main clause due to topicalization, which would mean that they stand in an Ā-position. However, provided the asymmetry with extracting topical subjects vs non-subject topical arguments from *da*-clauses [Ivanova 2022: 95–96], it is natural to conclude that standard Bulgarian like colloquial Serbian in (2) has PR to an edge A-position from finite *da*-clauses²³.

3.4. Raising of sentential arguments and restructuring

The early theories of PR contain two tacit or explicitly made assumptions: a) only non-sentential arguments raise; b) raising is only possible in biclausal structures. These assumptions leave out two phenomena — raising of sentential arguments to A-positions [Zimmerling 2018] and restructuring [Wurmbrand 2001; Stjepanović 2004].

The raising of sentential arguments to the subject position is an understudied mechanism, which can be diagnosed in language *L*, if there is some category exclusively licensed by grammatical subjects, and there are no other subject-

²³ Koeva [ibid.: 150] also mentions left dislocation tests, but they do not seem to confirm her analysis, since the variants with an overt resumptive pronoun in the *da*-clause are impossible: $[_{DP} Peter]_i$ *tryabva*₂ $[_{DaP} da __i$ *dojde*] ‘Peter must come’ ~ * $[_{DP} Peter]_i$ *tryabva*₂ $[_{DaP} toj]_i$ $da __i$ *dojde*], int. ‘Peter_i, he_i must come’. The same condition arguably holds for passive sentences, where left dislocation is blocked both with a resumptive pronoun after the particle *da* and before it; * $[_{DP} Panikata]_i$ *tryabva*₂ $[_{DaP} da$ ***tya***_i *băde* *izbegnata*] ~ * $[_{DP} Panikata]_i$ *tryabva*₂ $[_{DaP} ***tya***_i da$ *băde* *izbegnata*].

like expressions except for the raised sentential argument. This pattern is obligatory realized by the Russian semi-copular verb *javljat'sja* 'be really like', which takes a small clause complement and requires that the subject slot is filled by an overt DP or the expletive *èto* or by raised sentential arguments [Zimmerling 2025b]. In (18a), the finite CP [_{CP} *čto P*] embedded in the complement small clause and serving as the Stimulus argument of the adjectival small clause predicate is the only available syntactic expression for filling the subject slot by the matrix verb *javljat'sja*. Therefore it raises, and PRED_{INSTR} is assigned to the adjectival small clause predicate *neponjatnym* 'be unclear'. The variant (18b) without raising and with a non-agreeing predicative *neponjatno* instead of PRED_{INSTR} is ungrammatical.

(18) Russian

a. *Do si-x por javlja-et-sja*
 til this-GEN.PL time.GEN.PL exist-PRES.3SG-REFL

[_{SC-ARG}[_{AP} ***neponjatn-ym***, [_{CP} *čto tam vse-taki*
 unclear.ADJ-INSTR.SG.N COMP there after_all

proizoš-l-o^{STIM}]].
 happen.PST-PST-3SG.N

b. **Do six por javljaetsja*_{3SG} [***neponjatno***_{PRED} [_{CP} *čto tam vse-taki proizošlo*]^{STIM}]
 'It is still **unclear** what actually happened there.' {a=b}

Restructuring (alternatively — 'clause reduction' or 'clause union') is a mechanism of removing the clausal boundary and deleting parts of syntactic structure in one of the clauses [Wurmbrand 2001]. The early versions of the clause union analysis explore the idea that a dependent clause may have a reduced set of grammatical relations due to its internal build, but most authors agree that in RC⁺ sentences, the restructuring effects are triggered by a class of matrix predicates including modal and phasal verbs [Serdobolskaya 2008: 258; Wurmbrand 2019; Lyutikova 2022a: 36-37; Zimmerling 2025a]²⁴. In Polinsky

²⁴ It is noteworthy that Russian RC⁺ with dative subjects show both options. Root DIS clauses like *mne*_{DAT} *ne*_{NEG} *vyjti*_{INF.PFV} *otsjuda* 'It is not in the cards for me to get out from here' have a degraded upper clause containing the silent modal operator and a zero form of the BE-copula, while syntactic idioms with *neg-wh* words like *mne*_{DAT} *negde*_{NEG-WH} *spat'*_{INF} 'I have no place to sleep' have a degraded lower clause, since the *wh*-word raised to the upper clause and merged with the matrix negation [Zimmerling 2022; 2024: 26].

and Potsdam's typology of A-dependencies [Polinsky and Potsdam 2006; Potsdam, Polinsky 2012] control and raising require two clauses, while [Krapova 2025: 36–37] following [Wurmbrand, Lohninger 2023] outlines a continuum approach to Balkan Slavic *da*-subjunctives and defines three universal clause-complementation types — Propositions, Situations and Events. *Proposition complements* show the minimum of restructuring features. They involve epistemic contexts and are temporally independent. *Situation complements* pertain to irrealis contexts without speaker-or-utterance-oriented properties but with time and world parameters. *Event complements* have the maximum of restructuring features. They are tenseless and may have reduced argument or event structure: control and raising sentences have Event complements. These three types form a containment hierarchy based on complement size and can be roughly identified with the CP, TP (AspP) and VP projections in syntax [Krapova 2025: 14].

I revise the account of PR and assume that raising verbs *are* restructuring predicates. This contradicts the earlier insight that raising and restructuring verbs are related predicate classes that can be linked derivationally if e.g. active subject raising verbs develop passive restructuring uses [Wurmbrand 2001: 342–345; Lødrup 2026] but is in line with the derivational accounts of the clause size [Müller 2017; Pesetsky 2021; Geraci 2023]. If one wants to combine the intuition that raising predicates have an intrinsic ability to restructuring [Lyutikova 2022a: 36] with the Wurmbrand-style analysis in terms of complement size, one needs to restore the rigid contrast between PR and control. To manage this, I add the condition (vi):

- (vi) The sentences with PR enter the derivation as biclausal structures but can be restructured as monoclausal, while control sentences always remain biclausal.

Provided that restructuring effects can be checked, (vi) can be regarded a generalization over specific language data²⁵. Some linguists raise concerns about recasting the control *vs* raising contrast in terms of clause size, e.g. [Landau 2025: 10] maintains that “while clause size often correlates with the Raising-Control contrast language-internally, it is not a criterion of universal validity”. I take issue with this point and claim that conditions like (vi) can only be verified empirically in a general form, i.e. for an open class of the world’s lan-

²⁵ The preliminary observations on Slavic modal existentials and embedded *wh*-infinitives indicate that these two classes of Slavic sentences have restructuring and license clitic climbing [Stjepanović 2004; Šimík 2011: 143]. This is in line with the hypothesis that modal existential sentences have raising syntax [Zimmerling 2024: 21].

guages and not ‘language-internally’, whatever this label might mean. I nevertheless agree that the notions of raising and, probably, control as well, need to be revised to adjust them to theories of clause size / structure removal. The question then goes which diagnostics is effective for a) testing mono- vs biclausal structures; b) telling PR sentences from control sentences. I claim that the classical tests as preservation of idiom chunks, passivization of the embedded predicate and availability of the narrow scope reading, along with the absence of restrictions on animate subjects pertain to the initial stage of derivation, when all PR sentences are biclausal, and tentatively assume that another group of tests including the independent tense in embedded complement and the availability of independent negation characterize its final stage.

3.5. Semantics of embedded predicates

The semantics of embedded predicates in PR sentences has not been studied systematically²⁶. [Wurmbrand 2019: 17] following [Lødrup 2002: 3; 2008a] observes that there is a preference towards individual-level predicates (properties), while event interpretations are degraded or impossible. This does not hold for phasal verbs that take complements denoting processes and activities. Another adjustment concerns the type of the complement clause: finite, non-finite and small clauses can be associated with different predicate types in one and the same language, cf. [Kustova 2025] for Russian raising constructions with perception verbs. A more demanding claim advanced in [Wurmbrand 2019: 18] that ECM (object raising) belief verbs ascribe *de re* attitudes to their subjects is difficult to assess.

4. Are European languages uniform?

This section summarizes the preliminary research findings about the parametric variation in raising constructions across six European languages — English [Noël, Colleman 2009], Norwegian [Lødrup 2002; 2008a; 2008b; 2014; 2022; Engdahl 2022], Danish [Hansen 2000; Ørsnes 2006; 2013; Togeby 2014], Bulgarian [Osenova 2022; Koeva 2023; Krapova 2025; Ivanova 2025], Polish [Prze-

²⁶ Serdobolskaya’s chapter on raising (2008) published almost twenty years ago opens with a pessimistic statement: “There are a number of phenomena that are traditionally viewed as syntactic and are described primarily within formal linguistic frameworks. Semantic and pragmatic factors of these phenomena often remain underestimated and ignored [Serdobolskaya 2008: 245]. This is still true of PR/ RC⁺.

piórkowski, Rosen 2005; Bondaruk 2010; Patejuk, Przepiórkowski 2014], and Russian [Letuchiy, Viklova 2020; Lyutikova 2022a; 2022b; 2024b; Zimmerling 2022; 2025a; 2025b], cf. also [Baykov 2020; Baykov, Rudnev 2020] on Russian control constructions and [Burukina 2020] on purported transition cases between control and raising. I check the following parameters: (1) the raising domain; (2) the possibility of raising sentential arguments; (3) the type of raising: lexical *vs* mixed; (4) the domain, where the contrast of subject raising (conventionally — ‘nominativus cum infinitivo’, NCI) and object raising (conventionally — ‘accusativus cum infinitivo’, ACI) is diagnosed; (5) the status of NCI; (6) the status of ACI; (7) raising from Ā-positions; (8) special raising morphemes; (9) special control markers. I apply the NCI *vs* ACI labels both to languages as English and Danish, where the infinitive is spelled-out in the complement of raising verbs and to languages as Bulgarian or Russian, where active and passive paraphrases are licensed in small clause complements only, with the clausal subject assuming either the direct case form or the accusative case. The parameter (4) specifies the domain where the same raising verbs can select NCI and ACI complements by assuming a passive *vs* active voice form respectively.

4.1. Raising domain

Five languages from six, except for Bulgarian have raising from nonfinite clauses, while Bulgarian lacks infinitives. Raising out of small clauses is attested in all six languages. Hyperraising is absent from standard English, Norwegian, Russian and Polish, while colloquial Danish might license it marginally, cf. below the example (19) and discussion. Bulgarian deviates from other languages in our sample in that hyperraising out of finite *da*-clauses occurs in texts close to the standard norm, cf. the example (17) above.

4.2. Raising of sentential arguments

This pattern is obligatory realized by the Russian semi-copular verb *javljat'sja* ‘be really like’, which takes a small clause complement and requires that the syntactic subject slot is filled by an overt DP or the expletive *èto* or by raised sentential arguments [Zimmerling 2025b], cf. the example (18a) above. With verbs and copulas licensing impersonal constructions (*byt'* ‘be’, *stat'* ‘become’, *kazat'sja* ‘seem’) raising of sentential arguments is optional in Russian. It is accepted by one part of the speakers representing a stable idiom of Russian grammar [Zimmerling 2018]. Similar constructions of the type <consider> Y

good [CP] are sporadically found in colloquial Danish (Indo-European>North Germanic) and Bulgarian with displaced elements resembling predicatives or assessment markers with the meanings ‘good’, ‘excellent’ scoping over the proposition.

(19) Danish [KorpusDK], simplified after [Togeby 2014: 27]

<i>Jeg</i>	<i>tro-r</i>	<i>egentlig</i>	\emptyset_i	$[_{SC} __i]$	<i>udmærket</i>	$[_{CP}$	<i>at</i>	<i>de</i>
1SG	think-PRES	actually			excellent		COMP	3PL
<i>kunne</i>	<i>sejle</i>	<i>uden</i>		<i>greje-t</i>]].				
can.PST	sail.INF	without		equipment-DEF.N				

‘I actually think it’s great that they were able to sail without equipment’,
lit.: ‘I actually **think** [**great** [that they could sail without equipment]]’.

(20) Bulgarian

<i>ne</i>	<i>mi</i>	<i>izgležda</i>	\emptyset_i	$[_{SC} __i]$	<i>dobre</i>	$[_{DaP1}$	<i>da</i>	<i>bija</i>
NEG	1SG.DAT	seem.PRES.3SG			good		comp	beat.PRES.1SG
<i>stotici</i>	<i>km</i>	<i>păt</i> ,	$[_{DaP2}$	<i>za</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>vidja</i>	<i>s</i>
hundred.PL	km	way		GOAL	COMP	REFL	see.PRES.1SG	with someone

‘I don’t think it’s good to travel hundreds of kilometers to see someone’.
Lit.: ‘**Does not seem to me** [**good** [that I drag myself hundreds of kilometers
[to see someone]]]’ [<https://www.predpriemach.com/threads/Доверието-в-доброволците.51160/#post-548884>]

The analysis of (19) and (20) as raising is possible if one restores a SC without an overt subject. The colloquial sentence (19) in Danish, which is a *non-pro-drop* language with expletive subjects like *det*, is equivalent to the fully spelled-out structure (19’) with a finite CP: *Jeg tror* $[_{CP1}$ ***at det er udmærket*** $_{PRED}$ $[_{CP2}$ *at P*]]. Likewise, the colloquial sentence (20) in Bulgarian, which is a *pro-drop* language without overt expletives is equivalent to the fully spelled-out structure like (20’) with a restored finite CP: *Ne mi izgležda* $[_{CP}$ ***če*** \emptyset ***e*** ***dobre*** $_{PRED}$ $[_{DaP1}$ *da v₁*
 $[_{DaP2}$ *za da v₂*]]]²⁷.

²⁷ The element *udmærket* ‘excellent’ in the Danish example (19) could be alternatively analyzed not as predicative but as a verum focus operator extracted out of the finite CP: ... $[_{CP}$ *at de udmærket kan sejle uden grejet*] ‘that they really can sail without equipment’ — ... $[_{CP}$ *at de $__i$ kan...*]. This analysis suggested by Bjarne Ørsnes (p.c.) relies on the assumption that Danish has distant Ā-scrambling. The element *dobre* ‘good’ in the Bulgarian example (20) cannot be analyzed as a non-predicative adverbial.

4.3. The cues of raising: Lexical versus mixed

English and Bulgarian have lexical raising associated with lists of NCI and ACI verbs, while Russian, Polish, Danish and, to a lesser extent, Norwegian have mixed raising and use grammaticalized raising constructions associated with potentially open classes of predicates. The actual size of these classes may vary. It is maximal with Russian root dative-infinitive structures which can be built with virtually all Russian verbs with subject infinitives with the exception of those which are specified as subjectless in the lexicon²⁸ and more restricted in Norwegian or Danish, where the number of matrix verbs acting as raising operators seems to be conditioned by the inventories of embedded predicates in the corresponding sentences²⁹.

4.4. NCI versus ACI

In English and Norwegian, the regular correlation between subject raising verbs licensing the NCI construction is attested in all types of clauses. Bulgarian and Russian withhold it in small clauses only. Polish and Danish (with few exceptions) lack it.

4.5. ACI (object raising)

The class of object raising verbs is stable in English, Norwegian [Lødrup 2002], Bulgarian and Russian. Danish almost lost it, with the exception of the verb *anse* ‘consider’ [Ørsnes 2013; Engdahl 2022: 13], while Polish eliminated it completely. All English ACI verbs reportedly license proleptic *of* phrases like Eng. *I believe of her_i [CP that she_i...]*, cf. [Wurmbrand 2019: 18]. The corresponding hypotheses cannot be proven for other languages. In Russian, the valencies of ACI verbs on PP complements are lexicalized, while some belief ACI verbs lack them. Cf. *Ja dumaju o nej, [CP čto ona zanuda]* ‘I believe **of** her that she is a bore’, *Ja podozrevaju ejé v tom, [CP čto ona zanuda]* ‘I suspect her **of** being a bore’, **Ja sčitaju o nej [CP čto...]*. The lexicographical analysis of proleptic *vs* raising variants of ACI verbs is beyond the reach of this paper.

4.6. NCI (subject raising)

Five languages from six have subject raising verbs or non-verbal predicates. The Bulgarian data is insufficient.

²⁸ Cf. Rus. *tošnit* ‘vomit’ or *svetat* ‘dawn’.

²⁹ I am indebted to Ekaterina Lyutikova (p.c) for improving my initial formulation on languages with mixed raising. All disclaimers follow.

4.7. Raising from Ā-positions

English has two non-canonical raising constructions, where the moved elements originate in an Ā-position and raise to the matrix clause via some intermediate landing site: tough movement, cf. *Mary_i is tough* [_{InfP} to deal with _{_i}], cf. [Pesetsky 2013: 163] for discussion, and prepositional passive, cf. *Lord Nelson slept* [_{PP} in [_{DP} *This bed*]] → [_{DP} *This bed*_i] has been slept in _{_i} by *Lord Nelson*. Mainland Scandinavian languages including Norwegian and Danish have the second construction [Engdahl, Laanemets 2015]. Russian has a non-canonical head raising derivation with *wh*-raising in negative modal existentials: [_{NegP} **neg**° *T* [_{InfP} *inf*° *wh*°]] → **neg-wh**° *T* [_{InfP} *inf*° *wh*]]. However on the existing accounts, cf. [Apresjan, Iomdin 1989; Mel'čuk 2025], Russian *wh*-pronouns in this class of sentences originate in A-positions as their case form depends on the governing infinitive, cf. *vinit'*_{INF} **kogo**_{WH.ACC} ‘accuse someone’ → *ne°kogo_i* [_{InfP} *vinit*° _{_i}], *gordit'sja° čem*_{WH-INSTR} → *ne°čem_i* [_{InfP} *gordit'sja* _{_i}].³⁰

4.8. Special raising markers

Russian and Polish use *PRED_{INSTR}*, while Norwegian and Danish use the mediopassive morpheme in raising constructions. In Norwegian and Danish, the absence of the infinitive particle *at/å* is characteristic of raising verbs. Equative morphemes freely combine with raising verbs only in English, cf. En. *seem like*, *feel like*, *look like*. Some object raising verbs select PP-complements in Polish, Bulgarian and Russian. In sentences like (21), the preposition can be analyzed as an equative-type raising marker.

(21) Polish (Indo-European > West Slavic)

Wszysc-y od dawna uważa-l-i jq_i [_{SC} _{_i} [_{PP} **za** *nudziark-ę*]].
 all-NOM.PL from long consider-PST-PL 3SG.F for bore-ACC.SG.F
 ‘Everybody has for long considered her a bore.’

In Polish, which lost ACI verbs, the use of the preposition *za* is grammaticalized in object raising sentences and their passive counterparts with subject raising. This is not the case in Bulgarian and Russian. Danish and Norwegian use the equative marker *som* ‘<to consider> *Y* as *Z*>’, which partly corresponds

³⁰ The status of *wh*-adverbials like *gde* ‘where’, *kogda* ‘when’, *otkuda* ‘whence’, ‘where from’ in this class of sentences is less clear. In the Russian linguistic tradition, they are analyzed as infinitival dependencies on a par with case-marked *wh*-pronouns: *spat'*_{INF} **gde**_{WH.ADV} ‘sleep (some)where’ → *ne°gde_i* [_{InfP} *spat*° _{_i}], *uznat*° *otkuda*_{WH-ADV} ‘find out from (some)where’ → *ne°otkuda_i* [_{InfP} *uznat*’ _{_i}].

to Russian sentences with the equative marker *kak* ‘as’. Cf. Da. *betragte Y som Z* ‘consider Y as Z’, **betragte Y Z* int. ‘consider Y to be Z’, and Ru. *vosprinimat’ Y-a_{ACC} **kak** Z-a_{ACC}*, ‘treat Y as Y’, **vosprinimat’ Y-a_{ACC} [SC [NP Z-a_{ACC}]]*, **vosprinimat’ Y-a_{ACC} [SC [NP Z-m_{INSTR}]]*’.

4.9. Special control markers

The main marker of Polish and Russian control structures with PRO is the case-marking on the copredicate expressions like Ru. *odnomu, samomu* [Przepiórkowski, Rosen 2005; Baykov 2020]. A loose parallel is attested in Norwegian, where the copredicates lack case.

Table 1 Raising predicates in the European languages

		English	Norwegian	Danish	Bulgarian	Russian	Polish
Raising domain	infinitive clauses	OK	OK	OK	*	OK	OK
	small clauses	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	finite clauses	* ³¹	*	? ³²	OK	*	*
Raising of sentential arguments		(*)	(OK)	OK	OK	OK	(OK)
The cues of raising: lexical/mixed (by virtue of special predicate constructions)		lexical	mixed	mixed	lexical	mixed	mixed
NCI versus ACI		all types of clauses	all types of clauses	(*)	small clauses	small clauses	no
ACI (object raising)		regular	regular	relics	regular	regular	no
NCI (subject raising)		regular	regular	regular	(?)	regular	regular
Raising from Ā-positions		tough movement, prepositional passive	prepositional passive	prepositional passive	no	no	no

³¹ Zyman (2023), contested by Greeson (2025).

³² A collection of colloquial Danish examples is contained in [Hansen 2000: 82, 85, ex. (80)–(83), (131–138)], but it is unclear, whether the displaced negative and quantificational DPs are involved in A- or Ā-dependencies.

	English	Norwegian	Danish	Bulgarian	Russian	Polish
Special raising markers	<i>like</i>	mediopassive marker <i>-s</i> absence of the infinitive particle <i>å</i>	mediopassive marker <i>-s</i> absence of the infinitive particle <i>å</i>	no	predicative instrumental ... <i>kak...</i> ... <i>za</i> <i>kogo-l.</i>	predicative instrumental
Special control markers	no	complex form of the copredicate	?	no	case marking on copredicates (<i>odnomu</i> , <i>samomu</i>)	case marking on copredicates

5. Conclusion and perspectives

In this paper, I rendered the notions of raising and A-dependencies, with focus on the realization of raising predicates in languages with different morphosyntax. The constructs like ‘raising as in SAE languages’, ‘raising like in Turkic languages’, ‘raising-like sentences in the language *L*’ have limited typological value or reflect the incompleteness of the input data, since languages from the same group or the same areal may have different parametric settings for comparable raising constructions. The definition of raising must be recast for the open class of the world’s languages. There is a cross-linguistically stable correlation between the argument promotion and topicality as well between raising predicates and restructuring effects. The raising criteria need to be revised to account for the cases like (2), (4), (17), where the embedded argument raises to an edge position without filling the subject or object slots by the matrix verb. In such cases, a mixed A/Ā-dependency is realized.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; I, II, III — nominal classes; ADJ — adjective; AP — adjective phrase; ABS — absolutive; ACC — accusative; AGR — agreement; CNV — converb; COP — coordinate phrase; DAP — clause with the complementizer *da*; COMP — complementizer; CP — complement phrase; DAT — dative; DEF — definite; DP — determiner phrase; EMPH — emphatic; EQU — equative; ERG — ergative; F — feminine; GEN — genitive; INF — infinitive; INFP — infinitive phrase; INSTR — instrumental; IPFV — imperfective; M — masculine; N — neutrum; NEG — negation; NEGP — negation phrase; NFUT — non-future; NOM — nominative; OBL — oblique; PL — plural; PFV — perfective; PP — preposition phrase; PPERF — plus perfect; PRED — predicative;

PRES — present tense; PST — past tense; PTCP — participle; REFL — reflexive; SC — small clause; SC-ARG — argument small clause; SG — singular; STIM — stimulus; THEM — theme; vP — verb phrase.

References

Abeillé 2021 — Abeillé A. Control and Raising. Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar: The handbook. Müller S., Abeillé A., Borsley R. D., Koenig J.-P.(eds.). Berlin: Language Science Press, 2021. Pp. 489–535. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5599840

Aissen 2003 — Aissen J. Differential object marking: iconicity vs economy. Natural language and linguistic theory. 2003. Vol. 21. Pp. 435–483.

Apresjan, Iomdin 1989 — Апресян Ю.Д., Иомдин Л.Л. Конструкция типа *негда спать*: синтаксис, семантика, лексикография // Семиотика и информатика. 1989. Т. 29. С 34–92. [Apresjan J.D., Iomdin L.L. Construction of the type *negde spat'*: syntax, semantics, lexicography. Semiotics and informatics. 1989. Vol. 29. Pp. 34–92] (in Russian)

Bailyn 2012 — Bailyn J. 2012. The Syntax of Russian. Cambridge.

Baykov 2020 — Байков Ф.В. Косвенный контроль в русском языке // Rhema. Рема. 2020. № 1. С. 106–125. [Baykov F.V. 2020. Oblique control in Russian. Rhema. Рема. 2020. No. 1. Pp. 106–125. DOI: 10.31862/2500-2953-2020-1-106-125] (in Russian)

Baykov, Rudnev 2020 — Baykov F., Rudnev P. Not all obligatory control is movement. Journal of Linguistics. 2020. Vol. 56. No. 4. Pp. 893–906. DOI: [10.1017/S0022226720000237](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226720000237)

Berkovich 2025 — Беркович М. О дистантном скрэмблинге в мишарском татарском // Проблемы полевой тюркологии. М., 27.09.2025. [Berkovich M. On distant scrambling in Mishar Tatar. Problems of Field Turkology. Moscow, High School of Economics, 27.09.2025.

Boeckx, Hornstein 2004 — Boeckx C., Hornstein N. Movement under control. Linguistic Inquiry. 2004. Vol. 35. No. 3. Pp. 431–452. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0024389041402625>

Bondarenko, Davis 2024 — Bondarenko T., Davis C. Cross-clausal Scrambling and Subject Case in Balkar: On Multiple Specifiers and the Locality of Overt and Covert Movement. Syntax. 2024. Pp. 613–652. DOI: 10.1111/synt.12286

Bondaruk 2010 — Bondaruk A. Obligatory control in Irish and Polish – a reappraisal. Studia Celto-Slavica. 2010. Vol. 4. Pp. 89–102.

Bresnan 1982 — Bresnan J. Control and complementation. The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations. Bresnan J. (ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1982. Pp. 282–390.

Bresnan 2001 — Bresnan J. Lexical-Functional Syntax. Blackwell Publishers, 2004.

Burukina 2020 — Burukina I. Mandative verbs and deontic modals in Russian: Between obligatory control and overt embedded subjects. Glossa: a journal of general linguistics. 2020. Vol. 5. No.1. DOI: [10.5334/gjgl.905](https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.905)

Culicover, Jackendoff 2001 — Culicover P., Jackendoff R. Control is not Movement. Linguistic Inquiry. 2001. Vol. 32. No. 3. Pp. 493–512. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002438901750372531>

Davies, Dubinsky 2004 — Davies W., Dubinsky S. 2004. The Grammar of Raising and Control: A course in syntactic argumentation. Blackwell, 2004.

Engdahl 2022 — Engdahl E. Passive with control and raising in mainland Scandinavian. Nordic Journal of Linguistics. 2022. Vol. 47. No. 1. Pp. 1–41.

Engdahl, Laanemets 2015 — Engdahl E., Laanemets A. Prepositional passives in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish: A corpus study. Nordic Journal of Linguistics. 2015. Vol. 38. No. 3. Pp. 285–337.

Erlewine 2025 — Erlewine M. 2025. Atayalic subject and the nature of the nominative. <https://mitcho.com/research/atayalic.html>

Fortuin, Davids 2013 — Fortuin E., Davids E. Subordinate clause prolepsis in Russian. *Russian Linguistics*. 2013. Vol. 37. Pp. 125–155.

Geraci 2023 — Geraci C. Budding the tree. Towards a theory of structure removal. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*. 2023. Vol. 8. No. 1. doi: <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5759>

Greeson 2025 — Greeson D. 2025. Hyperraising is less constrained than previously thought: New evidence from English. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/009069>

Greeson, Sundaresan 2025 — Greeson D., Sundaresan S. Ingredients of hyperraising: the insights from Tamil <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/009348>

Haddad 2012 — Haddad Y. Raising in Standard Arabic: Forward, backward, and none. *Arabic language and linguistics*. R. Bassiouney, E. Graham Katz (eds.). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2012. Pp. 61–78.

Hansen 2000 — Hansen E. Anteponeret adverbial. *Ny Forskning i Grammatik*, 7. Nørgård-Sørensen J., Durst-Andersen P., Jansen L., Lihn Jensen B. og Pedersen J. (red.). 2000. S. 73–86. (in Danish) <https://tidsskrift.dk/nfg/article/view/23954/21020>

Hornstein 1999 — Hornstein N. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1999. Vol. 30. No. 1. Pp. 69–96.

Hornstein, Polinsky 2010 — Hornstein N., Polinsky M. Control as Movement. *Movement Theory of Control*. Hornstein, M. Polinsky (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2010. Pp. 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.154.01hor>

Ivanova 2022 — Иванова Е.Ю. Балканославянская ирреальность в зеркале русского языка (южнославянские ДА-формы и их русские параллели. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2022. [Ivanova E.Yu. Balkanic Slavic irrealis in mirror of Russian language (South Slavic da-forms and their Russian parallels). Moscow: LRC, 2022.

Ivanova 2025 — Иванова Е.Ю. Модальность и синтаксические конфигурации: глагол *tryabva* в болгарском языке // *Типология морфосинтаксических параметров*. 2025. Т. 8. вып. 2. С. 38–65 [Ivanova E. Modality and syntactic configurations: the verb *tryabva* in Bulgarian. *Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters*. 2025. Vol. 8. Iss. 2. Pp. 38–65] (in Russian)

Julien, Lødrup 2013 — Julien M., Lødrup H. Dobbel passiv og beslektede konstruksjoner i skandinavisk. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift*. 2013. Vol. 31. No. 2. Pp. 221–246.

Kalinina, Sumbatova 2007 — Kalinina E., Sumbatova N. Clause structure and verbal forms in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. *Finiteness*. Nikolaeva I. (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. 183–249. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199213733.003.0007>

Kalyakin 2025 — Калякин И.В. Цикличность дистантного согласования в муиринском даргинском // *Типология морфосинтаксических параметров*. 2025. Т. 8. № 1. С. 56–74. [Kalyakin I. V. Cyclic Long Distance Agreement in Muirin Dargwa // *Typology of morphosyntactic parameters*. 2025. Vol. 8. Iss. 1. Pp. 56–74. doi:10.37632/PI.2025.39.63.003]

Kibrik 1997 — Kibrik A.E. Beyond subject and object: Toward a comprehensive relational typology. *Linguistic Typology*. 1997. Vol. 1. No. 3. Pp. 1–68.

Kibrik 2003 — Кибрик А.Е. Константы и переменные языка. Спб.: Алтейя, 2003. [Kibrik A.E. Constants and variables of the language. St. Petersburg: Aletheia, 2003.] (in Russian)

Koeva 2023 — Коева С. Частита на речта като части на изречението, или дали винаги глаголите заемат отделна синтаксична позиция // *Bulgarian Language*. 2003. Supplement vol. 70. С. 143–157. [Koeva S. Parts of speech as Clause Constituents, or Do Verbs always Occupy a Separate Syntactic Position]. *Bulgarian Language*. 2003. Supplement vol. 70. Pp. 143–157. (in Bulgarian).

Krapova 2025 — Krapova I. Finiteness and the subjunctive: the case of Bulgarian da constructions from a comparative perspective. *Papers of the Institute for Bulgarian Language*. 2025. Vol. 38. Pp. 7–42.

Kustova 2025 — Кустова Г.И. Конструкции подъема с глаголами восприятия в русском языке // Типология морфосинтаксических параметров. Т. 8, вып. 2. С. 66–88 [Kustova G. Raising Constructions with verbs of perception in Russian. Typology of morphosyntactic parameters. 2025. Vol. 8. Iss. 2. Pp. 66–88] (in Russian).

Landau 2008 — Landau I. Two routes of control: evidence from case transmission in Russian. Natural language and linguistic theory. 2008. Vol. 26. Pp. 877–924. doi.org/10.1007/s11049-008-9054-0

Landau 2015 — Landau I. A two-tiered theory of control. MIT Press, 2015.

Landau 2024 — Landau I. Empirical challenges to the form-copy theory of control. Glossa: a journal of general linguistics. 2024. Vol. 9. No. 1. DOI: 10.16995/glossa.16406

Landau 2024 — Landau I. Control. Cambridge Elements. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009243124>

Letuchiy, Viklova 2020 — Летучий А.В., Виклова А.В. Подъем и смежные явления в русском языке (преимущественно на материале поведения местоимений) // Вопросы языкоznания. 2020. № 2. С. 31–60. [Letuchiy A.B., Viklova A.V. Raising and similar phenomena in Russian (mainly based on the behavior of pronouns). Voprosy jazykoznaniia. 2020. No. 2. Pp. 31–60. DOI: 10.31857/S0373658X0008776-2]

Lødrup 2002 — Lødrup H. Infinitival complements in Norwegian and the form-function relation. Proceedings of the LFG02 Conference. Butt M. and King T.H. (eds.). Stanford: CSLI Publications, 2002.

Lødrup 2008a — Lødrup H. Raising to object in Norwegian and the Derived Object Constraint. Studia Linguistica. 2008. Vol. 62. Pp. 155–181.

Lødrup 2008b — Lødrup H. The Diversity and Unity of the Accusative with Infinitive Construction: A Norwegian Perspective. Linguistics. 2008. Vol. 46. No. 5. Pp. 891–916. doi.org/10.1515/LING.2008.029

Lødrup 2014 — Lødrup H. Long passives in Norwegian: Evidence for complex predicates. Nordic Journal of Linguistics. Vol. 37. No. 3. Pp. 367–391.

Lødrup 2022 — Lødrup H. The grammatical realization of the long passive in Norwegian. Proceedings of the LFG'22 Conference. Butt M., Findlay J. and Toivonen I. (eds.) Stanford: CSLI. 2022. Pp. 222 – 244.

Lødrup 2026 — Lødrup H. The need for restructuring with Norwegian 'need'. Syntactic Frames in Scandinavian and beyond. Ramsevik Riksem R., Eik R. (eds.). Berlin: Language Science Press. 2026. (in print). <https://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/550>

Lyutikova et al. 2016 — Лютикова Е.А., Ронько Р.В., Циммерлинг А.В. Дифференцированное маркирование аргументов: морфология, семантика, синтаксис // Вопросы языкоznания. 2016, № 6. С. 113–127. [Lyutikova E.A., Ronko R.V., Zimmerling A.V. Differential argument marking: morphology, semantics, syntax. Voprosy jazykoznaniia. 2016, No 6. Pp. 113–127. DOI: 10.31857/S0373658X0001068-3]

Lyutikova 2022a — Лютикова Е.А. Есть ли синтаксический подъем в русском языке? Часть 1: Инфинитивные клаузы // Вестник Моск. ун-та. Сер. 9. Филология. 2022. № 4. С. 27–45. [Lyutikova E. A. Does Russian attest syntactic raising? Part one: infinitive clauses. Vestnik Mosk. un-ta. Ser. 9. Filologija. 2022. No. 4. Pp. 27–45.] (in Russian)

Lyutikova 2022b — Лютикова Е.А. Есть ли синтаксический подъем в русском языке? Часть 2: Малые клаузы // Вестник Моск. ун-та. Сер. 9. Филология. 2022. № 5. С. 58–74. [Lyutikova E. A. Does Russian attest syntactic raising? Part two: small clauses. Vestnik Mosk. un-ta. Ser. 9. Filologija. 2022. No. 5. Pp. 58–74. DOI: 10.55959/MSU0130-0075-9-2022-6-58-74]. (in Russian)

Lyutikova 2024a — Лютикова Е.А. К типологии эргативности: контроль и подъем в дагестанских языках // Ломоносовские чтения. М., МГУ, 27.03.2024. [Lyutikova E.A. On the typology of ergativity: control and raising in Dagestanian languages. Lomonosov readings. Moscow, MSU, 27.03. 2024.]

Lyutikova 2024b — Лютикова Е.А. Адъективные сказуемые в финитных и нефинитных клаузах // Вопросы языкоznания. 2024. № 6. С. 7–31. [Lyutikova E.A. Adjectival predicates in finite and non-finite clauses. Voprosy jazykoznaniya. 2024. No. 6. Pp. 7–31. DOI: 10.31857/0373-658X.2024.6.7-31.] (in Russian).

Lyutikova 2025a — Лютикова Е.А. Ролевая гипотеза и структура клаузы дагестанских языков // Вопросы языкоznания. 2025. № 6. С. 89–119. [Lyutikova E.A. The Role Hypothesis and the clause structure of the Northeast Caucasian languages. Voprosy jazykoznaniya. 2025. No. 5. Pp. 89–119. DOI: [10.31857/0373-658X.2025.6.89-119](https://doi.org/10.31857/0373-658X.2025.6.89-119)]

Lyutikova 2025b — Lyutikova E.A. Raising, control and case. Syntax in uncharted territories. Essays in honor of Maria Polinsky. Clemens L., Gribanova V., Scontras G. (eds.). Berkeley: Univ. of California, 2025. Pp. 409–431. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7280/S9TM7851>

Mel'čuk 2025 — Mel'čuk I. Russian sentences of the type *Mne negde spat'* 'I have no place to sleep': Once more. Voprosy Jazykoznaniya. 2025. No. 5. Pp. 154–173. DOI: [10.31857/0373-658X.2025.4.154-173](https://doi.org/10.31857/0373-658X.2025.4.154-173)

Mitrenina 2017 — Митренина О.В. Дативно-инфinitивная конструкция в русском языке как предложная группа // Лютикова Е.А., Циммерлинг А.В. (ред.). Типология морфосинтаксических параметров. Материалы международной конференции “Типология морфосинтаксических параметров 2017”. Вып. 4. М.: Государственный институт русского языка имени А. С. Пушкина, 2017. С. 64–70. [Mitrenina O.V. The dative-infinitive construction in Russian as PP. Tipologija morfosintaksicheskikh parametrov. Materialy mezhdunarodnoj konferencii “Tipologija morfosintaksicheskikh parametrov 2017”. Vyp. 4.Iss. 4. Lyutikova E.A, Zimmerling A.V. (eds.) Moscow: Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, 2017. Pp. 64 – 70.] (in Russian).

Müller 2017 — Müller G. Structure removal in complex prefields. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory. 2017. Vol. 36. Pp. 219–264.

Noël, Colleman 2009 — Noël D., Colleman T. The nominative and infinitive in English and Dutch. Languages in Contrast. 2009. Vol. 9. No. 1. Pp. 144–181.

Ørsnes 2006 — Ørsnes B. Creating raising verbs: An LFG-analysis of the complex passive in Danish. Proceedings of the LFG '06 conference. Butt M., Holloway King T. L.(eds.). Stanford: CSLI Publications, 2006. Pp. 386–405.

Ørsnes 2013 — Ørsnes B. The Danish reportive passive as a non-canonical passive. Non-canonical passives. Alexiadou A., Schäfer F. (eds.). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013. Pp. 315–336.

Osenova 2022 — Osenova P. Raising and Control Constructions in a Bulgarian UD Parsebank of Parliament Sessions. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Computational Linguistics in Bulgaria (CLIB 2022), Sofia: Department of Computational Linguistics, IBL – BAS, 2022. Pp. 68–74.

Oskolskaya 2025 — Оскольская С.А. Конструкции контроля и подъема в нанайском языке: предварительный обзор // Типология морфосинтаксических параметров. 2025. Т. 8, вып. 1. С. 75–98. [Oskolskaya S. Control and raising constructions in Nanai: a preliminary overview. Typology of morphosyntactic parameters. 2025. Vol. 8. No. 1. Pp. 75–98. doi:10.37632/PI.2025.76.97.004] (in Russian).

Pesetsky 2013 — Pesetsky D. Phasal movements, its diseases and discontents. Diagnosing Syntax. Lai-Shen Cheng L. and N. Corver (eds.). Oxford: Oxford university press, 2013. Pp. 123–157.

Pesetsky 2021 — Pesetsky D. 2021. Exfoliation: Towards a derivational theory of clause size. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004440>

Patejuk, Przepiórkowski 2014 — Patejuk A., Przepiórkowski A. In favour of the raising analysis of passivisation. Proceedings of the LFG14 Conference. 2014. Pp. 461–481.

Polinsky, Potsdam 2001 — Polinsky M., Potsdam E. Long-distant agreements and the topics in Tsez. Natural language and linguistic theory. Vol. 19. Pp. 583–646. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010757806504>

Polinsky, Potsdam 2002 — Polinsky M., Potsdam E. Backward control. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 2002. Vol. 33. No. 2. Pp. 245–282. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002438902317406713>

Polinsky, Potsdam 2006 — Polinsky M., Potsdam E. Expanding the scope of control and raising. *Syntax*. 2006. Vol. 9. No. 2. Pp. 171–192. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9612.2006.00090](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2006.00090)

Polinsky 2013 — Polinsky M. Raising and control. *The Cambridge handbook of generative syntax*. M. den Dikken (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. 41–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804571.021>

Postal 1970 — Postal P. On coreferential complement subject deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 2012. Vol. 1. No. 4. Pp. 439–500. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4177588>

Postal 1974 — Postal P. On raising. Cambridge, 1974.

Potsdam, Polinsky 2012 — Potsdam E., Polinsky M. Backward raising. *Syntax*. 2012. Vol. 15 (1). Pp. 75–108. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9612.2011.00158.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2011.00158.x)

Rosenbaum 1967 — Rosenbaum P. The grammar of English predicate complement constructions. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1967.

Przepiórkowski, Rosen 2005 — Przepiórkowski A., Rosen A. Czech and Polish raising/control with or without structure sharing. *Research in Language*. 2005. Vol. 3. Pp. 33–66.

Salzmann 2017 — Salzmann M. Prolepsis. *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. 2nd edition. M. Everaert, H. van Riemsdijk (eds.). Vol. 5. 2017. Pp. 3203–3245. DOI: [10.1002/9781118358733.wbsync062](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733.wbsync062)

Serdobolskaya 2008 — Serdobolskaya N. 2008. Towards the typology of raising. *New Challenges in Typology*. Vol. 2. A. Arkhipov, P. Epps (eds.). Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. Pp. 269–295.

Serdobolskaya et al. 2016 — Сердобольская Н.В., Аркадьев П.М., Шкапа М.В. К типологии подъема и смежных явлений: неканоническое маркирование актантов в актантных и обстоятельственных предложениях // *Rhema. Рема*. 2016. №1. С. 74–91. [Serdobolskaya N.V., Arkadiev P.M., Shkapa M.V. 2016. Raising and related phenomena: non-canonical argument marking in argument and adjunct clauses. *Rhema. Рема*. 2016. No. 1. Pp. 74–91]. (in Russian)

Šimík 2011 — Šimík R. Modal existential wh-constructions. PhD dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Sinitsyna 2025 — Синицына Ю.В. Конструкция с глаголом ‘казаться’ в татышлинском говоре удмуртского языка: первые наблюдения // Панич М.В., Сердобольская Н.В., Татевосов С.Г., Федорова О.В. (ред.). *Дискурс. Предложение. Слово. Сб. статей к юбилею ИМК. М. :ООО “Буки Веди”, 2025. С. 282–293. [Sinitsyna J.V. On a construction with the verb ‘seem’ in Tatyshli Udmurt: first observations. Diskurs. Predlozhenije. Slovo. Sbornik statej k jubileju IMK. Panich M.B., Serdobolskaya N.V., Tatevosov S.G., Fedorova O.V. (eds.). Moscow: Buki Vedi, 2025. Pp. 282–293.*

Skrzypek, Engdahl 2025 — Skrzypek D., Engdahl E. From ‘remain’ to ‘become’: the history of *bliva* in Swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*. 2025. Pp. 1–27. doi:10.1017/S0332586524000234

Stjepanović 2004 — Stjepanović S. Clitic climbing and restructuring with “finite clause” and infinitive complements. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*. 2004. Vol. 12. No. 1–2. Pp. 173–212.

Tanasić 1995 — Tanasić S. O upotrebi glagola *trebat*. Naš jezik. 1995–1996. Vol. 30. No. 1—5. S. 44–52 [Tanasić S. On usage of the verb *trebat* ‘must’. Naš jezik. 1995–1996. Vol. 30. No. 1–5. Pp. 44–52] (in Serbian).

Testelets 2009 — Тестелец Я.Г. Невыраженные актанты в полипредикативной конструкции // Тестелец Я.Г. (ред.). Аспекты полисинтезизма: очерки по грамматике адыгейского языка. Москва: РГГУ. С. 654–711. [Testelets Y.G. Unexpressed arguments in polyadic constructions. Aspekte polisintetizma: ocherki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka. Testelets Y.G., Arkadiev P.M., Letuchii A.B., Sumbatova N.R. (eds.). Moscow: Russian State Univ. for the Humanities, 2009. Pp. 654–711.]

Testelets 2021 — Тестелец Я.Г. Ролевые языки Северного Кавказа: идея А.Е. Кибрика через 40 лет // Rhema. Рема. 2021. № 2. С. 65–83. [Testelets Ya.G. The role languages of the North Caucasus: A.E. Kibrik’s idea after 40 years. Rhema. 2021. No. 2. Pp. 65–83.] (in Russian) <https://doi.org/10.31862/2500-2953-2021-2-65-83>

Togeby 2014 — Togeby O. Tidernes følge – hos Mikkelsen (The sequence of tenses - at Mikkelsen). Problemer og perspektiver i dansk syntaks: med Kristian Mikkelsen som anledning. Togeby O., Vikner S., Jørgensen H. (eds.). Universitets-Jubilæets Danske Samfund. Skriftserie; No. 585. Syddansk Universitetsforlag. S. 137–170 (in Danish). https://pure.au.dk/ws/files/109785711/Togeby_14_Tidernes_F_lge.pdf (Accessed 01.12.2025)

Vincent 2023 — Vincent N. Raising and control. Handbook of Lexical Functional Grammar. Dalrymple M. (ed.). Berlin: Language Science Press, 2023. Pp. 603–647.

Wurmbrand 2001 — Wurmbrand S. Infinitives: restructuring and clause structure. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Wurmbrand 2019 — Wurmbrand S. Cross-clausal A-dependencies. Papers from the 54th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS 54). 2019. Vol. 54. Pp. 585–604.

Wurmbrand, Lohninger 2023 — Wurmbrand S., Lohninger M. An implicational universal in complementation. Theoretical insights and empirical progress. Propositional arguments in cross-linguistic research: theoretical and empirical issues. Hartmann J., Wöllstein A. (eds.), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2023. Pp. 119–137.

Zimmerling 2018 — Циммерлинг А.В. Два диалекта русской грамматики: корпусные данные и модель // Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies. 2018. Issue 17. С. 818–833. [Zimmerling A.V. Two Dialects of Russian Grammar: Corpus Data and Formal Models. Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies, 2025. Iss. 17. Pp. 818–833.]

Zimmerling 2021 — Циммерлинг А.В. От интегрального к аспективному. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2021. [Zimmerling A.V. From Integral Frameworks to Aspective Descriptions. Moscow: LRC. 2021. (in Russian)]

Zimmerling 2022 — Циммерлинг А.В. Дативно-инфinitивные структуры и синтаксически идиомы в русском языке // Koeva S., Ivanova E. Yu., Tisheva J., Zimmerling A. (red.). Ontologija na situaciite za səstojanie – lingvistichno modelirane. Səpostavitelno izsledvane za bǎlgarski i ruski. Sofija: Prof. Marin Drinov, 2022. С. 281–300. [Zimmerling A. V. Dative-infinitive structures and syntactic idioms in Russian. Ontology of Stative Situations - Linguistic Modeling. A Contrastive Bulgarian-Russian Study. Koeva S., Ivanova E.Yu., Tisheva J., Zimmerling A. (eds.). Sofia: Marin Drinov, 2022. Pp. 281–300. DOI: 10.7546/STONTBgRu 2022.10] (in Russian)

Zimmerling 2024 — Zimmerling A. Microsyntax meets macrosyntax: Russian neg-words revisited. Russian Linguistics. 2024. Vol. 48 (6). Pp.1–35. DOI: [10.1007/s11185-024-09290-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-024-09290-7)

Zimmerling 2025a — Циммерлинг А.В. Конструкции с подъемом аргумента в русском языке // Горбунова Л.И., Буров Э.И. (ред.). Русская грамматика: полипарадигмальность как методологический принцип современных научных исследований. Материалы IX

международного симпозиума. Иркутск: ИГУ, 2025. С. 38–45. [Zimmerling A.V. Raising constructions in Russian. Russkaja grammatika: poliparadigmal'nost' kak metodologicheskij princip sovremennoj nauchnoj issledovanij. Materialy IX mezhunarodnogo simpoziuma.. Gorbunova L. I., Burov E.I. (eds.). Irkutsk: Irkutsk State University, 2025. Pp. 38–45.] (in Russian)

Zimmerling 2025b — Zimmerling A. To seem or not to seem. *Studia Slavistica*. 2025. Vol. 22. № 2 (in press).

Zyman 2023 — Zyman E. Raising out of finite clauses (hyperraising). *Annual review of linguistics*. 2023. Vol. 9. Pp. 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-022421-070658>

Статья поступила в редакцию 27.11.2025; одобрена после рецензирования 05.12.2025; принята к публикации 29.12.2025.

The article was received on 27.11.2025; approved after reviewing 05.12.2025; accepted for publication 29.12.2025.

Антон Владимирович Циммерлинг

д.ф.н.; Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина / Институт языкоznания РАН

Anton Zimmerling

Dr. Phil. Hab.; Pushkin State Russian Language Institute / Institute of Linguistics RAS

fagraey64@hotmail.com