I have argued on the concord (and non-concord) of subjects and predicates in Russian sentences, from a syntactic viewpoint. In particular, I have focused on sentences that contain a numeral or quantifier phrase in the subject. These sentences have two variants of predicates (third person singular vs. third person plural in non-past tense; neuter singular vs. plural in past tense or in predicates that consist of adjectives and particles). See examples (1) and (2) below:

(1)  Работают  сто  человек.
     Rabota-ют  st-o  čelovek.
     work-PRES.3PL  hundred-NUM.NOM  people-PL.GEN
     “There are a hundred people working.”

(2)  Работает  сто  человек.
     Rabota-ет  st-o  čelovek.
     work-PRES.3SG  hundred-NUM.NOM  people-PL.GEN
     “There are a hundred people working.”

I have applied a corpus-based analysis to be able to draw an objective conclusion on this issue. When variants of a language are analyzed, the instinctive judgments of native speakers often prevent description of reality. However, corpus-based analysis excludes the sense of prescription of the examinees, and thereby makes it possible to obtain accurate results regarding usage. In addition, I have widely applied a statistical method. To determine the correlation between categorical distinctiveness (morphology, syntax, etc.) in subjects and subject-predicate concord, I applied a chi-square test. Furthermore, to measure the influence of categorical distinctiveness on subject-predicate concord, I applied multi-regression analysis. The data obtained from these operations can be used to identify which predicate to use in a sentence containing a numeral or quantifier phrase.
This paper first surveys the syntactic structures of sentences that contain a numeral or quantifier phrase in the subject (Chapter 1). Second, data from Modern Russian (MR) will help determine whether a correlation exists between categorical distinctiveness in subjects and subject-predicate concord, and will reveal the wide range of influences on subject-predicate concord (Chapter 2). Third, XI century canonical manuscript data of Old Church Slavonic (OCS) and Old Russian (OR) will be used to analyze the predicate variants in sentences that contain a quantifier phrase in the subject (Chapter 3). Finally, a contrastive linguistic method will be used to demonstrate the historical influence (from OCS/OR to MR) on present-day subject-predicate concord (Chapter 4).

In Chapter 2, taking into consideration what has been noted by preceding studies, I list eight categories that may have correlations with subject-predicate concord. These categories include morphological, syntactical, semantic, lexical, and scriptural aspects. Chi-square tests reveal correlations between these categories and the preference for singular (SG) or plural (PL) form in the predicates (see Table 1 below).

**Table 1** Correlations between the categories and the preference for SG/PL form in the predicates (MR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>morphological</th>
<th>kind of predicates</th>
<th>verbal predicates</th>
<th>participial predicates</th>
<th>adjectival predicates</th>
<th>non-significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syntactical</td>
<td>kind of predicates</td>
<td>subject–predicate</td>
<td>predicate–subject</td>
<td>sub.1–predicate–sub.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>kind of predicates</td>
<td>with PL.NOM. marker</td>
<td>without NOM. marker</td>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>semantics of numerals</td>
<td>“два” (“two”)</td>
<td>“три” (“three”)</td>
<td>“пять” (“five”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>semantics of numerals</td>
<td>“сто” (“hundred”)</td>
<td>“тысяча” (“thousand”)</td>
<td>“миллион” (“million”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>animacy of a noun combined with numerals in subject</td>
<td>animate</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>existence / non-existence of approximate number expressions</td>
<td>with approx. num. expressions</td>
<td>without approx. num. expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>“быть” predicate/ non-“быть” predicate</td>
<td>“быть” predicate</td>
<td>non-“быть” predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Along with the classification method shown in Corbett 1978.*
On the other hand, multi-regression analysis will reveal the diversity of the influences of the categories on subject-predicate coordination, which is expressed by the hierarchy shown below.

**[Hierarchy 1]** The hierarchy of influence of the categories on subject-predicate concord (MR)
- element order > “быть” predicate/non-“быть” predicate > semantics of numerals > existence/non-existence of nominative marker > animacy of a noun in subject > kind of predicates > existence/non-existence of approximate number expressions

In regard to the OCS and OR, in the third chapter, the hierarchy shows somewhat different abstracts. The multi-regression analysis yields the result of influences of the categories on subject-predicate concord in OCS and OR, as shown in Hierarchies 2 and 3.

**[Hierarchy 2]** The hierarchy of influence of the categories on subject-predicate concord (OCS)
- element order > animacy of a noun in subject > “быть” predicate/non-“быть” predicate > existence/non-existence of approximate number expressions > semantics of numerals > kind of predicates

**[Hierarchy 3]** The hierarchy of influence of the categories on subject-predicate concord (OR)
- semantics of numerals > element order > kind of predicates > animacy of a noun in subject > “быть” predicate/non-“быть” predicate > existence/non-existence of approximate number expressions > script of numerals

The last chapter takes a contrastive linguistic viewpoint. Comparison of the three hierarchies shown above demonstrates the categories that have changed the intensity of the effect on subject-predicate concord and those that have not. The results are as follows:

1. Element order: In MR, the intensity of the effects is strong; it is as strong as those in OCS and OR.
2. “ёёёё” (“быть”) predicate/non-“ёёёё” (“быть”) predicate:
   - In MR, the intensity of the effects is strong; it is stronger than those in OCS and OR.
3. Semantics of numerals:
   - In MR, the intensity of the effects is medium; it is stronger than that in OCS but not as strong as that in OR.
4. Animacy of a noun in the subject:
   - In MR, the intensity of the effect is medium; it is not as strong as that in OCS but is as strong as that in OR.
5. Existence/non-existence of approximate number expressions:
   - In MR, the intensity of the effect is weak and is less strong than that in OCS but as strong as that in OR.
6. Type of predicate: In MR, the intensity of the effect is weak; it is as strong as that in OCS but not as strong as that in OR.