EVALUATING SYNCHRONIC EXPLANATIONS
BY MEANS OF DIACHRONY
on the nature of NSs and their history in Russian

Nerea Madariaga

University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU

OTiPL – MGU, Moscow

26 September 2018

Universidad del País Vasco
Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea

INDEX

1. Goal

2. Referential null subjects (NSs) in Modern Russian

3. Referential NSs in Old Russian (vs. Modern Russian)

4. The change and its implications for the analysis of referential NSs

1. Goal

To show in a practical way how diachronic data can help us decide between potential synchronic explanations

→ evaluate the available hypotheses about referential null subjects (NSs) with the help of diachronic data from the history of Russian pro-drop

Russian referential Null Subjects (NSs):

- **The options:** a pronominal nature vs. a rich inflectional nature of referential NSs in consistent NS-languages

- **The proposal:** change in infinitive NSs in Russian, related to the loss of consistent NS character of OR, renders the pronominal nature of referential NSs as the only alternative

2. On referential null subjects (NSs) in Modern Russian

Two types of languages taken into account here

(1) "Consistent" NS-languages

(Italian, Spanish, Old Russian…):

Non-emphatic, non-stressed ("weak") pronoun subjects **must be dropped**:

(1) a. - ¿Cómo (*tú) quieres la sopa?   ~ How do <u>you</u> want the soup?

      how   (*you) want the soup

  - (*Yo) la quiero caliente.   ~ <u>I</u> want it hot.

    (*I)   cl. want hot

  b. (Talking about Juan…)

    (*Él) vino y se llevó el ordenador ~ <u>He</u> came and took the computer away

    (*he) came and took the computer

6

(2) "Partial" NS-languages

(Finnish, Hebrew, Brazilian Portuguese, Russian, some Germanic languages…)

The baseline realization of subjects is overt, but they **can be dropped** under certain conditions:

(2) a. - Где ты любишь гулять?

   - Я люблю гулять в парке.

   b. - Он пришел и забрал компьютер.

(3) ((Ты)) дашь (мне), пожалуйста, посмотреть?

(4) Он$_i$ сказал, что e$_i$ придет вовремя.

Modern Russian (MR) is a partial NS-language

(Franks 1995, Lindseth 1998, McShane 2005,ff, Holmberg, Nayudu & Sheehan 2009, Roberts & Holmberg 2010, Tsedryk 2013, Madariaga 2011, 2018, Sheehan 2018, etc)

→ But this is not to say much…unless we describe its properties more specifically

How are NSs licensed? (in general)

The importance of C-layer in licensing subject drop

Variant 1: Frascarelli (2007, 2018):

- NSs are licensed by a (null) <u>Aboutness-shift Topic (A-topic) in C</u>

- The <u>Avoid Pronoun Principle</u>: avoid a strong pronoun whenever the A-topic is continuous, i.e. NS obligatory; cf. ex. (4)

- In partial NS-languages, Locality is also required for this licensing (ex. in Finnish stronger locality = NSs not licensed in matrix clauses)

- <u>1st and 2nd person subjects</u> can be dropped on a hearer-speaker basis (logophoric features); cf. ex. (1a), (3)

Variant 2: Sigurðsson (2011)

- Germanic topic drop and Finnish controlled 3rd person NSs = bound topics, they require local matching with C: a subject can be dropped if the position [Spec, C] is not occupied by sth else:

(5) a. Tala   stundum   íslensku.   (Icelandic)

   speak1SG sometimes Icelandic

    'I sometimes speak Icelandic.'

   b. * Stundum   tala   íslensku.

    sometimes speak1SG Icelandic

- 1st and 2nd person subjects dropped on a hearer-speaker basis

10

What about the obligatoriness / optionality of NSs?

Avoid Pronoun Principle (avoid a **strong** pronoun whenever A-topic is continuous) - for languages with no overt weak pronouns (like Spanish), but not for languages with overt weak pronouns (Russian)

(1) Not clear in some replies

(2) Clear in out-of-the-blue-contexts

→

11

Replies. Spanish (consistent NS) – 1

<u>Statement</u>:

- Juan es muy decidido. Ayer se le pinchó una rueda y la cambió enseguida

('Juan is a determined person. He got a flat tire and he immediately changed it')

<u>Reply 1</u>:

(6a) - ¿*(Tú) qué habrías   hecho en su lugar?

       you what would.2sg done in his place

    'What would you have done in his place?'

➔ Obligatory overt pronoun < clear shift of A-topic due to constrative topic

Replies. Spanish (consistent NS) - 2

<u>Statement</u>:

- Juan es muy decidido. Ayer se le pinchó una rueda y la cambió enseguida

('Juan is a determined person. He got a flat tire and he immediately changed it')

<u>Reply 2</u>:

(6b) - ¿(Tú) cómo te has   enterado?

         you how   cl. have.2sg known   ('How did you know?')

→ Optional pro < the shift of the A-topic is subject to interpretation: the

speaker may want to turn to a new A-topic ('you') or not

13

Replies. Russian (partial NS) – <u>help from the audience needed!!!!</u>

<u>Statement</u>:

– Ваня решительный человек. Когда у него начала спускать шина, он ее немедленно поменял.

<u>Reply 1</u>:

(7a) – Что бы *(ты) делал на его месте?

→ Obligatory overt subject –same as Spanish?

<u>Reply 2</u>:

(7b) - Откуда (ты) знаешь / Где (ты) узнал?

→ Optional overt subject – same as Spanish?

Out-of-the-blue contexts. Spanish

(8) - Hola, Pedro.

   - Hola, Juan, ¿(*tú) estás   estudiando?, ¿(*tú) todavía no has   cenado?

     hi   Juan   you are.2sg studying   you still   not have.2sg dinner

     'Hi, Juan, are you studying? Did not you have dinner yet?'

→ <u>Obligatory pro</u> < avoid strong pronouns when there is no shift in A-topic
(the NS is anchored by logophoric features)

15

Out-of-the-blue contexts. Russian

(9) - Привет, Петя.

   - Привет, Ваня, (ты) занимаешься? (Ты) еще не поужинал?

→ <u>Optional pro</u> < reference anchored in the hearer-speaker structure licenses NS, but it is not obligatory, as the overt pronoun in Russian can be also weak.

Embedded contexts – Spanish

(10) Ha   venido Pedro. (*Él) ha   dicho [que (*tú) has   cenado].

has.3sg come   Pedro   he has.3sg said   that you have.2sg had dinner

'Pedro came and said that you had dinner.'

→Obligatory pro < avoid strong pronouns when continuous A-topic

(a) The first NS is obligatory because of identity with the A-topic

(b) The second, because of logophoric features

17

BUT Embedded contexts – <u>Russian</u>

(11) Пришел Петя. (Он) сказал, [что *(ты) / (#он) сделал домашние задания]

→ Weak overt pronoun for obviation vs. NS under control for correference

(12) Пришел Петя$_i$. (Он) сказал, [что *(ты) приготовишь ужин] - <u>help from the audience!!!</u>

→ Weak overt pronoun & NS under control **(embedded contexts seem to not give access to logophoric features??)**

18

Two levels of asymmetries in licensing NSs in MoR

1st/2nd person		3rd person	
Root clauses	**Embedded clauses**	**Root clauses**	**Embedded clauses**
Logophorics	Logophorics? / Control?	Bound topic / continuous A-topic	Control

According to person features

1st/2nd person NS recoverable on a hearer-speaker basis:

(13) a.   Всем привет. (Я) уже вернулась!

    b.   Привет, когда (ты) вернулась?

    c.   Я уже думала, что (ты) не придешь. (Logophoric features accesed!!)

3rd p. NS: asymmetry according to degree of clausal embedding

- <u>In root finite clauses</u>: NS = locally licensed by A-topic or bound topic

in C (another element raised to CP blocks its licensing - Tsedryk 2013)

(From Tsedryk 2013)

(14) a. Я только что встретил Лену. (Она) сказала, что их отдел

скоро закроют.

b. Я только что встретил Лену. Что *(она) делает на кухне?

c. Я только что встретил Лену. *(Она) мне сказала, что наш

дом уже продан.

• <u>In embedded finite clauses</u>, under Obligatory Control (OC)

Tsedryk (2013): Russian NSs in finite embedded clauses under OC (a nominative chain); cf. Brazilian Portuguese – Nunes 2010 , Hebrew – Landau 2004):

(15) a.   Он сел потому, что (он) устал.

b.   Я убедила Сашу, чтобы *(он) пришел.

Two different views on the nature of referential NSs

(Roberts and Holmberg 2010, Biberauer 2018,

Cognola & Casalicchio 2018, etc)

→

Hypothesis (A): NSs are real pronoun subjects

- <u>In G&B</u>: pro = special null category in Spec,TP (Rizzi 1982, Cardinaletti 1997): already null when it enters the derivation from lexicon

    → not compatible with minimalism, because nulls cannot bear φ-features and φ-features on T are uninterpretable, so pro could not be interpreted

- In minimalism: **NSs** = deleted (weak) pronouns (Holmberg 2005, Roberts 2010)

  - A bundle of specified φ-features (a φP)

  - Functioning as weak overt pronouns in [Sp,TP]

  - Can be deleted at PF together with its φ-set just as copies are

  ~ null topics (Sigurðsson 2011, Tsedryk 2013 for partial NS-languages): the φ-features of such NS have no value, so they get a value from C

Hypothesis (B): NSs are something else

- Barbosa (2013, based on Borer 1986) for <u>consistent NS languages</u>

Also Manzini & Roussou (1999), Platzack (2004), Sigurðsson (2011)

→ no null category, no element in [Spec, T], the φ-features on T are interpretable and expressed as a verbal affix = the subject is directly expressed by rich verbal agreement inflection

→ Barbosa (2009): How to satisfy the EPP? perhaps because rich morphology contains incorporated subject pronouns and is sufficient to satisfy it → stipulation

3. Referential NSs in Old Russian (vs. Modern Russian)

NSs in Old Russian (finite contexts)

- **Old Russian (OR) was a consistent NS-language**

(Borkovskij 1978:10ff, Jung 2016, Meyer 2009, 2011, Madariaga 2011, 2018, Zaliznjak 2004)

- NS was compulsory in non-emphatic / non-discourse-related contexts (Avoid Pronoun Principle → NS ~ weak pronoun, as in Spanish) (17a)

- overt (strong) pronouns = emphatic (17b) →

1st/2nd person NSs in OR

(17) a. Почто е идеши опять, е поималъ еси всю дань. (*Laur. Chr.* 14v)

'Why did you come again? You have already picked the tax.'

b. Вижь сего <u>ты</u> юже еси хотѣлъ.   (*Laur. Chr.* 23v)

'See, this is what you (i.e. but not me) wanted.'

(<u>Context</u>: Sveneld wants to avenge his son, killed by Oleg, and convinces Yaropolk, Oleg's brother, to conquer Oleg's lands. While Yaropolk and Sveneld attack the city, nobody notices that Oleg falls from the overcrowded drawbridge and dies. Yaropolk takes the city and looks for his brother; when he finds Oleg's body, Yaropolk pronounces the sentence in (17b), blaming Sveneld for his brother's death.)

1st/2nd person: both stages seem similar, BUT + fronted element

"And Oleg said:"   (*Hypathian Chr.*, 15v)

(18) a. Где есть конь мои, <u>кгоже</u> **е** бѣхъ поставилъ кормити и блюсти

кго.

b. Где мой конь, <u>которого</u> *(я) приказал кормить и беречь? (MoR)

'Where is my horse, whom I had ordered to feed and take care of?'

→**In OR,** the fronted C-element does not intervene for NS to be licensed

(if there are logophoric features or no change in the A-topic)

→**In MoR,** the NS is banned because of the fronted relativized element.

3rd person NS agreeing with an A-topic in OR

(1st Novg Chr, 40-40v)

(19) Тои же весне оженися князь Мьстиславъ$_i$ Новегородѣ (…). И потомъ

е$_i$ позваша и ростовьци къ собе, и е$_i$ иде Ростову съ дружиною своею,

а е$_i$ сынъ остави въ Новегородѣ, и е$_i$ приде Ростову. И въ то врѣмя

умьрлъ бяше Михалко. И е$_i$ поиде съ ростовьци и съ суждальци

къ Володимирю…

'In the spring of that year, the prince Mstislav got married in Novgorod… Then, the people of Rostov called him for help, and he (= Mstislav) went to Rostov with his army and left his son in Novgorod, and attacked Rostov. At that time, Mikhail had already died. And he (= Mstislav) attacked the town of Vladimir together with the people of Rostov and Suzdal.'

3rd person NS: compare OR ~ Spanish vs. MoR

Contextual antecedent = *Jesus* mentioned quite far away (15 lines before)

(20) a. e Повелѣ имъ ити в гору Елевоньскую и ту е явися имъ. (*Laur. Chr.* 35v)

    b. (*Él) les ordenó   ir   al Monte de los Olivos y   (*él) allí   se

     he cl commanded.3sg. go to Mount of the Olives and   he there refl

    les apareció.   (Spanish)

    cl appeared.3sg.

    c.   *(Он) приказал им пойти в Масличную гору и там (он) явился им.

     'He (Jesus) commanded them to go to the Mount of Olives and there he

     appeared to them.'

OR overt pronominal subjects in contrastive or emphatic contexts

Often followed by Wackernagel particles: *to*, *že*, *uže*, *bo*, *i*… (Borkovskij 1978):

(21) a. Juan dijo que me ayudaría <u>pero *(yo)</u> le dije que no.   (Spanish)

       'Juan told me that he would help me, but I told him not to.'

  b. Реч(е) же Володимер чего ради от жены родися (…) <u>Он же</u> реч(е)

    <u>ему</u>   сего рад(и) понеже исперва род ч(е)л(о)в(е)ч(е)скии женою

    сгрееши…   (*Laur. Chr.* 35v)

    'Vladimir asked why he was born from a woman, and *he* (the philosopher)

    told *him* (Vladimir) that because of this: because mankind committed sin

    for the first time through a woman…'

Summarizing so far (NSs in <u>finite contexts</u>)

- <u>OR (consistent NS language):</u>

1. NS licensed by an A-topic.

2. Another C-feature forces strong pronouns (e.g. focus or contrastivity).

3. The deleted pronoun / V-to-T movement (rich morphology) satisfies the EPP of T.

- Remember! <u>Modern Russian (partial NS language):</u>

1. No V-to-T (Bailyn 2012, Gribanova 2013) → EPP on T satisfied by weak overt pronoun.

2. NSs:

   a. In matrix clauses: 1/ 2 p. licensed by logophorics; 3rd p. if it locally matches a feature in C or locally bound by an-A-topic

   b. In embedded clauses: licensed under control

Russian NSs in non-finite clauses

Early Slavic preserved IE **non-finite "agreeing" constructions** (**dative constructions** – analysed in an unified way by Andersen 1970, Madariaga 2015):

1. Dative subject + infinitive ([NP + inf]$_{DT}$)

→ for completives & purpose clauses (22a)

2. Absolute constructions ([NP + participle]$_{DT}$)

→ for other circumstantials (22b)   →→

36

(22) a. Pristǫpišę k nemu g(lago)lǫšte sadukei
came to him saying.PTCP.NOM Sadducees.NOM
[ne **byti** **vĭskrěšeniju**]
not be.INF resurrection.DAT
'The Sadducees, who said that there is no resurrection, came to him.'

(OCS, Matthew 22:23)[1]

b. [**Mŭnogu sǫštu narodu** i ne **imǫštemŭ**
many.DAT be.PTCP.DAT people.DAT and not have.PTCP.DAT
česo ěsti] (…) *Isusŭ glagola*
what eat Jesus.NOM said
'Being a lot of people there and having nothing to eat, Jesus said …'

(OCS, Mark 8:1)

From Madariaga (2015: 140). *Codex Marianus*

<u>The construction dative subject + infinitive</u>

was partially preserved

1) Root infinitive sentences: in OR & MoR

2) Embedded infinitive sentences: only in OR (in MoR it disappeared, except for some relictic uses ONLY in adjoined embedded constructions, not in complement position) → →

Root infinitive clauses (both in OR and MoR)

Both early Slavic and MoR display overt dative subjects in **root infinitive clauses**:

(23) a. <u>Брату твоему</u> Кыева не удержати.   (OR: *Suzdal Chr* 108b)

      'Your brother is not able to keep Kiev.'

    b. А что <u>нам</u> делать сейчас?   (MoR)

Embedded infinitive clauses

(Madariaga 2011, 2018)

In OR, they did not display syntactic control

- Early IE "subordinate" clauses = adjuncts (Kiparsky 1995)

- Traditional view: subordination in early IE was not developed

vs. MoR, where embedded infinitive clauses (in complement position) display OC, as most modern IE languages

In OR, same distribution of subjects

in root & embedded finite & non-finite clauses!!

In OR, a non-finite subject could be…

1. A NS with no change in the A-topic, non-controlled (24a)

2. An overt (strong) dative pronoun (emphatic, contrastive…), non-controlled (24b)

3. Any regular overt dative NP subject (24c)

4. Any non-verbal predicate (24a) or FQ (24b) referring to the non-finite subject

→ → →

(24) a. Молися [за мя_i] отче честныи [е_i <u>избавлену</u> быти от сети

неприязнины].   (*Laur. Chr.* 71b)

'Honorable Father, pray for me (for me) to be saved from devilment.'

b. Ты со мною цѣловалъ кр(е)стъ [ходити <u>нама</u> по одиной думѣ

<u>обѣма</u>].   (*Laur. Chr.* 170b)

'You and me swore (kissed the cross) that we both would do the same.'

c. И слышаше [быти <u>стуку и грому велику</u>].   (*Novgorod I Chr.*, 98)

'And he heard that there was a noise and a big thunder.'

In MoR: non-finite embedded completive clauses

= Obligatory Control (OC)

- Livitz (2014), Madariaga (2011, 2018): MoR infinitive NSs need a local, c-commanding, non-split antecedent (cf. 24 to 25), sloppy interpretation under ellipsis…

(25) a. * Молись за меня$_i$ [e$_i$ быть избавленным от этих неприятностей]

   b. * Я с тобой пообещал(и) [e$_{i+j}$ пойти вместе в кино]

<u>Remember. Tsedryk (2013)</u>: **embedded finite** NSs are also OC in MoR!!

- Claudi (2014), Pinelli & Luraghi (2015): the extension of что and чтобы (replacing да and дабы) by the 14-15th century was parallel to the quick extension of overt weak pronouns in finite embedded contexts (faster than in root sentences!)

Cf. Borkovskij (1978: 278), Lomtev (1956): the last instances of overt dative subjects in embedded context are from the 16-17th centuries in literary texts.

- Madariaga (2011, 2018), following the Movement Theory of Control (Boeckx & Hornstein 2007, Boeckx, Hornstein & Nunes 2010):

- The non-finite subject raises into the matrix clause for (nominative) case → nominative is reflected also on subordinate FQs.

- It leaves a trace (t) in the subject position of the embedded clause (≈ PRO).

(27) a. Иван хочет [t пойти домой один].   (Completive – new OC pattern)

   b. Иван задержался, чтобы [e пойти домой одному]. (Adjuncts – old pattern)

   c. Иван спросил, какие бумаги ему нужны, чтобы [его жене получить визу].

45

Summarizing: subjects in OR and the split in later Russian

		OR	MoR
Root (non-)finite subjects		NP / strong pronoun / NS	NP / weak pronoun / NS
Embedded (non)-finite subjects	No control	NP / strong pronoun / NS (any embedded clause)	NP / weak pronoun / NS (any finite clause and adjoined non-finite clauses)
	Control	?	trace (=PRO) (completive finite clauses under locality and some completive non-finite clauses)

Which is the source of overt non-finite dative subjects?

- Franks (1995): Russian root infinitives have a **[+tense] feature** which licenses dative case on overt subjects and related non-verbal predicates

- The corresponding φ-features perhaps inherited from C (Bailyn 2012, more generally Chomsky 2008), but they are there in any case:

(28) a. Дети приняли решение [e прийти одним]. (DAT.<u>PL</u>)

 b. [e Гулять ночью одной] очень опасно. (DAT.<u>FEM</u>)

→ If this is true for MoR, then in OR it also existed in embedded infinitive clauses, licensing dative case in them, too.

47

But diachronically there is a mysterious fact

- The loss of overt dative subjects in embedded infinitive clauses could not be due to a change in the ability of T to license case in general terms

    → root infinitives licensed (and still license) dative case

- So why should [+tense] be lost historically in embbeded infinitive clauses, if learners had sufficient evidence of the presence of overt dative pronouns / NPs in root infinitive contexts?   →→

4. The change and its implications for the analysis of referential NSs

Briefly on the change in the NS character of Russian

(Černyx 1954, Avanesov & Ivanov 1982, Ivanov 1990, Kibrik 2013, Lindseth 1998, Lomtev 1956, Meyer 2009, 2011, Migdalski 2013, Zaliznjak 2004)

1. Change in the tense system in Old Russian

1) OCS: tense-based verb system (present, perfect, aorist, imperfect, pluperfect…)

→ OR: aspect-based system (tenses: past, present, future).

1) One past form by 14th c. < old perfect = *l*-participle (gender, number) + present copula (person, number)

2. Present copula & past auxiliary lost

1) Loss of auxiliaries

   - 3rd p. auxiliary: completely lost by 13th c.

   - 1st/2nd p. auxiliary: completely lost by 15-16th c.

2) → Loss of V-to-T movement → Aux could not raise → extension of weak pronouns to satisfy EPP (Jung 2016)

(29) a. А <u>вы</u> <u>есте</u> вси хр(е)стъ <u>цѣловали</u>.   (*Hyp Chr.* 134, 13-14th c.)

   'You all swore on the cross.'

   b. А Дивея, государь, <u>яз</u> за себя не <u>суливал</u>.   (*Grjaznoj*, 16th c.)

   'Milord, I did not consider myself to be interchanged with Divey.'

3. **Emergence of weak overt pronouns in Middle Russian**

- Strong pronouns were dissociated from their emphatic function and spread (Eckhoff & Meyer 2011, Meyer 2011):

1) 1st/2nd subject strong pronouns (*ja(z), ty, my, vy*) became also weak (14-15th c.)

2) 3rd person pronoun created from demonstratives *onъ, ona, ono* for nominative case (*i, ja, je* for oblique cases); generalized in 16-17th c.

Summary: temporal sequence of the changes

in the NS pattern from OR to Middle Russian

When	Changes	
12th (or earlier)	Loss of 3rd p. auxiliary	Loss of tense distinctions
14-15th century	Extension of 1st/2nd p. weak pronoun	Loss of V to T movement
15-16th century	Loss of 1st/2nd auxiliaries	
16-17th century	Extension of onъ as 3rd p. weak pronoun	

- Diachronical asymmetries in NSs = synchronic asymmetries in MoR

    1) $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ vs. 3rd person

    2) root vs. embedded

- No phonological attrition of forms

- No impoverishment in person in present, future, imperative forms

- No historical correlation with loss of auxiliaries, very clearly in 3rd p.

- $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ p. weak pronouns precede loss of $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ p. auxiliaries

- No creation of new strong pronouns for $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ p., just the extension as weak of the existing ones

How OR stopped being a consistent NS-language

- OR displayed V-to-T movement

- 14-15th c: loss of V-to-T movement

→ Aux could not raise to T and check the EPP

→ reanalysis of 1/2nd person pronouns as (also) weak to satisfy EPP on T

- 15th c.: verbal auxiliaries were lost (maybe < redundancy of agreement)

- 16-17th c.: reanalysis of demonstrative *onъ* as 3rd p. pronoun (weak and strong) = Input Generalization of person feature after the change in 1st/2nd person?? (third-factor effect *à la* Biberauer & Roberts 2016)

- Topic drop (NS associated locally to C) arose by reanalysis of residual NSs as null topics in matrix clauses (Duguine & Madariaga in progress)

- PRO/trace arose as reanalysis of the existing NSs in embedded clauses (Madariaga 2015)

- It is not the loss of agreement what triggers loss of pro-drop (*pace* Müller 2006)

  - → loss of obligatory NSs <u>precedes</u> the loss of 1st/2nd person auxiliaries (Lomtev 1956, Zaliznjak 2004)

  - → In 3rd person, no overt weak pronoun and no Aux (only l-form = далъ) was the norm for some centuries (Zaliznjak 2004, Kibrik 2013)

56

Change in embedded contexts

(Madariaga 2011, 2018)

- By the 16th c.: from no control (30a) into Obligatory Control (30b) in infinitive clauses.

(by the time when the replacement of NSs by weak overt pronouns was completed in 1st/2nd p. and in progress for 3rd person)

(30) a.   Grammar 1: [NP$_i$ matrix-V [(NS / pronoun / NP)$_{i/j}$ V.inf]]

  b.   Grammar 2: [NP$_i$ matrix-V [t$_i$ V.inf]   (t ≈ PRO)

< motivated by the change in NSs in MR. HOW? →→

In OR: NS / overt dative subjects in embedded infinitive contexts = NS / overt nominative subjects in finite contexts, but later….

→ <u>NSs stopped being obligatory</u> in non-emphatic contexts < loss of obligatory NS = Russian stopped being a consistent NS-language

→ learners did not need or could not parse a NS in the subject gap of infinitive embedded clauses

→ they parsed the gap as the alternative null, a trace (≈PRO) < "movement preferred over pronominalization": Boeckx et al. (2010) →→

As a result, the MoR pattern:

(i) OC structures arose in embedded infinitive clauses (in complement position) (Я хочу прийти домой один)

(ii) adjoined embedded infinitive clauses (purpose clauses) did not fall under obligatory control and preserved the old pattern (Какие бумаги нужно собрать, чтобы моей жене получить визу?)

(iii) the newly created finite CPs (with что, чтобы) generalized as embedded clauses in complement function: most of them also fall under control when correferennt (Он сказал, что (#он) придет.)

Implications for the hypotheses on NSs

The diachronic data in Russian support hypothesis (A)

1. <u>All embedded NSs (finite and non-finite) were related diachronically:</u>

   > The subject gap competed with the other 'null' (PRO / trace)

   > control emerged in both finite and non-finite contexts

2. <u>In consistent NS-languages (OR):</u>

- NS could not just be rich agreement, but some real element in subject position, containing φ-features and case (nominative in finite contexts, and dative in non-finite)

- It was NOT the loss of agreement that triggered loss of obligatory NS

60

3. <u>Diachronic role of the Avoid Pronoun Principle:</u> the change from consistent into partial-NS must be characterized from the point of view of the (non-)obligatory insertion of NSs (not its availability)

→ The ability of infinitives to license dative case did not change (was maintained in root clauses)

→ NSs were not completely lost in the language

→ The only cue that changed for learners was <u>the loss of obligatoriness of NS with continuous A-topics (cf. Avoid Pronoun Principle)</u> → and this was precisely the cue triggering control in embedded structures

4. <u>pro-drop is not homogeneous</u>, but the interplay of a set of properties (Duguine 2013, 2014), interacting with other phenomena, such as control.

61

REFERENCES

Andersen, H. 1970. The dative of subordination in Baltic and Slavic. Baltic Linguistics: 1-9.

Avanesov R. I. & Ivanov, V. V. 1982. Istoriceskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Nauka, Moskva.

Bailyn, J. 2012. The Syntax of Russian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barbosa, P. 2009 Two kinds of subject pro. Studia Linguistica 63-1. 2-58.

Barbosa, P. 2013 Partial pro-drop as null NP-anaphora. In Y. Fainleib, N. Lacara, & Y. Park (Eds.) Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the NELS, 71-85.

Biberauer, T. 2018. Pro-drop and emergent parameter hierarchies. In Jan Casalicchio & Federica Cognola (eds.) Null Subjects in Generative Grammar. A synchronic and diachronic perspective. OUP, 94-135.

Biberauer. T. & I. Roberts. 2016. Parameter setting. In. Ledgeway, A. & I. Roberts, eds. The Cambridge handbook of historical syntax. Cambridge University Press.

Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein & J. Nunes. 2010. Control as Movement. Cambridge University Press.

Borer, H. 1986. The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics. Academic Press.

Borkovskij, V. I. 1978 Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: sintaksis - prostoe predloženie, M.

Cardinaletti, 1997. Agreement and control in expletive constructions. Linguistic Inquiry 28: 521-533

Černyx, P. Ja. 1954. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Nauka, Moskva.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 136-166.

Claudi, Tommaso. 2014. The status of subject pronouns in Old Russian. A diachronic analysis. MA thesis, University of Pavia.

Cognola, Federica & Jan Casalicchio. 2018. On the null-subject phenomenon. In Jan Casalicchio & Federica Cognola (eds.) *Null Subjects in Generative Grammar. A synchronic and diachronic perspective*. OUP, 1-28.

Duguine, M. 2013. Null arguments and cross-linguistic variation: a minimalist analysis of pro-drop. PhD diss., University of the Basque Country & Université de Nantes.

Duguine, Maia. 2014. Argument ellipsis: a unitary approach to pro-drop. The Linguistic Review 31: 515–550.

Duguine, Maia & Nerea Madariaga. In progress. Partial Null Subject languages in diachrony. Ms. University of the Basque Country – CNRS-IKER.

Eckhoff, H. & R. Meyer. 2011. Conditions on Null Subjects in Old Church Slavonic, a Contrastive View. Presentation ICHL, Osaka.

Frascarelli, Mara. 2007. Subjects, topics and the interpretation of referential pro. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 25: 691–734.

Frascarelli, Mara. 2018. The interpretation of pro in consistent and partial null subject languages: A comparative interface analysis. In Jan Casalicchio & Federica Cognola (eds.) Null Subjects in Generative Grammar. A synchronic and diachronic perspective. OUP, 211-239.

Franks, S. 1995. Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax, Oxford University Press.

Gribanova, Vera. 2013. Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis and the structure of the Russian verbal complex. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 31(1): 91–136.

Harley & Ritter 2002. 'Person and Number in Pronouns: A feature-geometric analysis. Language 8: 482–526.

Holmberg, A. 2005. Is There a Little Pro? Evidence from Finnish. Linguistic Inquiry 36: 533-564.

Holmberg, A., A. Nayudu & M. Sheehan. 2009. Three partial null-subject languages: a comparison of Brazilian Portuguese, Finnish and Marathi. Studia Linguistica 63: 59-97.

Hornstein, N. 1999. On Control. Linguistic Inquiry 30/1: 69-96.

Ivanov, V. V. 1990. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Prosveščenie, Moskva.

Jung, H. 2016. Null subjects and person in Old North Russian. Ms. Seoul National University.

Kibrik, A. A. 2013. Peculiarities and origins of the Russian referential system. In D. Bakker & M. Haspelmath (ed.) *Languages across boundaries: studies in memory of Anna Siewierska*. De Gruyter, 227-262.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1995. Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), Clause structure and language change. Oxford U Press.

Landau, I. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 22:811-877.

Lightfoot, D. (2017). Nothing makes sense in syntax except in the light of change. In Language, syntax, and the natural sciences, ed. Gallego, Á. and Martin, R. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lindseth, M. 1998. Null-subject properties of Slavic languages: with special reference to Russian, Czech and Sorbian. Otto Sagner.

Livitz, I. 2014. Deriving silence through internal reference: focus on pronouns. Ph.D. Dissertation New York University.

Lomtev, T. P. 1956 Očerki po istoričeskomu sintaksisu russkogo jazyka. Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, Moskva.

Luraghi, S. & E. Pinelli. 2015. The loss of referential null subjects in Russian: can subordinate clauses can tell us. Presentation at the conference on Slavic Corpus Linguistics. Tromso, April 2015.

Madariaga, N. 2011. Infinitive clauses and dative subjects in Russian. Russian Linguistics 35: 301-29.

Madariaga, N. 2015. The decline of non-finiteness as a syntactic mechanism of embedding in East Slavic. Journal of Historical Linguistics 5(1): 139-174.

Madariaga, N. 2017. Understanding Grammars through Diachronic Change. Frontiers in Psychology (Language Sciences), 8/1226, 2017.

Madariaga, N. 2018. Diachronic change and the nature of pronominal null subjects: the case of Russian. In Jan Casalicchio & Federica Cognola (eds.) *Null Subjects in Generative Grammar. A synchronic and diachronic perspective*. OUP, 171-98.

Manzini M. Rita & Anna Roussou. 1999. A minimalist theory of A-movement and control. UCL Working Papers in Linguistics 11: 403-440. University College London.

McShane, M. 2005. A Theory of Ellipsis. Oxford U Press.

Meyer, R. 2009. Zur Geschichte des referentiallen Nullsubjekts im Russischen. Zeitschrift für Slawistik 54: 375-97.

Migdalski, K. 2013. Diachronic source of two cliticization patterns in Slavic. In Challenging Clitics, ed. C.M. Salvesen & H.P. Helland, 135-158. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Müller, G. 2006. Pro-drop and impoverishment. In: P. Brandt & E. Fuß (eds.), Form, Structure, and Grammar. A Festschrift presented to Günther Grewendorf, 93-115. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Newmeyer, F. 2005. Against a Parameter-setting approach to language variation. Linguistic Variation Yearbook 4: 181–234.

Nunes, J. 2010. A Note on Wh-islands and Finite Control in Brazilian Portuguese. Estudos da Língua 8.2: 79-103.

Platzack, Christer. 2004. Agreement and the person phrase hypothesis. Working papers in Scandinavian syntax 73. University of Lund.

Rizzi, L. 1982. Issues in Italian Syntax. Dordrecht: Foris.

Roberts, I. 2010. A Deletion Analysis of Null Subjects. In: T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts and M. Sheehan (eds.) Null Subjects: the structure of parametric variation, CUP.

Roberts, I. 2012. Macroparameters and minimalism: A programme for comparative research. In Parameter theory and linguistic change, ed. Galves, C., Cyrino, S., Lopes, R., Sandalo F., and Avelar, J. (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 320-335.

Roberts, I. & A. Holmberg. 2010. Introduction: parameters in minimalist theory. T. Biberauer et alii (eds.) Null Subjects: the structure of parametric variation, Cambridge U Press, 1-57.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2018. On the difference between exhaustive and partial control. In Jan Casalicchio & Federica Cognola (eds.) *Null Subjects in Generative Grammar. A synchronic and diachronic perspective*. OUP, 141-170.

Sigurðsson, H. A. 2011. Conditions on argument pro-drop. Linguistic Inquiry 42.2: 267-304.

Tsedryk, E. 2013. Internal Merge of nominative subjects and pro-drop in Russian. Proceedings of the 2013 CLA conference. http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2013/actes2013.html

Timberlake, Alan. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. Cambridge University Press.

Walkden, G. 2012. Walkden, George. 2012. Refining the 'null argument cycle': the place of partial null argument languages. Paper presented at the 14th International Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference, Lisbon, July 2012.

Zaliznjak, A. A. 2004. Drevnenovgorodskij dialect. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

СПАСИБО!

THANK YOU!

MILA ESKER!