**Subject properties in change – The case of Russian**

The purpose of the study is to describe and to explain the change of the syntactic behavior of the first arguments in the history of Russian.

The synchronic description is based on the discussion of the syntactic properties proposed in order to identify subjects in Modern Russian, namely coordination reduction, binding of reflexives, control of the **PRO** reference in the embedded infinitive clauses with *chtoby*, no control of **pro** in the final finite constructions with *chtoby* and control of the **PRO**-reference in the adverbial participles. (cf. Moore&Perlmutter 2000, Keenan1976, Sigurðsson 2002, Testelec 2001).

While recent synchronic studies on the subject have provided detailed descriptions of syntactic patterns, little attention has been paid to the diachronic aspects of the phenomena in question. Thus, the present study pursues two goals. On the one hand, it describes how the first arguments behaved in the Old Russian, opening the discussion, "what did it take to be the Old Russian subject"[1]. In fact, the first results let us confirm that we need a modified cluster of criteria in order to describe the behavior of the syntactic arguments diachronically (Grillborzer 2014). Therefore, the Russian subjects obtained a part of their present properties in the Middle Russian period, as a result of several constructional changes, such as the significant loss of the overt subjects of the not-finite clauses and the establishment of the control relation between the arguments of the matrix clause and the covert syntactic subject PRO of the not-finite clause (ibid.). Madariaga (2011) traced the change from No Control to Obligatory Control in the subordinate non-finite clauses and the consequent loss of overt dative subjects in these constructions to the loss of pro-drop in the history of Russian[2].

Understanding the relationship between the development of the subject properties and the syntactic change requires broadening the view beyond the diachronic varieties of Russian. The comparative analysis of the behavior of the subjects (as well as its diachronic aspect) in such Slavic pro-drop languages as Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Bulgarian constitutes the second focal point of the present study und will allow us to gain a better comprehension of how the diachronic constructional change results in the change of syntactic properties of the first argument.

References:

Borkovskij, V. I. 1968. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij sintaksis vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov*. Členy predloženija. Moskva.

Grillborzer, Ch. 2014. *Sintaksis Konstrukcij s Pervym Datel'nym Aktantom – Sinchronnyj i Diachronnyj Analiz,* Ph.D. Thesis, Regensburg University.

---

[1] Motivated by "What does it take to be a dative subject" by Moore&Perlmutter (2000).
[2] The frequency of overt non-stressed non-emphatic personal pronouns increased slowly since the 13th century. They became obligatory by the 16th century (Borkovskij 1968).

Keenan, E. 1976. Towards a universal definition of 'subject'. Eds. Li, Ch. N., Thompson, S. *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press. 303–33.

Madariaga, N. 2011. Infinitive clauses and dative subjects in Russian. *Russian Linguistics 35/3*. 301-329

Meyer, R. 2011. *The history of null subject in North Slavonic*. Habilitation thesis. University of Regensburg.

Moore, J, Perlmutter, D. 2000. What Does It Take to Be a Dative Subject? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 18*. 373–416.

Sigurđsson, H. Á. 2002. To Be an Oblique Subject: Russian vs. Icelandic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 20*. 691–650.

Testelec, J. G. 2001. *Vvedenie v obščij sintaksis*. Izdatel'stvo RGGU, Moskva.