

This work is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research of Japan Society for Promotion of Science No.24520556

[1]. Introduction: Two claims:

- ①First, the notion of subject is not universal; ‘subject’ is not necessarily a priori.
- ②Second, in English subject or rather syntactic subject-requirement emerged as the result of a functional category emergence of T. Before this TP emergence, TP-related syntactic phenomena are not observed in earlier English.

[2] Is subject universal?

2.1. Introduction

Keenan’s (1976, 321) subject property list: three groups, semantic, morphological, and syntactic.

2.2. Is subject a semantic necessity?

●Subject is a semantic necessity, that is, subject is equated with the thematic role agent, or volitive actor, and is semantically necessary.

☛In many sentences there is no agent, for example, *John is tall*.

2.3. Morphological definition

●subject-verb agreement

☛In many languages verbs agree with no NP e.g. Chinese, Japanese and so on.

☛In many languages verbs agree with NPs in addition to subjects, e.g. Basque, Hungarian, and Georgian, etc.

☛In a few languages verbs may agree with objects.

2.4. Case marking

●the association of nominative case with subject

☛nominative case marking is used for a complement of a copula verb : *It is I*.

☛multiple functions of nominative case marking (i.e. *-ga*) in Japanese: subject, possessor of a subject, adjunct, the object of a stative predicate (Vermeulen 2002):

(1)possessor:

Usagi-ga/wa	mimi-ga	naga-i.
rabbit-Nom.	ear-Nom	long-Pres.

(Takahasi 1994: 395)

(2) adjunct:

Ano	jiko-ga	nihonjin-ga	takusan	sin-da
that	accident -Nom.	Japanese-Nom.	many	die-Past

‘It was that accident in which many Japanese people died.’ (Tateishi 1994: 21)

(3) Stative Construction:

John-ga	nihongo-ga	waka-ru.
John-Nom.	Japanese-Nom.	understand-Non-past.

‘John understands Japanese.’ (Takezawa: 1987: 24)

- No functional categories C and D, and T/I in Japanese (Fukui 1995)
- In the Minimalist approach, the relation between EPP and nominative case is obscured and EPP is dissociated from the notion of structural case and/or agreement (cf. Chomsky 1995: 282).

(4) John-Nom. America-to to go
 For John to go to America

3. EPP puzzle

Despite the difficulty of defining subjecthood, in the clause structure subjects seem to have an outstanding position as compared with other arguments.

- the Extended Projection Principle (EPP): the requirement that clauses have a subject.

☛ The EPP is described as “mysterious” (Chomsky 2008: 156).

☛ Japanese has no EPP, no expletives

(5) .a. Totemo samu-i-ne

 Very cold –non.past-f.particle ‘It is cold, isn’t it?’

 b. Kinoo doko-e it-ta?

 yesterday where-to go-past ‘Where did you go yesterday?’

☛ The EPP should be removed from Universal Grammar (cf. Grohmann et al. 2000; Bever 2009).

- expletive subjects without semantic content

(6) a. It is raining./ b. There lived a king in this castle.

- Chomsky (1995) EPP : a universally present strong D feature of T;

 Chomsky (2000, 2001): a feature requiring an overt element in the Spec position of a functional projection T.

☛ The EPP cannot be given a grammatical account and rather should be understood as part of a more general theory of learning (Bever 2009).

4. No EPP in Old English

4.1. Lexical-thematic Nature of Old English

- no functional categories such as DP, or TP, but only lexical categories (N, V, A, P or only content words) and their phrasal projections (NP, VP, AP, PP). See Abney (1987) and Radford (1990). Every constituent must be thematically related. This means that only arguments which are required by the meaning of a predicate must be syntactically realized (cf. Osawa 2003; 2007; 2009).

- a case system is thematically motivated: morphological case is assigned to thematically associated NPs only. (cf. Plank 1983: 255, Denison 1993: 18-19).

4.2. The absence of syntactic evidence for the presence of functional categories, esp. TP

- In PDE the presence of TP is responsible for many syntactic effects such as:

i) Nominative case assignment / checking to the subject

ii) *do*-support

iii) other auxiliaries

iv) separation of Tense, that is, TP is separated from VP.

v) subject requirement or EPP

- No auxiliaries in Old English

(7) Canst þu temian hig (Ælfric’s Colloquy 31/129)
 know you tame them ‘Know you how to tame them?’

- (8) Ic ne secge
I not say 'I do not say'

5. Impersonal constructions

5.1. Introduction

- (9) Siððan him hingrode (Ælfric Hom. I 166.12)
afterwards him (dative) hungered
'afterwards he hungered'

- (10) norþan sniwde
'it snowed from the north' (Seafarer 31)

5.2. What are impersonal constructions?

● There is no agreement between the predicate verb and nominal elements in number and person.

● reanalysis story: Non-subject NPs of impersonal constructions were reanalysed as subjects under the pressure of the fixed SVO word order (cf. van der Gaaf 1904; Jespersen 1927 Lightfoot (1979)).

- ☛ (11) þu eart sunu min leof, on þe ic well licade
you are son my love in whom I-nom. well liked
'You are my dear son whom I liked much.'

6 My proposal

☛ I claim that in impersonal constructions, sentences subjects simply did not exist in a given argument structure from the beginning. In (10), this clause structure is normal, self-sufficient structure, in which all necessary items are provided to convey the meaning. This also explains the origin of the impersonal constructions in which subjects are not expressed.

● semantics of impersonal verbs: the impersonal construction expresses a situation in which a human being if any is unvolitionally/unself-controllably involved. As McCawley (1976) suggests, That is to say, there is no agent who is to receive the nominative case, if we assume that there is motivated relation between thematic roles of arguments and their morphological case.

● Weather verbs like *snow*, or *rain*, etc. are the most typical examples.

- (12) i. non-intentional sensory and mental expressions

þyncan 'seem', mætan 'dream'

ii. emotional experiences

eglian 'be in trouble', hreowan 'feel sorrow'

iii. physical and biological experiences

hyngrian 'be hungry', þyrstan 'be thirsty'

iv. need/duty/obligation

neden 'be necessary'

v. (inalienable) possession/existence

laken 'be wanting'

vi. happenstance

gebyrian 'happen'

(McCawley 1976, 194)

● The requirement that all clauses should have a subject is a later development, due to the emergent TP, or due to the EPP-feature (cf. Chomsky 2005, 2008).

(14) him næs getiðod ðære lytlan lisse
him-Dat. not was granted that-Gen. small favour-Gen.

(18) I believed him to have stolen my money.

(20) Unaccusative verb [IP I [VP | [V' V NP]]] : *arrive, break, fall*.

Even in PDE, there is a question of why transitive expletive constructions are not allowed:

(26) a. A man appeared.

b. There appeared a man.

(27) a. Someone ate apples.

b. *There someone ate apples.

[9] Pāṇini's Kāraka theory,

● Subject, where are you from?

Drawing on Pāṇini's Kāraka theory, I claim that the nominative marked NP was originally something like adjunct outside the projection of V, although tentatively.

● In Sanskrit, which is hypothesized to be another completely lexical-thematic language on my hypothesis, there were strong correlations between morphological case and semantic roles of NPs which were called *karaka*.

● The *karakas*: semantically defined notions or deep cases in Fillmore's (1968) sense, or rather close to the thematic roles.

● six or seven *karakas*: they are semantically defined as *kartr* (agent), *karma* (the target of the action), *karana* (the means), *sampradana* (the recipient, etc.), *adhikarana* (the locus of the action), *apadana* (the starting point) and *hetu* (the causative agent).

● These *karakas* are morphologically realized as *vibhakti* (case forms). *vibhakti*:, *karma* by *dvitiya* (accusative), *karana* by *tritiya* (instrumental), *sampradana* by *caturthi* (dative) *adhikarana* by *saptami* (locative), *apadana* by *pancami* (ablative).

● The *kartr* (agent) is primarily represented by the instrumental case *tritiya*.

● Nominative case in Sanskrit, i.e. *prathama*, is the unmarked, neutral case, which is not related to any particular *karaka* (thematic role). The nominative-marked NP is outside the projection of V.

In Sanskrit clauses, the most closely related *karaka* to a predicate verb is usually not expressed explicitly. This *karaka* is the most closely related participant in the action or event described by a predicate verb. This primary *karaka* does not need to be expressed as the NP argument, since it is already expressed by the affix attached to the verb. See Thieme (1956, 2).

(28) (devadattah) odanam pac-a-ti
(Devadattah (Nom.)) ricegruel (Acc.) cooks (active)

(The parenthesis means this is an optional element.)

[10] Concluding remarks

Old English is different from Sanskrit, and much younger language: it is very difficult to prove that Old English is a purely, lexical-thematic language, still, its lexical-thematic nature is well attested in the limited development of functional categories. The EPP in PDE appeared due to the emergent TP in English. Before the emergence of TP, they are not observed in languages. Thus, the subject phenomenon is a good example of parameterized functional category systems and the resultant language variation.

Selected References

Abney, Steven P. (1987) *The English Noun Phrase in Its Sentential Aspect*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Bever, Thomas G. (2009) "Remarks on the Individual Basis for Linguistic Structures," In Piatelli- Palmarini

- Massimo, et al. (ed.) *Of Minds and Language: A Dialogue with Noam Chomsky in the Basque Country*. 278-298. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Breivik, Leiv. Egil (1983) *Existential There: A Synchronic and Diachronic Study*. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Burzio, Luigi (1986) *Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht:Reidel.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2000) "Minimalists Inquiries: The Framework." In Roger Martin, et al. (ed.) *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, (ed.) 89- 155. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2001) "Derivation by Phase," In Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1- 54. Cambridge, MA.:MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2005) "Three Factors in Language Design." *Linguistic Inquiry*. 36:1-22.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2008) "On Phases," *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133- 166, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Denison, David (1993) *English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions*, Longman, London and New York.
- Earle, John and Charles Plummer eds. (1892-1899) *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel: With Supplementary Extracts from the Others*, Clarendon, Oxford.
- Fillmore, Charles, J. (1968) "The Case for Case". In E. Bach and R. T. Harms. (eds.) *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1-88.
- Fukui, Naoki (1995) *Theory of Projection in Syntax*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Gaaf, van der (1904) *The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Constructions in the Middle English*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Gelderen, Elly van (1993) *The Rise of Functional Categories*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Gelderen, Elly van (2004) *Grammaticalization as Economy*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Gordon, Ida. ed. (1960) *The Seafarer*, Methuen, London.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. John Drury, and Juan Carlo Castillo (2000) "No More EPP," *WCCFL Proceedings*, (ed.) Billerey and Lillehaugen, 153- 166.
- Jespersen, Otto. (1927) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Part III*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Keenan, Edward, L. (1976) Towards a Universal Definition of "Subject", In Charles, N.Li (eds.) *Subject and Topic*, New York and London: Academic Press, 303- 333.
- Klaeber, Frederick ed. (1950) *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, Heath, Lexington.
- Krapp, George, Philip and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie eds. (1931-1953) *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records: A Collective Edition*, 6 vols. Columbia University Press, New York and London.
- Lightfoot, David (1979) *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- McCawley, Noriko A. (1976) 'From OE/ME "impersonal" to "personal" constructions: what is a "subject-less" S?', In Steever, S.B. et.al. (eds.) 192-204.
- Ohkado, Masayuki (1998) "On Subject Extraposition Constructions in the History of English." *Studies in Modern English*, 14. 53-78.
- Osawa, Fuyo (2003) "Syntactic Parallels between Ontogeny and Phylogeny," *Lingua* 113, 3-47.
- Osawa, Fuyo. (2007). "The Emergence of DP from a Perspective of Ontogeny and Phylogeny: Correlation between DP, TP and Aspect in Old English and First Language Acquisition." *Nominal Determination: Typology, Context Constraints, and Historical Emergence*. ed. by Elisabeth Stark, Elisabeth Leiss and

- Werner Abraham, 311-337, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Osawa, Fuyo (2009) "The Emergence of Functional Categories in the History of English," *English Linguistics* 26, 411-436.
- Plank, Frans (1981) "Object Cases in Old English: What Do They Encode? A Contribution to a General Theory of Case and Grammatical Relations," Ms. Englisches Seminar, Universität Hannover, 1-67.
- Plank, Frans (1983) "Coming into Being among the Anglo-Saxons: *Current Topics in English Historical Linguistics*," ed. by Michael Davenport, Erik Hansen and Hans Frede Nielsen, 239-278, Odense University Press, Odense.
- Radford, Andrew (1990) *Syntactic Theory and the Acquisition of English Syntax*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Radford, Andrew (2004) *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the Structure of English*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sweet, Henry ed. (1871) *King Alfred's West Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. EETS.
- Takahasi, Chioko. (1994) "Case, Agreement, and Multiple Subjects: Subjectivization in Syntax and LF," in Akatuka, Noriko (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4, Stanford, CSLI. 394- 411.
- Takezawa, Koichi (1987) *A Configurational Approach to Case- Marking in Japanese*, Ph.D. Disseration, University of Washington.
- Tateishi, Koichi (1994) *The Syntax of 'Subjects*, Stanford: CSLI.
- Thorpe, Benjamin ed. (1844) *The Sermones Catholici or Homilies of Ælfric* , Ælfric Society, London.
- Vermeulen , Reiko (2002) "Ga ga Constructions in Japanese," *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 14. 417-456.