

On emergence conditions of mirative clauses

Łukasz Jędrzejowski (University of Cologne, Germany)

l.jedrzejowski@uni-koeln.de

Introduction Usually, purpose clauses do not develop into further grammatical elements. In "World Lexicon of Grammaticalization", Heine & Kuteva (2002) point out only two possible development paths. Accordingly, purpose markers can develop into i) infinitive markers or ii) causal markers. The main aim of this talk is to add another development path. Mainly, I argue that purpose clauses (= PCs) can also develop into mirative clauses (= MCs) (cf. DeLancey 1997, 2012).
Phenomenon Compare the following two sentences from Modern English:

[1] *John is moving to Germany to learn German.*

[2] *John worked on the research project all summer, (only) to complete it within days of the deadline.* (Whelpton 2001: 313, ex 5)

What [1] and [2] have in common are: a) the adjunct clause status, b) the infinitive in the embedded clause, c) subject control, d) future orientation of the embedded event with respect to the matrix predication. Though, both clauses differ in meaning. Whereas in [1] the embedded clause is analyzed as a purpose clause (= PC), its counterpart in [2] has been referred to either as a prospective (cf. Leys 1971, 1998 and Pauly 2013a,b for Dutch and German) or as a telic clause (cf. Whelpton 1995, 2001 for English). In this talk I provide evidence showing that examples like in [2] should be analyzed as MCs marking information which is surprising/unexpected to the speaker.
Diachronic analysis To my knowledge, diachronic studies dealing with how MCs emerge are missing. I argue that i) MCs develop out of PCs, and ii) MCs emerge due to a temporal presupposition accommodation. In order to reanalyze the development of MCs, distinct features in the clause that contribute to evoking a mirative interpretation are needed. Correspondingly, I postulate: a) intentionality, b) target-directedness, and c) hypothetical result state (cf. Schmidtke-Bode 2009). As for PCs, the matrix verbal situation is performed with the intention of bringing about another situation, that of the purpose. No such intentionality can be observed with regard to MCs. They rather express a sequence of two events, whereby the following event appears to be surprising/unexpected. PCs are always target-oriented. MCs, in turn, lack this property altogether. In addition, as for PCs there is no necessity for the desired result to come about, as not every intention is successfully realized by action. MCs, on the other hand, presuppose the veridicality of the embedded proposition. I assume the loss of the features given in a)-c) to have paved the way for the development of MCs. What all these differences pointed out above boil down to is a change of PCs taking a circumstantial modal base and a teleological conversational background to MCs being evaluated against a doxastic modal base and taking a realistic conversational background. Concretely, circumstantial modal base concerns what is possible or necessary given a particular set of circumstances; in case of PCs, one has to consider what is possible or necessary for achieving a particular goal (intentionality + target-directedness). However, this particular goal (e.g. learning German in [1]) can be achieved iff q is true in a possible world, too, establishing a temporal relationship between p and q . Accordingly, the event time of p , t , has to follow the event time of q , t_1 . I argue that this temporal relationship has been incorporated into the compositional meaning of MCs, leading to syntactic constraints and to a change of interpretative effects, as no hypothetical result state is involved anymore. Following this line of reasoning, uttering an MC the speaker believes that p is true (cf. Lauer 2013), resulting in a doxastic modal base. As the content of an MC cannot be denied, a realistic conversational background is required to pick out every possible world containing a set of propositions that are true in such a world.

References

- DeLancey, Scott (1997): Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1(1): 33-52.
- DeLancey, Scott (2012): Still mirative after these years. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3): 529-564.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva (2002): *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Leys, Odo (1971): Die Präpositionalinfinitive im Deutschen. Einige Beobachtungen. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 60(1): 1-56.
- Lauer, Sven (2013): *Towards a Dynamic Pragmatics*. PhD thesis, Stanford University.
- Leys, Odo (1998): Prospektives *um*. *Deutsche Sprache* 16: 97-102.
- Pauly, Dennis (2013a): *Grenzfälle der Subordination: Merkmale, Empirie und Theorie abhängiger Nebensätze*. PhD thesis, Universität Potsdam.
- Pauly, Dennis (2013b): Prospective *um*-clauses as syntactically unintegrated clauses. *Proceedings of ConSOLE XX, 2012*, 169-184. Leipzig.
- Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten (2009): *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Whelpton, Matthew (1995): *The Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives of Result in English*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford.
- Whelpton, Matthew (2001): Elucidation of a telic infinitive. *Journal of Linguistics* 37(2): 313-337.