

New Insights into the Syntax and Semantics of Complementation

Convenors: Łukasz Jędrzejowski (ZAS, Berlin & University of Potsdam)
Mathias Schenner (ZAS, Berlin)
Kerstin Schwabe (ZAS, Berlin)

Date: 5 August 2013 (Monday)

Workshop description

The purpose of the workshop is to examine the diachronic origin and change of complementation structures within a language as well as across languages. In general, we would like to discuss how the emergence and change of different clause types/forms result in different clause-embedding predicate classes. Additionally, we would also like to pay closer attention to how semantic change of clause-embedding predicates may give rise to or prohibit (new) embedded complement types.

The issues we would like to address include, but are not limited to, the following ones:

Possible source constructions and their core properties

(i) One well-known pattern refers to clauses like *this is what X said* that may develop into a quotation marker and further into a complementizer, as documented, for example, by Frajzyngier (1984) in English-based creoles or Chappell (2008) in Sinitic languages. (ii) Adverbial subordinators are another common source for complementizers. Deutscher (2000), for example, tracks the development of *kīma* in Akkadian from a (temporal and causal) adverbial subordinator to a complementizer. In both cases, we would like to ask: Which semantic properties of the source construction facilitate (or are even required for) its development into a complementation structure? One natural candidate in the adverbial case seems to be factivity: Factivity provides a natural bridge from factive adverbial clauses (e.g. causal clauses) to complement clauses of factive matrix predicates. (iii) In German, temporal as well as causal adverbials may turn into complements (1a,b):

(1a) *Max leidet, [weil Lea krank ist] because-clause*
Max suffers because Lea ill is
'Max is suffering because Lea is ill.'

(1b) *Max leidet darunter_i [dass Lea krank ist]_i that-clause*
Max suffers PREP.COR that Lea ill is
'Max is suffering from the fact that Lea is ill.'

Questions in this connection are: What kinds of adverbial clauses are suitable for becoming complements of predicates and what predicates facilitate this process? What role do (prepositional) correlates play? What determines the emergence of (prepositional) correlates (Axel-Tober 2012) and what are the reasons of their vanishing w.r.t. English embedded declaratives? What are the source constructions of

non-factive predicates like, for instance, *consider*, *assume*, and *believe*? What are the reasons for different argument linking as for instance w.r.t. *es* vs. *darin glauben*?

Common properties of complementation and pre-complementation structures

These properties play a key role during any grammaticalization process when constructions are ambiguous between their source and target structures. As for the Akkadian *kīma* and its process of semantic bleaching, Deutscher shows that the causal adverbials (sources) and the complementation (target) construals are equally available:

(2) He complained to the governor *kīma* (= because/that) the barley was not collected.

It is clear that the semantics of the clause-embedding predicate (here: *complain*) plays a decisive role in this process. The general question here is: Which (semantic properties of) potential clause-embedding predicates provide adequate bridging contexts for which source constructions? To what extent can these changes and their syntactic consequences be accounted for in terms of semantic reanalysis (Eckardt 2006)?

Distinguishing properties of embedding and pre-embedding structures?

Furthermore we are interested in figuring out whether the target structure of a grammaticalization process is really a case of complementation or rather a more general type of embedding? Here we are looking for clear-cut syntactic and semantic tests that decide on the embedding type of the new construction. Interesting insights in this topic give negative matrix predicates (Iyeri 2010 for English). If their negation operator takes scope over another clause, the latter cannot be an independent assertion. Another test is related to binding. If a quantifier in one clause binds pronouns in another one, the latter is a promising candidate for subordination.

Inventories of clause-embedding predicates: expansion, consistency, reduction

While in Old High German (750-1050) – the oldest period of German, about 200 infinitive-embedding predicates can be attested (Demske 2001), Modern German possesses over 1300 predicates selecting infinitives. Here, the following questions arise: How do inventories of clause-embedding predicates change over time? What triggers these changes? Does it have any effects on the Left Edge of subordinate clauses (Force, Topic/Focus, complementizers) or perhaps even on the whole dependent clause? Are there systematic effects on the semantics of clause-embedding predicates when the categorical status of their complements develops from infinitive to finite clauses and vice versa? In what way does the morphological make-up of a particular clause-embedding predicate affect embedding possibilities (e.g. in German: *reuen* vs. *gereuen* vs. *bereuen*)? What are the conditions under which, for instance, prefix verbs (Leopold 1907), particle verbs (Stiebels & Wunderlich 1994) and sound emission predicates (Goschler 2011) emerge as clause-embedding predicates? Are there any languages that have reduced their inventory of embedding predicates?

Main Clause Phenomena and their distribution in the Diachronic Syntax

Following the seminal works by Emonds (1976) and Hooper & Thompson (1973), (M)ain (C)lause (P)henomena are assumed to be limited to main clauses and a restricted set of embedded clauses (see Heycock 2006 and Aelbrecht et al. 2012 for a general overview). One issue which immediately arises here and which has been picked up in the literature so far pertains to the Verb Second Phenomenon. In this connection, we address the following questions: What are the emergence circumstances of attested Verb Second Patterns, i.e. dependent V2 clauses in West-Germanic languages (Meinunger 2004), embedded *that*-clauses in Scandinavian languages (Wiklund et al. 2009) or second-position auxiliary clitics in selected Slavonic languages (Migdalski 2010)? What role do assertion, negation, factivity, illocutionary force, clause type, discourse particles play? What might be the prerequisite for the development of the Verb Second Patterns in general? Are there any other MCP occurring in the oldest periods of other languages?

The aim of the workshop is thus to bring together scholars dealing with different complementation cycles from a diachronic perspective. In particular, we invite contributions showing to what extent the attested changes have affected the present-day complementation systems and how they can be accounted for in various theoretical approaches.

References:

- Aelbrecht, Lobke / Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (2012): Main Clause Phenomena and the privilege of the root, in: *Main Clause Phenomena. New Horizons* ed. by Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye. (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 190). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1-19.
- Axel-Tober, Katrin (2012): *(Nicht-)kanonische Nebensätze im Deutschen. Synchrone und diachrone Aspekte*. (Linguistische Arbeiten 542). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Chappell, Hilary (2008): Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from verba dicendi in Sinitic languages, in: *Linguistic Typology* 12: 45-98.
- Demske, Ulrike (2001): Zur Distribution von Infinitivkomplementen im Althochdeutschen, in: *Modalität und Modalverben im Deutschen* ed. by Reimar Müller & Marga Reis. (Sonderheft Linguistische Berichte 9). Hamburg: Buske, pp. 61-86.
- Deutscher, Guy (2000): *Syntactic Change in Akkadian: The Evolution of Sentential Complementation*. Oxford University Press.
- Eckardt, Regine (2006): *Meaning Change in Grammaticalization. An Enquiry into Semantic Reanalysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emonds, Joseph (1976): *A transformational approach to English syntax. Root, structure-preserving, and local transformations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt (1984): On the origin of *say* and *se* as complementizers in Black English and English based Creoles, in: *American Speech* 53: 207-210.
- Goschler, Juliana (2011): Geräuschverben mit direktonaler Erweiterung: Syntax, Semantik und Gebrauch, in: *Konstruktionsgrammatik III: Von der Theorie zur Anwendung* ed. by Alexander Lasch & Alexander Ziem. (Stauffenburg Linguistik 58). Tübingen: Stauffenburg, pp. 29-43.
- Heycock, Caroline (2006): Embedded root phenomena, in: *Blackwell Companion to Syntax* ed. by Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk. (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics 19). Volume II, Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 174-209.
- Hooper, Joan & Sandra Thompson (1973): On the applicability of Root Transformations, in: *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465-491.

- Iyeri, Yoko (2010): *Verbs of Implicit Negation and their Complements in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Leopold, Max (1907): *Die Vorsilbe ver- und ihre Geschichte*. Hildesheim • New York: Georg Olms.
- Meinunger, André (2004): Verb position, verbal mood and the anchoring (potential) of sentences, in: *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery* ed. by Horst Lohnstein & Susanne Trissler. (Interface Explorations 9). Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 313-341.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof (2010): On the relation between V2 and second position cliticization, in: *Lingua* 120: 329-353.
- Stiebels, Barbara & Dieter Wunderlich (1994): Morphology feeds syntax: the case of particle verbs, in: *Linguistics* 32: 913-968.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena / Kristine Bentzen / Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson & Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir (2009): On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses, in: *Lingua* 119: 1914-1938.

Workshop program

8:00 - 9:00	Registration
9:00 - 9:15	Conference opening
9:30 - 9:40	Introduction (Convenors)
9:40 - 10:30	Ulrike Demske (Universität Potsdam) <i>Arguments of non-factive predicates. The rise of V1 clauses in German</i>
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee break
11:00 - 11:30	Sarah Courtney (Cornell University) <i>Diachronic sources of complementizer agreement: Germanic and Bantu</i>
11:30 - 12:00	Dorinda Tsai-Hsiu Liu (Academia Sinica, Taiwan) <i>Historical development of complementizers in Mayrinax Atayal</i>
12:00 - 12:30	Łukasz Jędrzejowski (ZAS, Berlin) & Mathias Schenner (ZAS, Berlin) <i>From an inferential C to a reportative C: The case of evidential 'jakoby'-clauses in Polish</i>
12:30 - 13:30	Lunch
13:30 - 14:20	Elly van Gelderen (Arizona State University) <i>The CP Cycle</i>
14:20 - 14:50	Ira Tsygankova (Universität Tübingen) <i>The development of the German complementizer 'zumal'</i>
14:50 - 15:20	Coffee break
15:20 - 16:10	Katrin Axel-Tober (Universität Tübingen) <i>Complementation structures in Old and Middle High German</i>
16:10 - 17:00	Regine Eckardt (Universität Göttingen) <i>Getting into Focus - Investigating Pre-Focus-Alternatives</i>
17:00	End of workshop

A B S T R A C T S

Ulrike Demske (Universität Potsdam)

Arguments of non-factive predicates. The rise of V1 clauses in German

Considering the Germanic languages, particular classes of predicates allow for their arguments to appear as V2 clauses (along with *dass*-clauses), as the literature well attests, cf. Reis (1995) for Present-Day German and Heycock (2006) for an overview of the phenomenon in various Germanic languages. So far unnoticed, however, is the fact that arguments of non-factive predicates might as well be instantiated by V1 clauses in Present-Day German, cf. (1-a) vs. (1-b).

- (1a) *Es entsteht der Eindruck, als wäre es um die Zukunft*
there arises the impression as were it for the future

der hiesigen Tierwelt nicht schlecht bestellt (A08/APR.08732)
of the local fauna not badly done
- (1b) *Es entsteht der Eindruck, um die Zukunft der*
there arises the impression for the future of the

hiesigen Tierwelt wäre es nicht schlecht bestellt
local fauna were it not badly done
'the impression arises that the local fauna would be doing well in the future'

The historical record of German witnesses V1 clauses as arguments of non-factive predicates already in the 16th century, as exemplified for a verb of cognition like *glauben* 'believe':

- (2) *dem machten zway der ansechlichen Raette/ (...) weyber glauben/*
him made two of the honorable aldermen wives believe

als hetten sy das aus der Salomea mund gehort/
as had they this of the Salome mouth heard
'the wives of two honorable aldermen made him believe that they had heard this from Salome'

In the present paper, I will build upon the rise of V1 clauses in environments such as (2) to provide a different point of view into the relationship between factivity, assertion and embeddedness (Hooper & Thompson 1973), widely discussed with respect to the Verb Second Phenomenon.

Heycock, C. (2006). Embedded root phenomena. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Volume 2, pp. 174-209. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hooper, J. and S. Thompson (1973). On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 465-497.

Reis, M. (1995). Extractions from verb-second clauses in German? In U. Lutz and J. Pafel (Eds.), *On extraction and extraposition in German*, pp. 45-88. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sarah Courtney (Cornell University)

Diachronic sources of complementizer agreement: Germanic and Bantu

Complementizer agreement (CA), although typologically rare, can be divided into two main subtypes: downwards agreeing as in (1), where the complementizer agrees with the subject of the lower clause, and upwards agreeing as in (2), where the complementizer agrees with the subject of the matrix (higher) clause.

(1) a. Kpeinzen *dan-k(ik)*morgen goan. (West Flemish, Haegeman, 1992)

I-think that-I(I)tomorrowgo

‘I think that I’ll go tomorrow.’

b. Kpeinzen *da-j (gie)*morgen goat.

I-think that-you(you)tomorrow go

‘I think that you’ll go tomorrow.’

(2) a. baba-ndu ba-bol-el-a Alfredi ba-li a-kha-khil-e (Lubukusu, Diercks, 2011)

2-people 2S-said-AP-FV 1Alfred 2-that 1S-FUT-conquer

‘The people told Alfred that he will win.’

b. Alfredi ka-bol-el-a baba-ndu a-li ba-kha-khil-e

1Alfred 1S-said-AP-FV 2-person 1-that 2S-FUT-conquer

‘Alfred told the people that they will win.’

These distinct patterns reflect the differing sources of the constructions. In both cases, the constructions are the result of reanalysis. However, the syntactic and semantic relations between the pre-analysis element and its arguments impact which agreement features are present on the complementizer.

Germanic CA is the result of extending a verbal agreement paradigm to a previously non-agreeing complementizer (De Vogelaer and van der Auwera, 2010). As part of this reanalysis, lower clause stand-alone pronouns are reanalyzed as agreement clitics hosted by the complementizer. Interpretable agreement features are reanalyzed as uninterpretable features, and a new agreement probe is created. This is the expected direction of change for interpretable/uninterpretable features following Van Gelderen (2009)’s account of the linguistic cycle.

Bantu CA, however, does not involve the reanalysis of only features but the creation of a new complementizer. The complementizers used in CA are derived from verbs and they appear to carry vestiges of their argument structure. Their relation to the higher subject is due to their prior relation with this subject as a verb taking it as “subject” and the lower clause as “object” or as part of a serial verb construction. This subject-verb relation is fossilized in CA, forcing the complementizer to form agreement relations that seem synchronically unmotivated by the syntax and semantics of the construction. However, these “unmotivated” agreements must obey the laws of normal syntactic agreement, which can lead to further syntactic change.

References: **De Vogelaer, Gunther and Johan van der Auwera.** 2010. When typological rara generate rarissima: analogical extension of verbal agreement in Dutch dialects. In *Rara & Rarissima: Documenting the Fringes of Linguistic Diversity*. Jan Wohlgemuth and Michael Cysouw (Eds.) de Gruyter & Co. •**Diercks, Michael.** 2011. Indirect Agree in Lubukusu complementizer agreement. To appear in NLLT. lingBuzz/001335. •**Haegeman, Liliane.** 1992. *Theory and description in generative syntax: A case study in West Flemish*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. •**van Gelderen, Elly.** 2009. Feature Economy in the Linguistic Cycle. *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*. Crisma, P. and Longobardi, G. eds. Oxford University Press.

Dorinda Tsai-Hsiu Liu (Academia Sinica, Taiwan)

Historical development of complementizers in Mayrinax Atayal

This study investigates the historical development of the complementizers and its implications in Mayrinax Atayal, an Austronesian language spoken in the mountainous area of Central Taiwan. Among the Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan (i.e., Formosan languages), Mayrinax Atayal is characterized as having the most clause linkers for connecting complement clauses (cf. Huang 1994). These complementizers are homophonous with some syntactic items in this language, including: (i) accusative case marker *cuʔ*; (ii) coordinating conjunction *ruʔ*; and (iii) verb of saying *mhaʔ*. For example, the accusative case marker *cuʔ* in (1) is homophonous with the complementizer *cuʔ* in (2).

- (1) mi-taal **cuʔ** mamaʔ kuʔ ʔulaqiʔ.
 AT.NFUT-see ACC uncle T child
 ‘The child saw/sees/is seeing (his) uncle.’
- (2) mi-taal-cu (**cuʔ**) [q<um>uliq cuʔ pilaʔ kuʔ ʔulaqiʔ].
 AT.NFUT-see-1S.T COMP steal<AT.NFUT> ACC money T child
 ‘I see that the child is stealing money.’

The homophony suggests that these complementizers have their origins in these syntactic items. It is expected that the changes of these complementizers have been accompanied by certain structural changes in their historical development. Based on this assumption, I examine the syntactic properties of the three complementizers and their co-occurring complement clauses. The outcome shows that the three complementizers underwent different degrees of reanalysis or grammaticalization. To be specific, the complementizer *cuʔ* has lost the syntactic properties of the accusative marker *cuʔ*. This suggests that the reanalysis of *cuʔ* has been completed. For instance, the clausal complement following the linker *cuʔ* cannot be replaced by an [+N] element. (Note: the element following the accusative marker *cuʔ* is a nominal category.) Regarding the complementizer *ruʔ*, it exhibits the properties of both the coordinating conjunction and the complementizer. For instance, the matrix and complement clauses linked by the complementizer *ruʔ* cannot be exchanged. (Note: Two clauses linked by the coordinating conjunction *ruʔ* can be exchanged.) According to Ross’s (1967) “Coordinate Structure Constraint”, an element from one conjunct cannot be moved out of that coordinate structure. This holds for the coordinating structure linked by the conjunction *ruʔ* in Mayrinax Atayal. Moreover, the *wh*-element cannot be moved out of the complement clause lead by *ruʔ*. The

mixed properties suggest that the reanalysis of *ru?* be in progress. As for the complementizer *ru?*, the verb of saying *mha?* has been grammaticalized as a complementizer. This is mainly evidenced from two respects: (i) The *mha?*-marked complementation structure is bi-clausal, which is distinct from a mono-clausal serial verb construction; and (ii) The verb of saying *mha?* underwent semantic bleaching and became a complementizer *mha?* (cf. Lord 1974).

Huang, Lillian Mei-jin. 1995a. *A Study of Mayrinax Syntax*. Taipei, Taiwan: The Crane Publishing Co.
 Lord, Carol. 1974. Causative constructions in Yorùbá. *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement 5*: 195–204.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT PhD dissertation.

From an inferential C to a reportative C: The case of evidential *jakoby*-clauses in Polish

Łukasz Jędrzejowski (ZAS, Berlin) & Mathias Schenner (ZAS, Berlin)

Introduction: In this talk, we will examine the development of Polish evidential complement clauses introduced by the complementizer *jakoby* (lit. 'as if') and show how an inferential head (lower C) developed into a reportative head (higher C).

Diachronic development: In Old Polish (1136 - 16th c), arguments of some matrix predicates can be realized as a complement *jakoby*-clause:

- (1) *ludziem na ziemi tako było widziało*
 people.DAT on earth.LOC so be.3SG.N.l-PTCP seem.3SG.N.l-PTCP
 [*jakoby się ono na nie obalić było chciało*]
 jakoby REFL it on them.ACC slay.INF be.3SG.N.l-PTCP want. 3SG.N.l-PTCP
 'The people on earth interpreted it as if it wanted to slay all of them.'
 (KG, *Kazanie I: Na Boże Narodzenie* 26-7)

In (1), the *jakoby*-clause is embedded under the matrix predicate *widzieć się* ('seem') and its licensing is restricted to verbs of seeming. In (2), a Present-day Polish example (1939 - present), the *jakoby*-clause is embedded under the matrix predicate *zaprzeczać* ('deny') and it can be embedded under verba dicendi, but not any longer under verbs of seeming:

- (2) *Firma zaprzeczyła, [jakoby były*
 company.NOM deny.3SG.F.l-PTCP jakoby be.PL.N-VIR.l-PTCP
zgłoszenia o wadliwych kartach]
 reports.NOM about faulty cards.LOC
 'The company denied that there (supposedly) were any reports about faulty prepaid cards.' (NKJP, *Dziennik Zachodni*, 27/9/2006)

- (2') **Firmie wydaje się, jakoby ...*
 company.DAT seem.3SG REFL jakoby

Analysis: In Old Polish, *jakoby* heads complement clauses of verbs that express indirect inferential evidence, like English *seem*. As a first approximation, one could

argue that *jakoby* itself expresses indirect evidence and enters a semantic concord relationship with the embedding verb, without directly contributing itself. However, we argue that *jakoby* already carried two additional seeds that determined its further development: (a) equative comparison, (b) non-factuality (or maybe even counterfactuality). These two elements are also visible in the English translations of Old Polish examples in involving subjunctive *as if* clauses (cf. 1).

In a nutshell, the component (a) paved the way for the use of *jakoby* in comparative adjunct clauses in New Polish where it can be translated as *like* (*He sang like a girl*). And component (b) paved the way for the dubitative meaning that *jakoby* contributes in complement clause of *verba dicendi* in Modern Polish.

Old Polish: In order to see that *jakoby* originally involved both components, it is instructive to compare infinite or *that* complements of *seem* in English with *as if* complement clauses. (The relevant facts are also similar for German *scheinen* with *als ob* complements.) In general, *seem* expresses indirect evidence, that is (3) expresses that the speaker (or some salient group of individuals) has some body of evidence X from which it follows that Maria is at home, as sketched in (4).

(3) *Maria seems to be at home.*

(4) $X \Rightarrow$ Maria is at home.

However, *as if* complement clauses are more complicated in that they involve a comparison of hypothetical situations to the actual situation, which we spell out here as a comparison of possible worlds. This is informally illustrated in (7), where '@' is an abbreviation for 'the actual world'. Thus (6) can be thought of as an explicit paraphrase of certain uses of (5) that makes the comparative (*just exactly those*) and the non-factual (use of subjunctive) components more visible. Interestingly, (6) has been used as an argument that subjunctive conditionals are not (always) counterfactual (Anderson 1951, von Stechow 1997).

(5) *It seems as if Jones took arsenic.*

(6) *If Jones had taken arsenic, he would have shown just exactly those symptoms which he does in fact show.*

(7) Jones shows these symptoms in $w \Rightarrow$ Jones took arsenic in w

|| | | | |

Jones shows these symptoms in @ \Rightarrow Jones took arsenic in @

Modern Polish: In Modern Polish, *jakoby* is restricted to complement clauses of speech act verbs. It shares with its earlier instances the characteristics of an indirect evidential, but changed from an inferential to a reportative element. A natural option is to analyze these clauses as involving evidential concord with the embedding matrix predicate. This is in line with the use of *jakoby* as a reportative adverbial (*allegedly*). However, *jakoby* also contributes a dubitative component that is clearly related to the non-factuality of its linguistic ancestors. There is a clear difference between *jakoby*-clauses and regular subjunctive clauses as complements to speech act verbs:

(8) *Anna twierdzi, [jakoby wygrała w lotka]*

A. claim.3SG jakoby win.3SG.F.1PTCP in lottery.LOC

'Anna claims, she supposedly won the lottery.'

(8') **Anna twierdzi, [że wygrałaby w lotka]*
A. claim.3SG that win.3SG.F.l-PTCP.SUBJ in lottery.LOC

Conclusion: Finally, we will show that all these changes outlined above also appear compatible with the *Late Merge Principle* (van Gelderen 2004, 2009) demonstrating how Late Merge makes a low C change into a high C.

Abbreviations: 1/2/3 - 1st/2nd/3rd person, ACC - accusative, DAT - dative, F - feminine, INF - infinitive, LOC - locative, l-PTCP - participle inflected for number and gender, N - neuter, NOM - nominative, N-VIR - non-virile, PL - plural, REFL - reflexive, SG - singular, SUBJ - subjunctive mood.

Selected references: A. R. Anderson (1951): A Note on Subjunctive and Counterfactual Conditionals, *Analysis* 11, pp. 35-38. E. v. Gelderen (2004): *Grammaticalization as Economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. K. von Stechow (1997): The Presupposition of Subjunctive Conditionals, in: *The interpretive tract* ed. by U. Sauerland & O. Percus. (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 25). Cambridge, MA: MITWPL, pp. 29-44.

Elly van Gelderen (Arizona State University)

The CP Cycle

In this paper, I will first show characteristic cyclical changes involving complementizers, e.g. 'whether' in the history of English starting out as a pronoun and after frequent topicalization being reanalyzed as an element in the left-most layer of the sentence. The same development occurs with prepositional phrases that are fronted and then reanalyzed as part of the CP layer. The paper then discusses cases that look problematic from an empirical point of view, such as those involving 'to the intent/end/purpose that', as chronicled in the work of Nykiel and Lecki (2013).

Ira Tsygankova (Universität Tübingen)

The development of the German complementizer zumal

German shows clear syntactic differentiation between subordinate and main clauses. The former requires the verb to go to the end position (a.) and allows correlatives (a') and the ellipsis of the matrix clause (a''). The latter does not and demands the verb in the second position (b.-b''). The examples show the subordinative conjunction *weil* in a. and the coordinative *denn* in b.

- a. Sie waren traurig, weil er nach Hause ging.
they were sad because he went home
- A'. SIE WAREN DESWEGEN TRAUIG, WEIL ER NACH HAUSE GING.
therefore they were sad, because he went home
- a''. Warum waren sie traurig? Weil er nach Hause ging.
WHY WERE THEY SAD? BECAUSE HE WENT HOME
- B. SIE WAREN TRAUIG, DENN ER GING NACH HAUSE.
they were sad because he went home
- b'. *Sie waren deswegen traurig, denn er **ging** nach Hause.
They were therefore sad, because he went home.
- b''. Warum waren sie traurig? *Denn er **ging** nach Hause.

Why were they sad? Because he went home.

The topic of my talk is the German causal conjunction *zumal*, which seems to be in between the two types of clause. At the first glance *zumal* seems to embed subordinate clauses due to the verb lying in the end position (c.). However the subordination tests show the coordinative character of *zumal*:

- c. Sie waren traurig, zumal er nach Hause ging.
- c'. *Sie waren deswegen traurig, zumal er nach Hause ging.
- c''. Warum waren sie traurig? *Zumal er nach Hause ging.

This syntactic behavior corresponds with a semantic peculiarity of *zumal*. While the rest of German causal conjunctions like *da*, *weil* and *denn* provide the only existing reason, *zumal* implies the existence of further reasons.

In my talk, I will show that the unusual behavior of the complementizer can be explained diachronically. Since the 14th century *zumal* can be found with the meaning of a focus particle (*zumal Frauen* = especially women). As a focus particle, *zumal* referred also to subordinate clauses.

- d. Meine Muhme hatte mich sehr lieb, **zumal weil** sie keine Tochter hatte [...].
[Gellert, 1775, 245]
My aunt liked me very much, especially because she did not have a daughter.
- d'. Meine Muhme hatte mich sehr lieb, **zumal** sie keine Tochter hatte [...].

In modern German, sentences d. and d'. are synonymous. It seems like the expression *zumal weil* “dropped” the conjunction *weil*, while *zumal* kept the meaning of the additive focus particle and became, in addition, the meaning of the causal subordinate complementizer.

The complementizer *zumal* is therefore a result of a reanalysis of a causal complementizer in a focus of a focus particle. This analysis explains the syntactic and semantic deviance of the conjunction *zumal* comparing to other German conjunctions.

References:

Gellert, Christian Fürchtegott *Sämtliche Schriften*. Teil 4. Leipzig: M.G.Weichmanns Erben und Reich; Caspar Fritsch (1775). König, Ekkehard Fokus Particles. In: J. Jacobs et al. *Syntax. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. V. 1. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter (1993). Pasch, Renate et al. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfers (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln)*. [Schriften des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache 9. Hrsg.: Hans-Werner Eroms, Gerhard Stickel & Gisela Zifonun]. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter (2003).

Katrin Axel-Tober (Universität Tübingen)

Complementation structures in Old and Middle High German

In early German the inventory of syntactic structures realizing propositional arguments was larger than in the modern language (e.g. Müller & Frings 1959, Johnk 1979, Lenerz 1984, Axel-Tober 2012). There existed (at least) the following five types of finite declarative constructions:

- (1) verb-late/final clause introduced by the complementizer *thaz* ‘that’
Quad [thaz síe thara fúarin] (Otfrid III 15, 33; c. 870 A.D.)
 (he) said that they there went-SUBJ
- (2) unIntroduced verb-final clause
Quáduu tho thie líuti [er únrehto dati] (Otfrid III 4, 35)
 said then the people he unjustly acted-SUBJ
- (3) dummy NP or correlative *thaz* in superordinate clause + *thaz*-clause
Er tháhta odo uuila tház-[thaz er ther dúriuuart wás], (Otfrid II 4, 7)
 he thought perhaps that that he the gatekeeper was
- (4) correlative *iz* ‘it’ in superordinate clause + *thaz*-clause
thanne furstant&icaron; ir iz . [thaz ih iz bin]. (Tatian 216, 28; c. 830 A.D.)
 then know you it that I it am
 ‘then you will know that I am he’
- (5) unIntroduced verb-second clause
Und Claudas sprach, [er deth es gern], (Lancelot 10, 21, 13th century)
 and Claudas said he did-SUBJ it with.pleasure

In a first step, the talk will provide evidence for the syntactic analyses of these constructions. Regarding the external syntax, it will address the role of different types of embedding elements (verbs, prepositions etc.), the syntactic relation between overt (or null) correlative elements and the subordinate clause, the syntactic status of different types of correlative elements (proforms vs. placeholders) and the role of long extraction constructions as evidence for complementation vs. adjunction structures. As to the internal syntax, the analysis of *thaz* (true complementizer vs. relative particle) and verb placement patterns will be discussed. In a second step, the diachronic relation between these constructions will be addressed, thereby focussing on the question which of the structures in (2) to (5) is the source construction for the development of the *thaz*-verb-final complement clause (cf. (1)) that still is the canonical type today. The proposed analysis will take issue with the standard assumption in grammaticalization accounts that *that*-type complementizers in Germanic evolved from demonstrative pronouns.

- Axel-Tober, K. (2012): *(Nicht-)kanonische Nebensätze im Deutschen: synchrone und diachrone Aspekte*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter.
- Johnk, L. D. (1979). *Complementation in Old High German*. Diss., The University of Texas at Austin.
- Lenerz, J. (1984). *Syntaktischer Wandel und Grammatiktheorie. Eine Untersuchung an Beispielen aus der Sprachgeschichte des Deutschen*. Tübingen
- Müller, G. & Th. Frings (1959). *Die Entstehung der deutschen ‚daß‘-Sätze*. Second edition. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Regine Eckardt (Universität Göttingen)

Getting into focus - investigating pre-focus-alternatives

In my talk, I will take a look at the development of focus sensitive constructions, with special attention to the semantic and pragmatic precursors of focus alternatives. Specifically, we will discuss the origin of German *nur* (= only), *sogar* (= even) and *barely/bloß*.

As data show, *nur* arose from an exceptive construction in OHG, and focus alternatives take the semantic place of former domains of quantification in the precursor construction. In the case of *sogar*, focus alternatives derive from necessary antecedents in discourse in the precursor construction. In the case of *barely/bloß*, the focus alternatives construe from entailed alternatives of the precursing use of the words.

While there seems to be no uniform "grammaticalization pathway" for focus sensitive items, these case studies illustrate what a full understanding of a given development minimally should amount to. In the final part, I will briefly review some focus sensitive particles the origin of which is, according to these standards, not yet fully researched.