

## On the development of mirative-prospective clauses in German

Łukasz Jędrzejowski (University of Cologne, Germany)  
l.jedrzejowski@uni-koeln.de

*Introduction* In this talk, I will examine the development of mirative-prospective adverbial clauses (= MPCs) headed by the complementizer *um* (lit. ‘about’) in the history of German. The aim of this talk is twofold. First, contrary to Pauly’s (2013, 2014) account I shall provide empirical evidence showing that MPCs are integrated into the matrix clause. Second, I will argue that MPCs developed out of purpose clauses (= PCs) in the 18<sup>th</sup> century in German, claiming that peripheral adverbial clauses can develop into central adverbial clauses (cf. Haegeman 2010).

*Phenomenon* Compare the sentences given in [1] and [2]:

[1] *Sie nahm den Regenschirm mit, um nicht nass zu werden.*  
she take.3SG.PST the umbrella with COMP NEG wet to become.INF  
‘She took the umbrella to not get wet.’

[2] *Sie stellte den Regenschirm neben sich, um ihn zu vergessen.*  
she put.3SG.PST the umbrella next REFL COMP him.ACC to forget.INF  
‘She put the umbrella right next to herself only to forget it anyway.’ (Leys 1988: 97)

In both cases, the dependent clause is headed by the complementizer *um* (lit. ‘about’) containing a *zu*-infinitive. Both clauses differ in meaning, though. While in [1] the *um-zu*-clause is analyzed as a PC (cf. Schmidtke-Bode 2009), its counterpart in [2] has been referred to in the literature as a prospective clause. According to Leys (1988), the relationship between the main and subordinate clause in [2] is not a purposive one; instead it is deemed to be a chronological one (= prospective). Additionally, based on DeLancey (1997) I also adopt a second term as to [2], viz. *mirative* marking information which is surprising/unexpected to the speaker. In what follows, I analyze such examples like in [2] as mirative-prospective adverbial clauses.

*Synchronic analysis* The received wisdom has it that adverbial clauses can be divided into three main groups: (i) central adverbial clauses (= CACs), peripheral adverbial clauses (= PACs), and non-integrated adverbial clauses (= NACs) (cf. Haegeman 2006, 2010 for English and Frey 2011, 2012 for German). Whereas CACs are taken to be merged with the IP- (English) or VP-domain (German) of the associated matrix clause and thus depend on its illocutionary force, PACs are claimed to possess their own illocutionary potential and be merged with the associated matrix CP. NACs, in turn, are deemed to be independent speech acts connected with the matrix clause in a pragmatic way. Keeping this division in mind, PCs have been analyzed as CACs (cf. Haegeman 2010, Frey 2012), while MPCs, according to Pauly (2013, 2014), have a NAC status. Main evidence for these two views come from different syntactic tests: (i) movement of the adverbial clause into the Spec,CP position of the matrix clause, (ii) correlative elements, (iii) question-answer pairs, (iv) scope of negation, (v) discourse particles, among many others. I disagree with both views and provide empirical evidence showing that whereas PCs should be analyzed as PACs, MPCs are CACs. As for (i), I will show that PCs exhibit no restrictions with respect to the movement to Spec,CP and to a middle field position within the matrix clause, while MPCs are restricted to their base position, i.e. to the VP-domain of the host clause. However, contrary to Pauly (2013, 2014), I assume MPCs to be dependent on the matrix clause to such an extent that any kind of movement to a higher position for information-structural reasons (e.g. via topicalization) is prohibited. In other words, MPCs are frozen in their base position and opaque to syntactic operations. As far as (v) is concerned, for example, Frey (2012) and Jacobs (to appear) argue that discourse particles cannot be licensed in PCs. Coniglio (2011: 147-149) points out, elaborating on *nur* und *ja*, that they can occur in PCs, but this is supposed to happen very seldom. The question of whether MPCs can host discourse particles has not been addressed in the literature so far. I discuss examples with different discourse particles and argue that while

PCs can host discourse particles, their occurrence in MPCs is disallowed. This straightforwardly follows from the analysis proposed here: If MPCs are CACs and thus exhibit a strong dependency relationship with their matrix clause depending on their illocutionary force, there is no possibility to license discourse particles, e.g. *wohl* (cf. Zimmermann 2004):

- [3] *Zum Abschluss eines strahlenden Sonntags versammelten sich,*  
 to:the end of:a radiant Sunday.GEN gather.3PL.PST REFL  
*gegen 200 Personen, um wohl eines der bekanntesten*  
 about 200 persons COMP DP one.GEN of:the most:known  
*Werke von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart zu genießen.*  
 about of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart to enjoy.INF

‘At the end of a radiant Sunday, about 200 people gathered together, probably to enjoy one of the most known works of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart.’ (DeReKo, *St. Galler Tagblatt*, 25/10/2000)

- [4] *Sie stellte den Regenschirm neben sich,*  
 she put.3SG.PST the umbrella next REFL  
*um \*wohl ihn \*wohl zu vergessen.*  
 COMP DP him.ACC DP to forget.INF

*Diachronic analysis* Studies dealing with the diachrony of MPCs are still missing. I provide diachronic evidence illustrating that MPCs emerged in German in the 18<sup>th</sup> century out of PCs and that this development happened via a temporal presupposition accommodation. In this context, two related questions arise: (i) What components relate the two types of adverbial clauses? (ii) What contextual properties facilitate the development of MPCs? What PCs and MPCs have in common are: a) the complementizer *um*, b) the infinitive form of the embedded verb headed by the infinitive marker *zu* ‘to’, c) the co-referentiality of the embedded subject, PRO, with the matrix subject, d) two events expressed by lexical verbs, e) future orientation of the embedded event with respect to the matrix predication, and f) successive interpretation of the situations involved (= relative tense in the sense claimed by Comrie 1985: 56). In order to reanalyze the development of MPCs, additional features in the clause that contribute to evoking a mirative-prospective interpretation are needed, though. Correspondingly, I postulate: a) intentionality, b) target-directedness, and c) hypothetical result state. 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 MPCs. They rather express a sequence of two events, whereby the following event appears to be surprising/unexpected to the speaker. PCs are always target-oriented. MPCs, 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. MPCs, on the other hand, presuppose the veridicality of the embedded proposition. This also accounts for why they cannot host discourse particles: The derivation crashes because the contribution of *wohl* (= speaker’s uncertainty) and the truth value of MPCs (= 1) conflict with each other (cf. [4]). PCs, in turn, do not presuppose any truth value of the embedded clause (= hypothetical result state). Hence, no mismatch arises, cf. [3]. I assume the loss of intentionality to have paved the way for the possibility of embedding surprising/unexpected situations. Finally, I provide diachronic semantic analysis showing that PCs taking a circumstantial modal base and a teleological conversational background shifted into MPCs equipped with an existential conversational background and presupposing the truth value of the embedded *p*. Diachronically, this change entailed a syntactic recategorization, turning PACs into CACs and, simultaneously, leading to a change of the merge height of attached clauses themselves.

*Selected references* L. Haegeman (2010): The internal syntax of adverbial clauses, in: *Lingua* 120(3): 628-648. J. Jacobs (to appear): On Main Clause Phenomena in German, in: *Linguistische Berichte*. O. Leys (1998): Prospektives *um*, in: *Deutsche Sprache* 16: 97-102. D. Pauly (2014): *Grenzfälle der Subordination: Merkmale, Empirie und Theorie abhängiger Sätze*. PhD thesis, Universität Potsdam. K. Schmidtke-Bode (2009): *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.