Somebody that I used to know, or: How do habitual verbal heads emerge? The case of German pflegen 'use(d) to'

Łukasz Jędrzejowski Universität Potsdam (Germany) lukasz-jedrzejowski@daad-alumni.de

Introduction. In this talk, we will examine emergence circumstances and the development of the habitual verbal head pflegen (lit. 'maintain') 'use(d) to' in the history of German and show that pflegen grammaticalized into a functional head in the transition from OHG (750-1050) to MHG (1050-1350). We will provide diachronic evidence showing that pflegen in its habitual usage (i) emerged out of the pattern pflegen + DP and (ii) requires a Hab operator restricting the domain of quantification.

Phenomenon. In Modern German (1900 -) the predicate *pflegen* can be used in two different ways. It can select either for DPs marked for the Accusative case (cf. [1]) or for infinitive complements headed by the infinitival marker zu 'to', as exemplified in [2]:

- [1] Sie pflegen [DP die Tradition [der Zunft]]
 they maintain.3PL the tradition of the craft
 'They cultivate the tradition of the craft.'
 (DeReKo, Rhein-Zeitung, 8/2/2013)
- [2] BilbaosParksweilund Gärten sindSpaniens $gr\ddot{u}n$, $_{\rm INF}\ es$ innun $be.3 \\ \mathrm{PL}$ Bilbao's parks and gardens now green because it in Spain's soviertgrößter Stadt*(zu)ausgiebigregnenpflegtfourth.biggest city extensively use.3SG to rain.INF 'Bilbao's parks and gardens are now so green because it has been raining extensively in the fourth largest city in Spain.' (DeReKo, Frankfurter Rundschau, 4/12/1999)

Analysis. To begin with, we will outline the basic properties of pflegen used as a Hab-head in Modern German. In brief, we assume pflegen to be a Hab-head merging in AspP between VP and CP, which requires a Hab operator binding the event variable and presupposing the plurality of events quantified over (cf. Boneh and Doron 2012). Contrary to Colomo (2011), we argue that a Gen operator cannot restrict the quantification domain of pflegen. Arguments provided for this view come from: (i) different kinds of quantification of events, (ii) the (in)compatibility with punctual adverbial modifications, and (iii) scope relationships between Gen and Hab. Syntactically, we analyze pflegen as a subject-to-subject raising predicate allowing embedding of weather predicates like regnen 'rain' (cf. [2]) and triggering an A-movement of the embedded subject into the matrix subject position. As the TP layer is supposed to be absent in German (cf. Haider 2009), we claim that the raised subject occupies [Spec-AspP] as its target. The structural high of AspP, in turn, imposes syntactic restrictions on dependent infinitives disallowing extraposition and, simultaneously, gives rise to restructuring effects, e.g. to the IPP-effect in older stages of German (cf. Hinterhölzl 2009). Diachronically, we shall illustrate that the pattern pflegen + infinitive occurred already in early MHG and that its compositional meaning has remained unchanged until today. We can reanalyze the grammaticalization of pflegen as follows



Figure 1: The grammaticalization of pflegen

and assume two different lexicon entries:

- a. $pflegen + DP \rightarrow [[pflegen]] = \lambda x \lambda y [pflegen'(x,y)]$
- b. $pflegen + infinitive = \Phi_{Hab} -> \lambda P \lambda s \lambda w \text{ [INIT } (P,s,w) \& \forall w' \in MB_{\tau(s),w} \exists e \text{ } [\tau(s) \subseteq \tau(e) \& \text{ ITER } (P,e,w')]] \text{ (based on Boneh & Doron 2008, 2012)}$

When employed as a transitive lexical V-head, pflegen is a two-place predicate quantifying over a set of objects (cf. [1]). We will show that embedded DPs could be marked for the Genitive, Dative and Accusative case in older stages and that only Accusative prevailed. Having undergone a grammaticalization process, pflegen became one-place subject-to-subject raising predicate. Following the Late Merge Principle (merge as late as possible) proposed in van Gelderen (2004), pflegen merges higher in the structure, i. e. in AspP, extending its quantification domain to events. Here, we will illustrate that the propositional argument could be realized in two different ways: either as a consecutive clause headed by the complementizer dass 'that' and with a silent correlate so 'so' (= CP) or as an infinitive (= VP). With regard to the first strategy, we will show that finite dass-clauses disappeared from the use in late ENHG (1600-1700). As for the latter, we will outline how bare infinitives suppressed their counterparts headed by the infinitival marker zu 'to'. The following example with a bare infinitive from the 19th century illustrates that this process was completed first in the 20th century:

[3] DieLeitungsolcherArbeitenhabenfranzösische Genieoffiziere, wodurchleadership of.such works have.3PL French genius.officers by.what dieselbenraschergefördert dergleichenweitwerden, alssonsthierthe.same far quicker sponsor.PTCP PASS.AUX.INF than usually of.that.kind here (DeReKo, KHZ, Mainzer Journal, 13/10/1849)) INF geschehen pflegthappen.INF use.3sg

'French genius officers are leading such works, whereby they are sponsored quicker than it usually happens.'

Conclusion. As it turns out, pflegen's development provides new insights into how functional heads develop in general. It clearly demonstrates, contrary to what Traugott (1997) claims, that subject raising verbs embedding infinitives can emerge out of the pattern predicate + DP and that a control structure as a linking bridge is not required for this development at all.

<u>Selected references</u>: N. Boneh & E. Doron (2012): Hab and Gen in the expression of habituality, in: *Genericity* ed. by A. Mari, C. Beyssade & F. del Prete, 176-191. Oxford: OUP. H. Haider (2009): *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: CUP.