

AG 1
Subordination: diachron und dialektal
(Subordination from a diachronic and dialectal perspective)

Claudia Bucheli Berger & Martin Salzmann
 c.bucheli@access.uzh.ch, martin.salzmann@uni-konstanz.de
 Universität Zürich, Universität Konstanz

**Alemannic *go/gi* as a non-canonical marker of subordination – verb doubling
 or complementizer?**

24.02.2010, 14.00–14.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

1. Introduction. All Alemannic varieties feature a subordinating particle *go/ga/gi*. The particle is predominantly found after motion verbs like *gaa* ‘go’, cf. (1)a. In this context, it is obligatory in all Alemannic varieties (Swiss German, Southern Germany, Vorarlberg, Liechtenstein, Alsatian) while the standard language and standardizing intermediate varieties use zero marking, cf. (1)b. In our paper we will show that the particle displays different syntactic behavior in the various dialects and we will propose a diachronic scenario that derives these synchronic differences. We will argue against previous analyses that treat the Swiss German variant as a kind of verb doubling. Rather, we will propose that the particle has complementizer function in Swiss German like in the other varieties, at least in some varieties.

2. Syntactic Differences. There is evidence that in Southern Germany, Liechtenstein and Vorarlberg the particle functions like a clause-initial complementizer. First, there is a strong tendency to place it at the beginning of the dependent clause (Brandner & Salzmann 2009). Second, it also introduces purpose clauses as in (2) where it competes with *zum* ‘in order to’ (in Swiss German *go* is ungrammatical in such sentences). In Swiss German, however, the particle is generally analyzed as a verbal element, a double of the motion verb that participates in the Verb Projection Raising system (van Riemsdijk 2002) and therefore can be placed more flexibly.

3. Previous analyses. Lötscher (1993) proposes that the particle goes back to the preposition *gen* ‘towards’. He further argues that it has developed into a complementizer-like element in Southern Germany, Liechtenstein and Vorarlberg while in Swiss German, a very different development took place: Due to phonetic similarity between *gen* and the motion verb, *gen* was re-interpreted as a double of the verb, thereby leading to a rule of verb doubling (cf. also van Riemsdijk 2002).

4. A new proposal. While we adopt the scenario for the non-Swiss varieties and do not want to rule out that verb doubling was the correct analysis at some point, new empirical findings argue against verb doubling for Swiss German from a synchronic point of view: First, the particle appears in a form clearly distinct from the motion verb in many varieties. Second, the integration into the verb projection raising system will be shown to be imperfect. Third, the particle also appears in complement clauses as in (3). This use is completely unexpected under verb doubling, but can be related to a strong preference to place *go* immediately in front of the infinitive. This suggests that at least in some varieties, *go* is more complementizer-like, similar to preverbal *zu*. Interestingly, the use in (3) happens to be found in varieties close to the German border. We then arrive at a picture where the particle has developed into a

complementizer-like element in all varieties, the major difference being the position: clause-initial vs. preverbal.

- (1) a) Er gaat **go/gi** de Unggle bsueche. b) Ich gehe Ø den Onkel besuchen.
he goes PRT the uncle visit I go the uncle visit
'He goes to visit the uncle.' (Alemannic) 'He goes to visit the uncle.' (SG)
- (2) Mir sin am Haag schdoo bliibä **go** luägä, wiä si ghiggä.
We are at.the fence stand remain PRT watch how they play_football
'We stopped at the fence to watch how they play.'
Noth (1993: 338) Southern Germany
- (3) Es isch e Frechhät, eifach **go** säge [...].
it is a impertinence simplyPRT say
'It is impertinent simply to say that [...]' (Swiss Alemannic)

Brandner, Ellen & Martin Salzmann 2009. Crossing the Lake: motion verb constructions in Bodensee-Alemannic and Swiss German. *GAGL* 48, 81–113.

Lötscher, A. 1993. Zur Genese der Verbverdoppelung. In *Dialektsyntax*, ed. by W. Abraham and J. Bayer, 180–200. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Riemsdijk, H. van. 2002. The unbearable lightness of GOing. *JCGL* 5, 143–196.

Noth, Harald. 1993. *Alemannisches Dialekthandbuch vom Kaiserstuhl und seiner Umgebung*. Freiburg: Schillinger Verlag.

Oliver Schallert

oliver.schallert@staff.uni-marburg.de

Universität Marburg

Infinitival complement clauses in Alemannic

24.02.2010, 14.30–15.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

On the basis of several different data types (acceptability judgements, analysis of transcribed sound-recordings), this talk deals with different types of *zu*-infinitivals (in the terminology of Bech 1983: '2nd Status') and in particular the status of the complementizer *zum* in Vorarlbergian Alemannic (VA). Alongside use in different kinds of adjunct clauses (1a., b.), this complementizer also occurs in complement clauses (2a., b.). As for the closely related Alemannic varieties spoken around Lake Constance ('Bodensee-Alemannisch'), Brandner (2006, 2008) assumes interferences with Standard German as the potential source of this construction.

- (1) a. und denn hät ma scho wied'r g'waartat *zum* d'r Wagga uffischtoßa
in an Büch'l zum Heua (Röns) (Ruoff & Gabriel 1998: 120, Z. 42f.)
'and then one used to wait in order to push the trolley into the heap of hay again'
- b. i ha z'wenig Kligeald, *zum* a Fahrkarta z'lösa (73/f: Satteins)
I have too few change COMP a ticket ZU=buy
'I don't have any change to buy a ticket.'

- (2) a. Dasssie mir *verbota* häät *zum* däs Buch leasa, (77/m: Hohenems)
 That she me forbidden has sub that book-AKK read,
 ischt scho allerhand.
 is quite something.
 'It's quite something that she has forbidden me to read the book!'
- b. I han vrgeässon *zum* a Karto koufo. (69/m: Lustenau)
 I have forgotten COMP a ticket buy
 'I have forgotten to buy a ticket.'

Independently of the question as to which role interferences played for the origin of these structures, the goal of this talk is to present a finer-grained picture of their syntactic and semantic-pragmatic properties, relevant factors being: (a) the semantic class of the *matrix predicate* (factive/implicative verbs, propositional verbs, motion verbs); (b) the degree of *syntactic integration* (measured, e.g. by the obligatoriness of the complementizer *zum*), or, put in more traditional terms, '(in)coherence' (Bech 1983).

As shown by different uses of 'um ... zu'-infinitival clauses like (1b.), the presence of an infinitival complementizer does not correlate with the syntactic function (complement, adjunct) of the infinitival clause, and, consequently, Zifonun et al. (1997: 1426–1430) label them complement clauses. Apart from this observation, I will discuss whether data like (2), i.e. infinitival complement clauses in the strict sense, are in conflict with Wöllstein's (2008: 161f.) hypothesis that complementizers force their structural complement to have referential properties (e.g. tense) that cannot be provided by infinite embedded phrases.

- Bech, Gunnar (1983): *Studien über das deutsche verbum infinitum*. Tübingen: Narr (1st edition 1955/1957 Kopenhagen: Munksgaard). 2nd ed.
- Brandner, Ellen (2006): „Bare Infinitives in Alemannic and the Categorical Status of Infinitival Complements“. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 6: 203–268.
- (2008): „Patterns of Doubling in Alemannic“. In: Sief Barbiere et al. (Hgg.): *Microvariation in Syntactic Doubling*. Bingley [u.a.]: Emerald Group Publishing, p. 353–379.
- Ruoff, Arno & Gabriel, Eugen (1998): *Die Mundarten Vorarlbergs. Ein Querschnitt durch die Dialekte des Landes* [CD with sound recordings included]. Graz: W. Neugebauer.
- Wöllstein, Angelika (2008): *Konzepte der Satzkonnexion*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Zifonun, Gisela & Hoffmann, Ludger & Strecker, Bruno (1997): *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Vol. 2. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Sara K. Hayden
 ceciliakate128@yahoo.com
 Universität Marburg
Relative Clauses in Pennsylvania German
 24.02.2010, 15.00–15.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

In contrast to Standard German which relies on inflected relative pronouns (1a.), Pennsylvania German (like many other German dialects) can introduce relative clauses with a particle instead, cf. (1b.). While the particle merely seems to indicate subordination, syntactic relations like “subject” in (1b.) obviously can also be expressed by a gap. In fact, the use of relative pronouns, while typical for standard written European languages, is otherwise rare worldwide (cf. Haspelmath 2001, Comrie 1998). In this respect, the dialects are more natural than Standard German (cf. Fleischer 2005).

- (1) a. Der Mann, *der* den Hut anhat. (Standard German)
the man REL.NOM.SG the hat wears
b. Der Mann, (*d*)*ass* der Hud ahod. (Pennsylvania German)
the man PART the hat wears

While pioneering work on relative clauses have largely relied on grammars, the present talk deals with “first-hand data”, i.e. data gathered from Old Order Amish speakers in Big Valley. This is to secure a broad, contemporary sampling of relative clauses for Pennsylvania German. My talk will present the most interesting findings from this research in light of a comparison to Fleischer (2005), Louden (1988), and Meister Ferré (1994), as well as to written samples of non-sectarian PG, determining whether or not my findings (also) confirm the predictions of the *Accessibility Hierarchy* (Keenan/Comrie 1977).

For instance, older grammars for PG indicate *wu* or *ass* as complementizers where a nominative or accusative relative pronoun would be expected in Standard German and the use of the dative demonstrative (2a.) where Standard German would have a genitive case relative pronoun (2b.).

- (2) a. Des iss der Mann, *dem sei* Fraa grank iss. (Pennsylvania German)
(Buffington/Barba 1965: 95)
b. Das ist der Mann, *dessen* Frau krank ist. (Standard German)
'This is the man whose wife is sick.'

Louden (1988) found that *as* has largely replaced *wu*, and that this complementizer is now even being used where Standard German would call for the genitive, cf. (3), thus replacing the periphrastic dative form in (2a.) with (3). This indicates that the possibility of encoding with a gap has extended to the so-called “GEN position” in the *Accessibility Hierarchy*.

- (3) Des is der Mann, *as sei* Fraa grank is. (Pennsylvania German)
(Louden 1988: 217)

- Buffington, A.F. / P.A. Barba (1965): *A Pennsylvania German grammar*. Allentown, PA: Schlechters.
Comrie, Bernard (1998): “Rethinking the typology of relative clauses”. *Language Design* 1: 59–86.
Fleischer, Jürg (2005): “Relativsätze in den Dialekten des Deutschen: Vergleich und Typologie”. In: Helen Christen (ed.): *Dialektologie an der Jahrtausendwende* (Linguistik online 24): 171–186.
Haspelmath, Martin (2001): “The European Linguistic Area: Standard Average European”. In: Martin Haspelmath et al. (eds.): *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Bd. 1. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, p. 1492–1510.
Keenan, Edward L. / Bernard Comrie (1977): “Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 63–99.
Louden, Mark L. (1988): *Bilingualism and syntactic change in Pennsylvania German*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International. (Printed 2004).
Meister Ferré, Barbara (1994): *Stability and change in the Pennsylvania German dialect of an old order Amish community in Lancaster County*. (Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik Beihefte 82.) Stuttgart: Steiner.

Merab Geguchadze
merab.geguchadze@uni-jena.de
Universität Jena

**Einige diachrone und dialektale Aspekte der Relativsatzbildung im
Georgischen**

24.02.2010, 15.30–16.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

Die moderne georgische Standardsprache kennt zwei Strategien zur Relativsatzbildung. Eine dieser Strategien bedient sich eines Relativpronomens und die Präsenz des Relativpronomens ermöglicht ihrerseits, dass für diesen Relativsatztyp fast alle syntaktischen Funktionen für die Relativierung zugänglich sind und dabei in der Regel Bezugs- und Bedeutungsambiguitäten vermieden werden können. Das Relativpronomen wird gebildet, indem an ein Interrogativpronomen bzw. -adverb das Suffix *-(a)z* angehängt wird (*romeli-z* – ‚welcher‘; *sad-az* – ‚wo‘). Auffallend ist jedoch, dass im gegenwärtigen Georgischen, wenn das Relativpronomen in eine komplexe Phrase eingebettet ist, das Suffix *-(a)z* am letzten bzw. rechtesten Glied der Phrase erscheint (*romlis saxli-z* – ‚dessen Haus‘), während es im Altgeorgischen auch in den komplexen Phrasen an das Relativpronomen suffigiert wurde.

So lässt sich zeigen, dass sich im Laufe der Zeit aus einem Relativpronomenmarkierenden Suffix ein suffixaler Relativsubordinator herausgebildet hat, wobei auch eine Koexistenz von beiden Formen während der Übergangsphase nachweisbar ist.

Die zweite Strategie verwendet eine Art Universalkonjunktion *rom*, durch die auch andere Arten von Nebensätzen subordiniert werden können, zur Einleitung des Relativsatzes, jedoch mit zwei obligatorischen Beschränkungen. Erstens darf die Bezugsphrase (Nukleus) im Relativsatz nicht durch ein Pronomen (Resumtivum) repräsentiert werden und zweitens, abgesehen von wenigen marginalen Ausnahmen, muss die Position vor dem Subordinator durch ein Satzglied besetzt sein. So werden Relativsätze zur Unterscheidung von anderen Nebensätzen ausreichend markiert. Das hat zur Folge, dass einerseits durch diese Strategie die komplexeren syntaktischen Funktionen nicht relativiert werden können und andererseits (besonders durch die zweite Beschränkung) oft für die konkrete Satzsemantik unerwünschte Bewegungen bzw. eine redundante Präsenz eines der (nicht relativierten) Argumenten durch ein Pronomen benötigt werden, um die Position vor dem Subordinator zu besetzen.

Es wird am Beispiel des Imeretischen, einer der westgeorgischen Mundarten, gezeigt, dass einige Dialekte, um die oben genannte Wortstellungsbeschränkung umzugehen, aus der Universalkonjunktion einen auf die Relativsatzbildung spezialisierten Subordinator *kero* entwickelt haben. Dabei wird ein Vorschlag gemacht, diesen Wechsel bzw. die Entstehung dieses Subordinators als Klitisierung der (zur Besetzung der Position vor dem Subordinator) expletiv eingesetzten Partikel *ke* an die Konjunktion *ro(m)* zu analysieren.

Roland Meyer
roland.meyer@sprachlit.uni-regensburg.de
Universität Regensburg

The C system of relatives and complement clauses in the history of Slavonic languages

24.02.2010, 16.30–17.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

According to the majority view in the literature, the German and English complementizers *dass* and *that*, respectively, are descendants of a demonstrative pronoun used as an object (cf. Roberts & Roussou 2003, Hopper & Traugott 2003², Harris & Campbell 1995, among others), arising when two independent clauses were combined into a subordination structure. As is well-known for English, the use of demonstratives and uninflected relativizers preceded that of relative pronouns with a *wh* base (Harris & Campbell 1995, 284f). Just like the complement clause subordinator, uninflected relativizers are traced back to demonstrative pronouns (Hopper & Traugott 2003, 196ff). Given these similarities, the question arises whether the development of uninflected relativizers and of complement clause subordinators from demonstratives were simply two alternative pathways of change, or whether one was ‚parasitic‘ on the other. The present paper argues that in Slavonic languages (Old Church Slavonic (OCS), Russian, Polish and Czech), there is support for an analysis under which the complement clause subordinator was directly *derived* from an uninflected relativizer, and only indirectly, if at all, from a demonstrative pronoun:

- (1) The subordinators *iż* (Polish) and *že* (Czech)/*že* (Polish) are descendants of the relativizer *iže* (Cz) / *ize* (Pl). The latter could occur in uninflected form with a resumptive pronoun already in the oldest Polish documents.
- (2) In OCS, *iže* was mostly an inflected relativizer consisting of a demonstrative and a (modal) particle. However, Večerka (2002) mentions uninflected, non-agreeing *iže* with resumptive pronouns in the embedded clause already in OCS.
- (3) In the Old Russian Birchbark letters, which most closely represent the very early vernacular (beginning from the 11th century), the most frequent type of relative clause was introduced by uninflected *čto* (Mendoza 2007). First instances of *čto* as a complement clause subordinator date from the 12th/13th century (Borkovskij 1979), widespread use in this environment arose no earlier than the 15th century.

According to 2., there is no reason to think that *wh* relatives were prior to relatives with an uninflected complementizer, even in OCS. 1. shows the development of complement clause subordinators from uninflected relativizers in a morphologically transparent way. 3. makes the same point even more strongly, because *čto* is morphologically distinct from a demonstrative pronoun. It remains to be shown how matrix verb classes and the position of the embedded clause interacts with the developments in 1.-3. First results by Mendoza (2007) indicate that in the early Old Russian vernacular, relative clauses had to be extraposed, and that they became sentence-internal only later (cf. Hopper & Traugott 2003 for English). To conclude, the Slavonic case shows a development diverging from the one standardly assumed for Germanic: Complement clause subordinators were modelled on uninflected

relativizers. This development lacks the hallmarks of a grammaticalization process and can more adequately be viewed as purely syntactic reanalysis.

- Borkovskij, V. 1979. *Istoričeskaja grammatika ruskogo jazyka. Sintaksis. Složnoe predloženie.* Moskva: Nauka.
- Harris, A. & Campbell, L. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective.* Cambridge: CUP.
- Hopper, P. & Traugott, E. 2003. *Grammaticalization.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mendoza, I. 2007. Relativsätze in den Birkenrindentexten. In: Junghanns, U. (ed.): *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik. XIII. JungslavistInnen-Treffen Leipzig 2004.* München: Sagner. 49-62.
- Roberts, I. & Roussou, A. 2003. *Syntactic change. A minimalist approach to grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Večerka, R. 2002. Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax. IV. Die Satztypen: der zusammenhängende Satz. Freiburg.

Olga M. Mladenova
omladen@ucalgary.ca
University of Calgary

From ±finiteness to connectors: A Bulgarian scenario of morphosyntactic change

24.02.2010, 17.00–17.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

One of the important markers of dependency status in Slavic is ±finiteness. This is true of most contemporary Slavic languages and even more so of Old Church Slavonic that besides an infinitive also featured a supine and various participial constructions (such as *Dativus Absolutus*). The well-known exceptions to this rule are the Balkan Slavic languages. One of the manifestations of the pervasive trend towards analytism which succeeded synthetic structures in these languages is the loss of the infinitive and its replacement with the subordinative connector *da* followed by a conjunctive (MacRobert 1980; Joseph 1983). There is however no reason to privilege the infinitive on the synthetic side of the divide and the *da*-construction on its analytic side. The comprehensive text-based study of the variety of early modern Bulgarian analytic replacements of synthetic finite & non-finite verbal constructions demonstrates the existence of analytic options ranging from coordination by means of the most frequent connector *i* ‘and’ to the connector *ta* with intermediary properties between coordination and subordination and, finally, to the subordinative connector *da*. Comparison with the non-Slavic Balkan languages brings to the fore a similar picture, except that only Romanian uses a separate connector with intermediary properties (*de*) and a fourth option appears on the stage: the asyndetic juxtaposition of two conjoined finite verbs (Fraenkel 1926: 304-307; Frîncu 1969; Civ’jan 1973: 122-123). Since coordinative *i* is in later texts and the contemporary language banned from this slot and it sometimes corresponds to Greek *καί* ‘and’ in the original text from which the Bulgarian was translated, it can be seen as a bookish feature of those texts that did not reflect actual linguistic use. For Bulgarian *ta* one can reconstruct a path from a focus particle first to a coordinative and later to a subordinative connector. This amounts to a radical change of distribution from exocentric to endocentric constructions, which must have been triggered by the decline of the ±finiteness marker (Mladenova 2010). The earliest connector to be introduced in this environment – subordinative *da* – perhaps took a similar path for which we have indirect evidence in the recurring similarities in the constellations of functions that *ta* and *da* have across Slavia as well as in their hypothetical common

origin (Nikolaeva 2008: 266-269, 280, 291-292). The paper will search for additional arguments for or against such a scenario of *da*'s evolution.

- CIV'JAN, T. V. 1973. Appozicija v svjazi s nekotorymi tendencijami razvitija sintaksičeskix struktur novogrečeskogo jazyka. *Balkanskoe jazykoznanie*, ed. S. B. Bernštejn & G. P. Klepikova, 93-141. Moskva: Nauka.
- FRAENKEL, E. 1926. Zur Parataxe und Hypotaxe im Griechischen, Baltoslawischen und Albanischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 43.290-315.
- FRÎNCU, C. 1969. Cu privire la "uniunea lingvistică balcanică". Înlocuirea infinitivului prin construcții personale în limba română veche. *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară*, 20.69-116.
- JOSEPH, B. D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MACROBERT, C. M. 1980. *The Decline of the Infinitive in Bulgarian* (PhD Dissertation). Oxford: University of Oxford.
- MLADENOVA, O. M. 2010. Bulgarian *ta*. *Balkanistica* 23.237-265.
- NIKOLAEVA, T. M. 2008. *Neparadigmatičeskaja lingvistika: Istorija "bluždajuščix častic"*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur.

Emanuela Sanfelici & Cristina Bertoncin
emanuela.sanfelici@sns.it, cristina.bertoncin@sns.it
Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa

The syntax-semantics interface of non-finite clauses in Irish and Basque: a diachronic perspective

24.02.2010, 17.30–18.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

This work proposes a diachronic and comparative study of the syntax-semantics interface of non-finite clauses in Irish and Basque within the Minimalist Program framework (Chomsky 2000, 2001). These two languages share some interesting features, such as the syntax of numerals (vigesimality), the auxiliary system (two copulas), accentual system, and vocabulary (Vennemann 2003). In this work we test whether there are similarities in the syntactic patterns of non-finite complementation in these two languages.

One of the most striking features of the Celtic languages (Thurneysen 1946) is the lack of infinitive as inflectional category. Instead, a verbal noun (VN) is used: the VN is a form synchronically derived from a verbal nominalization and as all nouns it is regularly inflected for number. Mainly, there exist two syntactic structures for encoding complementation: (1) VN_[NOM/ACC] (its arguments show nominal cases, such as genitive for objects of transitive verbs and subjects of intransitive verbs, and dative in the PPs encoding the subject of transitive verbs, if overtly realized); (2) *do* "to" +VN_[DAT] (the subject or the object of the VN can appear in nominative or in accusative). We will focus on the latter construction (2), analysing the internal syntax and the semantic values it encodes. For Old and Middle Irish, it has been proposed (Disterheft 1980) that this structure implies raising-to-subject and raising-to-object. We rather propose a different approach: in non-finite clauses the structure *do*+VN_[DAT] can assign case to its arguments, so that they stay in the subordinate clause instead of raising to the matrix clause, and then we focus on the internal syntax of non-finite clauses, with special attention to the complementary distribution of PRO and lexical subjects.

In Basque, in all its stages, predicate of non-finite clauses is a verbal nominalization (VN): a suffix in *-tze/-te* is attached to every verbal stems. The VN is a true noun, in the sense that it is inflected for case. The encoding of its arguments is typically

verbal: ergative for the subjects of transitive verbs, and absolutive for objects of transitive verbs and subjects of intransitive verbs. Beside this construction, there exists also a more nominal one (Trask 1997) – as well as in Old and Middle Irish –, i.e. the transitive VN as a complement of motion verbs. In this case, the VN assigns genitive to its object instead of absolutive, and the subject of the motion verb must control the VN. This syntactic pattern was found in all northern texts (French Basque) from the earliest to the most recent, and it is still present in the northern speech nowadays. In Southern Basque varieties, in turn, this construction is not attested, and the verbal (ergative-absolutive) system is used.

This work hopes to elucidate the diachronic change of syntactic parameters and the syntax-semantics interface in non-finite sentential complementation, focusing on the status of PRO and on Case-theory.

Chomsky, N., 2000, Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Martin, R. *et al.* (eds.), *Step by Step*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp.89-155.

Chomsky, N., 2001, Derivation by phase. In Kenstowicz, M., (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 1-52.

Disterheft, D., 1980, *The Syntactic Development of the Infinitive in Indo-European*, Slavica Press, Columbus, Ohio.

Thurneysen, R., 1946, [reprint 2003], *A Grammar of Old Irish*, School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin.

Trask, R., 1997, *The History of Basque*, Routledge, London/New York.

Vennemann, T., 2003, *Europa Vasconica - Europa Semitica*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Chris Reintges
CReintges@linguist.jussieu.fr
CNRS-Université Paris 7

In between coordination and subordination: The case of the Coptic Egyptian conjunctive

24.02.2010, 18.00–18.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

1. BACKGROUND. Foley & Van Valin (1984: chapter 6) acknowledge three types of interclausal nexus relations: coordination, subordination, and cosubordination. The three types of interclausal nexus are defined in terms of two syntactic parameters [\pm dependent] and [\pm embedded], cf. table 1.

Table 1. *A ternary distinction of nexus relations*

COORDINATION	[– embedded]	[– dependent]
SUBORDINATION	[+ embedded]	[+ dependent]
COSUBORDINATION	[– embedded]	[+ dependent]

Cosubordination behaves syntactically like standard symmetric coordination in that the linked clauses are neither modifiers nor arguments of the main verb in superordinate clause. Cosubordination is distinguished syntactically from coordination in that the linked clauses depend on a superordinate clause in some feature, for instance, tense, aspect and illocutionary force.

2. THE CONJUNCTIVE CONJUGATION. Coptic Egyptian [Ancient Egyptian, 3rd–11th c. AD] has several dependent verb conjugations to formally encode asymmetric VP/clause coordination. The most central one is the conjunctive, in which several clauses are placed in sequence, but neither of them is embedded in the other. Conjunctive verbs have no inherent temporal, aspectual or modal features of their own. Rather, the exponent of asymmetric clause linkage occupies the same position as pre-subject

tense/aspect/mood particles. As a result, conjunctive verbs receive a temporal and aspectual value by being anaphorically related to a controlling verb in the initial conjunct.

- (1) *Binary clause coordination with conjunctive verb* (Testament of Isaac 233, 13-14)
se=na-mere pə-βios ən-t-anakhɔ:rɛ:sis et-waaβ
3PL=FUT-love.NOM DEF.M.SG-life LINK-DEF.F.SG-seclusion COMP.REL-be.holy.STAT
ən=se-apatasse əm-pə-kosmos
CONJ=3PL-renounce.ABS PREP-DEF.M.SG-world
'They (the hermits) will love the life of holy seclusion and renounce the world.'

There are, however, other instances of conjunctive clauses, which share with subordinate clauses the property of being embedded into the syntactic structure of the main clause.

- (2) *Conjunctive complements to manipulative verbs* (Till, KHML I 5, 18-19)
awɔ: a=f-keleue nə=se-entə=f etʃəm pə-βɛ:ma
and PERF=3SG.M-demand.ABS CONJ=3PL-bring.PRON-3SG.M to DEF.M.SG-tribunal
'And he (the governor) ordered (that) they bring him (Apa Nahrow) to the tribunal.'

3. SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS. The anaphoric tense function of the conjunctive can be directly related to its morpho-syntax, which involves the external merge of a relative complementizer into the designated functional projection for tense. As relative complementizers, the base morphemes *nə-* can be co-indexed with the tense/aspect particle in the first conjunct. I will argue that the conjunctive morpheme is merged into a left-peripheral *Fin*(initeness) projection in the Rizian (1997) cartography. In this position (*FIN0*), it is in complementary distribution with tense/aspect particles. To account for the high degree of overlap between coordinated and adverbially subordinated conjunctive clauses, I will argue that both co-subordinative and subordinative nexus involve the same peripheral level of structural embedding, namely adjunction.

Robert Truswell

rtruswel@staffmail.ed.ac.uk

University of Edinburgh

Syntactic and Semantic Dependencies in Early Modern English Relative Clauses

25.02.2010, 9.00–9.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

This talk is concerned with a relative construction found in 16th–19th century English, illustrated in (1).

- (1) They might stifle his evidence; [[which to prevent__], he put it in safe hands]

These constructions involve three clauses: an *antecedent clause* 'they might stifle his evidence'; a *island clause* 'which to prevent'; and a *host clause* 'he put it in safe hands'. The last two clauses may be considered together as a 'Relative with a Leftward Island', or 'RLI'. I show that the unusual, tricausal nature of the construction arises as a result of a discrepancy between the syntactic and semantic dependencies holding within it.

RLIs are a variety of continuative relative clause: they are nonrestrictive, and are typically used to advance a narrative. Examples like (2) strongly suggest that the island and host clauses form a syntactic and semantic unit to the exclusion of the antecedent clause.

- (2) she must needs resist (this force); [[which if she be not able to do__], then followeth her Death and Destruction].

Furthermore, theoretical and empirical considerations lead us to conclude that the relative pronoun remains within the island clause: theoretically, the alternative would involve extraction from a strong island; empirically, if the relative pronoun could leave the island clause, we would expect it to be able to continue to move successive-cyclically, producing examples like (3), but such examples are never found.

- (3) * . . . which I am sure that if she be not able to do__ , then followeth her Death and Destruction.

Finally, there is some evidence that RLIs are syntactically un subordinat ed: they are never found sentence-medially, unlike regular relative clauses, which suggests a treatment of them as syntactically independent sentences. Syntactically, then, the only relationship between clauses is the subordination of the island clause to the host clause.

This means that the relative pronoun in an RLI functions as an E-type pronoun, finding its antecedent without any help from the syntax. The existence of RLIs is therefore predicted to correlate with the presence of regular relative clauses with nonlocal antecedents, as in (4), which, like RLIs, are essentially unattested in Present-Day English.

- (4) thy frendes_i do styke fast to the_j, [whych_i will not suffer the to wante comforte of the tyme presente, nor hope of the tyme to come].

Many researchers (Sells 1986, Demirdache 1991) have concluded that the nonrestrictive relative pronoun in Present-Day English is also an E-type pronoun. However, both RLIs and examples like (4) have disappeared. Preliminary data suggest that the two constructions may have declined in parallel, beginning in the late 17th century. This suggests the hypothesis that there is a syntactic condition forcing relative clauses to be merged subordinate (and adjacent) to their antecedents in PDE, which was absent in earlier periods.

Demirdache, H. (1991). Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives and Dislocation Structures. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.

Sells, P. (1986). Coreference and Bound Anaphora: A Restatement of the Facts. In Proceedings of NELS 16, pp.434–446.

Ulyana Senyuk
u.senyuk@mx.uni-saarland.de
Universität des Saarlandes

Zum Status der durch *d*-Wörter eingeleiteten Sätze im Frühneuhochdeutschen
25.02.2010, 9.30–10.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

Während die Einordnung bestimmter Nebensatztypen im Gegenwartsdeutschen mittels der klar ausgeprägten Subordinationsmarker meistens unproblematisch ist,

scheint das in den älteren Stufen des Deutschen aufgrund funktionaler Mehrdeutigkeiten nicht immer der Fall zu sein.

Gegenstand meines Vortrags sind Sätze wie in (1a/b) aus dem Frühneuhochdeutschen, die durch pronominale *d*-Wörter (Pronominaladverbien oder Demonstrativpronomina) eingeleitet sind und Verbendstellung aufweisen:

- 1 a. Die Ungarische Stände wollen der Römisch. Kayserin Kröhnung aus gewissen Ursachen eher/ als man gedachte/ befördert haben/ **deßwegen sich einige Magnaten allhier befinden.** (MER 380:22)
- b. daher kumpt/ das in der not/ ein yglicher teuffen/ vnd absolutieren kann/ **das nit muglich were /** (Luther, An den christlichen Adel, S. 367)

In der bisherigen Forschungsliteratur wurden diese Sätze als Hauptsätze mit Verbendstellung analysiert (vgl. Lötscher 2000). In meinem Vortrag möchte ich dafür argumentieren, dass die vorliegenden Sätze abhängigen Status haben.

Ausgangspunkt meiner Argumentation bilden die weiterführenden Relativsätze im Gegenwartsdeutschen, die einen Mischfall zwischen Koordination und Subordination bilden (vgl. Hollers Analyse 2005) und im Rahmen der graduellen Subordinationstheorie (vgl. Reis 1997, Fabricius-Hansen 1992) an die Peripherie der Subordination platziert und als nicht-kanonische, nicht-eingebettete und nicht-integrierte Nebensätze klassifiziert werden. Die untersuchten Sätze aus dem Frühneuhochdeutschen weisen die gleichen grammatischen Eigenschaften wie weiterführende Relativsätze im Gwd.: Semantisch und pragmatisch verhalten sie sich wie Hauptsätze (vgl. eine eigene Proposition und Fokus-Hintergrund-Gliederung) und auf der formalen Ebene sehen sie wie die abhängigen Sätze aus (vgl. relative Einleiter und Verbendstellung). Ferner sollen im Vortrag auch die *afinite* Konstruktion, die für die Syntax des Frühneuhochdeutschen sehr typisch ist, als zusätzlicher Marker der Abhängigkeit diskutiert werden.

Fabricius-Hansen, C. (1992): Subordination. In: Hoffmann, L. (Hg.): Deutsche Syntax. Ansichten und Aussichten. Berlin: de Gruyter, 458-483.

Holler, A. (2005): Weiterführende Relativsätze. Empirische und theoretische Aspekte. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Lötscher, A. (2000): Verbendstellung im Hauptsatz in der deutschen Prosa des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts. In: Sprachwissenschaft 25, 153-191.

Reis, M (1997): Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweit-Sätze. In: Dürscheid, C., Ramers, K.-H. & Schwarz, M. (Hgg.): Sprache im Fokus. Festschrift für Heinz Vater zum 65. Geburtstag. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 121-144.

Augustin Speyer

Speyer@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main

Zur Integriertheit kausaler (Neben-) Sätze im Frühneuhochdeutschen

25.02.2010, 10.00–10.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

Kausale Verhältnisse können im heutigen Deutsch durch syntaktisch integrierte Nebensätze (1) oder durch Koordination zweier Hauptsätze (2a, b) ausgedrückt werden.

- (1) Karl verfolgt den Einbrecher, weil es ihm der Inspektor befohlen hat.
- (2) a. Uller schaltete das Licht an. Denn es war sehr dunkel.
b. Das ist unklug, weil es hat ja die letzte Zeit viel geregnet.

Der Status von Sätzen wie (2b) ist unklar; gegen die Integriertheit spricht u.a. die Verbstellung und die Tatsache, dass sie nur in der rechten Peripherie auftreten können (3a), wohingegen wirklich integrierte Sätze stellungsmäßig freier sind (3b, c; zu Kriterien der Integriertheit vgl. Reis 1997; Wöllstein 2008). Sätze wie (2b) sind im heutigen Deutsch, v.a. in oberdeutschen Dialekten (Scheutz 2001) sehr verbreitet und werden gemeinhin als Ausdruck eines Sprachwandelprozesses hin zur Parataxe gesehen.

- (3) a. *Weil es war sehr dunkel, schaltete Uller das Licht an
 b. Weil es sehr dunkel war schaltete Uller das Licht an
 c. Uller schaltete, weil es sehr dunkel war, das Licht an.

Diese Optionalität, das adverbiale Verhältnis integriert oder nicht integriert auszudrücken, unterscheidet Kausalsätze von den meisten anderen adverbialen Bestimmungen, z.B. Konditionalsätzen oder Finalsätzen, die nur in subordinierter Form realisiert werden können. Doch ist es keine wirkliche Optionalität, da Sätze wie (2b) nur unter bestimmten semantischen und pragmatischen Bedingungen möglich sind (Uhmann 1998).

Betrachtet man kausale Bestimmungen im Frühneuhochdeutschen, stellt man fest, dass sie wesentlich häufiger als syntaktisch dependente Adjunksätze, aber auch als andere Adverbialbestimmungen nur mangelhaft integriert sind: Entweder sie sind als Satz mit Verbzweitstellung realisiert, die zu der Zeit für Hauptsätze bereits die Norm ist. Oder sie stehen, wenn sie für subordinierte Sätze typische Verbletzstellung aufweisen, an der äußersten rechten Peripherie, in der Position, die nach Reis (1997) für unintegrierte Nebensätze charakteristisch ist. Subordiniert können Kausalsätze im Frühneuhochdeutschen nur unter bestimmten informationsstrukturellen und semantischen Bedingungen stehen. In meinem Vortrag identifiziere ich diese Bedingungen und schlage einen Bogen zum heutigen Deutsch. Dabei zeigt sich, dass die Bedingungen, die heute für den Wechsel von integrierten und nichtintegrierten Kausalsätzen greifen, bereits im Frühneuhochdeutschen erkennbar sind, und dass die nichtintegrierte Variante die eindeutig bevorzugte ist. Somit handelt es sich bei dem heute feststellbaren Phänomen unintegrierter Kausalsätze nicht um ein Sprachwandelphänomen, sondern um eine Perpetuierung des frühneuhochdeutschen Befunds, die sich in der Umgangssprache halten kann, da keine stilistischen Vorgaben inferieren.

Reis, Marga (1997): Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweitsätze. In: Dürscheid, Christa, Karl-Heinz Ramers & Monika Schwarz (Hgg.): Sprache im Fokus. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 121-144

Scheutz, Hannes (2001): On causal clause combining: the case of weil in spoken German. In: Selting, Margret & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (Hgg.): Studies in interactional linguistics. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 111-139.

Uhmann, Susanne (1998): Verbstellungsvariation in Weil -Sätzen: Lexikalische Differenzierung mit grammatischen Folgen, Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 17: 92-139.

Wöllstein, Angelika (2008): *Konzepte der Satzkonnexion*. Studien zur Deutschen Grammatik (SdG 70) Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Svetlana Petrova
s.petrova@staff.hu-berlin.de
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

(Non)veridicality and sentential complementation in the history of German
25.02.2010, 10.30–11.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

A number of empirical facts suggest that mood selection in dependent clauses in older German is explainable if we apply the notion of (non)veridicality, cf. Giannakidou (in press). While variation between indicative and subjunctive is characteristic for veridical predicates, nonveridicality, i.e. the lack of truth inference, is a basic property unifying the types of dependent clauses that strictly select the subjunctive in Old High German. These are complement clauses of directive/volitive predicates (1), concessive clauses, temporal clauses opened by *before* as well as relative clauses in the scope of negation. Exactly these contexts are known to select the subjunctive complementizers *na* in Greek and *da* in Bulgarian, as opposed to the indicative complementizers *pu/oti* in Greek and *ce* in Bulgarian.

(Non)veridicality also determines some later developments in clause complementation in German. In modern German, complements of veridical predicates allow embedded V2, while those of nonveridical predicates block it (2), unless a modal verb is introduced in the complement clause (3). Again, there are cross-linguistic parallels in this respect. Meinunger (2006, 467) observes that V2-blockers in modern German are the equivalents of those predicates that require the subjunctive in Romance. In Bulgarian, insertion of a modal verb in the complement clause of a directive verb automatically renders subjunctive *da*-complementation ungrammatical, requiring the default veridical complementizer *ce* (4a-b).

These facts show that the changes in mood selection in dependent clauses in German cannot be reduced to morphological erosion of the subjunctive itself but result from changes in the syntactic conditions licensing assertive reading in the clause. The paper suggests that these changes correlate with the establishment of an epistemic feature in C, triggering assertive reading and allowing for embedded V2, as proposed by Truckenbrodt (2006). The evolution of this requirement rules out embedded requests with a subjunctive main verb in C, which are attested for Middle High German (5) but ungrammatical today.

- (1) *bát hér Inan thaz her íz fon erdu / arleitti*-SBJ (Tatian 55, 10-11)
'[he] asked him to push it [the boat] away from the shore'
- (2) *Maria befiehlt Peter, dass er nach Hause geht/ *er geht nach Hause.*
'Maria orders Peter to go home'
- (3) *Maria befiehlt Peter, er möge/soll nach Hause gehen.*
'Maria orders Peter, he should go home'
- (4) a. *Maria kaza na Petar da/*ce otide v kashti.*
Maria said to Peter SUBJ-compl/*IND-compl go home.
b. *Maria kaza na Petar *da/ce trjabva da otide v kashti.*
'Maria said to Peter *SUBJ-compl/IND-compl must go home'
- (5) *(er) sagete sînen degenen, si waeren-SUBJ des gewar, daz ...*
(Paul 2007, 401)
'he said to his knights that they should take care that ...'

- Giannakidou, A. (in press): The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: Temporal semantics and polarity. In: *Lingua* (2009), doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.007.
- Meinunger, A. (2006): On the discourse impact of subordinate clauses. In *The Architecture of Focus*, eds. V. Molnár and S. Winkler, 459-487. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Paul, H. (2007): *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 25th edition. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Truckenbrodt, H. (2006): On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. In: *Theoretical Linguistics* 32 (3), 257-306.

Jackie Nordström
 Jackie.Nordstrom@nordlund.lu.se
 Lund University

Complementizers and propositional modality
 25.02.2010, 11.30–12.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

In the Germanic languages (and many others), there are two kind of subordinators: complementizers (including relativizers) and adverbial subordinators. In Nordström (2010), it is argued that complementizers are propositional-modal morphemes whereas adverbial subordinators are prepositions, prepositional phrases, and adverbs.

In the Germanic languages, it is argued that THAT (*dass* etc.) and IF (*ob* etc.) denote the realis-irrealis distinction: THAT is used for positive propositional attitudes, whereas IF is used for negative ones. THAT is the unmarked choice after factive, semifactive, speculative and reportative predicates, whereas IF is the only choice after predicates of uncertainty, dependence, discussion, investigation, asking etc. Importantly, IF can also occur after semifactive and reportative predicates to indicate that the speaker (and sometimes also the matrix subject) does not know whether or not the proposition is true (Sitta 1971, CGEL, SAG). In English and Swedish, furthermore, IF is also used in conditional protases to indicate that the proposition is hypothetical. With this meaning, it can also occur after certain factive predicates (e.g. predicates of caring, forgetting). Corpus searches in German, English, and Swedish further show that IF is used after dubitative predicates when both the speaker and the matrix subject have doubts over the veracity of the proposition. However, when the speaker, in contrast to the matrix subject, does not doubt that the proposition is true, THAT is used (THAT is also used when the proposition is given information). The use of THAT and IF highly correlates with the use of the indicative-subjunctive in languages such as Spanish.

It is further argued that English restrictive relative *that* is also a realis complementizer. It has the same origin as declarative *that*. Furthermore, restrictive relative clauses are typically presupposed to be true (i.e. semantically realis).

Lastly, it is argued that adverbial subordinators belong to different parts of speech than complementizers. Although adverbial subordinate clauses can often be classified as either factual ('because', 'when', 'although' etc.) or non-factual ('in case', 'as if' etc.; Hengeveld 1998), they often have prepositional or adverbial homonyms (*seit, bis, während; before, after, since* etc.). Furthermore, in the West European languages, adverbial subordinators are often complex, consisting of an adverbial first element and a complementizer as a second element (*so dass, als ob; in that, even if; parce que, en ca que*; Kortmann 1998). The adverbial subordinators are therefore analyzed as prepositions, prepositional phrases, or adverbs that select complement clauses headed by complementizers, which in turn determine whether the clause is

factual or non factual. Note that in English, some even function as factive predicates: *notwithstanding the fact that*. Conditional IF in English and Swedish, however, is analyzed as a complementizer because of its related use in complement clauses. Furthermore, in colloquial Swedish, conditional *om* can be preceded by the adverbial *ifall*, i.e. *ifall om* 'in case if'.

- The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. 2002. Rodney D. Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds). Cambridge: CUP.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1998. Adverbial clauses. In Johan van der Auwera (ed.) *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. 335–420. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, Bernd. 1998. Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera (ed.) *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. 457–562. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nordström, Jackie. 2010. *Modality and Subordinators*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sitta, Horst. 1971. *Semanteme und Relationen: Zur Systematik d. Inhaltssatzgefüge im Dt.* Frankfurt: Athenäum-Verlag
- Svenska Akademiens Grammatik*. 1999. Ulf Teleman, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. Stockholm: Nordsteds Ordbok.

Anna Martowicz
anna@ling.ed.ac.uk
University of Edinburgh

From markers of mood to markers of conditionality and purpose: Remarks on grammaticalization

25.02.2010, 12.00–12.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

In the languages of the world the interclausal relations of purpose and conditionality are, similarly to other circumstantial relations, encoded by a range of strategies – from juxtaposition, through specialized verb forms and marked word order to more or less grammaticalized markers called in the European linguistic tradition adverbial subordinators. The domain of circumstantial relations still awaits more systematic research treatment (the most extensive study so far is that written by Kortmann (1997) which is focused exclusively on the European languages). One of the issues that call for more detailed study is that of grammaticalization pathways that led to the emergence of the broadly understood markers of subordination. This paper aims to contribute to our state of knowledge in this area by discussing one of the sources of markers of conditional and purpose clauses.

In their list of sources of explicit markers of conditional clauses Heine and Kuteva (2002) mentioned copula, verb 'to say', interrogatives (polar questions) as well as temporal conjunctions 'while' and 'when'. Purpose markers, according to the authors, come most often from verbs ('to say', 'to give', 'to come to', 'to go to'), nouns ('matter', 'fact', 'affair'), benefactive and allative markers (be they case suffixes or adpositions) and complementizers. One of the interesting groups of grammatical categories that the authors left unmentioned are mood markers and particles with related functions. Cross-linguistic data provide us with numerous examples of syntactic and functional overlaps (polysems) where an intentional mood marker, for instance, is also used as a clause-linking device (subordinator) in clauses of purpose (1a,b) or where a perfective irrealis marker has a polyseme in the group of explicit exponents of conditional relations (2a,b).

1. Retuara

- a) Parua ki-baʔa-ērā baa-yu
Banana 3SGM-eat-INTEN do-PRES
'He is going to eat the banana' (or 'He is about to eat the banana')
- b) ki-re dā-wapahī-reʔā kopereka ki-taʔa-ērā
3SGM-TERM 3PL-pay-PST 3SGM-guard-PURP
'They paid him to guard the door'

2. Kayah Li

- a) pe la síplɔno lu to nʌ ke
1P intrusively understand ʒOBV NEG NØ PERFIRR
'We just don't understand them'
- b) vɛ ke já sʌ boʌ ka lo bɣ ʔʌ
1SG COND die and.then go:TH bury at:V this
'If I ('go and') die, come bury me here'

Drawing on examples from Vitu, Nivkh, Suppyire, Central Alaskan Yup'ik, Polish, Khwe, Retuarā, Lezgian, Achagua, Ilokano, Warlpiri, Lepcha, Kayah Li and Santali I attempt to explain the processes of reanalysis that stood behind the grammaticalization pathway from mood (and related) markers to the markers of circumstantial relations of conditionality and purpose.

HEINE B., KUTEVA T. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KORTMANN B. (1997). *Adverbial Subordination. A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kerstin Schwabe & Robert Fittler
schwabe@zas.gwz-berlin.de
ZAS Berlin, Berlin

Conditionals as indirect complements
25.02.2010, 12.30–13.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

There are conditionals in German like (1) where the pronouns *es* or *darüber* in the consequent can be co-referent with the antecedent (Fabricius-Hansen 1980).

- (1) a. Frank bedauert es_i [wenn Maria kommt]_i
Frank regrets it if Maria will come
b. Frank ist traurig darüber_i [wenn Maria kommt]_i
F is sad about if Maria will come
c. Frank zieht es_i vor [wenn Maria kommt]_i

These constructions, for short the *wenn-form*, can be paraphrased by an implication where the consequent contains a correlate (*cor*) and an embedded *dass*-clause.

- (2) F predicate pronoun, wenn σ : $(-)\sigma \Rightarrow$ F predicate *cor* *dass* σ

Unlike their corresponding constructions with an embedded declarative, preposed *wenn*-forms can have in their consequent a pronoun – cf. *Wenn M kommt, bedauert es F* vs. *Dass M kommt, bedauert *es F* 'That M is coming F regrets it'.

The joint reference of the pronoun and conditional is, however, impossible with predicates like *annehmen* 'assume', *hoffen dass* 'hope', *(es) bedenken dass* 'consider', and *darüber nachdenken dass* 'think about'. Predicates licensing the *wenn*-form are shown in the following exemplary list:

- (3) a. *wissen* 'know', *hören* 'hear', *fühlen* 'feel', *sehen* 'see', *sagen* 'tell',
b. *akzeptieren* 'accept', *bedauern* 'regret'
c. *(darüber) traurig sein* 'be sad', *(darüber) froh sein* 'be glad'
d. *vorziehen* 'prefer'

The talk will present that and how the co-reference of the clausal pronoun and the antecedent in *wenn*-forms depends on particular semantic properties of the matrix predicate.

Except for *sagen* 'tell' all verbs in (3) are inherently (anti-)factive or (anti-)veridical (cf. Schwabe & Fittler's (2009a) or Egré's (2008) notions) provided they exhibit a correlate:

- (4) F predicate cor dass $\sigma \Rightarrow (\neg) \sigma$
a. F bedauert es [nicht], dass M kommt \Rightarrow M kommt
b. F ist [nicht] darüber traurig, dass M kommt \Rightarrow M kommt
c. F zieht es [nicht] vor, dass M kommt \Rightarrow M kommt nicht

Like all predicates in (3a) – they belong to the so called *objective predicates* (cf. Schwabe & Fittler 2009 a,b) – *sagen* 'tell' is factive if it occurs in a *wenn*-form.

The (anti-)factivity (4) and the paraphrase (2) together imply that σ is a necessary and sufficient condition for 'F predicate cor dass σ '. Thus, (2) and (4) imply the following equivalence:

- (5) F predicate cor, dass $\sigma \Leftrightarrow \{(\neg) \sigma \ \& \ [(\neg) \sigma \Rightarrow \text{F predicate, dass } \sigma]\}$

This equivalence thus can be regarded to be a necessary condition for a well-formed *wenn*-form.

A further analysis leads to the following characterization of embedding predicates licensing the *wenn*-form: The predicates are either *i.* objective and semi-implicative (3a) or *ii.* non-objective and factive and invalid with tautologies (3b) or *iii.* non-objective and cognitive [F predicate dass $\sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$ follows from what x knows & σ is not tautological] (3c) or *iv.* non-objective and anti-factive (3d).

Égré, P. (2008), "Question-Embedding and Factivity", *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 77, 85-125.

Fabricius-Hansen, C., "Sogenannte ergänzende wenn-Sätze. Ein Beispiel syntaktisch- semantischer Argumentation". In: Festschrift für Gunnar Bech zum 60. Geburtstag. *Kopenhagener Beiträge zur germanistischen Linguistik*, Sonderband 1. København.

Schwabe K. & Fittler R. (2009a), "Semantic Characterizations of German Question-Embedding Predicates", in: P. Bosch, D. Gabelaia, and J. Lang (eds.): *TbiLLC 2007*, LNAI 5422, 229-241. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Schwabe K. & Fittler R. (2009b), "Syntactic force of consistency conditions for German matrix predicates, proceedings of The Tenth Symposium on Logic and Language. Balatonszemes, August 26-29 2009.

Elly van Gelderen
 ellyvangelder@asu.edu
 Arizona State University
The CP-Cycle: Increasing Subordination
 26.02.2010, 11.30–12.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

In this paper, I will explore changes in markers of subordination during the history of English. I focus on some changes that can be characterized as cyclical: from pronoun and from prepositional phrase to complementizer. After an introduction, in which I review the typical sources for complementizers, I discuss *whether* and PPs headed by *after*, *for*, and *in*. I end by providing an account of this using a Minimalist framework.

Whether is an interrogative pronoun in Old English (1) and, after frequent preposing, as in (2) and (3), is reanalyzed as an element in the left-most layer of the sentence.

- (1) ... *witig god on swa hwæþere hond, ... mærdō deme swa him gemet þince.*
 wise lord to so which-ever hand ... glory grant so him right think
 'And may the wise lord grant glory to whichever side he thinks right.'
 (*Beowulf* 686)
- (2) ***Hwæðer þara twegra dyde þæs fæder willan***
 'Who of-the two did the father's will?'
 (*West Saxon Gospel Corpus*, Matthew 21.31)
- (3) ***hwæðer sel mæge æfter wælræse wunde gedygan uncer twega***
 who better may after bloody-storm wounds survive 1.D.GEN two-GEN
 'Who of us two is better at surviving wound after the deadly battle?'
 (*Beowulf* 2530-2)

The interrogative is reanalyzed as yes-no marker but as well as a subordinate C, as in the ambiguous (4).

- (4) *se snotera bad. hwæþer him alwalda æfre wille ... wyrpe gefremman*
 the wise waited whether him almighty ever would ... change accomplish
 'the wise one waited whether the almighty would ever grant him change.'
 (*Beowulf* 1313-5)

A similar pattern occurs with prepositional phrases that are clear VP-adverbials in (5) but increasingly get fronted in (6) and then reanalyzed as part of the CP layer in (7).

- (5) *æþelinga gedriht swefan æfter symble*
 noble company sleeping after feast (*Beowulf* 118-9)
- (6) ***Æfter þysan com Thomas to Cantwarebyri***
 'After this, Thomas came to Canterbury.' (Chron A, a 1070)
- (7) *Her forðferde ... 7 æfter þon forðferde Gyric mæsse preost.*
 'In this year died ... and after that died Gyric the mass-priest.'
 (Chron A, a 963)

The explanation I will suggest is in terms of minimalist feature economy. The pronoun *whether's* semantic Q-features in (1) and (2) are reanalyzed as [i-Q] in (3) and (4). Likewise in the case of the PP, the semantic spatial and temporal features are reanalyzed as grammatical ones. I examine the types of features (semantic, phi- and

case) that prepositions have and what happens to these after the reanalysis to complementizer.

Peter Öhl

lmu@oehl.ges-us-info.de

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

**Romanische und germanische Subjunktionen in einem ökonomiebasierten
Modell syntaktischen Wandels**

26.02.2010, 12.30–13.00 Uhr, Raum 1.201

Wir schlagen in diesem Beitrag ein generatives ökonomiebasiertes Sprachwandelmodell vor, das die kognitiven Aspekte performanzbasierter und beim Erstspracherwerb auftretender Wandel in einen Zusammenhang bringt. Zunächst erläutern wir dessen konzeptuelle Voraussetzungen und veranschaulichen diese anhand gängiger Beispiele aus der Diachronie des deutschen Subjunktionensystems (u.a. der Komplementierer *dass*; Adverbialsatzkonnectoren wie *weil*, *während*, *wenn*, *damit*). Im Anschluss diskutieren wir – mit einem Seitenblick auf einige (alt-)germanische Sprachen – die Entwicklung der lat. Komplementierer *quod/quia* (> it. *che*, frz. *que*), die wir von reinen Subjunktionen wie lat. *ut* abgrenzen, welche in dieser Hinsicht unter- bzw. gar unspezifiziert sind. So kann lat. *ut* neben deklarativen Objektsätzen auch temporale, konsekutive, finale, kausale, konzessive und sogar konditionale Adverbialsätze einleiten. In modernen roman. Sprachen wie Frz. und It. stehen an Stelle eines derartigen uneindeutigen Systems solche, die durch die relativ klare Trennung von verschiedenen Subjunktionen für Adverbialsätze und für Komplementsätze gekennzeichnet sind. Dies wurde ermöglicht durch die Grammatikalisierung von Elementen der relativen *qu*-Pronominalstämme zu spezifischen Subjunktionen und durch die Verdrängung der reinen Subjunktion *ut*.

Eine derartige Folge von Wandeln kann in einem ökonomiebasierten generativen Modell wie folgt erklärt werden: Hochgradig spezifizierte sprachliche Strukturen sind nicht etwa unökonomisch, sondern werden den Anforderungen kognitiver Ökonomie lediglich auf andere Weise gerecht, als geringer spezifizierte und deshalb weniger aufwändige Strukturen. So ist z.B. ein minimales Inventar von polysemen Ausdrücken im Lexikon zwar ökonomisch hinsichtlich des Aufwands an lexikalischem Material. Die ein-eindeutige Zuordnung von Denotaten erlaubt aber die Interpretation von Elementen ohne zusätzliche Operationen. Morphsyntaktisch bzw. lexikalisch explizitere Sprachsysteme sind also hinsichtlich der kognitiven Ökonomie nur anders entworfen, als einfacher strukturierte. Wir schlagen vor, dass diese Variation unter den Sprachen der Welt zum einen durch verschiedene *Strategien des Erstspracherwerbs* begründet ist, zum andern durch *performanzbasierte* Wandel, wobei augenscheinliche Überschneidungen darauf zurückzuführen sind, dass die sprachliche Performanz und die Verarbeitung sprachlichen Inputs beim Erstspracherwerb durch dieselben grundlegenden *Prinzipien kognitiver Ökonomie* gesteuert sind.

Ulrike Demske
u.demske@mx.uni-saarland.de
Universität des Saarlandes

**Subordinationsmarker im Deutschen: Zur Geschichte hypothetischer
Vergleichssätze**

26.02.2010, 13.00–13.30 Uhr, Raum 1.201

Die Subordination eines Teilsatzes lässt sich im Gegenwartsdeutschen mittels Verbstellung ebenso anzeigen wie durch geeignete Einleitungselemente. Im Regelfall lösen subordinierende Konjunktionen VE-Stellung aus, in Verbindung mit Konjunktionen wie *weil* und *obwohl* findet sich das finite Verb jedoch auch in Zweit-Stellung. Dieser Unterschied in der Verbstellung korreliert mit einem Unterschied in der Qualität der Subordinationsbeziehung: *Weil*-VE-Sätze sind integrative Bestandteile ihres Bezugssatzes, während *weil*-Verb-Zweit-Sätze nur lose mit ihrem Bezugssatz verknüpft sind, was sich mittels der jeweiligen Ausprägung der Satzverknüpfung auf syntaktischer, semantischer, pragmatischer und prosodischer Ebene nachweisen lässt. Für Konditionalsätze haben jüngst Axel & Wöllstein (2009) die Position vertreten, dass sich nur für die Sätze der Form *wenn* + VE-Stellung die einschlägigen Parameter für Integration nachweisen lassen, während konditionale Sätze mit Erst-Stellung des finiten Verbs unintegriert sind.

In diesem Beitrag soll es um die hypothetischen Vergleichssätze im Deutschen gehen, deren Subordinationsmarkierung in zweierlei Hinsicht aus dem Rahmen fällt: Hypothetische Vergleichssätze werden entweder eingeleitet durch *als*, dem das finite Verb in Erst-Stellung folgt, oder durch zweiteilige Subjunktionen (*als ob*, *als wenn*, *wie wenn*) in Verbindung mit VE-Stellung. Nur wenn man mit Oppenrieder (1991) annimmt, dass *als* und *wie* als Vergleichspartikeln zu analysieren sind, die Konditionalsätze entweder in Form eines VE-Satzes oder eines durch *ob* oder *wenn* subjunktional eingeleiteten VE-Satzes subkategorisieren, entsprechen die hypothetischen Vergleichssätze der kanonischen Subordinationsgrammatik des Deutschen. Aus gegenwartssprachlicher Perspektive stellt sich im Anschluss an Axel & Wöllstein (2009) die Frage, ob der Unterschied in der Verbstellung bei den hypothetischen Vergleichssätzen ebenfalls mit einem Unterschied in der Qualität der Subordinationsbeziehung korreliert, was an den einschlägigen syntaktischen, semantischen, pragmatischen und prosodischen Eigenschaften dieser Relation zu überprüfen ist. Aus diachroner Perspektive ist zu fragen, weshalb hypothetische Vergleichssätze im Mittelhochdeutschen ausschließlich durch VE-Sätze ausgedrückt werden können, die entweder durch *als* oder *als ob* eingeleitet werden, seit dem 16. Jhd. aber zunehmend *als* in Verbindung mit einem V1-Satz der sprachlichen Realisierung eines hypothetischen Vergleichs dient.

Ich werde in meinem Beitrag zeigen, dass hypothetische Vergleichssätze unabhängig von der Verbstellung im Gegenwartsdeutschen wie auch in den älteren Sprachstufen des Deutschen in ihren Bezugssatz integriert sind. Außerdem werde ich dafür argumentieren, dass Entstehung und Ausbreitung von hypothetischen Vergleichssätzen der Form *als* + V1-Stellung im Verlauf des Frühneuhochdeutschen maßgeblich beeinflusst werden von der Ausdifferenzierung im Inventar subordinierender Konjunktionen sowie der Konsolidierung der Subordinationsgrammatik in dieser Periode der deutschen Sprachgeschichte.