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1 Introduction

DFG research project “The syntax of functional left peripheries and its relation to information structure” (start: February 2015, PI: Julia Bacskaï-Atkari)

website: http://www.ling.uni-potsdam.de/~bacskaï-atkari/dfg.html

main goals: flexible model for the syntactic marking in functional left peripheries

• functional left peripheries and clause-typing
• functional left peripheries and information structure
• functional left peripheries and ellipsis

Phase 1: functional left peripheries and clause-typing – hypotheses:

• Left-peripheral functional heads are syntactic cues.
• Operators moving to the left periphery are also syntactic cues.
• Functional left peripheries are defined by economy and overtness requirements.

providing an alternative to rigid cartographic approaches

• the size of the CP-domain (and the functional vP-domain) is flexible
• determining factors: features, the (un)interpretability of features, lexical properties
• overtness as a key factor: interface requirements taken into consideration

languages: West Germanic (English, German, Dutch, also dialects)
lesser extent: Scandinavian languages, Yiddish, Hungarian, Romance languages
2 Approaches to the CP-periphery

CP-domain: responsible for clause-typing and marking finiteness

Rizzi (1997; 2004)

(1) ForceP (TopP) (FocP) (TopP) FinP

IntP in interrogatives may appear between ForceP and FinP

ForceP and FinP: may be headed by complementisers, hence true CP layers

suggests a one-to-one relationship between function and position – problematic

especially for information structural movement (Fanselow & Lenertová 2011, SFB-632)

• IS-related movement: [topic] or [focus] are not lexical features

• if TopP or FocP are designated layers, ForceP does not select FinP (Sobin 2002)

also: a given C head may be associated with various functions

e.g. that encodes declarative Force and finiteness

→ collapse of CP layer in Rizzi (1997; 2004) – often just a single C-element

no multiple complementisers in Standard Italian

complementiser combinations do not always follow a Force + Fin pattern

hypothetical or irreal comparatives: as if – rather two Force heads in German

German patterns (Jäger 2010: 469, ex. 4):

(2) a. Tilla läuft, als liefe sie um ihr Leben.
   Tilla runs than run.SBJV.3SG she for her.N life
   ‘Tilla is running, as if she were running for her life.’

b. Tilla läuft, als ob sie um ihr Leben liefe.
   Tilla runs than if she for her.N life run.SBJV.3SG
   ‘Tilla is running, as if she were running for her life.’

c. Tilla läuft, als wenn sie um ihr Leben liefe.
   Tilla runs than if she for her.N life run.SBJV.3SG
   ‘Tilla is running, as if she were running for her life.’

d. Tilla läuft, wie wenn sie um ihr Leben liefe.
   Tilla runs as if she for her.N life run.SBJV.3SG
   ‘Tilla is running, as if she were running for her life.’

availability of als and ob: cannot be combination of as-clause and if-clause (that is wie wenn), cf. also Jäger (2010)
grammaticalised form, one single left periphery

two C heads encoding [conditional] and [comparative] each

- lower C position: overt complementiser or verb movement
- higher C selects the lower one — no *wie liefe, *wie ob

lower C available for movement
  → no violation of the Minimal Link Condition (Chomsky 1995)

structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C CP} \\
\text{als C'} \\
\text{C} \ldots \\
\text{ob}
\end{array}
\]

dialectal variation in German comparative than-clauses

(4)  a. Romy ist größer \textbf{als} Peter.
    ‘Romy is taller than Peter.’

    b. %Romy ist größer \textbf{als wie} Peter.
    ‘Romy is taller than as Peter’

    c. %Romy ist größer \textbf{wie} Peter.
    ‘Romy is taller as Peter.’

independent evidence that both \textit{als} and \textit{wie} are heads in (4)
  see Jäger (2010), Bacskaï-Atkari (2014a;e)

→ two C heads in (4b), again not Force+Fin distinction
structure similar to (3):

(5) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C CP} \\
\text{als C'} \\
\text{C \ldots} \\
\text{wie}
\end{array}
\]

dialects that have \textit{als wie} may use \textit{als wie} in structures like (2), cf. (Thurmail 2001: 62)

(6) \%Er schreit, \textbf{als wie wenn} er beim Zahnarzt wäre.

`He is shouting as if he were at the dentist’s.’

structure on the basis of (3) and (5) should involve 3 heads, where the middle head is not even Int

(7) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C CP} \\
\text{als C'} \\
\text{C CP} \\
\text{wie C'} \\
\text{C \ldots} \\
\text{wenn}
\end{array}
\]

so: a rigid cartographic approach is untenable even for clause-typing, hence without IS-related movement

proposal: size of the CP defined purely by features and the availability of lexical elements specified for these features

key assumption: overtness
clause-typing operators (hence: C-operators): overtly encoding clause-typing features

C-operators categorially distinct from C heads, but both take part in overt encoding – feature of a head can be checked off either by inserting an element into the head or a phrase into the specifier

3 Embedded interrogatives

relevant features: [sub], [wh]

- [sub]: encoding finite subordination; encoded by a functional C head, does not have to be overt.
- [wh]: encoding the interrogative nature of the clause; encoded either by an operator (in wh-questions) or by a functional (C or F) head (polar questions); has to be overt in embedded clauses because no intonational distinction available

uninterpretable [wh] feature of a functional head checked off by insertion of a [wh] lexical head or by moving a [wh] operator to the specifier (or the head: Alemannic/Bavarian)

examples in English:

(8) a. I asked if Anthony had eaten the cheese.
b. I asked who had eaten the cheese.

structures:

(9) a. CP
    C’
    C[wh],[sub] . . .
    if[wh],[sub]

b. CP
   wh[wh] C’
   C[wh],[sub] . . .

no need for projecting a further layer for encoding [sub]

also: inserted head does not have to be lexically specified as [sub]

- German ob ‘if’ available in main clause questions (with some restrictions)
- some wh-elements in Bavarian/Alemannic move to the C head
Doubly Filled COMP effects in Alemannic and Bavarian (Bayer & Brandner 2008)

- phrase-sized wh-elements show the effect (with dass ‘that’) – wh-element phrase-sized if co-occurring with lexical phrases, P heads (even lexical case suffixes) – (10a) and (10b)
- head-sized wh-phrases (e.g. wer ‘who.NOM’, wen ‘who.ACC’, was ‘what.NOM/ACC’): dass cannot be inserted (regular pattern) – complementary distribution, hence the wh-element moves to the C head itself – (10c)
- head-sized wh-phrases show the effect if they are contrastively focussed and can be interpreted only as operators in a specifier – (10d)

examples from Alemannic:

(10) a. I frog mich wege wa dass die zwei Autos bruchet.
   I ask REFL for what that they two cars need
   ‘I wonder why they need two cars.’
   (Bayer & Brandner 2008: 88, ex. 3b)

b. I ha koa Ahnung, mid wa für-e Farb dass-er zfriede wär.
   I have no idea with what for-a colour that-he content would-be
   ‘I have no idea with what colour he would be happy.’
   (Bayer & Brandner 2008: 88, ex. 4b)

c. *I wett gern wisse, wa dass i do uusfille mus.
   I would gladly know what that I there out-fill must
   ‘I'd like to know what I have to fill out there.’
   (Bayer & Brandner 2008: 88, ex. 5b)

d. Ich woass WO dass er abfahrt aber noit WENN.
   I know where that he leaves but not-yet when
   ‘I know WHERE it (the train) will leave but not WHEN.’
   (Bayer & Brandner 2008: 93, ex. 18, quoting Noth 1993: 424)

movement of wh-element: targets the C head is possible, if not, it targets the [Spec,CP]
insertion of dass: subject clitic has to cliticise onto an element in the C head
(Bayer & Brandner 2008)

structure for Doubly Filled COMP pattern, see (10a):

(11) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{wege wa}_{[\text{wh}]} \quad \text{C'} \\
\text{C}_{[\text{wh}],[\text{sub}]} \\
\text{dass}_{[\text{sub}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

complementiser not specifically [wh] but should not be incompatible, i.e. [–wh]
insertion of lexically [wh] C element would check off the uninterpretable feature on C → the wh-phrase could not move

dialectal differences in the lexical properties of dass:

• [–wh] in Standard German
• underspecified for [±wh] in Alemannic/Bavarian

no need for projecting any further layer

Hungarian embedded interrogatives: regular split of [sub] and [wh]

(12) a. Szeretném tudni, (hogy) ki ette meg a sajtot.
    like.COND.1SG know.INF that who ate.3SG PRT the cheese.ACC
    ‘I would like to know who has eaten the cheese.’

    b. Szeretném tudni, (hogy) Mari ette-e meg a sajtot.
    like.COND.1SG know.INF that Mary ate.3SG-Q PRT the cheese.ACC
    ‘I would like to know who if it was Mary who has eaten the cheese.’

Hungarian seems to show a doubling pattern

but: two elements not on the same periphery

• hogy ‘that’: a C head, insensitive to [±wh] – see É. Kiss (2002)

structure:

(13) a. CP
    ┌─────┐
    │ C'  │
    └─────┘
      └───┘
        ┌─┐
        │ C[wh],[sub] ... (hogy)[sub] FP
        └─┘  
          ┌─┐
          │ klj[wh] F'  
          └─┘
            ┌─┐
            │ F[wh] VP
            └─┘
              ┌─┐
              │ ette_e t_i t_j meg
              └─┘

    b. CP
    ┌─────┐
    │ C'  │
    └─────┘
      └───┘
        ┌─┐
        │ C[wh],[sub] ... (hogy)[sub] FP
        └─┘  
          ┌─┐
          │ Mari_e F'
          └─┘
            ┌─┐
            │ F[wh] VP
            └─┘
              ┌─┐
              │ ette_e[wh] t_i t_j meg
              └─┘

[wh] feature passed on to the functional vP-domain – FP (functional projection) checked off either by wh-element or -e head
CP projection hosting *hogy* not generated as an extra layer on top of a *wh*-marking CP
one CP has to be there to encode [sub], [wh] passed on to a lower projection
difference in ordering in Germanic and Hungarian double marking
  - Germanic: *wh* + C head – Doubly Filled COMP effect, same CP
  - Hungarian: C head + *wh* – different left peripheries, separate CP and FP
  → marking of [wh] does not require multiple CPs

4 Relative clauses

relevant features: [sub], [rel]
  - [rel]: encoding the relative nature of the clause; encoded either by an operator or by a functional C head, does not have to be overt (if a zero [rel] head available in the lexicon, restrictions, e.g. English)

question: whether [rel] necessarily implies [sub]

there also non-finite relative clauses, see Chomsky (1977) for English
see Ackerman & Nikolaeva (2013) for a typological perspective

(14) A desk is a dangerous place **from which** to view the world. (John le Carré)


→ movement of the operator triggered even if [rel] is interpretable on the functional head

→ real doubling of [rel] head and [rel] operator possible

eamples in English:

(15) a. This is the book **that** explains the difference between cats and tigers.
    b. This is the book **which** explains the difference between cats and tigers.

structures:

(16) a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C}_{\text{[rel],[sub]}} \\
\text{that}_{\text{[rel],[sub]}} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{which}_{\text{[rel]}} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C}_{\text{[rel],[sub]}} \\
\end{array}
\]

no need for projecting a further layer for encoding [sub] in (16b)
in (16a): a covert operator moves to [Spec,CP] as there is no relative in situ
does not affect overt marking

Doubly Filled COMP pattern in English

Van (Gelderren 2013: 59, ex. 85):

(17) a. This program in which that I am involved is designed to help low-income
first generation attend a four year university and many of the resources
they...
b. it's down to the community in which that the people live.

structure:

```
CP
in which[rel] C'
  C[rel],[sub] ...
  that[rel],[sub]
```

inserted head: also a [rel] head, not any complementiser ↔ interrogatives

evidence from South German: wo instead of dass 'that' in relative clauses
see Brandner (2008), Brandner & Bräuning (2013)

• regular relative complementiser: wo
• relative operators also possible (obligatorily triggering V2) – pronouns are
  borrowings from Standard German
• doubling also possible (wh wo... V), cf. Weise (1917)
• → [rel] head filled either by an element lexically specified as [rel] or V-movement

[rel] head filled in varieties that do not have relative operators genuinely

• even in English: Middle English wh-based relative operator an innovation alongside
  that head, see Van Gelderen (2004; 2009)
• other languages without operators: Modern Icelandic sem and er (Thráinsson 2007)

Hungarian: a language without that-relatives

(19) Ez az az ember, aki felette a sajtomat.
    this that the person who.REL up.ate.3SG the cheese.POSS.1SG.ACC
    ‘This is the person who has eaten up my cheese.’

structure as in (16b)
relative clause formation follows a similar pattern also in earlier periods (Old and Middle Hungarian) – cf. Bacskaia-Atkari (2012; 2014a;c), Bacskaia-Atkari & Dékány (2015), see also Dömötör (1991), Sipos (1991), Juhász (1991)

but: a doubling-like pattern in late Old Hungarian and early Middle Hungarian

- *hogy* ‘that’ + relative pronoun

- see Galambos (1907), rediscovered by Kenesei (1992a;b), recently discussed by Bacskaia-Atkari (2012; 2013; 2014a;c; to appear), and Bacskaia-Atkari & Dékány (2014; 2015)

- not the dominant pattern (see Dömötör 2014)

(20) olyaat tezık raytad *hogy kytol* felz
such.ACC do.1SG you.SUP that who.ABL fear.2SG
‘I will do such on you that you fear.’ (Sándor Codex 14v)

*hogy* not a relative complementisers otherwise (Bacskaia-Atkari & Dékány 2015)
↔ English and German patterns
→ *hogy* marks subordination

structure:

(21)

```
CP
    |
    C'
     |   |
  C[rel]
     |   |
    C[rel]
     |   |
  hogy[rel]
     |   |
  ki[rel]
    |
```

question: why a separate CP for [sub] generated (no need for overt marking)

possible source: embedded degree clauses (analogy)
    cf. Bacskaia-Atkari (2014a;c) on the parallelism with relative clauses

also: comparative/equative sub clauses are relative clauses (cf. Chomsky 1977)

original comparative complementiser *hogy* ‘that’ gradually replaced by *mint* ‘how/as/than’

modelling of the process:


third stage in (22): *mint* ambiguous between an operator and a head
analogy: relative clauses generally can be introduced by subordinator + operator
difference in ordering in Germanic and Old/Middle Hungarian double marking
- Hungarian: C head + relative Op. – different CPs because overt C head not [rel]
if two CPs, lower one contains the operator – Minimal Link Condition satisfied
↔ strict cartographic approaches would assume a double CP for Germanic too
- avoiding Doubly Filled COMP effects, as in Baltin (2010)
- but: no explanation for ordering differences cross-linguistically
→ marking of [rel] does not require multiple CPs, but projection of an extra layer possible
if [sub] C head not equipped with [rel]

5 Embedded degree clauses

relevant features: [sub], [rel], [compr], [pol:neg]
- [compr]: encoding the comparative nature of the clause; encoded either by an
  operator or by a functional C head, has to be overt
- [pol:neg]: encoding the negative polarity of the clause in the absence of a negative
  operator (degree negation, not clausal negation); encoded by a functional head (Pol
  or C), has to be overt (negation and negative polarity marked morphologically, cf.
  Dryer 2013)
equative clauses (as-clauses) and comparative clauses (than-clauses):

(23)  a. Mary is as tall as Peter is.
      b. Mary is taller than Peter is.
comparative subclauses are negative polarity environments (Seuren 1973):

(24)  She would rather die than lift a finger to help her sister.
reason: degree semantics
- equatives express degree equality (d=d’)
- comparatives express degree inequality (d≠d’, either d>d’ or d<d’)
asymmetry between equatives and comparatives attested in several languages
  synchronically and/or diachronically
Hungarian equatives:

     Mary so tall was.3SG as how.REL tall Peter was.3SG
     ‘Mary was as tall as Peter.’

     b. Mari olyan magas volt, mint Péter volt.
     Mary so tall was.3SG as Péter was.3SG
     ‘Mary was as tall as Péter.’

     c. Mari olyan magas volt, amilyen (magas) Péter volt.
     Mary so tall was.3SG how.REL tall Peter was.3SG
     ‘Mary was as tall as Péter.’

Hungarian comparatives:

(26)  a. Mari magasabb volt, mint amilyen (magas) Péter volt.
     Mary taller was.3SG as how.REL tall Peter was.3SG
     ‘Mary was taller than Péter.’

     b. Mari magasabb volt, mint Péter volt.
     Mary taller was.3SG as Péter was.3SG
     ‘Mary was taller than Péter.’

     Mary taller was.3SG how.REL tall Peter was.3SG
     ‘Mary was taller than Péter.’

pattern in (25a) attested in non-standard English too:

(27)  %Mary is as tall as how tall Péter is.

structure for (25a):

(28)  \[
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{CP} \\
    \text{C'} \\
    \text{C[subj,compr]} \\
    \text{mint[subj,compr]} \text{amilyen[rel,compr]} \text{C'} \\
    \text{C[rel,subj]} \ldots
    \end{array}
\]

lower C head specified for [rel] but not [compr] → further layer necessary

separation of [rel] and [compr]: comparative complement not necessarily a relative clause
phrasal comparatives in Italian (PP headed by di ‘of’), genitive in Russian, Polish
and Greek, adessive in Hungarian
[rel] and [compr] cannot be encoded by a single overt head in English and Hungarian – no such lexically specified element

single CP if the lower C is specified for [compr] too and the operator is overt, as in (25c):

(29) \[
\begin{array}{c}
CP \\
\text{amilyen}_{[rel],[compr]} \\
C' \\
\text{C}_{[rel],[compr],[sub]} \ldots \\
\end{array}
\]

not available in English even for speakers who accept (27) – selectional restrictions on the CP from the matrix Deg

elliptical pattern in (25b): C head with [rel] specification is missing

- no operator movement triggered
- [rel] uninterpretable on a non-moved XP: ellipsis saves the construction
  see Bacskai-Atkari (2014c), Bacskai-Atkari & Kántor (2011; 2012) for comparatives
- no Doubly Filled COMP effects either: no [rel] complementiser available in Hungarian → a [rel] C head cannot be filled (operators have no double status either)

structure:

(30) \[
\begin{array}{c}
CP \\
C' \\
\text{C}_{[sub],[compr]} \ldots \\
\text{mint}_{[sub],[compr]} \\
\end{array}
\]

comparatives: additional [pol:neg] feature: C head mint may be with or without it (two lexical items)

structure for comparatives like (26a):

(31) \[
\begin{array}{c}
CP \\
C' \\
\text{C}_{[sub],[compr],[pol:neg]} \\
\text{mint}_{[sub],[compr],[pol:neg]} \\
\text{amilyen}_{[rel],[compr]} \\
\text{C}_{[rel],[sub]} \ldots \\
\end{array}
\]
elliptical pattern in (26b): C head with [rel] specification is missing, same as for equatives:

(32)  
```
  CP
   
  C'

  C_{[sub],[compr],[pol:neg]}  \cdots
```

structure for the illicit configuration in (26c):

(33)  
```
  CP
   amilyen_{[rel],[compr]}

  C'

  C_{[sub],[compr],[pol:neg],[rel]}  \cdots
```

[pol:neg] cannot be checked off: comparative/relative operator not a negative operator

ordering (cross-linguistically well attested): comparative C head + comparative operator

- comparative C heads not encoding [rel]

- Minimal Link Condition

expectation: if there is a language that has a complementiser lexically specified as [rel] and [compr], and there is also an overt [rel], [compr] operator, there will be a single CP showing the same doubling that is attested in relative clauses (hence: operator + complementiser order)

evidence from Old High German:

- *wie* in equatives appears in Early New High German, and goes back to Middle High German *swie*, which in turn stems from Old High German *so wie so*, see (Jäger 2010: 488) – (34a)

- *so wie so* appears in free relatives, just as *so wer so* or *so waz so* in non-comparative free relatives, where the *so*+WH combination is in [Spec,CP] and *so* is in C, see (Jäger 2010: 488), cf. Behaghel (1928), Paul (1920)

- *so* used as a C head in *as*-clauses in Old and Middle High German, see (Jäger 2010: 470–472) – (34b)

- *so* available as a relative complementiser on its own in Middle High German, see (Paul 2011: 405), (Ferraresi & Weiß 2011: 98) – (34c)
examples:

(34)  
a. er bi unsih todl thulti, so wio so er selbo wolti
    he by us death suffered as how as he self wanted
    ‘he suffered death by us, as he himself wished’ (Otfrid V, 1, 7)
    (Jäger 2010: 488, ex. 46, quoting Schrod 2004)

b. ir scult wesn fruot. so die natrun.
    you.PL should.2PL be cunning as the.PL snakes
    ‘you should be cunning as snakes’ (Physiologus 142v, 6)
    (Jäger 2010: 472, ex. 14)

c. ich hete ir doch vil lihte ein teil geset,
    I have.COND.1SG she.DAT PRT perhaps a.M.ACC part say.PTCP
    der vil grossen liebe so min herze an si hat
    the.F.GEN much great.F.GEN love as my.N heart at she has
    ‘perhaps I should have expressed to her a part of the great love that my
    heart has towards her’ (Rudolf von Rotenburg VII, 2,1–2)
    (Ferraresi & Weiß 2011: 98, ex. 30, quoting Paul 2007: 414)

hence: Doubly Filled pattern possible in embedded degree clauses, but only if the C head
is specified as [compr] and [rel]

structure for (34a):

(35)

```
CP
   so wie[rel],[compr] C'
        C[sub],[compr],[rel] ... 
```

→ embedded degree clauses do not necessarily not have multiple CPs, but they very
often do, due to the feature distribution of [rel] and [compr], and [rel] and [pol:neg],
which are not always possible to be marked on the same head
6 More on the functional vP-periphery

recall: (Modern) Hungarian marks [wh] overtly on the functional vP-periphery feature passed on from C to F

paradigm:

(36) a. Ki ette meg a sajtot?
    who ate.3SG PRT the cheese.ACC
    ‘Who has eaten the cheese?’

b. Megetted(-e) a sajtot?
    PRT.ate.2SG-Q the cheese.ACC
    ‘Have you eaten the cheese?’

c. Azt kérdeztetem, (hogy) ki ette meg a sajtot.
    that.ACC asked.1SG that who ate.3SG PRT the cheese.ACC
    ‘I asked who had eaten the cheese.’

d. Azt kérdeztetem, (hogy) megetted-e a sajtot.
    that.ACC asked.1SG that PRT.ate.2SG-Q the cheese.ACC
    ‘I asked if you had eaten the cheese.’

wh-questions show the same pattern already in Old Hungarian (Bacskaia-Atkari 2014b)

embedded polar questions in Old Hungarian: introduced by the complementiser ha ‘if’:

(37) megírda’técc Amânac kéuánauala megtudni ha
    PRT.announced.3PL Haman.DAT wishing.be.PST PRT.know.INF if
    mégmaradna étoménbën
    PRT.stay.COND.3SG this.law.INF
    ‘they told Haman, to see whether his matters would stand’ (Vienna Codex 55,
    middle of the 15th century)

appearance of -e in embedded polar questions in Middle Hungarian:

(38) kérdette túlle ha nyughatike
    asked.3SG (s)he.ABL if rest.POSS1B.3SG-Q
    ‘(s)he asked him/her whether (s)he could rest’ (Witch Trial 13; from 1724)
changes in embedded clauses:

(39)  

a.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\mid \\
\text{C'} \\
\mid \\
\text{C}_{[\text{wh}]} \ldots \\
\mid \\
\text{ha}_{[\text{wh}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\mid \\
\text{C'} \\
\mid \\
\text{C}_{[\text{wh}]} \ldots \\
\mid \\
\text{ha}_{[\text{wh}]} \text{FP} \\
\mid \\
\text{F'} \\
\mid \\
\text{F}_{[\text{wh}]} \ldots \\
\mid \\
\text{e}_{[\text{wh}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

c.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\mid \\
\text{C'} \\
\mid \\
\text{C}_{[\text{wh}]} \ldots \\
\mid \\
\text{ha}_{[\text{wh}]} \text{FP} \\
\mid \\
\text{F'} \\
\mid \\
\text{F}_{[\text{wh}]} \ldots \\
\mid \\
\text{e}_{[\text{wh}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

-e present in main clause interrogatives already in Old Hungarian:

• optional, just like in Modern Hungarian

• most typically located in the F head (verb-adjacent)

• traces of an older pattern, whereby -e is clause-final: the C head of a head-final CP, which also requires the co-presence of a clause-initial question particle such as nemde or minemde ‘whether, isn’t it’, see É. Kiss (2014)

examples:

(40)  

a. něde tů incab nagobbac vattoc aŋocnal ē
Q you rather greater.PL are.3PL those.DAT Q
‘Are ye not much better than they?’ (Munich Codex 12vb, from 1466)

b. Te vag ē Daniěl Iuda fogfaganac fiaibol
you are Q Daniel Judah captivity.POSS.DAT sons.POSS.ABL
‘Art thou that Daniel, which art of the children of the captivity of Judah?’ (Vienna Codex 142, middle of the 15th century)

structure for (40a):

(41)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\mid \\
\text{nemde/minemde} \text{C'} \\
\mid \\
\text{TP} \\
\mid \\
\text{C} \\
\mid \\
\text{-e} \\
\end{array}
\]
the two heads in C and F may even co-occur:

(42) Mínemde elfelethethí-e az aña v kis germoket-e
    Q off.forget.PASS.3SG-Q the mother she small child.POSS.ACC-Q

‘Can the mother forget her small child?’ (Nádor Codex 26r, from 1508)
    (É. Kiss 2014: 16, ex. 17)

summary of changes:

- reanalysis of -e from head-final C into head-initial F: in line with a major typological
  change from “SOV” to “Top Foc V X” (see É. Kiss 2013)
  - change from predominantly head-final to predominantly head-initial projections
  - evolution of a functional vP-periphery (FP layers) that hosts predicational
    items (focus, wh-elements etc. – see É. Kiss 2006; 2008a;b)
- introduction of -e into embedded clauses alongside the C head ha ‘if’ – analogy
  from main polar questions, and from wh-questions (overt marking of [wh] on the
  functional vP-periphery)
- disappearance of doubling pattern: ha disappears from embedded polar questions,
  subordination marked by hogy ‘that’ (optionality)

7 Conclusion

aim: providing a flexible, feature-based approach to functional left peripheries

realisation of layers largely depends on overtness requirements – syntactic encoding

- embedded interrogatives: mostly single CP (possibly with Doubly Filled COMP),
  layer spreading (Hungarian)
- relative clauses: mostly single CP (possibly with Doubly Filled COMP), double CP
  if [sub] marked separately (Old Hungarian)
- embedded degree clauses: mostly double CP – [rel] carried by a lower C than [compr]
  and [pol: neg]; Doubly Filled pattern possible (Old High German)
- lower C in multiple CPs: related to operator movement (if any)
- functional vP-periphery: attested in structures closely resembling IS-related move-
  ment targeting the same periphery – embedded interrogatives in Hungarian

→ number of layers, ordering can be modelled on the basis of features
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