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Introduction

CP-layer of the clause:

- responsible for clause typing – clausal Type in Cheng (1991) and Force in Chomsky (1995), Rizzi (1997, 283) – relating clause to a superordinate clause or to the discourse (see Rizzi 1997)

- responsible for encoding finiteness – Rizzi (1997, 283–285), following e.g. Holmberg & Platzack (1988); finiteness distinct from tense (↔ Den Besten 1983), CP rather encodes whether there is tense at all (e.g. English that co-occurring with tensed verbs, for co-occurring with infinitives, see Chomsky & Lasnik 1977) – relating CP to its complement domain

- CPs can be iterated – minimal CP (Bacskai-Atkari 2015, Sobin 2002), as opposed to cartographic template of Rizzi (1997)
Complementisers

encoding clause type and finiteness in embedded clauses:

(1)  
   a. I know **that** Mary has arrived.  
   b. I don’t know **if** Mary has arrived.
Structure

(2) CP
   /   
  C'   
     /   
    C_{[\text{fin}],[Q]} \ ... 
      /   
     if_{[\text{fin}],[Q]}
Rejected cartographic structure


(3) *CP
   \[ C'[C[Q]\text{CP}\text{if}[Q]C'] \]
   \[ C[\text{fin}] \ldots \]
   \[ \emptyset[\text{fin}] \]
Absence of overt complementiser

(4)  
   a. I know _ Mary has arrived.  
   b. I know who _ has arrived.  
   c. I don’t know whether _ Mary has arrived.  
   d. _ Mary has arrived.  
   e. **Has** Mary arrived?  
   f. When **did** Mary arrive?
German V2

(5) a. Ralf **hat** gestern eine Torte gebacken.  
Ralph has yesterday a.F.ACC cake baked.PTCP  
‘Ralph baked a cake yesterday.’

b. Gestern **hat** Ralf eine Torte gebacken.  
yesterday has Ralph a.F.ACC cake baked.PTCP  
‘Ralph baked a cake yesterday.’
Questions

- what are the conditions licensing an empty C head
- why verb movement takes place and how it is related to other ways of lexicalising the C head
- whether and to what extent movement/insertion to [Spec,CP] is related to the lexicalisation of the C head
Proposal

- regular West Germanic pattern: [fin] on C has to be lexicalised by an overt element (interface condition) – complementiser or verb movement
- zero complementiser: has to be licensed, cross-linguistic variation in its interpretability
- movement/insertion to [Spec,CP]: due to clause-typing features such as [wh] or [Q], insertion of anaphor or to [edge] feature, but: no overtness requirement
- filling of [Spec,CP] and C essentially independent → V1 and V3 matrix word orders possible
Embedded clauses

(6)  

a. Peter says **that** she likes books.  
b. Peter says she likes books.  
c. **That** she likes books is surprising.  
d. *She likes books is surprising.
German

(7) a. Peter sagt, **dass** sie Bücher mag.
    Peter says that she books likes.
    ‘Peter says that she likes books.’

    b. *Peter sagt, sie Bücher mag.
    Peter says she books likes
    ‘Peter says that she likes books.’

    c. Peter sagt, sie **mag** Bücher.
    Peter says she likes books
    ‘Peter says that she likes books.’
Differences among verbs

“bridging verbs” allowing V2, not others (see Featherston 2004 for a detailed analysis of the distinction):

(8) a. Peter bezweifelt, dass sie Bücher mag.
Peter doubts that she books likes.
‘Peter doubts that she likes books.’

b. *Peter bezweifelt, sie mag Bücher.
Peter doubts she likes books
‘Peter doubts that she likes books.’
Structure for overt complementiser (English and German)

(9)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C[fin],[sub]} \\
\text{that[fin],[sub]} \\
\text{dass[fin],[sub]}
\end{array}
\]
Zero complementiser in English

(10)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C[fin],[sub]} \\
\emptyset[\text{fin],[sub}]
\end{array}
\]
Structure for German

(11)

CP

DP

sie

C′

C[fin],[edge]

V

C[fin],[edge]

mag
German V2

Fanselow (2009): movement to [Spec,CP]: due to an [edge] feature – no direct relation between movement to [Spec,CP] and verb movement to C

standard analysis of V2 (see e.g. Den Besten 1989, Fanselow 2002, 2004a,b, 2009, Frey 2005): XP in [Spec,CP] and the verb to C (adjoining to C via head adjunction), XP not restricted to subject DPs

selectional restrictions imposed by the matrix verb: whether the [edge] feature is allowed on the C head – distinction between proper complement clauses (canonical subordination) versus other dependent clauses
Variation

(12)  

a. Peter schreit, **als wäre** er beim Zahnarzt.  
Peter shouts as be.COND.3SG he at.the dentist  
‘Peter is shouting as if he were at the dentist’s.’

b. Peter schreit, **als ob** er beim Zahnarzt wäre.  
Peter shouts as if he at.the dentist be.COND.3SG  
‘Peter is shouting as if he were at the dentist’s.’

c. Plan an escape route, **if** fire should break out.

d. Plan an escape route, **should** fire break out.
Embedded polar questions

(13)  a. I wonder if Mary is coming.

       b. Ich frage mich, ob Maria kommt.

       I ask.1SG me.ACC if Mary comes

       ‘I wonder if Mary is coming.’
Structure

(14)

CP

C'

C[fin],[sub],[Q] ...

if[fin],[sub],[Q]

ob[fin],[sub],[Q]
Embedded *wh*-questions

(15)  

a. I wonder *which book* (% *that*) Mary likes.

b. Ich frage mich, *welches Buch* (% *dass*) Maria mag.

‘I wonder which book Mary likes.’

standard varieties: no complementiser inserted ↔ certain dialects (see e.g. Weiß 2013, Bayer & Brandner 2008 for German)

Bacskai-Atkari (2016a): substandard dialects showing Doubly Filled COMP effects regular in lexicalising [fin] on C by an overt element
(16)  a. 

```
CP
   \bear{\text{which book}[\text{wh}]}
      C'
        C[\text{fin}],[\text{wh}],[\text{sub}]  \ldots
            \emptyset[\text{fin}],[\text{sub}]
```

b. 

```
CP
   \bear{\text{which book}[\text{wh}]}
      C'
        C[\text{fin}],[\text{wh}],[\text{sub}]  \ldots
            \text{that}[\text{fin}],[\text{sub}]
```
Cross-linguistic variation

difference between the dialects: lexical difference (*that* vs. *zero*)
but not in terms of the syntactic features: *[wh]* feature present on the C head

zero subordinator not exceptional in English (see declaratives) but *[fin]* regularly lexicalised by an overt element in interrogatives (Bacskai-Atkari 2016a)

German: licensing of the zero subordinator restricted to embedded constituent questions (Standard pattern)

Doubly Filled COMP dialects in German: regular insertion of the finite subordinator *dass*
Main clauses and V2

canonical order in German main clauses: V2

(17) a. Ralf hat gestern eine Torte gebacken.
Ralph has yesterday a.F.ACC cake baked.
‘Ralph baked a cake yesterday.’

b. Gestern hat Ralf eine Torte gebacken.
yesterday has Ralph a.F.ACC cake baked.
‘Ralph baked a cake yesterday.’
Structure

(18)

CP

DP  C'

Ralf  C[fin],[edge]  ...

gestern  ...

V  C[fin],[edge]

hat

filling of [Spec,CP]: result of [edge] feature (Fanselow 2009)
(19) a. **Who did** you invite?

b. **Wen hast du eingeladen?**

   who.ACC have.2SG you invited.PTCP

   ‘Who did you invite?’
Structure

(20)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{who}_{[\text{wh}]} \\
\text{wen}_{[\text{wh}]} \\
\text{C}_{[\text{fin}],[\text{wh}]} \\
\text{\ldots} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{C}_{[\text{fin}],[\text{wh}]} \\
\text{did} \\
\text{hast}
\end{array}
\]
Non-canonical matrix word orders

surface V1 clauses in German – question: underlyingly V1 (no element in the [Spec,CP] position) or underlyingly V2

claim here: zero elements in V1 main clauses not unmotivated (↔ Zwart 2005)
Matrix polar questions

(21) **Hast** du Peter gesehen?
     have.2SG you Peter seen
     ‘Have you seen Peter?’

first position: polar operator corresponding to *whether* (Larson 1985) – inserted directly into the [Spec,CP] position (Bianchi & Cruschina 2016); covert operator inserted if the complementiser is overt (e.g. *if*, German *ob*), cf. Zimmermann (2013, 86)

polar operator not entirely specific to interrogatives – disjunctive operators in conditionals, similarly to morphophonologically identical complementisers between the two clause types (cf. Bhatt & Pancheva 2006; Arsenijević 2009; Danckaert & Haegeman 2012)
(22) a. **Hwæðer wæs** iohannes fulluht þe of heofonum whether was John’s baptism that of heavens
þe of mannum
or of man
‘Was the baptism of John done by heaven or by man?’ (*West Saxon Gospel*; Van Gelderen 2009, 141)

b. And the Lord seide to Caym, Where is Abel thi brother? The which answeryde, I wote neuere; 
**whether am** I the keper of my brother?
(Wycliffe Bible older version, Genesis 4.9)

c. **Whether did** he open the Basket?
(*The Tryal of Thomas Earl of Macclesfield*)
Structure

(23) 

```
CP
  \_ Op·[Q] C'
    \_ \_ C[fin],[Q],[edge] \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ V C[fin],[Q]
        \_ \_ \_ have
            \_ \_ hast
```
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V1 conditionals

(24) Ist die Entscheidung gefallen, gilt sie für alle.  
Once the decision has been taken, it applies to all.

anaphoric elements possible:

(25) Ist die Entscheidung gefallen, dann / so gilt sie für alle.  
Once the decision has been taken, it applies to all.
(26) a. *∅/So/Dann gilt die Entscheidung für alle, ist sie gefallen.

b. *∅/So/Dann gilt die Entscheidung für alle, wenn sie gefallen ist.

‘The decision applies to all once it has been taken.’
V1 declaratives

(27) A: Peter ist gekommen.
     Peter is come.
     ‘Peter has arrived.’

     B: Hab ich (schon) gesehen.
       have.1SG I already seen
       ‘I have (already) seen it.’
Anaphors

(28) *Hab ich (schon) gesehen, dass Peter gekommen ist.
    'I have (already) seen that Peter has arrived.'
Word orders

V1 clauses examined here: underlyingly V2 – no overtness requirement on the element in the specifier (even if anaphors move via [edge] feature and not a clause-typing feature), no surface V2 requirement – restrictions on the specifier and lexicalising [fin] on C not tied together


(29) Morgen ich geh Arbeitsamt.
tomorrow I go job.centre
‘Tomorrow I will go to the job centre’.
Conclusion

elements in C and their role in clause typing

- overt complementisers – canonical configuration, availability subject to licensing conditions (cases examined here: restricted to embedded/dependent clauses); [fin] lexicalised by an overt element regularly; no [edge] feature

- zero complementisers – cross-linguistic variation, available lexical items in certain languages (embedded and/or main clauses)

- verb movement – head adjunction, no complementiser in C – [fin] lexicalised by the verb adjoined to C; [edge] feature present to project the phrase, element in [Spec,CP] either overt (surface V2) or not (surface V1)
Thank you!

Danke!

Tack!
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