

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© editorial matter and organization Agnes Jäger, Gisella Ferraresi, and Helmut Weiß 2018
© the chapters their several authors 2018

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2018

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017950124

ISBN 978-0-19-881354-5

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Contents

<i>Series preface</i>	vii
<i>Preface and acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>List of figures and tables</i>	ix
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>List of contributors</i>	xv
1. Introduction	1
<i>Agnes Jäger, Gisella Ferraresi, and Helmut Weiß</i>	
Part I. The Left Periphery	
2. Introduction to Part I	15
<i>Svetlana Petrova</i>	
3. Origins of verb-second in Old High German	22
<i>Katrin Axel-Tober</i>	
4. Verb-initial declaratives in Old High German and in later German	48
<i>Svetlana Petrova</i>	
5. The prefield after the Old High German period	64
<i>Augustin Speyer and Helmut Weiß</i>	
6. Adverbial connectives	82
<i>Gisella Ferraresi</i>	
Part II. The Middle Field	
7. Introduction to Part II	125
<i>Gisella Ferraresi and Agnes Jäger</i>	
8. The Wackernagel complex and pronoun raising	132
<i>Helmut Weiß</i>	
9. Serialization of full noun phrases in the history of German	155
<i>Augustin Speyer</i>	
10. History of negation in High and Low German	181
<i>Anne Breitbarth and Agnes Jäger</i>	
Part III. The Right Periphery	
11. Introduction to Part III	223
<i>Eric Fuß</i>	

12. The OV/VO alternation in Early German: Diagnostics for basic word order <i>Eric Fuß</i>	230
13. OV versus VO in Old High German: The case of <i>thaz</i> -clauses <i>Svetlana Petrova and Helmut Weiß</i>	263
14. Prosodic and information-structural factors in word order variation <i>Roland Hinterhölzl and Svetlana Petrova</i>	277
15. Periphrastic verb forms <i>Augustin Speyer</i>	289
16. On the history of the IPP construction in German <i>Agnes Jäger</i>	302
17. The ACI construction in the history of German <i>Augustin Speyer</i>	324
<i>Sources</i>	349
<i>References</i>	360
<i>Index</i>	397

Series preface

Modern diachronic linguistics has important contacts with other subdisciplines, notably first-language acquisition, learnability theory, computational linguistics, sociolinguistics, and the traditional philological study of texts. It is now recognized in the wider field that diachronic linguistics can make a novel contribution to linguistic theory, to historical linguistics, and arguably to cognitive science more widely.

This series provides a forum for work in both diachronic and historical linguistics, including work on change in grammar, sound, and meaning within and across languages; synchronic studies of languages in the past; and descriptive histories of one or more languages. It is intended to reflect and encourage the links between these subjects and fields such as those mentioned above.

The goal of the series is to publish high-quality monographs and collections of papers in diachronic linguistics generally, i.e. studies focusing on change in linguistic structure, and/or change in grammars, which are also intended to make a contribution to linguistic theory, by developing and adopting a current theoretical model, by raising wider questions concerning the nature of language change, or by developing theoretical connections with other areas of linguistics and cognitive science as listed above. There is no bias towards a particular language or language family, or towards a particular theoretical framework; work in all theoretical frameworks, and work based on the descriptive tradition of language typology, as well as quantitatively based work using theoretical ideas, also feature in the series.

Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts

University of Cambridge

The common interpretation of limited embedded verb second in Scandinavian involves the presence of two subsequent CPs in the complement of certain matrix predicates if they appear in assertive environments, i.e. in non-modalized, non-negative matrix contexts (de Haan and Weerman 1986). If the conditions for limited embedded verb second are fulfilled, then the head of the higher CP hosts the complementizer of the complement clause while V_{fin} targets the head of the lower CP.

Assuming that the structure of the clause in OHG only provides C as the landing site of the verb whenever it moves to the left, Axel (2007) derives the orders in (21) and (22) as V-to-C movement in a complement clause, similar to embedded verb second in Scandinavian. However, it has not been studied if the remaining conditions required for limited embedded verb second in Scandinavian are fulfilled in OHG as well. Therefore, the interpretation of the orders in this group in analogy to the Scandinavian data must be considered an open issue.

13.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, we addressed a well-known and intensively studied property of historical German, namely variation in word order, especially in the order of the verb and its complements. We presented a survey of word orders attested in dependent clauses, because such contexts minimize the number of possible movement operations of the verb, and then surveyed different ways in which these orders have been analysed in the formal literature on the issue.

The explanation of word order variation is set in the context of the generative discussion in a cross-Germanic comparison and shows how sensitive the models are towards conceptual innovations in the general linguistic discussion. Although there are a variety of ways of analysing the attested patterns, and although some of the questions cannot receive a complete answer because of the lack of conclusive data, we hope to have been able to show that word order in historical German is by no means accidental or irregular but allows for the proper representation within different models of phrase structure.

14

Prosodic and information-structural factors in word order variation

ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL AND SVETLANA PETROVA

14.1 Introduction

In Chapter 13, it was argued that the word order variation found in dependent clauses in OHG can be explained either as extraposition from a head-final base order, or as leftward movement of the finite verb to a designated functional projection in the left periphery of the clause. This chapter presents an account that elaborates on the second option. It outlines an alternative account of the variation in the order of verbs and their complements, which is couched within the Universal Base Hypothesis (Kayne 1994). According to this approach, all projections, lexical and functional ones, have a universal head-complement order. The different surface orders are derived by adopting a series of cyclic leftward movement operations which affect both NP complements as well as non-finite complements like VPs and small clauses.

It has been shown by Zwart (1993) for Dutch and by Hinterhölzl (2006) for German that all attested surface orders in OV languages can be derived from a universal VO base plus movement of arguments and VP-internal predicates to dedicated licensing positions in the middle field, as illustrated in (1a). In this approach, movement of NP and PP arguments serves to check the *c*-selection of the verb, while the movement of VP-internal predicates and particles serves to form complex predicates. In the remainder of the chapter, we will refer to these movement operations as licensing movement. Thus, superficial VO orders are derived by (i) spell-out of the lower copies of licensing movement out of the VP (Hinterhölzl 2009b) or (ii) by remnant movement of the VP (VP intraposition) across the material extracted from the VP before, as illustrated in (1b):

- (1) a. [_{CP} that [_{Agro} XP_i [_{PRT}_j [_{VP} V XP_i PRT_j]]]]
 b. [_{CP} that [_{VP} V t_i] [_{Agro} XP_i] t_{VP}]

A basic assumption in this approach is that additional movement operations that are triggered by information-structural and prosodic factors play a crucial role in explaining word order variation in early Germanic. This type of approach has been pursued by

Clause Structure and Word Order in the History of German. First edition. Agnes Jäger, Gisella Ferraresi, and Helmut Weiß (eds).

This chapter © Roland Hinterhölzl and Svetlana Petrova 2018. First published 2018 by Oxford University Press.

Roberts (1997) for OE, modified in Biberauer and Roberts (2005), by Hróarsdóttir (2000a, 2000b, 2009) for ON, and by Hinterhölzl (2004, 2009b) for OHG. In what follows, we will outline the basic arguments of these approaches and will show—on the basis of the corpus study presented by Petrova (2009) and Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010)—how these models combine licensing movement and scope-related movement triggered by information-structural requirements with leftward head movement of the finite verb.

14.2 Word order variation in older Germanic

It is well known that the early Germanic languages allowed for greater freedom in word order than their modern descendants (see Chapters 11 and 12). In this respect, mixed word orders are of special interest since they challenge accounts based on the head complement parameter.

Next to mixed word orders in modern Yiddish, as in (2) (Diesing 1997), we find mixed OV/VO orders in the older stages of all Germanic languages, as is illustrated for OE in (3) (Pintzuk 1999), for ON in (4) (Hróarsdóttir 2009), and for OHG in (5) (taken from the Tatian translation). As the examples in (3b) from OE and (5b) from OHG clearly show, we do not only find a combination of pure OV word orders, as in (3a) and in (5a), and pure VO orders, as in (4b), in the same text, but also mixed word orders within the same sentence. In the OE example in (3b), for example, the infinitive precedes the finite auxiliary, as is typical for an OV language, but the direct object follows the selecting verb (and the auxiliary), as is typical for a VO language (see also Haider 2010b for a summary of the discussion and examples):

- (2) a. Maks hot nit gegeben Rifken dos bukh
Max has not given Rifken the book
'Max has not given the book to Rebecca'
(Diesing 1997: 402)
- b. Maks hot Rifken dos bukh nit gegeben
Max has Rifken the book not given
'Max has not given the book to Rebecca'
(Diesing 1997: 402)
- (3) a. þæt he his stefne up ahof
that he his voice up raised
'that he raised up his voice'
(Pintzuk 1999: 71)
- b. þæt ænig mon atellan mæge ealne þone demm
that any man relate can all the misery
'that no man could tell all this misery'
(Pintzuk 1999: 36)
- (4) a. efftir þad þeir höffdu eplid eted
after that they had apple.the eaten
'after that they had eaten the apple'
(Hróarsdóttir 2009: 74)

- b. að hann haði edið kjotið
that he had eaten meat.the
'that he had eaten the meat'
(Hróarsdóttir 2009: 74)
- (5) a. (quia dictum est antiquis)
thaz then alton giqu&an uúas
that to.the old.ones said was
'that it was said to our ancestors'
(Tatian 64, 13)
- b. (quae uocatur b&hleem)
thiu uuas ginemnit b&hleem
that was named Bethlehem
'that was called Bethlehem'
(Tatian 35, 17)

While mixed word orders in Yiddish, OE, and ON have been and are subject to thorough investigation and heated debates concerning their correct analysis (Diesing 1997; Vikner 2001 for Yiddish; Roberts 1997; Pintzuk 1999 for OE), the discussion concerning older stages of German has just started in the last years (see Chapters 12 and 13). We briefly recapitulate the main facts and points of significance, as a prelude to a more detailed exploration of the information-structural patterns in the data and their derivation within the universal VO base hypothesis.

Traditional grammarians have pointed out that word order in older Germanic is less fixed than in the modern varieties, and argued that word order preferences are due to a large degree to stylistic factors. Most notable among these is Behaghel's law of increasing constituents. Behaghel (1923–32, Vol. IV) notes that pronouns and unmodified nouns tend to precede the verb, while modified nouns, PPs, and other heavy material tend to follow it, which gave rise to the generalization in (6) (Behaghel 1923–32, Vol. IV: 5).

- (6) Light elements precede heavy elements in OE, ON, and OHG

The statement in (6) raises the question of what 'light' means in this context. The first interpretation is that 'light' in (6) is to be understood as prosodically light. In the same passage, Behaghel also talks about information-structural weight and the general rule that constituents with greater informative weight follow informationally light elements. As it turns out, both factors make relevant predictions about the unmarked word order in older Germanic.

There is good evidence that prosodic and information-structural factors play a major role in determining word order in ON (Hróarsdóttir 2000a, 2000b, 2010) and in OE (Taylor and Pintzuk 2011, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c). In particular, Hróarsdóttir (2010) reports that both factors play a role in ON word order but concludes that prosodic weight was the decisive factor in ON. Taylor and Pintzuk (2012a, 2012b) argue for the relevance of both factors for determining word order in OE. They also show that the two conditions though overlapping are independent of each other and conclude that the information-structural factor weakens at the end of the OE period.

An important observation about word order in OHG is that pronouns and verb particles do not appear after the selecting verb, while PP-adjuncts and PP-arguments do. This property can be related to the law of increasing constituents stated in (6), or better, to the prosodic condition in (7). In (7), it is assumed that a syntactic constituent counts as heavy, if it is branching (Hinterhölzl 2011). Thus, the prosodic condition allows light, non-branching constituents to precede the verb, but requires heavy constituents, that is, phrases containing two words and more to follow the verb.

(7) The weight condition (PF-transparency):

A specifier that constitutes a heavy syntactic constituent must appear on a right branch with respect to the selecting/modified head (to occupy a more prominent branch than the head in prosodic structure).

In Hinterhölzl (2010), it is shown that information-structural requirements regularly override the effects of condition (7) in OHG. Thus, we will concentrate on the information-structural conditions that determine word order in OHG in this chapter.

14.3 Information-structural conditions on word order in OHG

Petrova (2009) and Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010) discuss evidence indicating that mixed word orders are motivated by information structure. They examine corpus evidence from the OHG Tatian translation and show that there is a tight correlation between the information-structural value of a constituent in the clause and its positional realization relative to V_{fin}. Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010) compare these data to selected examples from Isidor, which are partially confirmed and slightly extended in Schlachter's (2012) complete investigation of the role of information structure on word order in early OHG.

The information-structural category that is at the centre of attention of these studies is the expression of focus, i.e. of that part of the utterance that signals the presence of alternatives in the linguistic context. Two semantic types of focus are distinguished in the literature. On the one hand, new-information focus (also called 'presentational focus') marks that part of the utterance that has been selected out of an implicitly assumed, open set of alternatives. On the other hand, contrastive focus marks constituents that are selected as members of an explicitly mentioned set of alternatives. Below, the main observations on the role of focus on word order variation in OHG will be presented.

14.3.1 The position of background versus new-information focus

As commonly assumed, the new-information focus of the utterance comprises information that is requested, or asserted as new in the sentence. In contrast, background, or presupposed information, is that part that has been explicitly mentioned in the previous context, or that is inferable via world knowledge or anchoring to other given information (Prince 1981).

In OHG dependent clauses, expressions conveying presupposed information regularly appear to the left of V_{fin} and in the higher middle field. For example, pronominal arguments are firmly associated with the Wackernagel domain, i.e. the

left edge of the middle field, immediately below C (see also Chapter 8). Consider (8) showing that the OHG equivalents of pronominal arguments that are post-verbal in the Latin original are systematically realized in the position below C; the same applies to pronouns lacking an equivalent in the Latin:

- (8) (usquedum dicam [tibi])
 unzan [ih] [thir] quede
 until I you tell
 'until I tell you'
 (Tatian 40, 28)

In some isolated cases, pronouns are not located in the Wackernagel position. But there is always an explanation for this distribution. First, there are cases where the OHG word order reproduces the word order of the Latin original. A relevant example is (9a) where the post-verbal position of the pronoun can be attributed to Latin influence. Second, fronting of a pronoun to the Wackernagel domain is blocked by the line break, as in (9b). Finally, there are cases in which a root-clause interpretation with V_{fin} in C is plausible,¹ see (9c); under this interpretation, the pronoun, which follows V_{fin} immediately, can be analysed as occupying the Wackernagel position:

- (9) a. (ut raperent eum)
 thaz sie fiengin [inan]
 that they arrest.PRET.SBJV him.ACC
 'that they arrested Him'
 (Tatian 119, 9)
- b. (& in manibus / tollent té)
 thaz sie mit Iro hanton / thih nehmen
 that they with their hands you take
 'that they hold you with their hand'
 (Tatian 50, 10–11)
- c. (quoniam / sicut proph&am eum habebant)
 uuanta / samasó uuizagon hab&un Inan
 because like prophet had him
 'because they regarded Him as a prophet'
 (Tatian 204, 24–5)

Note that apart from pronouns, lexical phrases conveying presupposed information also appear in the middle field of OHG dependent clauses. The corpus provides plenty of examples in which NPs referring to given or inferable information are shifted from the post-verbal position in the Latin original to the preverbal one in OHG. Consider the position of the second appearance of the NP *uueralt* 'the world' in (10a), which resumes previously mentioned information. The same applies to the constituent *gote* 'God' in (10b), which is inferable in the context of the presentation of

¹ Jäger (2008: 84f) shows that the majority of the *wanta* clauses in the OHG Tatian display verb second word order, suggesting that they are root clauses.

Jesus in the temple. Note also that there is no example in which a lexical constituent conveying given or inferable information is shifted from the preverbal position in Latin to the post-verbal position in OHG.

- (10) a. (non enim missit deus filium suum / In mundum ut Iudic& [mundum])
 nisanta got sinan sun / In uueralt thaz her
 NEG.sent God his.ACC.SG son in world that he
 [uueralt] tuome
 world condemned.PRES.SBJV
 'God didn't send His son into the world in order to condemn the world'
 (Tatian 197, 30-1)
- b. (postquam Impl&i sunt dies / ... tulerunt illum In hierusalem / ut sisterent eum [domino])
 after thi u gifulta uuarun taga / ... brahtun sie Inan thô In hierusalem /
 thereafter filled were days brought they him then to Jerusalem
 thaz sie Inan [gote] giantuuvrtitin
 that they him God presented.PRET.SBJV
 'after the days [of her purification] they brought him to Jerusalem to
 present him to God'
 (Tatian 37, 11-14)

Let us turn to the informational status of constituents appearing post-verbally in OHG dependent clauses. Special attention will be given to those examples which contain post-verbal material in contrast to the Latin word order. We can distinguish two basic groups of constituents that appear to the right of V_{fin} in subordinate clauses in OHG: (i) complements of main verbs and (ii) complements of auxiliary or copula verbs.

Complements of main verbs appearing preverbally in Latin but post-verbally in the vernacular are rare in the corpus. But it is crucial that in all of them, the post-verbal XP represents novel information, as *diuual* 'devil' in (11). At the same time, the corpus provides no examples in which novel material positioned after V_{fin} in the Latin original is shifted to the domain to the left of V_{fin} in OHG:

- (11) (et obtulerunt ei omnes male habentes [...] & qui demonia habebant)
 Inti bráhtun imo / alle ubil habante [...] Inti thie thár hab&run [diuual]
 and brought him all evil having and those PTC had devil
 'and they brought to him all sick people and those who were possessed by the
 devil'
 (Tatian 58, 30-59, 1)

Much more frequently, the constituent that appears after V_{fin} is the non-finite part of a complex predicate, for example a predicative adjective (12a), a nominal complement of a copula verb (12b), or the non-finite main verb (12c):

- (12) a. (ut [...] caeci fiant)
 daz sie sin blinte
 that they are.PRES.SBJV blind.PL
 'that they became blind'
 (Tatian 224, 6)

- b. (de ciuitate nazar&h)
 fon theru burgi thi u hiez nazar&h
 from the town which was.called Nazareth
 'from the town which was called Nazareth'
 (Tatian 35, 16)
- c. (nisi conuersi fueritis / & efficiamini sicut parvuli)
 nibi ir uuerdet giuuentite / inti gifremite soso theser luzilo
 unless you become converted and formed like this child
 'unless you convert and become like this child'
 (Tatian 151, 12)

At first sight, the two groups with post-verbal constituents shown in (11) and (12) appear to have little in common. However, from the point of view of information structure, these constituents share one important property, namely they constitute the asserted part, or the new-information focus in the utterance. As for the post-verbal argument in (11), this interpretation results from its novelty in the discourse. By contrast, the post-verbal constituents in (12) do not display properties of discourse referents and therefore cannot be analysed with respect to the given/new distinction. However, together with V_{fin}, they constitute the asserted part of the proposition, as opposed to the domain of background material, which is placed before V_{fin}.

In sum: background information precedes V_{fin} on the surface, while novel information follows V_{fin}, with which it constitutes the domain of new-information focus. In other words, the position of V_{fin} is a device in structuring the utterance according to the well-known iconic given-before-new principle of information packaging. So far, this distribution confirms Schlachter's (2004) initial observations about the factors that trigger medial position of V_{fin} in early OHG embedded clauses. This picture, however, will receive an important modification when the role of contrastive focus is considered.

14.3.2 The position of contrastive information

Let us look at the positional realization of constituents justifying an interpretation in terms of contrastive focus. In particular, this applies to elements displaying a relation of correction or semantic opposition to another entity explicitly mentioned in the discourse, as well as to elements bound by a focus-sensitive operator like *even*, *only*, or *also*. Furthermore, there are instances in which a single constituent bears special emphasis due to rhetorical considerations.

Petrova (2009) and Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010) observe that contrastive information is associated with a particular position in the clause, namely the one immediately preceding V_{fin} in the clause (while background does not need to be adjacent to V_{fin}). In the corpus of these studies, this position is targeted by thirty-six of forty-three contrastive phrases, i.e. in 84% of the cases involving contrast or emphasis on an XP. It is important to note that this positional realization applies to all types of phrases, so for example to arguments (13a) and (13b) but also to complex adjuncts (13c) and simple adverbs (13d). The phrases in square brackets either form a contrastive pair with another element present in the context (*not X... but Y*), or are in the scope of a silent

focus operator triggering an exhaustive interpretation (for example, the presentation to God is required for the first-born son only, not for others, in (13d)):

- (13) a. (quid faciat [dextera tua])
 niuizze iz thin uuinistra / uuaz [thin zesuu] tuo
 NEG.know it your left.hand what your right.hand do
 'your left hand should not know what your right hand is doing'
 (Tatian 67, 5)
- b. (ne uidearis [hominibus] / ieunans)
 thaz thu [mannon] nisis gisehán / fastenti úzouh thinemo fater
 that you people NEG.be seen fasting but your father
 'that you do not appear fasting to the people but to your father'
 (Tatian 68, 31)
- c. (non iurare [omnino])
 Ír guhortut thaz then alton giqu&an uúas / nifursuueri thih
 you heard that to.the predecessors told was NEG.swear you
 hane ih quidu íu / thaz mán [zi thuruhslahti] nisuuere
 PTC I tell you that INDEF at all NEG.swear
 '[you heard that it was told to your predecessors: "You should not swear"]
 But I tell you that you should not swear at all'
 (Tatian 64, 17)
- d. (adaperiens uuluam)
 íogiuuelih gommanbarn thaz uuamba [êrist] Intuot
 each male.child which womb for.the.first.time opens
 'each male child which opens the womb for the first time'
 (Tatian 37, 17)

In seven cases (16%), the contrastive phrase is not in the position immediately before V_{fin}. However, the linear order of the constituents in these examples either corresponds to that of the original Latin sentence, see the bare plural *rehte* 'the righteous man' in (14a), or the transposition of the contrastive XP to the left of V_{fin} is blocked by the line-per-line principle of the translation (cf. Chapter 1), see the NP *thiu himiliscun* 'the heavenly matters' in (14b):

- (14) a. (Non enim ueni uocare [iustos] / sed peccatores in poenitentiam)
 niquam zi thiu thaz ih giladoti [rehte] / ouh suntige
 NEG.came for the.reason that I called righteous but sinful
 zi riuue
 to repentance
 'I haven't come to call the righteous people but the sinners for repentance'
 (Tatian 91, 24)
- b. (si dixero uobis / [caelestia])
 oba ih íu erdlíhhu quad... oba ih íu quidu / [thiu himiliscun]
 when I you earthly told if I you tell the heavenly
 '[when I told to you earthly things] if I tell you the heavenly things'
 (Tatian 197, 14–15)

14.3.3 Theoretical implications

To resume, the positional distribution of arguments depending on their information-structural value in the utterance in the Tatian translation, according to Petrova (2009) and Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010), is summarized in (15):

- (15) a. background information is located preverbally, in the (upper) middle field of the clause
 b. the domain of new-information focus follows V_{fin}
 c. contrastively focused information is placed left-adjacent to V_{fin} and surfaces between the background domain and V_{fin}

These findings lead to the conclusion that OHG is discourse-configurational, i.e. that there is a tight correlation between the information-structural value of sentence constituents and their positional realization in the clause. In this section, we want to address the question of how these empirical observations can be integrated into a syntactic model.

The principles of word order that we have established for OHG bear parallels to those described by Diesing (1997: 390–6) for Yiddish. According to her, the different syntactic realization of object NPs with respect to the selecting main verb triggers three different types of semantic interpretation. Hinterhölzl (2004: 154) observes that these interpretations correspond to different categories of information structure. Leftward movement of an NP outside the VP is associated with definiteness and specificity, i.e. with background information, while post-verbal placement yields an existential reading of discourse-new indefinite NPs as instances of new-information, or presentational focus. Additionally, both definite and indefinite objects in the position left-adjacent to the verb gain a special, marked status which is only possible when contrastive or corrective emphasis is put on them, i.e. when they are contrastively focused. Hinterhölzl (2004) accounts for this distribution by assuming movement of the verb to the head of a focus phrase (FocP) which is situated at the left edge of the middle field above the case-checking projections for arguments. While contrastive elements move to [SpecFocP], new objects remain in the scope of the focus head where they receive case, as is illustrated in (16):

- (16) [_{CP} Background [_{FocP} ContrFocus V_{fin} [_{AgP} NewInformFoc [_{VP} t_V XP]]]]

Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010) retain the idea of a focus phrase which is situated between CP and VP in the structure of the clause, but introduce a significant modification to the previous account. From the viewpoint of the empirical results, they replace V by V_{fin}, as is illustrated in (16). Thus, the position of contrastive focus is left-adjacent not to the main verb but to V_{fin} in the clause. All patterns attested in OHG subordinate clauses can be derived according to the following operations:

- (17) a. V_{fin} is moved to the head of focus phrase (FocP).
 b. [SpecFocP] is reserved for contrastively focused information; this explains the left adjacency of contrastive information to V_{fin} observed in the data.
 c. constituents which convey new information remain in the scope of the focus phrase, i.e. after V_{fin}.

- d. given and presupposed constituents leave the scope of the focus phrase by movement to a position outside the FocP, e.g. to the Wackernagel position and to different topic positions in the left periphery.

Petrova (2009) and Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010) also address the question of why the distinction of two focus positions should be made explicit in the structure of the clause in OHG. One strong reason for doing so comes from the prosodic realization of focus, especially in cases of multiple foci. Consider examples like (18) which involves two distinct pairs of alternatives, namely the PPs *in mir* 'in me' and *In therru uueralti* 'in this world' on the one hand, and the object expressions *sibba* 'peace' and *thrucnessi* 'tribulation' on the other. In the Latin version, the members of the different contrastive pairs are realized in the same domain relative to V_{fin}. In the OHG text, however, the members of the distinct focus domains are displaced, being separated by V_{fin}:

- (18) (ut in me pacem habeatis / In mundo presuram habebitis)
 thisu sprah ih iu/ thaz [in mir] habet [sibba] / [In therru uueralti]
 this spoke I you that in me have peace in the world
 habet ir [thrucnessi]
 have you.PL tribulation
 'these things I have spoken to you that in Me you may have peace; in the world,
 you will have tribulation'
 (Tatian 290, 7–9)

Such examples suggest that OHG seeks to avoid the stacking of two different focus phrases in the same structural domain in the clause. The reason for this might be purely phonological. Focus is associated with stress, and because the two phrases represent two different semantic types of focus, each of them should represent a separate phonological phrase, bearing its own stress. Placing (the unaccented) V_{fin} in between these two focus constituents helps to avoid the clash of two heavily stressed phrases in one and the same topological domain in the clause. In other words, fronting of V_{fin} to Foc is motivated by the Clash Avoidance Principle introduced by Speyer (2010) to explain similar phenomena, for example the role of topicalization in the history of English.

But this principle still leaves open why the two different semantic types of focus, i.e. new-information versus contrastive focus should be designated special positions in the clause. A possible suggestion is that the different positional realization of focus types in OHG is used to dissolve focus ambiguities (Petrova 2009). For Modern German, it is well known that main accent on the right-most XP in base order yields either VP- or XP-focus. Scrambling the right-most XP to the left is considered a strategy to minimize the focus domain (Rosengren 1993), allowing an otherwise unaccented higher XP to receive main stress and narrow-focus interpretation (see Abraham 1992). Petrova (2009) suggests that a similar strategy is implemented in OHG on syntactic grounds, in that phrases belonging to VP-focus surface in post-verbal position while narrow (XP-) focus is only realized in preverbal position, with

14.3.4 Discussion and supporting evidence

Following the above observations, V_{fin} plays an important role as a discourse structuring device organizing the clause according to information-structural principles. It is important to determine whether this distribution is restricted to Tatian or is also found in other OHG texts, such as the Isidor translation. Recall that for this text, Schlachter (2004) has already described the properties related to (15a) and (15b). What is still missing in describing the role of information structure in word order variation in Isidor is the condition in (15c), i.e. the role of contrast in the organization of the clause.

Some facts concerning the main objective of the text are crucial to the interpretation of the examples. It is well known that the purpose of the Isidor treatise was to vindicate the notion of Trinity against the doctrine of Arianism. By references to statements of the Old Testament, the text attempts to verify the divine origin of Christ, who, contrary to the assumptions of the Arianists, was not only adopted, but created by God the Father.

Petrova and Hinterhölzl (2010) find examples in Isidor in which the information-structural categories of background, new-information focus and contrastive focus are exactly as in Tatian. Consider the data in (19). Expressions classifying as background information, such as the anaphoric NP *christ gotes sunu* in (19a) or the pronoun *ir* in (19b), appear preverbally, while material conveying the asserted part of the utterance follows V_{fin}. In turn, expressions bearing a contrastive interpretation, for example those excluding an alternative to the divine origin of Jesus (conveyed by the PP *fona fater* 'by the Father' in (19a)), or members of a set of alternatives (*iu* 'already' versus *noh* 'still' in (19b)) are placed immediately before V_{fin}:

- (19) a. Mit so mihhiles herduomes urchundin ist nu so offenliihho armarit
 with so great glorious proof is now so evidently said
 dhazs christ gotes sunu... [fona fater] uuard chiboran
 that Christ God's son from Father became born
 'By so many facts it is evidently said that Christ, the Son of God, was
 created by the Father'
 (Isidor 2, 3)
- b. Souhemes auur uuir nu ziidh dhera christes chiburdi huuedhar ir
 explore but we now time of.the Christ's birth whether he
 [iu] quhami odho uuir [noh] sculim siin quhemandes biidan
 already came or we still shall his arrival expect
 'But let us explore the time of Christ's birth, whether He already came or we
 still have to expect His arrival'
 (Isidor 5, 5)

Schlachter's (2012) complete investigation of the position of V_{fin} in dependent clauses in Isidor confirms these properties, but adds some modifications. She identifies orders in which a contrastive focus follows V_{fin}. for example cases of so-called

the right (20b). At the same time, XPs in the pattern Aux – XP – V may also receive contrastive interpretation, see (20c):

- (20) a. (quia moriens caro eius non uidit corruptionem)
 dhasz imu arsterbandemu siin fleisc ni chisah enigan unuuillun
 that he.DAT dying.DAT his body NEG saw any corruption
 ‘that his body showed no corruption after he died’
 (Isidor 9, 12)
- b. (Quod in persona specialiter christi domini nostri accipitur)
 dhazs dhiz ist chiquhedan [in unseres druhtines nemin]
 that that is said in.the our.GEN Lord.GEN name
 ‘that this is said in our Lord’s name’
 (Isidor 3, 3)
- c. (intellege christum)
 dhazs dhar ist christ chizeihnit
 that there is Christ designated
 ‘that it is Christ who is designated there’
 (Isidor 3, 2)

Schlachter (2012) concludes that in early OHG texts, the position of V_{fin}, which is not fixed yet, is used to express focus on an object in various word order patterns to a larger extent than is possible in later texts.

14.4 Conclusion

This chapter addressed the derivation of different word order patterns from a universal VO base and leftward movement of constituents related to the expression of information structural categories. It was shown that in OHG, constituents are mapped according to their information-structural contribution into the following three domains in the clause: (i) presupposed, or background material is realized in the (upper) middle field, (ii) material that belongs to the domain of new-information focus appears post-verbally, while (iii) contrastively focused phrases are realized left-adjacent to V_{fin}.

To account for this distribution of constituents in the clause, we assume leftward movement of V_{fin} to the head of a functional projection FocP which separates the domains of background and presentational focus in the clause, with [SpecFocP] being reserved for phrases with a contrastive interpretation. This explanation takes into account the interaction between prosodic and information-structural conditions in word order variation.

15

Periphrastic verb forms

AUGUSTIN SPEYER

15.1 Periphrastic verb forms as an example of grammaticalization

In the context of word order at the right sentence periphery in German, the verbal complex formed by periphrastic verb forms is crucial, cf. Chapters 12 and 13 on the role of the ordering of finite and non-finite verbs in determining the basic word order and on phenomena such as verb raising and verb projection raising. The present chapter discusses the development of periphrastic verb forms and related processes of syntactic change.

The rise of periphrastic verb forms is a classic example of the combination of semantic and morphosyntactic change processes that is referred to descriptively as ‘grammaticalization’. Following, among others, van Gelderen (1993); von Stechow (1995); Roberts and Roussou (2003); Öhl (2009); and Ferraresi (2014), grammaticalization is understood here as a sequence of language changes that concern different subsystems:

- The first step is the semantic change called ‘semantic bleaching’. If there is a prolific use of a combination of one specific lexeme L_1 with other lexemes L_n , where all L_n are of the same category, and if the usage is such that L_1 shares at least one semantic feature with a grammatically encodable category C (e.g. one of the universal pool of φ -features or other features able to head a functional projection),¹ the semantic content of L_1 will change such that most, if not all semantic features except the feature(s) conforming to the φ -feature constituting C will be deleted.
- Once this is on its way, syntactic changes set in, reflecting the semantic change. Usually these are reanalysis processes that lead to L_1 governing L_n and recategorization processes from lexical to functional categories.
- If such a sequence of changes happened once, it is possible that this sequence of changes serves as a model for other, similar changes (‘analogical extension’).

¹ For instance, if L_1 can be understood as a metaphor for C (e.g. ‘going to a place’ as a metaphor for ‘doing in the future’), or is understood as bearing some other logical relation to C (e.g. if an event A causes