Anne Breitbarth (Ghent University)

Resumption after left-peripheral conditional clauses in Middle Low German

Background. In Middle Low German (MLG), V2 word order is well established (Rösler 1997, Petrova 2012, Mähl 2014), though certain V3-orders are possible, both after non-clausal and clausal constituents (Battefeld 2009, Donhauser & Petrova 2009, Tophinke 2009, Petrova 2012, Wallmeier 2015, Dreessen & Ihden 2015). For V3-orders involving left-peripheral adverbial clauses (LPAC), it has been argued for temporal adverbial clauses that they almost always feature the subject between the LPAC and the finite verb of the matrix clause, and that this word order seems to be chronologically older than structures involving a resumptive element like *so* 'so' or *do* 'then' (Battefeld 2009, Donhauser & Petrova 2009).

In the present paper, I challenge the assumed chronology, based on the left periphery of matrix clauses with left-peripheral conditional clauses, and argue that (one subtype of) the V3-patterns with a nominal element between LPAC and matrix Vfin represent(s) a transitional stage on the way to full syntactic integration of LPACs, and that structures involving correlates / resumptives are older.

Empirical basis. MLG legal texts feature a rich inventory of left-peripheral conditional constructions, which according to standard assumptions, are not syntactically integrated into their matrix clauses (e.g. Tophinke 2009, Wallmeier 2015), considering the latter mostly exhibit V2 order, as in the matrix clause (bold) of the asyndetic conditional protasis in (1).

(1)   [Do wi des nicht] **so schole wi [...] to hamborch [...] in riden**
        'If we do not do that, we [...] shall ride into Hamburg [...]'   (UB Lübeck)

Observations. Unlike in Middle and Early New High German (e.g. Behaghel 1932, Thim-Mabrey 1987, Axel 2002), *so* (as in (1)) is **not** the most frequent element in the initial position of the V2 matrix clause following the conditional protasis. Rather, as already described for temporal adverbial clauses (Battefeld 2009 and Donhauser & Petrova 2009), superficial V3 order with a phrasal (non-correlative) element are the most frequent type of word order in MLG (for conditionals, see also Tophinke 2009:170). For the current paper, all (311) left-peripheral conditional clauses in a corpus of five MLG legal texts were examined. In this corpus, the initial element of the V2 matrix clause depends somewhat on the type of protasis (resumptive *so* is more frequent after asyndetic conditionals), but in most cases (ca. 74%), it is a topical element, like a d-pronoun, personal pronoun, or a full NP referring to a salient entity in he discourse (see below). Those that are not are impersonal pronouns (*man* 'one') or expletives (*it* 'it'), that is, elements typically associated with a low position in a split-CP analysis of the clausal left periphery.

In contrast to Battefeld's (2009) findings, the (pro)nominal elements following the LPAC are **not** mostly subjects. Only comparing elements that are subjects, direct objects, and indirect objects in the matrix clause in our corpus, subjects account for 62.8%, direct objects for 33.5%, and indirect objects for 3.7%. Therefore, more than a third of these clauses cannot be subsumed under "non-inverted V3" (Haegeman & Greco to app.). The type of resumptive pronoun correlates with the grammatical function expressed: (in)direct objects are (almost) exclusively d-pronouns (2a) (and some full NPs, (2b)), as in German Left Dislocation, while subjects can additionally also be regular personal pronouns (3), as in Hanging Topic constructions. What the 'resumptive' elements in all clauses in the corpus have in common is that they are topical, and that their referent is a constituent of the preceding conditional clause (2b), or a

subconstituent of one (3), though sometimes, this referent may be introduced more indirectly, as *ere kinder* 'their children' through the enumeration of marriage constellations in (4), but it is still salient.

(2) a. [Heuet auer he len untfanghen er he wrde aldus] **dat** ne verluset he nicht der mede
'But if he has received a fiefdom before he became thus, he does not lose **that** because of it.'

b. [Wente were dat man ieneghes mannes knecht sculdeghede vmme rof] **Den knecht** scal de man vnsculdich maken
'For if someone accused any man's servant of the theft, the man shall indemnify (for) **the servant**.' (UB Lübeck)

(3) [Wirt dan en man uan sinen wiue mit rechte scheden] **se** behalt doch ere liftucht de he er geuen heuet [...]
'If a man is legally divorced from his wife, **she** shall still keep her annuity that he has given to her.' (Oldenburg, *Sachsenspiegel*)

(4) [Nemet och twe brodere twe sustere vnde de derde broder en vromede wif**] ere kindere** sint doch ghelike na ir iewelic des andren erue to nemende
'If two brothers marry two sisters, and the third borther takes an unrelated wife, **their children** shall still have equal rights to take the others' inheritance' (Oldenburg, *Sachsenspiegel*)

Analysis. While apparently not syntactically integrated into their matrix clauses, left-peripheral conditional clauses in MLG importantly differ from peripheral adverbial clauses (Haegeman 2003, 2010) in semantic terms, as they express a condition for the realisation of the event expressed in the matrix (i.e., they constrain its interpretation), like central adverbial clauses, and not a background assumption yielding additional inferences in combination with the matrix. That is, they are not frame setters (Haegeman & Greco to app.). These constructions also differ in the protasis being 'resumed' by elements picking up on referents introduced into the discourse by the protasis itself. These 'resumptive' elements do not seem to correlate with the conditional being linked at the content or speech-act level (as proposed by Ebert et al. 2014 for Present-Day German).

I assume, following Petrova (2012) (on V3 in MLG involving non-sentential left-peripheral XPs) and Walkden (2017) (on different Germanic V3-varieties), that the resumptive pronouns and DP after left-peripheral conditional clauses in MLG occupy a low position in the CPdomain, for instance Walkden's SpecCP1 conflating Top$_{Fam}$P and FinP. While a higher position hosting frame setters must be available in MLG (cf. Petrova 2012 on non-sentential frame setters), it is not clear whether this position is where the left-peripheral conditional clauses are found, as their semantic integration makes them look more like central adverbial clauses. I argue, however, that the use of familiar topics picking up on referents introduced by the LPAC instead of resumptive adverbials like *so* indicates that left-peripheral conditional clauses are in an intermediate stage between non-integration and integration, with integration being achieved at the level of discourse structure. Rather than an earlier stage leading to full integration (V2 / inversion after LPAC) via a stage with *so*-resumption, I argue that the (pro)nominal resumption discussed in the present paper is the MLG counterpart of *so*-resumption, which is more common in MHG and ENHG, where the (pro)nominal type is much less common, and indeed seems to be a transfer from MLG (Donhauser & Petrova 2009).