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Middle Low German (MLG) = group of West Germanic dialects north of Benrath isogloss (no High German sound shift; i.e. wa, dor, ma, mark)

written in several scribal dialects (Schreibsprachen) between ca. 1250 and 1650; international influence (Hanseatic League); replaced by ENHG as written language from 1550 onwards
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BACKGROUND

Still very little is known about the syntax of historical Low German, particularly Middle Low German (c. 1150-1600). What we do know (a.o.):

1. Head-final VP, but V(P)R + extraposition possible (Petrova 2012)
3. Mainly V2, but certain V3 orders are possible (Petrova 2012, Wallmeier 2015, Dreessen & Ihden 2015)
4. Left-peripheral conditional clauses are not yet integrated (Tophinke 2009)

Today: Degrees of integration

‘Resumptive’ patterns after left-peripheral (functionally) conditional clauses (LPCC):

LPCC — (XP*) — V

(*XP = Resumptive / XP / ∅)
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BACKGROUND

- Still very little is known about the syntax of historical Low German, particularly Middle Low German (c. 1150-1600)
- What we do know (a.o.): MLG had
  1. head-final VP, but V(P)R + extraposition possible (Petrova 2012)
  2. verb movement in matrix clauses and certain ‘transparent’ embedded clauses (Petrova 2012, Mähl 2014)
  3. mainly V2, but certain V3 orders are possible (Petrova 2012, Wallmeier 2015, Dreessen & Ihden 2015)
  4. left-peripheral conditional clauses are not yet integrated (Tophinke 2009)

Today: Degrees of integration

‘Resumptive’ patterns after left-peripheral (functionally) conditional clauses (LPCC):

\[
\text{LPCC} \rightarrow (\text{XP}^*) \rightarrow V_{\text{fin}}
\]

\( (*\text{XP} = \text{Resumptive} / \text{XP} / \emptyset) \)
Axel (2002): initial adverbial clauses (“AS$_\text{links}$”) are **not integrated** in High German until late 15$^{\text{th}}$ c., esp. MHG (1050-1350) 14-53% V3 (1) and up to 37-78% **resumption** (2)

(1) a. [Da sie alle zusamen kamen,] sie wurden des zu rate
‘When they all came together, they decided about this.’ (ProLa I 176,10)

b. [Und da es umb die mitnacht kam,] der sarganten eyner was offgestanden
‘And when it was around midnight, one of the sergeants had got up.’ (ProLa II 151,3)

(2) [Und ee dann ir hinweg rytent,] so sagen ich uch vor allen rittern
‘And before you then ride off [so] I will tell you before all knights ... ’ (ProLa II 180,26)
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Axel (2002): initial adverbial clauses ("AS\textsubscript{links}") are **not integrated** in High German until late 15\textsuperscript{th} c., esp. MHG (1050-1350) 14-53% V3 (1) and up to 37-78% resumption (2)

(3) a. [Da sie alle zusamen kamen,] sie wurden des zu rate  
‘When they all came together, they decided about this.’  
(ProLa I 176,10)

b. [Und da es umb die mitnacht kam,] der sarganten eyner was offgestanden  
‘And when it was around midnight, one of the sergeants had got up.’  
(ProLa II 151,3)

(4) [Und ee dann ir hinweg rytent,] so sagen ich uch vor allen rittern  
‘And before you then ride off [so] I will tell you before all knights …’  
(ProLa II 180,26)

Thim-Mabrey (1987:199): initial adverbial clauses in ENHG (1350-1650) are followed by resumptive/correlative *so* in 82% of 259 cases in her corpus
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  - almost always: subject between adverbial clause and Vfin of matrix
  - this word order chronologically older than structures involving a resumptive element like so ‘so’ or do ‘then’

(11)  
  a. CP – subject – Vfin
  b. CP – so/do – Vfin

- Tophinke (2009)x: low degree of integration of (functionally) conditional clause in left periphery of matrix clause (based on Raible’s (1992) hierarchy):
  1. Juxtaposition of clauses without junction
  2. Junction by resumption
  3. ...
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- Battefeld (2009), Donhauser & Petrova (2009): left-peripheral *temporal* clauses
  - almost always: subject between adverbial clause and Vfin of matrix
  - this word order chronologically older than structures involving a resumptive element like *so* ‘so’ or *do* ‘then’

(12)  

a. CP – subject – Vfin  
b. CP – *so/do* – Vfin

  1. Juxtaposition of clauses without junction
  2. Junction by resumption
  3. ...

BACKGROUND
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Syndetic conditionals

If I should eventually be overcome by death, [so] I set up and make my testament and last will about my goods to bequeath (UB Lübeck)

Asyndetic/V1 conditionals

If we don’t do that, we [...]

shall ride into Hamburg [...]

(UB Lübeck)
BACKGROUND
Middle Low German

- expectation for MLG, based on findings from MHG and ENHG (Thim-Mabrey 1987, Axel 2002): lots of resumption as well, esp. with so?
**BACKGROUND**

Middle Low German

- expectation for MLG, based on findings from MHG and ENHG (Thim-Mabrey 1987, Axel 2002): lots of resumption as well, esp. with *so*?

(15) a. **syndetic conditionals**

\[ Jfft \ ik\ denne\ na\ dem(e)\ willen\ godes\ van\ deme\ dode\ auerwunnen\ werde\] *So* sette vn(de) make ik myn testame(n)te vn(de) latesten willen van mynem(e) nalaten(en) gude ‘If I should eventually be overcome by death, [so] I set up and make my testament and last will about my goods to bequeathe’

(UB Lübeck)

b. **asynthetic/V1 conditionals**

\[ Do \ wi\ des\ nicht\] *so* schole\ wi […] to hamborch [...] in riden ‘If we don’t do that, we […] shall ride into Hamburg [...]’

(UB Lübeck)
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① challenge the simple picture (juxtaposition > so > integration)
② show that so is only used with a certain type of conditionals, and is not the most common strategy in MLG
③ argue that d-pronouns are an early and wide-spread resumption strategy
④ claim that they a rather part of a type of Left Dislocation structure
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not entirely (or rather, at all) balanced corpus of 10 texts / text collections

1. legal texts (charters, lcodes of law, statutes)
   - Oldenburger illustrated ms. of the Sachsenspiegel (code of law), Kloster Rastede 1336
   - Oldenburg, 25 charters, 1331-1375
   - Rüthen, Statutarrecht, Ms. M, ca. 1350
   - Soest, Schrae im Statutenbuch, ca. 1367
   - Herford, Rechtsbuch, um 1375
   - Lübeck, 50 charters, 1300-1500

2. religious texts
   - Bordesholmer Marienklage, 1475
   - Prayer 1 (appendix to Dat myrren bundeken, Th. a Kempis, Münster), 1480

3. literary texts
   - translation of Boccaccio’s Historie van veer Koepluden vnde eyner thuchtigen vramen Vrouwen, 1510

4. private letters
   - letter of Agneta Willeken, 1535
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   NN Oldenburger illustrated ms. of the *Sachsenspiegel* (code of law), Kloster Rastede 1336
   NN Oldenburg, 25 charters, 1331-1375
   WF Rüthen, *Statutarrecht*, Ms. M, ca. 1350
   WF Soest, *Schrae* im Statutenbuch, ca. 1367
   WF Herford, *Rechtsbuch*, um 1375
   LB Lübeck, 50 charters, 1300-1500

2 religious texts
   NN *Bordesholmer Marienklage*, 1475
   WF Prayer 1 (appendix to *Dat myrren bundeken*, Th. a Kempis, Münster), 1480

3 literary texts
   NN translation of Boccaccio’s *Historie van veer Koepluden vnde eyner thuchtigen vramen Vrouwen*, 1510

4 private letters
   NN letter of Agneta Willeken, 1535
TYPES OF INITIAL (FUNCTIONALLY) CONDITIONAL CLAUSES

[16]  a. **syndetic protases**
[Oft en man sines tuges wil afgan [...] ] he sal bekennen vnde lesten eder besaken vnde dare vore sweren
‘If a man wants to rid himself of his witness [...] then he shall confess and carry out, or deny and swear (an oath) on it.’ (Oldenburg, *Sachsenspiegel*)

b. **asynedtic/V1 protases**
[Do wi des nicht] so schole wi [...] to hamborch [...] in riden
‘If we don’t do that, we [...] shall ride into Hamburg [...]’ (UB Lübeck)

c. **pseudo V1 protases**
[were dat al so [dat eyn vrowe eyne dochter hedde vnd er ere man vorstorue vnd se eynen anderen man neme vnd van deme eynen ander dochter hedde] so solde yo de yrste dochter de se van dem yrsten manne hadde der moder gherade boren
‘If it were the case that a woman should have a daughter and her husband should die and she should marry another man and have a daughter with him, so should her first daughter that she had with the first husband be of the same legal status to the mother’ (Rüthen, *Statutarrecht*)

d. **“irrelevance” conditionals/ universal free relatives**
[So wey dat dede] dey solde wedden deme Rayde dey hoyghesten bôte
‘Whosoever did that (he) should pay the council the highest fine.’ (Soester Schrae)
(= if anyone did that ...
CORPUS RESULTS

XP between LPCC and matrix clause can be a:

1. d-pronoun
2. personal pronoun
3. NP, PP
4. so, da
5. locative adverb, pronominal adverb
6. impersonal pronoun, expletive...

only one case of ∅

most frequent elements: retained 344/375 clauses

d-pron
so
pers.pron
NP
PP
synd
V1
irr.
were
Total

3 (11.1%) 21 (77.7%) 3 (11.1%) 1 (3.7%) 0 27
43 (27.6%) 55 (35.3%) 27 (17.3%) 27 (17.3%) 4 (2.7%) 156
74 (79.6%) 10 (10.8%) 3 (3.2%) 5 (5.4%) 1 (1.1%) 93
40 (59.7%) 19 (28.4%) 0 8 (11.9%) 0 67
160 105 33 41 5 344
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- XP between LPCC and matrix clause can be a:
  1. d-pronoun
  2. personal pronoun
  3. NP, PP
  4. so, da
  5. locative adverb, pronominal adverb
  6. impersonal pronoun, expletive ...

- only one case of $\emptyset$

- most frequent elements: retained 344/375 clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>d-pron</th>
<th>so</th>
<th>pers.pron</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>$\Sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>synd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irr.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CORPUS RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>d-pron</th>
<th>so</th>
<th>pers.pron</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irr.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(diachronic variation unfortunately linked to genre variation – only 5 charters from Lübeck are from around 1500)
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  - d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy
  - diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax
  - "irrelevance" conditionals are restricted to legal texts
  - "pseudo-V1" conditionals (were) are double as frequent (as a type of LPCC) around 1350 (= in legal texts) as they are around 1500, seem to pattern with irrelevance conditionals (preferring d-pronouns)

- observation (II):
  - syndetic protases become more frequent, prefer so V1 conditionals seem less integrated throughout (more NPs, PPs, pers. pronouns)

- observation (III):
  - even without irrelevance conditionals, resumption by d-pronouns is a prominent strategy in the 14th c. (39% d-pronouns, vs. 37% so-resumption)
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
CORPUS RESULTS

■ observations (I):
  ■ d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  ■ d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy
CORPUS RESULTS

■ observations (I):
  ■ d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  ■ d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy

■ diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax from non-legal texts;
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  - d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy

- diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax from non-legal texts;
  - “irrelevance” conditionals are restricted to legal texts
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  - d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy

- diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax from non-legal texts;
  - “irrelevance” conditionals are restricted to legal texts
  - “pseudo-V1” conditionals (were) are double as frequent (as a type of LPCC) around 1350 (= in legal texts) as they are around 1500, seem to pattern with irrelevance conditionals (preferring d-pronouns)
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  - d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy

- diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax from non-legal texts;
  - “irrelevance” conditionals are restricted to legal texts
  - “pseudo-V1” conditionals (were) are double as frequent (as a type of LPCC) around 1350 (= in legal texts) as they are around 1500, seem to pattern with irrelevance conditionals (preferring d-pronouns)

- observation (II):
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  - d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy
- diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax from non-legal texts;
  - “irrelevance” conditionals are restricted to legal texts
  - “pseudo-V1” conditionals (were) are double as frequent (as a type of LPCC) around 1350 (= in legal texts) as they are around 1500, seem to pattern with irrelevance conditionals (preferring d-pronouns)
- observation (II):
  - syndetic protases become more frequent, prefer so
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  - d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy

- diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax from non-legal texts;
  - “irrelevance” conditionals are restricted to legal texts
  - “pseudo-V1” conditionals (were) are double as frequent (as a type of LPCC) around 1350 (= in legal texts) as they are around 1500, seem to pattern with irrelevance conditionals (preferring d-pronouns)

- observation (II):
  - syndetic protases become more frequent, prefer so
  - V1 conditionals seem less integrated throughout (more NPs, PPs, pers. pronouns)
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (I):
  - d-pronouns are most frequent in first sub-period, and personal pronouns, NPs and PPs disappear towards second sub-period
  - d-pronouns disappear entirely in second sub-period; so becomes preferred resumption strategy

- diachronic development? not so fast: legal texts seem to have different syntax from non-legal texts;
  - "irrelevance" conditionals are restricted to legal texts
  - "pseudo-V1" conditionals (were) are double as frequent (as a type of LPCC) around 1350 (= in legal texts) as they are around 1500, seem to pattern with irrelevance conditionals (preferring d-pronouns)

- observation (II):
  - syndetic protases become more frequent, prefer so
  - V1 conditionals seem less integrated throughout (more NPs, PPs, pers. pronouns)

- observation (III): even without irrelevance conditionals, resumption by d-pronouns is a prominent strategy in the 14th c. (39% d-pronouns, vs. 37% so-resumption)
CORPUS RESULTS

(17) a. If however an heir becomes sisters or brothers with all that may later belong to the extended family, (s)he takes the same part of it (the heritage), whether it be a man or a woman. (Oldenburg, Sachsenspiegel)

b. If he then finds the lost good, he must take that back without anyone's objection (Soest, Schrae)

c. If it were so that a man or his friends caught a man with his daughter in his guard, they are allowed to hold him without going to court and force him to marry the virgin. (Rüthen, Statutarrecht)
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (IV): d-pronouns ± exclusively familiar topics introduced in the protasis:

  a. [S wen auer en erue vorsusteret unde uorbroderet alle de sic like na to der sibbe stippen de nemet liken del dar an it si man eder wif ‘If however an heir becomes sisters or brothers with all that may later belong to the extended family, (s)he takes the same part of it (the heritage), whether it be a man or a woman.’ (Oldenburg, Sachsenspiegel)

  b. [vindet hey dan dat vorlorne ghuyt dat můt hey wol weder nemen sunder iemans wedersprake ‘If he then finds the lost good, he must take that back without anyone’s objection’ (Soest, Schrae)

  c. [Were dat also. dat eyn man ofte sine vront eynen man begripen by syner dochter in syner were den mochten se halden ane broke des gherichtes vnd dvingen en dat he de iuncvrowen tho echte neme ‘If it were so that a man or his friends caught a man with his daughter in his guard, they are allowed to hold him without going to court and force him to marry the virgin.’ (Rüthen, Statutarrecht)
observations (IV): d-pronouns ± exclusively familiar topics introduced in the protasis:

(19)    a. [S wen auer en erue vorsusteret unde uorbroderet alle de sic like na to der sibbe stippen moghen] de nemet liken del dar an it si man eder wif
‘If however an heir becomes sisters or brothers with all that may later belong to the extended family, (s)he takes the same part of it (the heritage), whether it be a man or a woman.’
(Oldenburg, Sachsenspiegel)
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (IV): d-pronouns ± exclusively familiar topics introduced in the protasis:

(20)  a. [S wen auer en erue vorsusteret unde uorbroderet alle de sic like na to der sibbe stippen moghen] de nemet liken del dar an it si man eder wif
‘If however an heir becomes sisters or brothers with all that may later belong to the extended family, (s)he takes the same part of it (the heritage), whether it be a man or a woman.’ (Oldenburg, Sachsenspiegel)

b. [vindet hey dan dat vorlorne ghuyt ] dat můt hey wol weder nemen sunder iemans wedersprake
‘If he then finds the lost good, he must take that back without anyone's objection’ (Soest, Schrae)
CORPUS RESULTS

- observations (IV): d-pronouns ± exclusively familiar topics introduced in the protasis:

(21) a. [S wen auer en erue vorsusteret unde uorbroderet alle de sic like na to der sibbe stippen moghen] de nemet liken del dar an it si man eder wif
   ‘If however an heir becomes sisters or brothers with all that may later belong to the extended family, (s)he takes the same part of it (the heritage), whether it be a man or a woman.’
   (Oldenburg, Sachsenspiegel)

b. [vindet hey dan dat vorlorne ghuyt ] dat můt hey wol weder nemen sunder iemans wedersprake
   ‘If he then finds the lost good, he must take that back without anyone's objection’
   (Soest, Schrae)

c. [Were dat also. dat eyn man ofte sine vront eynen man begripen by syner dochter in syner were] den mochten se halden ane broke des gherichtes vnd dvingen en . dat he de iuncvrowen tho echte neme
   ‘If it were so that a man or his friends caught a man with his daughter in his guard, they are allowed to hold him without going to court and force him to marry the virgin.’
   (Rüthen, Statutarrecht)
CORPUS RESULTS

Summary of observations:

1. Resumption by so is preferred with syndetic protases.

2. "Resumption" by d-pronoun very frequent early on, esp. with less prototypical LPCCs, viz. irrelevance and were-conditionals, but also without irrelevance conditionals.

3. The d-pronoun is a familiar topic introduced inside the LPCC, while so resumes the entire LPCC.

4. V1-protases: higher frequency of personal pronouns, NPs, PPs etc. between LPCC and matrix Vfin.
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Summary of observations:

1. Resumption by *so* is preferred with syndetic protases.
2. "Resumption" by d-pronoun very frequent early on, esp. with less prototypical LPCCs, viz. irrelevance and *were*-conditionals, but also without irrelevance conditionals.
3. The d-pronoun is a familiar topic introduced inside the LPCC, while *so* resumes the entire LPCC.
4. V1-protases: higher frequency of personal pronouns, NPs, PPs etc. between LPCC and matrix Vfin.
THE IDEA

Claims:

1. LPCCs resumed by d-pronouns are more integrated than LPCCs followed by personal pronouns, NPs or PPs.

2. This is a type of Left Disclocation. Where it is not the entire LPCC that is resumed, the LD'ed constituent pied pipes the LPCC.

Ingredients:

1. Older Germanic had split CP (Walkden 2015)

2. (non-clausal) LD-topics are below framesetters in MLG (Petrova 2012), i.e. inside the matrix CP (Haegeman & Greco 2018 on FrameP)

3. conditionals are topics (Haiman 1978, Ebert et al. 2014)
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Claims:

1. LPCCs resumed by d-pronouns are more integrated than LPCCs followed by personal pronouns, NPs or PPs.
2. This is a type of Left Dislocation. Where it is not the entire LPCC that is resumed, the LD’ed constituent pied pipes the LPCC.

Ingredients:

1. Older Germanic had split CP (Walkden 2015)
2. (non-clausal) LD-topics are below framesetters in MLG (Petrova 2012), i.e. inside the matrix CP (Haegeman & Greco 2018 on FrameP)
3. conditionals are topics (Haiman 1978, Ebert et al. 2014)
INGREDIENTS

Older Germanic V > 2
Walkden (2015): Proto-West Germanic had V-to-Fin movement only, and 0-2 pre-finite constituents depending on information-structural status;
Walkden (2015): Proto-West Germanic had V-to-Fin movement only, and 0-2 pre-finite constituents depending on information-structural status;

(26)  

a. \[\text{ForceP (Aboutness)} \text{Force}^\circ [\text{FinP (Familiar/RNS)} \text{V}_{\text{fin}} [\text{TP} ... ]]]\]  
b. \[\text{ForceP (Aboutness)} \text{V}_{\text{fin}} [\text{FinP (Familiar/RNS)} \text{Fin}^\circ [\text{TP} ... ]]]\]
Older Germanic V>2

Walkden (2015): Proto-West Germanic had V-to-Fin movement only, and 0-2 pre-finite constituents depending on information-structural status;

(28)  
   a. \[\text{ForceP (Aboutness) } \text{Force}^\circ \ [\text{FinP (Familiar/RNS) } V_{\text{fin}} \ [\text{TP} \ldots]]]\n   b. \[\text{ForceP (Aboutness) } V_{\text{fin}} \ [\text{FinP (Familiar/RNS) } \text{Fin}^\circ \ [\text{TP} \ldots]]]\n
V2 word order is quite well established in MLG (Rösler 1997, Petrova 2012, Mähl 2014), though certain V>2-orders are possible with non-sentential preverbal XPs (frame setters, foci, topics) (Petrova 2012)
Older Germanic V > 2

Walkden (2015): Proto-West Germanic had V-to-Fin movement only, and 0-2 pre-finite constituents depending on information-structural status;

\[(30) \quad \text{a. } \begin{array}{c}
& \text{[ForceP (Aboutness) Force}^\circ \text{ [FinP (Familiar/RNS) V}_\text{fin} \text{ [TP ... ]]}]
\end{array}
\]

\[\quad \text{b. } \begin{array}{c}
& \text{[ForceP (Aboutness) V}_\text{fin} \text{ [FinP (Familiar/RNS) Fin}^\circ \text{ [TP ... ]]}]
\end{array}\]

V2 word order is quite well established in MLG (Rösler 1997, Petrova 2012, Mähl 2014), though certain V > 2-orders are possible with non-sentential preverbal XPs (frame setters, foci, topics) (Petrova 2012)

(according to Petrova, adverbial CPs are always adjoined to the matrix CP, following Axel 2002)
Walkden (2015): Proto-West Germanic had V-to-Fin movement only, and 0-2 pre-finite constituents depending on information-structural status;

(32)  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } [\text{ForceP (Aboutness) } \text{Force}^\circ \ [\text{FinP (Familiar/RNS)} \ V_{\text{fin}} \ [\text{TP } \ldots ]]] \\
&\text{b. } [\text{ForceP (Aboutness) } V_{\text{fin}} \ [\text{FinP (Familiar/RNS)} \ \text{Fin}^\circ \ [\text{TP } \ldots ]]]
\end{align*}
\]

V2 word order is quite well established in MLG (Rösler 1997, Petrova 2012, Mähl 2014), though certain V＞2-orders are possible with non-sentential preverbal XPs (frame setters, foci, topics) (Petrova 2012)

(according to Petrova, adverbial CPs are always adjoined to the matrix CP, following Axel 2002)

(33)  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } [\text{ForceP [TopP frame-setter [FocP [TopP LD-topic [FinP d-pron. [Fin′ \ V_i] [VP \ldots t_i]]]]]]]} \\
&\text{b. } \text{Hanging Topic } [\text{ForceP [TopP frame-setter [FocP [TopP [FinP pers.pron. [Fin′ \ V_i] [VP \ldots t_i]]]]]]}
\end{align*}
\]
Haegeman & Greco (2018): FrameP is a discourse projection above ForceP: evidence from complementation and temporal construal in West Flemish V3
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Haegeman & Greco (2018): FrameP is a discourse projection above ForceP: evidence from complementation and temporal construal in West Flemish V3

(35)  a. De vrydag, ze zei da ze moest werken. ‘[On Friday]$_i$, she said$_i$ that she had to work$_*i$’
    b. [FrameP frame-setter [ForceP XP V$_i$ ... [FinP ... t$_i$ ]]]
INGREDIENTS

V>2 in MLG

- Haegeman & Greco (2018): FrameP is a discourse projection above ForceP: evidence from complementation and temporal construal in West Flemish V3

(36) a. De vrydag, ze zei da ze moest werken. ‘[On Friday]$_i$, she said$_i$ that she had to work$_i$’

b. [FrameP frame-setter [ForceP XP V$_i$ ... [FinP ... t$_i$]]]

- Walkden (2017) split-CP analysis of V>2 in Germanic contact varieties: conflation of left-peripheral heads into 2 CP-projections:

1. $\text{CP}_1 \sim \text{FinP}+\text{FamP}$
2. $\text{CP2} \sim \text{Focus field up to ForceP}$
Haegeman & Greco (2018): FrameP is a discourse projection above ForceP: evidence from complementation and temporal construal in West Flemish V3

(37) a. De vrydag, ze zei da ze moest werken. ‘[On Friday]$_i$, she said$_i$ that she had to work$_i$’

b. [FrameP frame-setter [ForceP XP V$_i$ ... [FinP ... t$_i$]]]

Walkden (2017) split-CP analysis of V>2 in Germanic contact varieties: conflation of left-peripheral heads into 2 CP-projections:

1. CP$_1$ ~ FinP+FamP
2. CP$_2$ ~ Focus field up to ForceP

→ left periphery in MLG:

[ (Hanging Topic) [FrameP (frame-setter) [CP$_2$ (LD-topic) [CP$_1$ (d-pron.) [TP ... ]]]]]
Conditionals are topics

Ebert el al. (2014): central / peripheral distinction (as in Haegeman’s work) corresponds in German to Hanging Topic vs. Left Dislocation.

(38) a. LD: Seine Tochter, die liebt jeder
  'His daughter, everyone is very fond of.'

b. HT: *Seine Tochter, jeder liebt sie. 'His daughter, everyone is very fond of.'

  'Every orchid blossoms several times a year if you groom it well.'

  'If you want to know something about it, every orchid blossoms several times a year.'
INGREDIENTS

Conditionals are topics

(Haiman 1978, Ebert et al. 2014)

Ebert et al. (2014): central / peripheral distinction (as in Haegeman’s work) corresponds in German to Hanging Topic vs. Left Dislocation.

(40) a. LD: Seine i Tochter, die liebt jeder i. ‘His i daughter, everyone i is very fond of.’

b. HT: *Seine i Tochter, jeder i liebt sie. ‘His i daughter, everyone i is very fond of.’

(41) a. Wenn man sie i gut pflegt, dann blüht [jede Orchidee] i mehrmals im Jahr. ‘Every orchid blossoms several times a year if you groom it well.’

b. *Wenn du etwas über sie i wissen willst, [jede Orchidee] i blüht mehrmals im Jahr. ‘If you want to know something about it, every orchid blossoms several times a year.’
**INGREDIENTS**
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- conditionals are topics (Haiman 1978, Ebert et al. 2014)
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- conditionals are topics (Haiman 1978, Ebert el al. 2014)
- Ebert el al. (2014): central / peripheral distinction (as in Haegeman’s work) corresponds in German to Hanging Topic vs. Left Dislocation

(44) a. LD: Seine i Tochter, die liebt jeder i. ‘His i daughter, everyone i is very fond of.’
b. HT: *Seine i Tochter, jeder i liebt sie. ‘His i daughter, everyone i is very fond of.’

(45) a. Wenn man sie i gut pflegt, dann blüht [jede Orchidee] i mehrmals im Jahr. ‘Every orchid blossoms several times a year if you groom it well.’
b. *Wenn du etwas über sie i wissen willst, [jede Orchidee] i blüht mehrmals im Jahr. ‘If you want to know something about it, every orchid blossoms several times a year.’
 Conditionals are topics (Haiman 1978, Ebert et al. 2014)

Ebert et al. (2014): central / peripheral distinction (as in Haegeman’s work) corresponds in German to Hanging Topic vs. Left Dislocation

(46) a. LD: Seine\textsubscript{i} Tochter, die liebt jeder\textsubscript{j}. ‘His\textsubscript{i} daughter, everyone\textsubscript{j} is very fond of.’
b. HT: *Seine\textsubscript{i} Tochter, jeder\textsubscript{j} liebt sie. ‘His\textsubscript{i} daughter, everyone\textsubscript{j} is very fond of.’

(47) a. Wenn man sie\textsubscript{i} gut pflegt, dann blüht [jede Orchidee]\textsubscript{j} mehrmals im Jahr. ‘Every orchid blossoms several times a year if you groom it well.’
b. *Wenn du etwas über sie\textsubscript{i} wissen willst, [jede Orchidee]\textsubscript{j} blüht mehrmals im Jahr. ‘If you want to know something about it, every orchid blossoms several times a year.’
ANALYSIS

irrelevance conditionals started integration via d-resumption: they are left-dislocated free relatives (topical, definite descriptions expressing maximal plurality, have an argument position in the matrix clause (cf. binding, (48))


'Who(ever) scratches her car, makes enemies with every owner.'

this strategy adds a variant to the pool of conditional structures that is very similar on the surface to simple juxtaposition / HT-protases:

HT NP / PP / pers.pron. Vfin
LD d-pron. Vfin

without irrelevance conditionals, d-resumption occurs in 38.7% of conditionals around 1350; with them, it's 50.5%
irrelevance conditionals started integration via d-resumption: they are left-dislocated free relatives (topical, definite descriptions expressing maximal plurality, have an argument position in the matrix clause (cf. binding, (48))
irrelevance conditionals started integration via d-resumption: they are left-dislocated free relatives (topical, definite descriptions expressing maximal plurality, have an argument position in the matrix clause (cf. binding, (48))

(50) Wer ihr Auto zerkratzt, macht sich [jede Besitzerin] zum Feind.
‘Who(ever) scratches her car, makes enemies with every owner.’
irrelevance conditionals started integration via d-resumption: they are left-dislocated free relatives (topical, definite descriptions expressing maximal plurality, have an argument position in the matrix clause (cf. binding, (48))

(51) Wer ihr \(_i\) Auto zerkratzt, macht sich [jede Besitzerin] \(_i\) zum Feind. ‘Who(ever) scratches her car, makes enemies with every owner.’

this strategy adds a variant to the pool of conditional structures that is very similar on the surface to simple juxtaposition / HT-protases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>NP / PP / pers.pron.</th>
<th>Vfin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>d-pron.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vfin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
irrelevance conditionals started integration via d-resumption: they are left-dislocated free relatives (topical, definite descriptions expressing maximal plurality, have an argument position in the matrix clause (cf. binding, (48))

Wer ihr Auto zerkratzt, macht sich [jede Besitzerin] zum Feind.

‘Who(ever) scratches her car, makes enemies with every owner.’

this strategy adds a variant to the pool of conditional structures that is very similar on the surface to simple juxtaposition / HT-protases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>NP / PP / pers.pron.</th>
<th>Vfin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>d-pron.</td>
<td>Vfin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

without irrelevance conditionals, d-resumption occurs in 38.7% of conditionals around 1350; with them, it's 50.5%
ANALYSIS

- both strategies track referents in discourse:

(53)  

a. [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*)

b. [vindet hey dan *dat vorlorne ghuyt*] *dat* můt hey wol weder nemen sunder iemans wedersprake  

‘If he then finds the lost good, he must *that* take back without anyone's objection’  

(Soest, *Schrae*)
both strategies track referents in discourse:

(55) a. [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*)

   b. [vindet hey dan dat vorlorne *ghuyt*] *dat* můt hey wol weder nemen sunder iemans wedersprake ‘If he then finds the lost good, he must *that* take back without anyone's objection’ (Soest, *Schrae*)

in case of conditional protases that are *not* irrelevance conditionals (FRs), this can be interpreted as LD-topicalisation (with resumption by a d-pronoun) of the aboutness topic, with *pied piping* of the whole clause.
ANALYSIS

- both strategies track referents in discourse:

(57) a. [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*)

b. [vindet hey dan dat vorlorne *ghuyt*] *dat* můt hey wol weder nemen sunder iemans wedersprake  
‘If he then finds the lost good, he must *that* take back without anyone's objection’  
(Soest, *Schrae*)

- in case of conditional protases that are *not* irrelevance conditionals (FRs), this can be interpreted as LD-topicalisation (with resumption by a d-pronoun) of the aboutness topic, with *pied piping* of the whole clause.

(58) a. [Whose[+wh] book] *i* did you borrow *t*?  

b. [Vortmer wanner de Stath *pale eder strůke* +top to den Damme behŏuet] *i* de moghen se an den haghen höwen *i* [...]  
‘Furthermore, if/when the city needs poles or bushes for the dam, they may cut them from the forest …’  
(UB Oldenburg 1345)
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ANALYSIS

- increasing integration of protasis via spread of d-resumption from irrelevance conditionals to more prototypical (formally) conditionals:

- syndetic protases are quite rare, esp. around 1350 (only 3.2% – around 1500 already 60%), V1 conditionals show greater variability in ‘resuming’ elements throughout (but 30% d-resumption)

- esp. pseudo-V1 conditionals with *weret (sake) dat* take on d-resumption – WHY?
  1. as (pseudo-)conditional protases, *weret*-protases are topical anyway (though perhaps originally HT)
  2. they introduce an aboutness topic: the *dat*-clause
  3. in the generalisation of d-resumption to conditional aboutness topics, and topics pied piped by them, they can become part of LD-topicalisation structure

- early establishment of d-resumption with *weret*-protases indicates an earlier grammaticalisation of this structure as conditional connector than usually assumed (Tophinke 2009, Wallmeier 2012, Merten 2015)
were dat also
dat eyn den anderen sloghe...
den broke
mach
he ... beteren
Were dat also
dat eyn man ofte sine vront
eynen man begripen by syner dochter
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- frequent use of irrelevance conditionals in early MLG legal texts adds prominent LD-topicalisation variant to the pool of variants
- topicalhood of conditional protases invites reanalysis of at least some types of conditional protases
- intermediate stage on the way to full syntactic integration; analogy to non-sentential multiple XP-fronting?
  
  d-resumption
  
  juxtaposition $\rightarrow$ so-resumption
  
  juxtaposition $\rightarrow$ so-resumption (integration)

- more data needed: non-legal texts from around 1350, more legal texts from around 1500
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