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What is this talk about?

Compare [1] and [2] from Present-day German:

[1] Sie nahm den Regenschirm mit, um nicht nass zu werden.

she took the umbrella with COMP NEG wet to become.INF

‘She took the umbrella to not get wet.’


she put the umbrella next REFL COMP him.ACC then DISC.PART to forget.INF

‘She put the umbrella right next to herself only to forget it anyway.’

(Leys 1971; Leys 1988: 97)
What is this talk about?

[1]: ... *um nicht nass zu werden*

[2]: ... *um ihn dann doch zu vergessen*
What is this talk about?

However, the *um-zu*-clauses differ. For example: Movement to the matrix Spec,CP position is blocked in [2], but not in [1]:

[1']  [[[Spec,CP *Um nicht nass zu werden]$_i$ [c$_0$ nahm] sie den Regenschirm mit]$_t$$_i$
    COMP NEG wet to become.INF took she the umbrella with

[2']  [[[Spec,CP Um ihn dann doch zu vergessen]$_i$ ...
    COMP him.ACC then DISC.PART to forget.INF ...
    [c$_0$ stellte] sie den Regenschirm neben sich]$_t$$_i$
    put she the umbrella next REFL
What is this talk about?

[1] and [2] do differ. They constitute two different clause types:

[1] *Sie nahm den Regenschirm mit,*  [um nicht nass zu werden].

she took the umbrella with COMP NEG wet to become.INF

‘She took the umbrella to not get wet.’

[2] *Sie stellte den Regenschirm neben sich,*  

she put the umbrella next REFL

[um ihn dann doch zu vergessen].

COMP him.ACC then DISC.PART to forget.INF

‘She put the umbrella right next to herself only to forget it anyway.’

(Leys 1988: 97)
What is this talk about?

[2] Sie stellte den Regenschirm neben sich,
she put the umbrella next REFL

[um ihn dann doch zu vergessen].
COMP him.ACC then DISC.PART to forget.INF

'She put the umbrella right next to herself only to forget it anyway.'

mirative-prospective clause

a) mirative: grammatical category marking information which is surprising/unexpected to the speaker (see DeLancey 1997) (cf. the discourse particle doch in [2] and Abraham (2017), Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina (2016) and Trotzke (2017) on mirativity in Indo-European languages);

b) prospective: relationship between the main clause and the subordinate clause (chronological / temporal: Leys 1988)
What is this talk about?

Japanese lacks mirative-prospective clauses introduced by a complementizer:

   Julia-TOP forget.NON-PST in:order:to umbrella-ACC buy.PAST
   Intended: ‘Julia bought an umbrella in order to forget it.’
   (Shinya Okano, personal communication)

To render their meaning, one is forced to use dedicated adverbials:

   John-TOP grow:up-CONJ to:my:surprise linguist become.PAST
   ‘John grew up (only) to become a linguist.’
   (Shinya Okano, personal communication)
What is this talk about?

Languages differ with respect to the availability of mirative-prospective clauses.

Languages possessing mirative-prospective clauses:

a) Germanic: Afrikaans (*om*), Dutch (*om*), Faroese (*fyri*), German (*um*), Icelandic (*til þess að*), Norwegian (*for*) + English (*to*);

a) Slavic: Czech (*aby*); Polish (*żebý*), Russian (*čtoby*);

b) Romance: Brazilian Portuguese (*para*), French (*pour*), Italian (*per*);

c) Uralic: Hungarian (*hogy*).

Languages lacking mirative-prospective clauses:

a) Dravidian: Tamil

b) Indo-European: Greek

c) Indo-Iranian: Hindi-Urdu

d) Japonic: Japanese

e) Sino-Tibetan: Mandarin Chinese

f) Turkic: Turkish
What is this talk about?

English possesses three purpose complementizers:

[5]  a. Maria went to bakery \([\text{in order to get some croissants}]\).
    b. Brendan put the bike into the garage \([\text{so that it would not get wet in the rain}]\).
    c. I brought a book \([\text{for Aaron to read on the plane}]\).

(Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 1)

However, none of these elements grammaticalized into mirative-prospective complementizers:

[6]  a. *Paul put the umbrella right next to himself \([\text{in order to forget it anyway}]\).
    b. *Paul put the umbrella right next to himself \([\text{so that he would forget it anyway}]\).
    c. *I brought an umbrella \([\text{for Paul to forget it anyway}]\).

Instead, an infinitive clause without a complementizer is used:

[7]  \textit{John grew up (only) to become a linguist.}
The focus of today’s talk is on Present-day German:

[1] *Sie nahm den Regenschirm mit, um nicht nass zu werden.*

she took the umbrella with COMP NEG wet to become.INF

‘She took the umbrella to not get wet.’

[2] *Sie stellte den Regenschirm neben sich,*

she put the umbrella next REFL

*um ihn dann doch zu vergessen.*

COMP him.ACC then DISC.PART to forget.INF

‘She put the umbrella right next to herself only to forget it anyway.’

(Leys 1988: 97)
What is this talk not about?

Um-zu-clauses can also give rise to a counterfactual interpretation:

[8]  *Dieses Paket ist zu schwer,*
    
    this parcel be.3SG too heavy
    
    *um es hochzuheben.*
    
    COMP it.ACC to.lift:up.INF

'This parcel is too heavy to lift it up.'

(Meier 2000: 224; ex 19a)

**Paraphrase:** If one would be able to lift up this parcel,

it would not be as heavy as it is.

I’m not concerned with such cases in this talk.
Leading questions

- To what extent do purpose and mirative-prospective clauses differ?
- What components relate the two types of adverbial clauses synchronically?
- How do mirative-prospective clauses emerge?
- What contextual properties facilitate the development of mirative-prospective clauses?
- What does the development of mirative-prospective clauses teach us about the development of adverbial clauses in general?
Main hypotheses

**H1:** Although purpose clauses and mirative-prospective clauses do not differ on the surface, they constitute two different clause types:

a) purpose clauses are low adjuncts exhibiting no derivational restrictions,

b) mirative-prospective clauses are TP-adjuncts frozen in their base position.

**H2:** Mirative-prospective clauses emerge out of purpose clauses:

a) This process comes about via a temporal presupposition accommodation.

b) The development of mirative-prospective clauses instantiates a young grammaticalization process attested across many languages.

c) The grammaticalization is upward.
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Um-zu-clauses in Present-day German
What purpose and mirative-prospective *um-zu*-clauses have in common are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Purpose clause</th>
<th>Mirative-prospective clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Complementizer <em>um</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Embedded infinitive clause</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Infinitival marker <em>zu</em> ‘to’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subject control (PRO)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Future orientation with respect to the matrix predication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Selected similarities between purpose and mirative-prospective clauses in German
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

Difference 1: Mirative-prospective clauses are prohibited in the matrix Spec,CP position:

\[ [\text{Spec,CP } \text{Um nicht nass zu werden}]_i [c^0 \text{ nahm}] \text{ sie den Regenschirm mit}]_t \]

\[ [\text{Spec,CP *Um ihn dann doch zu vergessen}]_i \ldots \]

\[ \ldots [c^0 \text{ stellte}] \text{ sie den Regenschirm neben sich}]_t \]

COMP NEG wet to become.INF took she the umbrella with

COMP him.ACC then DISC.PART to forget.INF

put she the umbrella next REFL
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

Difference 2: Only purpose clauses can be moved to the middle field of the matrix clause:

Hans be.3SG COMP French to learn.INF to Paris move.PTCP
‘Hans has moved to Paris to learn French’

[12] *Hans hat, [um ihn dann doch zu vergessen] ...
Hans have.3SG COMP him.ACC then DISC.PART to forget.INF
... den Regenschirm neben sich gestellt
the umbrella next REFL put.PTCP
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

According to Zimmermann (2004), the semantic modification with the discourse particle *wohl* ‘presumably’ results in a weaker commitment to the embedded proposition. The speaker is uncertain about $p$:

[13]  
\[
\text{Du bist (wohl) krank.}
\]

you be.2SG DISC.PART sick
‘Presumably, you’re sick.’

[14]  
Meaning of *wohl*:
\[
[[\text{wohl } p]] = f^w \text{ assume}(x,p), \text{ whereby } x = \text{ speaker}
\]

In reported speech, the attitude holder can be shifted (cf. Döring 2013):

[15]  
\[
\text{Maria sagte, dass sie (wohl) krank ist.}
\]

Maria say.3SG.PST that she DISC.PART sick be.3SG
‘Maria said that she is (probably) sick.’
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

Not much is known about the discourse particle *wohl* in German infinitive adverbial clauses.

Discussing purpose clauses, Coniglio (2011: 147-149) points out that discourse particles can occur in purpose *um-zu*-clauses, but this is supposed to happen very seldom. He mentions corpus examples with *nur* and *ja*.

According to Frey (2012: 406), purpose clauses should be analyzed as central adverbial clauses, meaning they are supposed to disallow discourse particles (cf. Haegeman 2006, 2010).

Jacobs (2018) assumes *wohl* to be allowed to be licensed only in non-intentional contexts. In other words, *wohl* is expected not to occur in purpose clauses.
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

Purpose um-zu-clauses can host the discourse particle wohl:

[16] Darüber hinaus habe Rex technische Kenntnisse besessen,
in:in addition have.3SG.KONJI Rex technical knowledge possess.PTCP
so Plath weiter, um wohl auch an vertrauliche
so Plath further COMP wohl also at confidential
Informationen im Konzern zu gelangen.
in:the concern to arrive.INF

‘In addition, Rex is supposed to have had technical information, as Plath further reports, in order to, presumably, get to confidential information, too.’
(DeReKo, Braunschweiger Zeitung, 15/5/2012)

Grosz (2014) shows that purpose clauses can also host bloß, JA, and ruhig.
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

Mirative-prospective clauses, on the other hand, cannot license *wohl*:

[17] \textit{Sie stellte den Regenschirm neben sich,}
she put.3SG.PST the umbrella next REFL
\textit{um *wohl ihn *wohl dann doch *wohl zu vergessen.}
COMP wohl him.ACC wohl then DISC.PART wohl to forget.INF
Intended meaning: ‘She put the umbrella right next to herself presumably only to forget it anyway.’
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

Purpose *um-zu*-clauses can be in the scope of a negation operator:

[18] Łukasz zieht nach Amsterdam *um*,
Łukasz move.3SG to Amsterdam VERB.PART

*nicht um zu feiern,*
NEG COMP to celebrate.INF

*sondern um Niederländisch zu lernen.*
but COMP Dutch to learn.INF

‘Łukasz is moving to Amsterdam not to do party all the time but to learn Dutch.’

In [18], the first *um-zu*-clause is in the scope of the negation *nicht* ‘not’; the second purpose clause, in turn, provides the real purpose of/reason for why Łukasz is moving to Amsterdam.
Um-zu-clauses: Differences

Mirative-prospective *um-zu*-clauses cannot be in the scope of a negation operator:

[19] *Łukasz hat für die Prüfung lange gelernt,
Łukasz have.3SG for the exam long learn.PTCP

nicht um durch sie dann doch durchzufallen,
NEG COMP through her.ACC then DISC.PART fail.INF

sondern um alles dann doch zu vergessen.
but COMP everything then DISC.PART to forget.INF

Intended meaning: ‘Łukasz learnt for the exam for a long time not to fail at the end, but to forget everything anyway’ (only purpose reading is available)
Um-zu-clauses: Syntactic differences

Based on what we have seen so far, Table 4 gives an overview over selected syntactic differences between purpose and mirative-prospective clauses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Purpose clause</th>
<th>Mirative-prospective clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prefield position (Spec,CP)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle field position</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discourse particle <em>wohl</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negation scope</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Selected syntactic differences between purpose and mirative-prospective clauses in German
Um-zu-clauses: Semantics differences

Besides the syntactic differences, purpose clauses and mirative-prospective clauses differ semantically, too:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Purpose clause</th>
<th>Mirative-prospective clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intentionality</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Target-directedness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hypothetical result state</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Selected semantic differences between purpose and mirative-prospective clauses in German
Um-zu-clauses: Semantics differences

[1] *Sie nahm den Regenschirm mit, um nicht nass zu werden.*

a) Intentionality: The subject performs an action (= taking the umbrella) with the intention of bringing about another action (= not getting wet).
b) Target-directedness: Subject’s intention is target-oriented.
c) Hypothetical result state: It remains unknown whether the subject will get wet or not.


a) Intentionality: Not available (instead: contrast, a mirative effect arises).
b) Target-directedness: Not available.
c) Hypothetical result state: Not available (instead: veridicality is involved).
Um-zu-clauses in the history of German & Reanalysis
Um-zu-clauses: Diachrony

Purpose clauses emerge in ENHG, whereas first occurrences of mirative-prospective clauses can be traced back to NHG:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language period</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old High German</td>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>750-1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle High German</td>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>1050-1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early New High German</td>
<td>ENHG</td>
<td>1350-1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New High German</td>
<td>NHG</td>
<td>1650-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present-day German</td>
<td>PdG</td>
<td>1900-present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Language periods in the history of German
Reanalysis

Step 1: In older German, purpose clauses have the surface structure of complement clauses:

(20) \( \text{mein lip phlach meinner sel ie ze meren} \)
\( \text{my body use.3SG.PST of: the soul ever to strengthen.INF} \)

' my body took care for my soul so that it could be strengthened’
(MHD, M319-G1 tok-dipi 3447-3461)

(21) \( \text{der mensch gebraucht des feuers sich zu wermen} \)
\( \text{the man need.3SG the fire.GEN REFL to warm.INF} \)

' The man needs the fire in order to warm himself’
(Grimm & Grimm 1878: 1826-1836)

Theoretically, two analyses are conceivable:

a) \( [VP \text{ verb [complement clauses DP + zu + infinitive]}] \)
b) \( [VP \text{ verb [DP ]} + [adjunct clause zu + infinitive]}] \)
Reanalysis

Step 1: Purpose clauses – as apposed to complement clauses – contain a covert modal verb taking a circumstantial Modal Base and being evaluated against a teleological conversational background (cf. Nissenbaum 2005):

[20] mein lip phlach meinner sel ie ze meren
my body use.3SG.PST of:the soul ever to strengthen.INF

‘my body took care for my soul so that it could be strengthened’
(MHD, M319-G1 tok-dipi 3447-3461)

But one needs to disambiguate (20) on the surface.
Reanalysis

Step 2: *Um* as a preposition grammaticalizes into a complementizer (*P⁰ → C⁰*):

- Purpose clauses contain a teleological covert modal (cf. Nissenbaum 2005):
  \[
  \text{[[Mod}_{\text{teleological}}]_{a,w} = \lambda p.\lambda e.\lambda w' \ [w' \text{ is compatible with the goals relevant to } e: \ p(w')]}
  \]
- *Um* as a C-head is the spell-out of the covert teleological modal (cf. Grosz 2014).
Reanalysis

The grammaticalization of *um* (P⁰ → C⁰) happened in ENHG (1350-1650):

[22]  *Hat den Zimmerleuthen nicht allein Kunst vnd verstanden*

have.3SG the.3PL.DAT carpenters.DAT NEG only skill and mind

*verliehen vmb Heuser vnnd Schiffe / sondern auch stehende*

confer.PTCP COMP houses and ships but also standing

*Bruecken zu machen* ‘[God] gave skills and brains to the carpenters to build

not only houses and ships but also standing bridges’

(Ulrich Schmidl, *Neuwe Welt*, 1567, p. 5)

a) Intentionality: God performs an action with the intention of bringing about another action.
b) Target-directedness: God’s intention is target-oriented.
c) Hypothetical result state: It remains unknown whether the carpenters will succeed.
Reanalysis

Purpose clauses attach to $\text{Mod}_{\text{volitional}} P$ in the hierarchy proposed by Cinque (1999, 2006):

- ... can be moved to Spec,CP
- ... depend on the matrix TP
- ... are in the scope of NegP

Purpose $um$-$zu$-clause
Reanalysis

Step 3: *Um* as a functional C-head grammaticalizes into a higher functional head, giving rise to a mirative-prospective interpretation:

\[ \text{CP} \rightarrow \text{CP}_{\text{mirative-prospective}} \]

\[ \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{CP}_{\text{mirative-prospective}} \]

\[ \text{NegP} \rightarrow \text{CP}_{\text{purpose}} \]

\[ \text{Mod}_{\text{volitional}} \rightarrow \text{CP}_{\text{um-zu-clause}} \]
Reanalysis

Step 3: *Um* as a functional C-head grammaticalizes into a higher functional head, giving rise to a mirative-prospective interpretation:

\[
\text{CP} \quad \text{mirative-prospective} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{um-zu-clause}
\]

MB: circumstantial
CB: teleological

MB: doxastic
CB: realistic

\[
\text{CP} \quad \text{purpose} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{um-zu-clause}
\]
Reanalysis

First mirative-prospective clauses occur in the 19th century:

[23] ... *der* (...) *wieder* auftauchte,

... who again appear.3SG.PST

*um dann bald ganz in dem Walde zu verschwinden*

COMP then soon totally in the forest.DAT to disappear.INF

‘... who again appeared only to disappear in the forest again anyway’
(DeReKo, Wilhelm Raabe, 1874/75, *Frau Salome*, p. 291-382)

a) Intentionality: not available (speaker reports about two chronological events).
b) Target-directedness: not available (two contrasting events are being described).
c) Hypothetical result state: not available (veridicality: embedded $p$ must be true according to the speaker).
Reanalysis

Mirative-prospective attach to TP:

Spec,CP

CP

TP

CP

mirative-prospective

um-zu-clause

NegP

Mod_{volitional}P

VP

... cannot be moved to Spec,CP

... depend on the matrix TP

... cannot be in the scope of NegP
Um-zu-clauses: Syntactic differences

Where do these differences come from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Purpose clause</th>
<th>Mirative-prospective clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prefield position (Spec,CP)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle field position</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discourse particle <em>wohl</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negation scope</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Selected syntactic differences between purpose and mirative-prospective clauses in German
Step 2 --> Step 3: Negation


she moved to America COMP there wet fastly to marry.INF

i) ‘She moved to America with the intention to marry quickly.’

ii) ‘She moved to America and it happened that she married shortly after.’

(Leys 1989: 100)

[24'] Sie zog nach Amerika *nicht, um dort sehr schnell zu heiraten.*

she moved to America NEG COMP there wet fastly to marry.INF

i) ‘She did not move to America with the intention to marry quickly.’

ii) *‘She did not move to America and it happened that she married shortly after.’

(Leys 1989: 100)

Mirative-prospective clauses cannot be negated because they merge above NegP.
Step 2 → Step 3: Movement to a higher position

[25] *Um sehr schnell zu heiraten, zog sie nach America.*

COMP very quickly to marry. INF moved she to America

i) ‘She moved to America with the intention to marry quickly.’

ii) *‘She moved to America and it happened that she married shortly after.’

Pittner (2016: 515) accounts for this restriction assuming that mirative-prospective clauses have to follow their host clause, as the embedded event has to follow the matrix event (iconicity principle).
A temporal presupposition has been accommodated and integrated into the compositional meaning of mirative-prospective clauses:

Step 2 \(\rightarrow\) Step 3: Movement to a higher position
Step 2 → Step 3: Movement to a higher position

[26] Sie zog nach Amerika, um dort sehr schnell zu heiraten, ...

she moved to America COMP there wet fastly to marry.INF

i) ‘She moved to America with the intention to marry quickly ...

ii) ‘She moved to America and it happened that she married shortly after ...

... aber ich glaube es nicht.

‘but I don’t believe it.’

The ii) interpretation does not survive.

a. Purpose clause: A particular goal (= getting married) can be achieved (p =1), iff q is true in a possible world w’, too. Since this sequence of two events is a presupposition (≠ truth conditions), the purpose clause can move.

b. Mirative-prospective clause: Since the consecutio temporum belongs to the compositional meaning of the mirative-prospective clause, it is frozen in its base position.
Step 2 → Step 3: Discourse particle *wohl*

The accommodation of the temporal presupposition leads to a change of the covert modal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Modal Base (MB)</th>
<th>Conversational Background (f)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCs</td>
<td>circumstantial</td>
<td>teleological</td>
<td><em>In view of goals:</em> function $f$ which assigns sets of propositions to members of $W$, such that for any world $w \in W$: $f(w) \cap p \subseteq q$ ($= f$ assigns to every possible world a set of propositions in which $p$ is achieved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPCs</td>
<td>doxastic</td>
<td>realistic</td>
<td><em>In view of facts of such and such kind:</em> function $f$ which assigns sets of propositions to members of $W$, such that for any world $w \in W$: $w \in \cap f(w)$ ($= f$ assigns to every possible world a set of propositions that are true in it)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 2 $\rightarrow$ Step 3: Movement to a higher position

A temporal presupposition has been accommodated and integrated into the compositional meaning of mirative-prospective clauses:

```
CP
  ↓
TP
  ↓
NegP
  ↓
Mod<sub>volitional</sub>P

CP
  ↓
CP mirative-prospective um-zu-clause

Temporal presupposition accommodation

CP
  ↓
CP purpose um-zu-clause
```

- hypothetical result state has been overwritten
- intentionality gets lost
Step 2 —> Step 3: Discourse particle *wohl*

[27] Sie stellte den Regenschirm neben sich,

she put.3SG.PST the umbrella next REFL

um *wohl* ihn *wohl* dann doch *wohl* zu vergessen.

COMP wohlt him.ACC wohlt then DISC.PART wohlt to forget.INF

Intended meaning: ‘She put the umbrella right next to herself presumably only to forget it anyway.’

Assuming the truth value $p = 1$ for mirative-prospective clauses and using the discourse particle *wohl* expressing a weaker commitment towards what is embedded, a semantic clash arises.
Conclusions

- The main aim of this talk has been to show that purpose clause can develop into mirative-prospective clauses.
- Although both adverbial clause types do not differ on the surface, they exhibit many syntactic and semantic differences.
- Mirative-prospective clauses emerge due to a presuppositional meaning added to the common ground by an entailment relationship between both types of adverbial clauses.
- Usually, purpose markers develop either into an infinitive marker (cf. Baka *na*, Seychellois Creole *pur*) or causal markers (cf. To’aba’ita *uri*, Twi *sɛ*), as suggested by Heine & Kuteva (2002). The development of mirative-prospective instantiates a next grammaticalization path.
Thank you for your attention!
Selected references


References


Appendix A

Pauly (2013, 2014) argues that as soon as an infinitive *um-zu*-clause is replaced by a finite clause introduced by the complementizer *damit*, a mirative-prospective reading is excluded:

[a] Sie zog nach Amerika, *um dort sehr schnell zu heiraten*

she moved to America COMP there wet fastly to marry.INF

i) ‘She moved to America with the intention to marry quickly’

ii) ‘She moved to America and it happened that she married shortly after’

(Leys 1989: 100)

[b] Sie zog nach Amerika, *damit sie dort sehr schnell heiraten konnte*

she moved to America COMP she there wet fastly marry.INF could.3SG

i) ‘She moved to America with the intention to marry quickly’

ii) *‘She moved to America and it happened that she married shortly after’*
This observation is too strong, though:

[c] Wenn er das sagt, erinnert Helten ein wenig an Sisyphos, den
when he this say.3SG remind.3SG Helten a little at Sisyphos the
Greek mythological:hero who his stone again:and:again the
Berg hinauf rollt, nur damit er dann wieder runter
mountain VPTCL roll.3SG only PROSP.COMP he then again down
 kullert.
roll.3SG
‘When he says this, Helten reminds of Sisyphos a little, the Greek
mythological hero, who rolls his stone uphill again and again, only to
have it roll down again.’

(DeReKo, Mannheimer Morgen, 11/01/2006)