



## Special Issue Proposal for *Language Sciences* (Elsevier)

### 1. Issue title and guest editors

#### **Issue title:**

Complement and parenthetical constructions: Theory and description

#### **Guest editors**

##### An Van linden

Associate Professor of English Linguistics, University of Liège & Research Fellow KU Leuven  
Department of Modern Languages: Linguistics, Literature and Translation  
Place Cockerill 3-5  
4000 Liège  
Belgium  
[an.vanlinden@uliege.be](mailto:an.vanlinden@uliege.be)

##### Lieselotte Brems

Associate Professor of English Linguistics, University of Liège & Research Fellow KU Leuven  
Department of Modern Languages: Linguistics, Literature and Translation  
Place Cockerill 3-5  
4000 Liège  
Belgium  
[lbrems@uliege.be](mailto:lbrems@uliege.be)

##### Lieven Vandelanotte

Associate Professor of English Linguistics, University of Namur & Research Fellow KU Leuven  
Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures  
University of Namur  
Rue de Bruxelles 61  
5000 Namur  
[lieven.vandelanotte@unamur.be](mailto:lieven.vandelanotte@unamur.be)

## 2. Proposal

This special issue brings together the papers presented at the successful 2019 workshop “The syntagmatic properties of complementation patterns: Accommodating lexical and grammatical uses of CTP-clauses” (<https://ctp-clauses.sciencesconf.org>). It focuses on **complement-taking predicate clauses** (CTP-clauses) occurring in **complement constructions** that allow for functional variation – i.e. showing both complementizing/lexical uses and modifying/grammatical uses (cf. Boye & Harder 2007) – as well as in **parenthetical constructions** (e.g. *It is a good idea, I think*). While traditionally complement clauses have been analysed as constituents of the main clause headed by the CTP (e.g. Noonan 1985: 42), usage-based approaches – drawing on conversational data – proposed an alternative analysis, viewing the complement clauses as central and the CTP-clauses as “epistemic/evidential/evaluative fragments” (Thompson 2002: 136–141). Recently Boye & Harder’s (2007, 2012) functional approach to CTP-clauses has attempted to strike a balance between the traditional and the usage-based approaches, arguing for a distinction between the levels of usage and structure, and proposing tests to attribute instances showing the same structure to three different types of use, i.e. discourse-primary lexical uses, discourse-secondary lexical uses, and grammatical uses (invariably discourse-secondary). The papers in this issue present various functionalist approaches to the topic of CTP-clauses, with a good mix of theoretical concerns and empirical case studies. After an introduction by the guest editors, the issue proper moves from more general and typological papers, over more theoretically-oriented papers to diachronic corpus studies of English.

The first paper is by **Kasper Boye**, who revisits his earlier, co-authored work on the structure and use of complement-taking predicates (Boye & Harder 2007, 2012) referred to above. Integrating distinct theoretical approaches (viz. Brinton 1996, 2008; Kaltenböck et al. 2011), he now casts his net wider and studies complement relations other than those expressed by attitude predicates (e.g. utterance predicates, manipulative predicates), and hence also semantic complement types other than propositional complements (e.g. illocutions, States of Affairs). He points out that all of these allow for modifying uses under specific circumstances. In addition, he develops a new, cross-linguistically applicable theoretical account that accommodates possible grammaticalization of parenthetical clauses, focusing on the notion of constructional slots.

Next, the paper by **William McGregor** presents a typological and theoretical investigation of belief and thought complements – as in *he believes/thinks that the turtle is dead* – in a sample of about sixty Australian Aboriginal languages. Interestingly, in a number of languages the distinct construction status of belief and thought complements is not straightforward, as they can hardly be differentiated from reported speech constructions. However, some languages do show evidence for a distinct complement construction type devoted to expressing mistaken beliefs. McGregor also homes in on the theoretical issue of the nature of the relation between the CTP-clause and the clause expressing the thought (the ‘complement’), irrespective of the type of use (lexical vs. grammatical) of the CTP-clause. He rejects the traditional complementation analysis (e.g. Noonan 1985) of the clause of thought serving in an argument role in the matrix clause, and argues instead that the syntagmatic relation at issue is one of framing, which belongs to the interpersonal semiotic (cf. McGregor 1997).

**Stef Spronck**’s paper builds on observations like McGregor’s that belief and thought complements are not always constructionally distinct from reported speech constructions. Spronck focuses on utterance predicates only and puts forward reported speech as a ‘primary syntactic category’, or a construction type at the highest level of schematicity, which subsumes both direct speech and indirect speech as daughter constructions, in spite of the former – in languages like English – showing a kind of parataxis and the latter a kind of complementation. Drawing on data from three typologically distinct languages (Dutch, the Bantu language Kikuyu and the Australian Aboriginal language Ungarinyin), he argues that direct and indirect speech show basically the same syntagmatic relation between CTP-clause and reported clause, and that complementation is recruited in reported speech to a different degree in each of the languages analysed.

**Bernd Heine** and **Gunther Kaltenböck** focus on the development of CTP-clauses used as parentheticals or comment clauses in the light of existing diachronic case-studies, and gauge the explanatory potential of a number of competing theoretical accounts. Ultimately they propose Discourse Grammar – which consists of sentence grammar and thetical grammar – as the framework that accommodates the observed developments best, assigning a central role to co-optation, after which grammaticalization can (but need

not) take place. They also clarify the syntactic status of grammatical uses of complement constructions with overt complementizer within Discourse Grammar, a construction type that had not been discussed within that framework so far. They put forward a constructional account, positing multiple source constructions, some of which belong to sentence grammar and others to thetical grammar.

The paper by **Kristin Davidse** takes the similarity between impersonal predicative CTP-clauses (e.g. *it is no wonder*), impersonal existential CTP-clauses (e.g. *there's no doubt*) as well as first-person CTP-clauses (e.g. *I have no doubt*) in allowing both lexical and grammatical uses, as a starting point to build a case for assigning (at least) these three construction types the same syntagmatic analysis. Davidse thus rejects the generative view of *it*-extraposition as a phenomenon *sui generis*, and argues instead that together with complement constructions with *there BE + noun* and *I have + noun* it forms a single schematic construction type, viz. the complementation construction. She bolsters her case by showing that specificational cleft constructions show a range of matrix clauses (viz. predicative, existential, possessive) comparable to that of complementation constructions and can also be given a unified syntagmatic analysis, i.e. one of secondary specification constructions. While based on English corpus data, her analysis could potentially be extended to other languages.

**An Van Linden, Lieselotte Brems and Kristin Davidse** reconsider earlier joint work on CTP-clauses containing *no + noun* (viz. *wonder, doubt, need, chance* and *way*), which display both lexical and grammatical uses of complement constructions, but do not show adverbial/parenthetical uses across the board. Interestingly, the availability of adverbial/parenthetical uses is found to depend on the semantic type of complement (e.g. factive for *it BE 'no' wonder*, propositional attitude for *there BE 'no' doubt*, and (root) modal for *there BE 'no' need/have 'no' need*) and, concomitantly, on the level of clause structure the qualificational meaning of the *no + noun* string applies to. In addition, the authors establish correlations between formal types of complement and the types of qualificational meaning their CTP-clauses express.

**Charlotte Maekelberghe's** paper concentrates on CTP-clauses with *imagine*, whose grammatical uses show an unusually high degree of formal variability, both in terms of TAM values in the CTP-clause and in terms of formal types of complement. On the basis of a Hierarchical Configurational Frequency Analysis (Gries 2004; Hilpert 2009) applied to a synchronic dataset, Maekelberghe finds correlations between the formal type of complement and the possibility of grammatical uses; e.g. CTP-clauses with gerund complements are restricted to lexical use, while those with zero *that*-clauses typically show grammatical use. In addition, grammatical variants of CTP-clauses – be it in complement structures or parenthetical use – are shown to often contain modal auxiliaries, and hence show more semantic variation than the formally constrained high-frequency parentheticals *I think* and *I guess*.

The last two papers take a diachronic perspective. The paper by **Caroline Gentens** turns to a semantic type of CTP so far unaddressed in this special issue, viz. manner-of-speaking predicates (e.g. *babble, whisper, shout*). It presents a diachronic corpus study of *shriek*, which in addition to its original use as an intransitive predicate comes to function in parenthetical clauses as a direct speech reporting predicate. This case is special in that it does not involve the 'reduction' of a CTP-clause to a zero-complement phrase (e.g. *I think*), but rather the augmentation of an intransitive verb. In semantic terms, the parentheticals do not show schematic, speaker-related meanings, but instead retain a lexically specific component of manner of speaking. Thus, the development of *shriek* is very different from that of *odds are* and *chances are* discussed below, and does not fit the grammaticalization pathway proposed for the latter along the lines of Boye & Harder (2007, 2012). Instead, it presents evidence of co-optation at work, and thus adds to the diachronic validity of Discourse Grammar (cf. Kaltenböck et al. 2011).

**María José López-Couso and Belén Méndez-Naya's** paper, finally, presents a diachronic corpus study of third person CTP-clauses *chances are* and *odds are*, which at present show the three uses referred to above: lexical use of complement construction, grammatical use of complement construction and parenthetical use. Their study shows that third person CTP-clauses manifest the same structural and functional parameters and shifts as first-person CTP-clauses (e.g. *I think*), and that the three uses observed synchronically form stages on a diachronic pathway. The use of historical data allows tracing formal evidence of grammaticalization, such as the loss of variability in the *chances-* and *odds-NPs* and TAM restrictions in the VP, as well as concomitant semantic changes in the parentheticals, and can shed a light on the explanatory value of co-optation.

## References

- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. *Complement-Taking Predicates: Usage and Linguistic Structure*. *Studies in Language* 31 (3): 569–606.
- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2012. A Usage-based Theory of Grammatical Status and Grammaticalization. *Language* 88: 1–44.
- Brinton, Laurel. 1996. *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, Laurel. 2008. *The comment clause in English: Syntactic origins and pragmatic development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gries, Stefan Th. 2004. HCFA 3.2. A program for R.
- Hilpert, Martin. 2009. The German *mit*-predicative construction. *Constructions and Frames* 1 (1): 29–55.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35 (4): 848–893.
- McGregor, William. 1997. *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Noonan, Michael. 1985. Complementation. In Timothy Shopen, (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol. II, 42–139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. 'Object complements' and conversation. *Studies in Language* 26 (1): 125–164.

### 3. How the special issue relates to the aims and scope of the journal

The papers in this issue bring together a range of approaches, sharing a broadly functionalist and constructional orientation, adhering to such tenets as the ideas that elements of structure are defined functionally; that grammar emerges out of usage; and that linguistic 'signs' or constructions consist of pairings of form and meaning. Beyond such shared theoretical assumptions, the authors do not specifically adopt a single framework as (sometimes) narrowly conceived. Rather, the papers and their authors enter into a dialogue which allows strengths of different but broadly compatible approaches to come to the fore, and new theoretical insights to be proposed. The same applies to the various methodologies and types of linguistic argumentation relied on, including typological sampling, various kinds of synchronic and diachronic corpus analyses (including Hierarchical Configurational Frequency Analysis), patterns of syntactic alternation and diagnostics of grammaticalization.

Collectively the papers allow a number of hitherto neglected or poorly understood constructions to come into sharper focus, providing better, and better argued for, descriptions, while at the same time hammering out a better theoretical handle on much-debated 'big issues' relating to complementation and parentheticals, both in English and crosslinguistically. We think this special issue is timely, given the need now to take stock of existing traditional, usage-based, and more recent functional work in this domain, bringing these different historical research strands to a new synthesis and moving the debate forward. Ultimately, we hope the special issue contributes to a better understanding of how humans structure talk about the various mental states (beliefs, reports, surprises, likelihoods, and so on) complement and parenthetical constructions convey.

In critically re-examining this important area of linguistic research, across a broad range of languages and from different, but compatible, theoretical and methodological perspectives entering into a constructive dialogue, we think this issue fits the aims and scope of *Language Sciences* particularly well.

#### 4. List of paper titles, with authors and abstracts.

##### 1. Introduction by the guest editors

The introduction by the guest editors, each of whom has extensive editing experience and has research experience in the field of complementation, will present the state of the art and discuss the contributions made by the different articles, as well as identifying recurring themes across them to help readers see connections between the various case studies and across somewhat different, but broadly compatible functional theoretical approaches. The research questions answered by the contributions include:

- (a) While belief and thought complement constructions easily allow the shift from complementizing to modifying and parenthetical uses in English, do they also do so crosslinguistically?
- (b) What makes CTP-clauses prone to shift from complementizing to modifying uses? Which semantic and/or formal types of complement relation do (not) allow for this shift?
- (c) Do complement constructions with impersonal or non-first person matrices manifest the same structural and functional parameters and shifts as first person CTP-clauses?
- (d) Which theoretical framework can best account for the observed data: Discourse Grammar, Thetical grammar, grammaticalization theory, Semiotic Grammar?
- (e) As grammatical uses of CTP-clauses typically show (i) a more limited range of morphological distinctions and syntactic combinations than lexical uses, and (ii) schematic, speaker-related meanings, can we expect the same for structurally parenthetical uses?
- (f) Do lexical uses of CTP-clauses always diachronically precede grammatical uses, as suggested by Boye and Harder (2007, 2012), and do grammatical uses of CTP-clauses always diachronically precede structurally parenthetical uses?

##### 2. CTP-clauses with modifying status: The role of complement types and constructional slots *Kasper Boye, University of Copenhagen*

Research on the distinction between complementizing and modifying CTP-clauses focuses on constructions which involve sentence-type (or “balanced”) and propositional complements like that in (1).

(1) They say Liège is nice.

In the first part of the paper, we argue that CTP-clauses may – with a well-defined group of exceptions – have modifying uses with all syntactic types of complements (i.e. both sentence-type or “balanced” complements and reduced or “deranked” complements). It also argues, however, that syntactic complement type restricts the development of complementizers into conventionalized modifiers.

Subsequently, the paper presents a semantic typology of complements which distinguishes three types: propositional complements as in (1), illocutionary complements as in (2), and State-of-Affairs complements as in (3).

(2) They said ‘go to Liege!’

(3) They asked her to go to Liege.

Based on this typology, it is argued that CTP-clauses may – again, with a well-defined group of exceptions – have modifying uses with all three types of complements, but that the modifications will be of different semantic types.

Focusing on constructions with sentence-type and propositional complements, the second part of the paper deals with the development of parenthetical clauses. We take our point of departure in three existing accounts (Boye and Harder 2007; Brinton 1996; Kaltenböck et al. 2011), pointing out problems in all of them. We then propose a synthesis which incorporates the main insights of the accounts in Boye and Harder (2007) and in the works of Heine and Kaltenböck, while amending their weaknesses. Heine

and Kaltenböck's approach is invoked in order to account for the development of non-initial parentheticals (e.g. *Liège is nice, they say*) in terms of theticalization, while Boye and Harder's theory is employed to account for the possible grammaticalization of parentheticals. It is argued that constructional slots, which are ignored in both approaches, play the important role of bridging the gap between theticalization and grammaticalization. The synthesis proposed also allows us to be precise about the status of sentence adverbs with respect to the lexicon-grammar distinction. Finally, this synthesis is compared with van Bogaert's (2011) analysis, according to which parenthetical clauses grammaticalize as a schematic structure arising through generalization over individual items such as *I think, I believe*, etc.

## References

- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31 (3): 569–606.
- Brinton, Laurel. 1996. *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35 (4): 848–93.
- Van Bogaert, Julie. 2011. I think and other complement-taking mental predicates: A case of and for constructional grammaticalization. *Linguistics* 49 (2): 295–332.

### 3. Belief and thought complements in Australian languages: Typology and theory

*William B. McGregor, University of Aarhus*

Rather little has been written on the grammar of complement constructions in Australian languages. Grammars rarely provide much information, and few articles (let alone books) treat the topic either in particular languages or cross-linguistically. In this paper I address this lacuna by undertaking a typological and theoretical investigation of belief and thought complements – as in *he believes/thinks that the turtle is dead* – in Australian Aboriginal languages. The investigation is based on a corpus of about sixty languages, partly a convenience sample (depending on available information and my own expertise) and partly a representative one (the major geographical regions and some major families are included, albeit unevenly). I argue that in some languages there is evidence in favour of a distinct complement construction type for the expression of mistaken beliefs. Some Australian languages attest a complement construction (or constructions) for the expression of other reported beliefs or thoughts – i.e. that are not specified for their veracity. These show some evidence (in some languages) of being distinct from reported speech constructions in terms of certain formal choices; however, the evidence is inconclusive as to their status as separate construction types: they may or may not represent a single vague framing construction which includes also reported speech.

Aside from the issue of construction status, an important theoretical issue is the nature of the relation between the matrix clause specifying the speech or thought act, and the clause expressing the thought. I argue that there is no evidence that the clause of thought serves in an argument role in the matrix clause, and thus that the construction is not a complement construction in the traditional sense. Rather, I propose that a distinct type of grammatical relation is involved, separate from both embedding (as a complement) and dependency, a relation I have elsewhere dubbed framing. I outline some of the properties of this relation and argue that it is a relation belonging to interpersonal grammar.

### 4. Complementation is not a primary syntactic category. Reported speech is.

*Stef Spronck, University of Helsinki*

Compare the elements *a* and *b* in examples (1) and (2):

- (1) [John said:]<sub>a</sub> ["Perhaps it might rain today"]<sub>b</sub>  
(2) [John said]<sub>a</sub> [that nobody would come tomorrow]<sub>b</sub>

Traditionally, the relation between the clausal elements *a* and *b* and in (1) has been analyzed as a type of apposition or ‘parataxis’ (see McGregor, 1997; and references therein) and in (2) as a relation of subordination or complementation. Under this analysis the syntactic structures in (1) and (2) are fundamentally distinct.

However, three separate proposals have been put forward in the literature arguing that (1) and (2) *share* a common syntax. In a seminal account, McGregor (1994) proposes that both in direct speech (as in (1)) and in indirect speech (as in (2)) the same syntactic relation pertains between elements *a* and *b*, a functional relation he calls ‘framing’, in which clausal element *a* syntactically ‘frames’ element *b*. Within a generative approach, Speas (2004) hypothesizes an ‘evidential node’ under which the clausal elements *b* in (1) and (2) can be understood as evidential projections within a similar underlying structure. And Güldemann (2008) labels the elements *a* in (1) and (2) ‘quotative indexes’ which are added as ‘tags’ to the clauses *b*.

In this paper I argue that each of these proposals is right in highlighting the syntactic similarities between (1) and (2), drawing on typological evidence and data in three unrelated languages: Dutch (extracted from the Corpus of Spoken Dutch), the Bantu language Kikuyu and the Australian Aboriginal language Ungarinjin (based on original fieldwork). This also creates a problem, however, because if (1) and (2) have a similar syntactic structure, how do we qualify the obvious syntactic *differences* between the two, specifically, the fact that in English and many other language indirect speech as in (2) appears to have a complementizing structure, whereas direct speech as in (1) does not. When we try to describe the syntax of reported speech and thought cross-linguistically (cf. Spronck and Nikitina 2019), it becomes clear that languages vary in the extent to which the syntactic relations of complementation and reported speech and thought overlap (Rumsey 2019). But they often co-occur.

In order to account for these observations, I argue that complementation is recruited in reported speech by a more fundamental syntactic relation to a different degree in each of the languages analyzed. I introduce the notion of a ‘primary syntactic category’ and *n*<sup>th</sup>-order syntactic categories, and classify reported speech as an example of the former and complementation as a second or third order syntactic category (depending on the respective language). I argue that by making this distinction, our account of complementation as a functional syntactic structure gains descriptive accuracy and that doing so allows for a more nuanced analysis of the construction type. Even though the proposal is intended to be compatible with multiple syntactic models, it directly feeds into ongoing debate in Construction Grammar about the relation between different levels of syntactic generalization (Goldberg 2009).

## References

- Goldberg, Adele E. 2009. The nature of generalization in language. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20(1). 93–127.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McGregor, William B. 1994. The Grammar of Reported Speech and Thought in Gooniyandi. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 14(1). 63–92.
- McGregor, William B. 1997. *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rumsey, Alan. 2019. Response to Spronck and Nikitina “Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain”. *Linguistic Typology* 23 (1): 237–244.
- Speas, Margaret. 2004. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114: 255–276.
- Spronck, Stef and Tatiana Nikitina. 2019. Reported speech constructions are a dedicated syntactic domain: Typological arguments and observations. *Linguistic Typology* 23 (1): 119–159.

## 5. From clause to discourse marker: On the development of complement-taking predicate clauses Bernd Heine, University of Cologne & Gunther Kaltenböck, University of Graz

The origin and development of comment clauses (Quirk et al. 1985: 1112f), such as the ones illustrated in (1) and (2), have been the subject of considerable discussion in recent years with different source

constructions and diachronic pathways having been proposed. Among these are Thompson and Mulac's (1991) matrix clause hypothesis, Brinton's (2008, 2017) final adverbial clause origin, Boye and Harder's (2007) developmental cline from lexical to grammatical element, and Fischer's (2007) lexicalization account. The crucial question to be answered is how a clausal (lexical) unit, a so-called complement-taking predicate (CTP) clause, eventually ends up being used as a syntactically independent, positionally flexible discourse marker (or comment clause).

- (1) Paul, I am getting a hit to 10 Senate Democrats, which **I admit** is a little bit like a solar eclipse. (COCA, Spoken, 2017)
- (2) Well, **I mean**, the prosecution was disappointed in the outcome in this case. (COCA, Spoken, 2017)

After a brief survey and critical evaluation of existing accounts this paper outlines an alternative proposal for the development of CTP-clauses within the framework of Discourse Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013). By drawing on historical data from existing studies, it is argued that the development of these discourse markers cannot be exhaustively accounted for by principles of grammaticalization alone but involves the cognitive-communicative operation of co-optation (e.g. Heine 2013; Heine et al. 2017). Co-optation is a highly productive operation which essentially lifts a linguistic element out of sentence grammar for specific discourse functions, thereby creating a parenthetical comment clause (or so-called thetical), which subsequently may be subject to grammaticalization.

Particular attention will also be given to the syntactic status of clause-initial CTP-clauses with a *that*-complementizer (e.g. *I think that John went to London*), as these are potentially ambiguous between matrix clauses (sentence grammar) and comment clause disjuncts (thetical grammar). It is argued that these initial CTP-clauses with *that* can best be captured by a Construction Grammar account which assumes taxonomic links between constructions. More precisely, initial CTP-clauses with *that* activate links to constructions from both sentence grammar and thetical grammar and are sensitive to different degrees of entrenchment of these constructions, as is shown by synchronic data from the British component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-GB).

## References

- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31 (3): 569–606.
- Brinton, Laurel. 2008. *The comment clause in English: Syntactic origins and pragmatic development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brinton, Laurel. 2017. *The evolution of pragmatic markers in English: Pathways of change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, Olga. 2007. *Morphosyntactic change. Functional and formal perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51(6): 1205–1247.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva and Haiping Long. 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In Bischoff, Shannon and Carmen Jany (eds.), *Functional Approaches to Language*, 175–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck and Tania Kuteva. 2017. Cooptation as a discourse strategy. *Linguistics* 55: 1–43.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35 (4): 848–893.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Thompson, Sandra A. and Anthony Mulac. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticalization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Vol. 2, 313–329. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

## 6. A cognitive-functional account of 'extraposition' and 'cleft' constructions

*Kristin Davidse, KU Leuven*

The transformational tradition has bequeathed to us accounts of extraposition (1a) and cleft (2a) constructions, which treat them as phenomena *sui generis*, unrelated to other constructions and analyzable only as form-meaning *mismatches* deriving from more basic variants, viz. the non-extraposed construction (1b) and the 'de-clefted' simple proposition (2b). In these accounts, subject *it* and verb *be* are viewed as (largely) devoid of meaning.

- (1) (a) It was a wonder to them that I get to do all this stuff. (WB)  
(b) That I get to do all this is a wonder to them.
- (2) (a) Ideally, there would be a (discreet) knock on the door and Laura would come in ... The door did open but it was Cassie who entered. (WB)  
(b) Cassie entered.

Against this, I advocate an analysis that treats the constructions in (1a) and (2a) as members of more schematic constructions, viz. complementation constructions (Davidse and Van Linden 2019) and cleft constructions (Davidse 2000, Lambrecht 2001), both of which subsume a comparable range of matrices, viz. copulars with *it* (1a, 2a), or marginally *that* (1c, 2c), existentials (1d, 2d), and clauses with *have* (1e, 2e). I argue that the complementation constructions (1a,c,d,e) and the 'cleft' constructions (2a,c,d,e) are each characterized by a distinct functional-structural assembly, which 'naturally' codes their semantics (Langacker 2017), and to which the different matrix types contribute finer meaning differences (cf. Méndez-Naya 1995; Kaltenböck 2003).

- (1) (c) He says that's no wonder, that the wedding had been postponed. (Google)  
(d) She may never match her full-brother Ollie Magern but there is no doubt Petite Margot has a big race in her. (WB)  
(e) I've no doubt I'll see you at dinner soon. (WB)
- (2) (c) A: I knew the maternity hospital had closed. B: That's Fulford that's closed (WB)  
(d) Now you've got a fair sort of permanent staff now. There's Fred has been there for years. (WB)  
(e) A: you have got a member of staff working for each department? B: I've got John does the presses. (WB)

In the complementation constructions, the matrix may be discourse primary (Boye and Harder 2007, 2012) and convey (1a), (1e), or allow to infer (1c), a cognitive or emotional state, in which case we are dealing with reporting or factive constructions. The matrix may also be discourse secondary, in which case it conveys modal, as in (1d), or mirative or evidential qualifications of the proposition in the discourse primary complement clause.

I argue that cleft constructions are secondary specification constructions (Davidse and Kimps 2016), in which the specification relation between the variable (coded by the cleft relative clause) and the value (the postverbal complement in the matrix) is 'secondary' in the same way as the predication relation is in secondary predication (McGregor 1997), i.e. dependent on both the controller and the matrix verb. In the examples with impersonal matrices, the cognitive agent involved in the specificational act remains 'off-stage' (Langacker 2002: 15), and can be inferred to be the actual speaker, as in (2c) and (2d), or a character serving as focalizer, as in (2a). In matrix types with personal pronouns, as in (2e), *I've got*, the agent involved in the specification relation is coded overtly.

### References

Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31 (3): 569–609.

- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2012. A usage-based theory of grammatical status and grammaticalization. *Language* 88: 1–44.
- Davidse Kristin. 2000. A constructional approach to clefts. *Linguistics* 38 (6): 1101–1131.
- Davidse Kristin and Ditte Kimps. 2016. Specificational *there*-clefts: functional structure and information structure. *English Text Construction* 9 (1): 115–142.
- Davidse, Kristin and An Van linden. 2019. Revisiting ‘*it*-extraposition’: The historical development of constructions with matrices (*it*)/(*there*) *be* + NP followed by a complement clause. In Paloma Núñez-Pertejo, María José López-Couso, Belén Méndez-Naya and Javier Pérez-Guerra (eds.), *Crossing Linguistic Boundaries: Systemic, Synchronic and Diachronic Variation in English*, 81–103. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2003. On the Syntactic and Semantic Status of Anticipatory *it*. *English Language and Linguistics* 7: 235–255.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 39: 463–516.
- Langacker, Ronald. 2002. Deixis and subjectivity. In Brisard (ed.) *Grounding: the epistemic footing of deixis and reference*, 1–27. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald. 2017. Functions and assemblies. Plenary lecture. 14th International Conference of Cognitive Linguistics. University of Tartu, 10–14 July 2017.
- McGregor, William. 1997. *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Méndez-Naya, Belén. 1995. *Hit* and *thaet* Anticipating Subject Clauses in OE: True Syntactic Equivalents? *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, XCVI: 23–37.

## 7. Grammatical uses of ‘*no*’ + noun and the hierarchy of qualifications of SoAs **An Van linden, Lieselotte Brems & Kristin Davidse, University of Liège & KU Leuven**

This paper focuses on a set of English clausal expressions containing the negative indefinite determiner *no* + noun, as in (1a)-(2a), and their adverbial counterparts, e.g. *no wonder* (1b), or elliptical variants of clausal expressions, e.g. *no need* (2b). Both structural types can be used to qualify States-of-Affairs (SoAs), in which case they show grammatical use rather than lexical use (cf. Boye and Harder 2012). For example, in (1) both the clausal (1a) and the adverbial (1b) *no wonder* structures attitudinally qualify their propositions miratively (DeLancey 2001: 369) as wholly unsurprising, whilst in (2) the clausal and elliptical expressions with *no need* express a modal qualification of an SoA, viz. absence of necessity. The other strings that will be studied are *no chance* (Van linden and Brems 2018), *no way* (Davidse et al. 2014) and *no doubt* (Davidse et al. 2015).

- (1) (a) It’s *no wonder* Norwegians hunt whale. There’s nothing else left to catch. (WB)  
 (b) The relatives were very annoyed, *no wonder*, and it caused friction in the family (WB)
- (2) (a) Decker: Well, look. Why don’t we reschedule for, say, Tuesday?  
 Bill: Oh, there is *no need* to reschedule. We can just carry on while [...]. (CASO)  
 (b) Woman: She’s got a bit of a crisis on her hands right now. You want to keep holding?  
 Jake: Uh -- tell you what -- *no need*. I’m sure she’s going to be on her way home soon [...]  
 (Corpus of American Soap Operas)

We will investigate which types of meaning the patterns express, and how these relate to (i) the formal type of complement clause in the case of the clausal structures, and (ii) the availability of adverbial or elliptical uses. The observations will be explained adopting a functional analysis of the clause (e.g. Hengeveld 1989), and Nuyts’s (2005) functional hierarchy of state-of-affairs (SoA) qualifications.

First, the data show that the distribution of *to*-infinitival complements, which lack deictic tense marking (cf. Bolinger 1967: 351-359), is restricted to qualificational meanings that apply to potential SoAs, such as dynamic and deontic modality (cf. Van linden 2012: ch. 2). By contrast, *that*-clauses are not semantically restricted and are also found with strings whose qualificational meaning applies to propositions, such as epistemic and mirative meanings. The same goes for *of*-gerundial complements.

Second, we observe that the level of clause structure the qualificational meaning of the *no* + noun string applies to also determines the availability of adverbial or elliptical uses. When the qualificational meaning applies to propositions, the non-clausal counterparts function as adverbials, typically disjunct adverbials (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 615), featuring also positional flexibility (cf. (1b)) (Gentens et al. 2016). By contrast, when it applies to SoAs, the non-clausal counterparts are merely elliptical matrices (so in fact covertly clausal structures), which cannot shift position (cf. (2b)). In such cases, the meaning of the (elliptical) matrix is assumed to be secondary to the SoA denoted in the complement clause (rather than to the discourse, as in (1b)), much like modal auxiliaries are (grammatically) secondary to their main verb.

## References

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. The imperative in English. In: Jakobson, Roman (ed.), *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, 335–362. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2012. Grammatical Status and Grammaticalization. *Language* 88: 1–44.
- Davidse, Kristin, An Van linden, Jacob Lesage and Lieselotte Brems. Negation, grammaticalization and subjectification: the development of polar, modal and mirative *no way*-constructions, ICEHL18, 14–18 July 2014, University of Leuven.
- Davidse, Kristin, Simon De Wolf and An Van linden. 2015. The development of (*there/it is / I have*) *no doubt* expressing modal and interactional meaning. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 16 (1): 25–58.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369–382.
- Gentens, Caroline, Ditte Kimps, Kristin Davidse, Gilles Jacobs, An Van linden and Lieselotte Brems. 2016. Mirativity and rhetorical structure: The development and prosody of disjunct and anaphoric adverbials with ‘*no*’ *wonder*. In Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer and Arne Lohmann (eds.), *Outside the Clause*, 125–156. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1989. Layers and operators in Functional Grammar. *Journal of Linguistics* 25: 127–157.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2005. The modal confusion: On terminology and the concepts behind it. In Alex Klinge and Henrik Høeg Müller (eds.), *Modality: Studies in form and function*, 5–38. London: Equinox.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Van linden, An. 2012. *Modal adjectives: English deontic and evaluative constructions in diachrony and synchrony* [Topics in English Linguistics 75]. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Van linden, An and Lieselotte Brems. 2018. It was *chance*’s chance to become polyfunctional in the modal domain. Twentieth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL20), University of Edinburgh, 27–31 August 2018.

## 8. *Imagine all the clauses: Formal variability in complement-taking predicate constructions with imagine*

**Charlotte Maekelberghe, KU Leuven**

The present study investigates the different uses of the complement-taking predicate (CTP) *imagine*. Similar to other complement-taking mental predicates such as *think*, *suppose* and *believe*, *imagine* has both a ‘lexical’ variant, as in examples (1)–(2), and a ‘grammatical’ or ‘parenthetical’ variant, as in (3)–(4).

- (1) **Imagine** if that had happened on a day I’d come up to see you?
- (2) I don’t like don’t like Tom Cruise (...) so and I **couldn’t imagine** him being a six-foot odd marine
- (3) A: so like poison in n it yeah  
B: yeah it was poisoned (.) **I should imagine** it was poisoned
- (4) A: paparazzo becomes paparazzi  
B: paparazzo?  
A: that’s the singular **I would imagine** of a paparazzi

Despite the fact that it is frequently listed among English CTPs with grammatical uses, the verb *imagine* has a number of specific features that distinguish it from other members of this class. As noted by Van

Bogaert (2010), grammatical CTP clauses with *imagine* display an unusually high proportion of variant forms deviating from the prototype *I imagine* – as can be witnessed in (3)–(4). Furthermore, *imagine* combines with a wide array of complement types, ranging from various finite complements (*that*, zero, *wh*- and *if*-clauses), to non-finite gerundive complements and nominal direct objects.

It is precisely this formal variability that makes CTP constructions with *imagine* ideally suited for an in-depth comparative analysis of formally and semantically distinct complements. In this paper, I examine all CTP constructions with *imagine*, including lexical uses, found in the Spoken BNC2014 corpus. By applying a Hierarchical Configurational Frequency Analysis (Gries 2004; Hilpert 2009) to a set of over 2,000 instances of *imagine*-CTP constructions, I identify clusters of features associated with particular complement types, such as the CTP's TAM properties, polarity and clausal position. The different configurations that are found for each complement type are then discussed in light of their formal and semantic properties, with special attention to the opposition between zero/*that*-complementation and gerundive complementation (Maekelberghe 2019).

Not surprisingly, zero complementation turns out to be most strongly associated with syntagmatic variability, as its CTP-clause can occur in various clausal positions. In addition, its CTP-clause displays the highest degree of internal variability, as it can combine with a wide range of modal auxiliaries, whereby especially *would* and *should* mark grammatical status (3)–(4). Interestingly, gerund complements, which are only found with lexical uses of *imagine*, are significantly associated with negative polarity, as in (2). Especially in cases where negation is to be read as non-raised (cf. Boye and Harder 2007: 579), gerundive complementation seems to be the preferred option.

The present results are interesting in several respects. Firstly, they confirm Van Bogaert's (2010) finding that grammatical variants of CTPs do not necessarily display less formal variation than lexical variants. Secondly, they reveal an apparent division of labour between those complement types that allow for a modifying CTP-clause, and those that do not. A detailed examination of those different configurations, it is argued, can shed new light on the formal and functional properties of lexical vs. grammatical uses of CTP-clauses.

## References

- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-Taking Predicates: Usage and Linguistic Structure. *Studies in Language* 31 (3): 569–606.
- Gries, Stefan Th. 2004. HCFA 3.2. A program for R.
- Hilpert, Martin. 2009. The German *mit*-predicative construction. *Constructions and Frames* 1 (1): 29–55.
- Maekelberghe, Charlotte. 2019. The English gerund revisited. Exploring semantic differences through collocational analysis. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 15 (1): 205–237.
- Van Bogaert, Julie. 2010. A constructional taxonomy of *I think* and related expressions: accounting for the variability of complement-taking mental predicates. *English Language & Linguistics* 14 (3): 399–427.

## 9. Manner components in Early and Late Modern English direct speech reporting Caroline Gentens, University of Stockholm

This study turns to the pathway of change whereby originally intransitive manner-of-speaking predicates (e.g. *babble*, *whisper*, *shout*) come to function in parenthetical clauses as direct speech reporting predicates. On the descriptive plane, the paper presents a detailed analysis of the recent development of *shriek*, based on data from the Early Modern English Books Online database and the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts. The relevance of the development is highlighted against the backdrop of three long-term trends in the history of English, viz. (i) the diachronic increase in manner lexicalizations in general, and in manner-of-speaking verbs especially over the course of the Late Modern English period (cf. Fanego 2012), (ii) the historical cycle of fixation and renewal affecting direct speech reporting clauses (Cichosz 2019), and (iii) diachronic transitivization processes with non-prototypical object patterns (e.g. Visser 1963; Bouso 2017; Traugott and Trousdale 2013).

On the theoretical plane, the study calls for reflection on the natural compatibility and range of applicability of multiple theories of parenthetical clauses depending on which types of change are targeted. The case presented does not involve the standardly assumed ‘reduction’ of a clause to a zero-complement phrase, but rather the augmentation of an intransitive predicate. It does not involve semantic bleaching to a core grammatical meaning such as epistemic hedging or mirative marking or a discursive meaning such as attention-getting, but instead maintains a lexically specific component of manner of speaking. As such, the study highlights how the increasingly discursively secondary and conventionalized nature that seems to present direct reporting parentheticals as parallel to CTP grammaticalization processes is counterbalanced by a quest for expressive variability and the crucial impact of source-specific lexical semantics. For manner-of-speaking predicates in particular, it is argued that the lexical-semantic notion of ‘manner/result complementarity’, i.e. the idea that a verb root cannot lexicalize ‘manner’ and ‘result state’ simultaneously, and the concomitant differences in argument realization it predicts, naturally accommodate the diachronic co-optation of this set of predicates into the reporting frame within the theory of thetical grammar.

## References

- Bouso, Tamara. 2017. Changes in argument structure in the history of English, with special reference to the emergence and development of reaction object constructions. PhD dissertation, University of Santiago de Compostela.
- Cichosz, Anna. 2019. Parenthetical reporting clauses in the history of English: the development of quotative inversion. *English Language and Linguistics* 23 (1): 183–214.
- Fanego, Teresa. 2012. Motion events in English: The emergence and diachrony of manner salience from Old English to Late Modern English. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 33: 29–85.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Visser, Fredericus Theodorus. 1963. *An historical syntax of the English language. Volume 1: Syntactical units with one verb*. Leiden: Brill.

## 10. From complementizing to modifying status: On the grammaticalization of the CTP-clauses *chances are* and *odds are*

**María José López-Couso & Belén Méndez-Naya, University of Santiago de Compostela**

Complementation structures in which the complement-taking-predicate clause is downgraded to a parenthetical represent a common developmental pathway for epistemic markers. This is, for example, the origin that has been proposed for widely studied first person epistemic parentheticals like *I think*, *I guess*, and *I gather* (e.g., Thompson & Mulac 1991) and for impersonal parenthetical clauses with a third person singular subject, such as *it may be* and *it looks like* (cf. López-Couso and Méndez-Naya 2014, 2016). In the parenthetical use of such constructions, the matrix-subordinate relation is reversed, the parenthetical clause becomes syntactically and prosodically independent, shows greater positional mobility, and typically conveys the speaker’s stance. Interestingly, some third person parentheticals have moved a step further, losing their clausal status and becoming adverbs (e.g. *maybe*, cf. López-Couso and Méndez-Naya 2016) or quasi-adverbs (e.g. *looks like*, cf. López-Couso and Méndez-Naya 2014).

The inventory of complementation structures serving as the source for clausal parentheticals also includes sequences like those in bold in examples (1) and (2), which feature the nouns *chances* (OED s.v. *chance* n., adj., and adv.) and *odds* (OED s.v. *odds* n.):

- (1) **The chances are** that you will never behold the light of another sun. (COHA, 1852)
- (2) If you go in tired, burdened and concerned, **the odds are** that life will look decidedly different when you emerge. (OED s.v. *odds*, n. 6.a; 2001 *Nat. Health* Oct. 62/3)

Structures of this type, which are used to convey the meaning of probability, seem to be at the origin of examples such as (3) and (4), where the *chances are-* and *odds are-*clauses occur parenthetically and have modifying, rather than complementizing status (Boye and Harder 2007: 568).

(3) the perpetrators of this crime plan very carefully -and, **chances are**, knew about her apartment...;  
(COCA, 1991)

(4) And now, night having fallen, he's come alive, the way he always has and, **odds are**, always will.  
(COCA, 2005)

Drawing on data from COHA (Davies 2010–) and COCA (Davies 2008–), this paper explores the adverbialization of *chances are-* and *odds are-*parentheticals, paying attention to (i) the types of complementation structures in which the nouns *chances* and *odds* occur, taking into account, among other issues, complementizer selection and its relevance for the emergence of the parentheticals; (ii) the formal indications of on-going grammaticalization, such as unambiguous parenthetical (i.e. medial or final) position, morphosyntactic fixation of the parenthetical clause (loss of variability in the *chances-* and *odds-*NPs; TAM restrictions in the VP), etc.; (iii) the acquisition of subjective and intersubjective functions of the *chances are-* and *odds are-*parentheticals; and (iv) the distribution of the constructions at issue across time and register.

## References

- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31 (3): 569–606.
- Davies, Mark. 2008–. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 560 million words, 1990-present*. Available online at <https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>.
- Davies, Mark. 2010–. *The Corpus of Historical American English (COHA): 400 million words, 1810–2009*. Available online at <https://corpus.byu.edu/coha/>.
- López-Couso, María José and Belén Méndez-Naya. 2014. From clause to pragmatic marker: A study of the development of *like*-parentheticals in American English. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 15 (1): 66–91.
- López-Couso, María José and Belén Méndez-Naya. 2016. From clause to adverb: On the history of *maybe*. In Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer and Arne Lohmann (eds.), *Outside the Clause*, 157–176. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- OED = *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Available online at <http://www.oed.com>.
- Thompson, Sandra A. and Anthony Mulac. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticalization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Vol. 2, 313–329. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

## 5. Proposed time schedule

- (i) deadline first submission: 1<sup>st</sup> August 2020
- (ii) completion first review round: 1<sup>st</sup> November 2020
- (iii) deadline revised manuscripts: 1<sup>st</sup> February 2021
- (iv) completion of the review and revision process: 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021

## 6. Preferred format of special issue (*Continuous or Traditional Special Issue*)

Traditional Special Issue