

Łukasz Jędrzejowski, Ulrike Demske (Eds.)  
**Infinitives at the Syntax-Semantics Interface**

# Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs

**Editor**

Volker Gast

**Editorial Board**

Walter Bisang

Jan Terje Faarlund

Hans Henrich Hock

Natalia Levshina

Heiko Narrog

Matthias Schlesewsky

Amir Zeldes

Niina Ning Zhang

**Editor responsible for this volume**

Volker Gast

## Volume 306

# **Infinitives at the Syntax-Semantics Interface**

---

A Diachronic Perspective

Edited by  
Łukasz Jędrzejowski  
Ulrike Demske

**DE GRUYTER**  
MOUTON

ISBN 978-3-11-051847-4

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-052058-3

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-051859-7

ISSN 1861-4302

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: RoyalStandard, Hong Kong

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

☺ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

# Preface and acknowledgments

This book goes back to the 46th annual meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, September 18–21, 2013. The conference hosted the workshop on infinitives at the syntax-semantics interface from a diachronic perspective, convened and organized by the volume editors, Łukasz Jędrzejowski and Ulrike Demske.

We thank the organizers of the SLE conference and the SLE secretary, Bert Cornillie, for their excellent preparation and administration of both conference and workshop. We would like to thank anonymous reviewers, the series editors, in particular Volker Gast, for constructive criticism and helpful suggestions. We are particularly indebted to Ilaria De Cesare, Alexander Klaaßen and Joana Windloff for their meticulous editorial work. Thanks are also due to Birgit Sievert and Julie Miess of de Gruyter for their editorial and technical support.

Potsdam, May 2016

Łukasz Jędrzejowski, Ulrike Demske



# Table of contents

Preface and acknowledgments — v

List of contributors — ix

Łukasz Jędrzejowski and Ulrike Demske

- 1 **Infinitival patterns and their diachronic dynamics: Questions and challenges — 1**

## I **Acl verbs and restructuring effects**

Thomas Grano

- 2 **Restructuring at the syntax-semantics interface — 31**

Isabela Nedelcu and Irina Paraschiv

- 3 **The Romanian infinitive selected by perception and cognitive verbs — 55**

Jerneja Kavčič

- 4 **A diachronic perspective on the semantics of Acl clauses in Greek — 81**

## II **Infinitive structures versus other non-finite and finite patterns**

Frauke D'hoedt and Hubert Cuyckens

- 5 **Finite, infinitival and verbless complementation: The case of *believe*, *suppose* and *find* — 115**

Virginia Hill

- 6 **Early Modern Romanian infinitives: Origin and replacement — 147**

Augustin Speyer

- 7 **Semantic factors for the status of control infinitives in the history of German — 169**

Éva Dékány

- 8 **Anti-agreeing infinitives in Old Hungarian — 193**

Rosemarie Lühr

- 9 The emergence of expressions for purpose relations in older Indo-European languages — 223**

Björn Wiemer

- 10 Main clause infinitival predicates and their equivalents in Slavic: Why they are not instances of insubordination — 265**

**Language index — 339**

**Subject index — 341**

# List of contributors

## **Hubert Cuyckens**

KU Leuven  
Department of Linguistics  
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21  
PO Box 3308  
3000 Leuven  
Belgium  
hubert.cuyckens@arts.kuleuven.be

## **Éva Dékány**

Research Institute for Linguistics of the  
Hungarian Academy of Sciences  
Benczúr utca 33.  
1068 Budapest  
Hungary  
dekany.eva@nytud.mta.hu

## **Ulrike Demske**

Universität Potsdam  
Institut für Germanistik  
Geschichte der deutschen Sprache  
Am Neuen Palais 10, Haus 5  
14469 Potsdam  
Germany  
ulrike.demske@uni-potsdam.de

## **Frauke D'hoedt**

KU Leuven  
Department of Linguistics  
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21  
PO Box 3308  
3000 Leuven  
Belgium  
frauke.dhoedt@arts.kuleuven.be

## **Thomas Grano**

Indiana University  
Department of Linguistics  
Memorial Hall 322  
Bloomington, IN 47405-7005  
USA  
tgrano@indiana.edu

## **Virginia Hill**

University of New Brunswick  
Humanities and Languages  
Tucker Park, P.O.Box 5050  
Saint John, NB  
Canada E2L 4L5  
hillvirginia80@gmail.com

## **Łukasz Jędrzejowski**

Universität Potsdam  
Institut für Germanistik  
Geschichte der deutschen Sprache  
Am Neuen Palais 10, Haus 5  
14469 Potsdam  
Germany  
lukasz-jedrzejowski@daad-alumni.de

## **Jerneja Kavčič**

Department of Classics  
Faculty of Arts  
University of Ljubljana  
Aškerčeva 2  
SI-1000 Ljubljana  
Slovenia  
jerneja.kavcic@ff.uni-lj.si

## **Rosemarie Lühr**

HU Berlin  
Unter den Linden 6  
10099 Berlin  
Germany  
rosemarie.luehr@hotmail.de

## **Isabela Nedelcu**

“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”  
Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian  
Academy  
Calea 13 Septembrie 13  
050711, Bucharest  
Romania  
isabela.nedelcu@yahoo.com

**Irina Nicula Paraschiv**

“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”  
Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian  
Academy  
Calea 13 Septembrie 13  
050711, Bucharest  
Romania  
irina\_nicula@yahoo.com

**Augustin Speyer**

Universität des Saarlandes  
Fakultät P, FR Germanistik  
Neuere deutsche Sprachwissenschaft  
Campus C5 3  
66123 Saarbrücken  
Germany  
a.speyer@mx.uni-saarland.de

**Björn Wiemer**

Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität  
Institut für Slavistik, Turkologie und  
zirkumbaltische Studien (ISTziB)  
Jakob-Welder-Weg 18  
55128 Mainz  
Germany  
wiemerb@uni-mainz.de

Łukasz Jędrzejowski and Ulrike Demske

# 1 Infinitival patterns and their diachronic dynamics: Questions and challenges

## 1 Motivation

The present volume contains contributions dealing with non-finite structures and their diachronic change across languages. It relates to a prominent and widely discussed syntactic topic, which has been attracting more and more attention, particularly in the past two decades. There exists a large number of studies on the infinitival systems of particular language periods, as well as on selected topics across various languages. The first group of studies comprises, among other publications, Robbers (1997) on Afrikaans, ter Beek (2008) and Rutten (1991) on Dutch, Chierchia (1984), Geisler (1995), Mair (1990) and Moulton (2009) on English, Hoekstra (1997) on Frisian, Bech (1955/57), Grosse (2005), Höhle (1978), Kiss (1995), Lee-Schoenfeld (2007) and Wurmbrand (2001) on modern German, Zinn (2008) on Ket, Knyazev (2016) on Russian, Denecke (1880) on Old High German, Pearce (1997) on Old French and Rochette (1988) on modern Romance languages, to name just a few. In the case of cross-linguistics studies, much attention has been paid to control structures and their derivation, see for instance Boeckx et al. (2010), Grano (2015), Landau (2013), Martin (1996), Pires (2006) as well as references cited there for recent discussion. Studies on the development and change of infinitival structures are more scarce, but see Coupé (2015) and Ijbema (2002) on Dutch, Joseph (1983) on Balkan languages, Callaway (1913), De Smet (2013), Fanego (1996, 1998), Iyeiri (2010), Los (2005), Rudanko (2000) and Warner (1982) on English, Demske-Neumann (1994) on German, and Mensching (2000) and Schulte (2007) on Romance.

The main aim of the present volume is to relate the synchrony and diachrony of infinitival systems in different languages to each other, based on empirical data, and to show to what extent infinitival systems of modern languages can be accounted for by examining changes in earlier language periods. In pursuing this aim, we define the term *diachrony* in a broad sense here, i.e. as covering not only language change observed between individual language periods of one language, but also comprising theoretical as well as empirical investigations dealing with a single language period, and being relevant to diachronic considerations in a larger sample of languages.

---

Łukasz Jędrzejowski and Ulrike Demske, Universität Potsdam

DOI 10.1515/9783110520583-001

## 2 Infinitive structures in flux

The development of infinitival clauses involves different syntactic dimensions of the core grammar. It not only affects the entire complementation system of a particular language, it also gives rise to changes on other levels of grammar, e.g. lexical semantics and morphology. In this section, we briefly illustrate how the syntactic dimensions interact with each other and to what extent other parts of the grammar may be involved in the processes of the change under investigation. In pursuing this aim, we examine, by way of example, the use of the directive matrix predicate *befehlen* ‘command’ in Early New High German (1350–1650), and compare its selectional properties with those that are associated with its Present-day German (1900–) counterpart (for a general overview of infinitive-embedding predicates in Early New High German see Ebert 1976 and Maché & Abraham 2011). As it turns out, these observations are relevant to the Germanic as well as the typological diachrony of infinitival clauses and contribute to a broader typological discussion of clause-linkage in general (cf. Noonan 2007 [1985], Bril 2010, Cristofaro 2003, Dixon & Aikhenvald 2009, Gast & Diessel 2012, Haiman & Thompson 1988, Wiemer & Letuchiy, to appear, among many others).

In *Neuwe Welt*, an Early New High German travel report from 1567, the object control verb *befehlen* ‘command’ embeds predominantly finite complements. We focus on the first 60 examples in which *befehlen* selects for a sentential complement here. Table 1 gives an overview of the complement types selected by *befehlen*:

**Table 1:** The distribution of complement clauses embedded under the object control verb *befehlen* ‘command’ in *Neuwe Welt* (1567)

Complement type		Number of examples (percentage)	
1.	indicative complements	0 (= 0%)	
2.	finite complements with a modal verb	17 (= 28%)	
3.	subjunctive complements	<i>Konjunktiv I</i>	0 (= 0%)
		<i>Konjunktiv II</i>	9 (= 15%)
4.	verb second complements	24 (= 40%)	
5.	infinitive complements	bare infinitives	0 (= 0%)
		<i>zu</i> -infinitives	10 (= 17%)
In total:		60 (= 100%)	

In 50 (= 83%) out of 60 cases *befehlen* embeds a finite complement. Remarkably, two groups can be distinguished. The first group contains clauses headed by the complementizer *dass* ‘that’. The embedded verbal phrase usually contains an infinitive of a lexical verb and an inflected modal verb. The following two examples illustrate this configuration with *sollte* ‘should’ and *wollen* ‘want’:

- (1) *Er befahl auch dem Bartholme Dias / dz er mit*  
 he command.3SG.PST also the.DAT Bartholme Dias dass he with  
*jm biß zu dē ort Mine genant / fahren sollte*  
 him.DAT until to the place Mine call.PTCP go.INF should.3SG  
 ‘He also commanded Bartholme Dias to go with him to the place called Mine’  
 (Ulrich Schmidl, 1567, *Neuwe Welt*, p. 3)
- (2) *vñ befahl jm mit ernst /*  
 and command.3SG.PST him.DAT with earnestness  
*dz er sich wolte bearbeiten*  
 that he REFL want.3SG.PST exert.INF  
 ‘and [he] seriously commanded him to exert himself’  
 (Ulrich Schmidl, 1567, *Neuwe Welt*, p. 3)

In addition, subjunctive forms could occur instead of modal verbs, too. Notice, however, that only the *Konjunktiv II* mood is attested in such cases:

- (3) *Vnd befahl erstlich einem Ferdinand Lorenzo genant /*  
 and command.3SG.PST first a.DAT Ferdinand Lorenzo call.PTCP  
*das er auß dē Holtz / zwey Schiff machē liesse*  
 that he from the wood two ship make.INF let.3SG.SBJV  
 ‘And [he] first commanded to Ferdinand Lorenzo to make two ships  
 from wood’  
 (Ulrich Schmidl, 1567, *Neuwe Welt*, p. 3)

What the examples given in (1)–(3) have in common is the presence of the complementizer *dass* ‘that’, the final position of finite verbs as well as the use of modal verbs or subjunctive morphology in the embedded clause.

The second group of examples contains complements obeying the verb second rule which are not introduced by a complementizer. Interestingly enough, in all 17 cases (= 28%) it is the modal verb *sollte* ‘should’ that occupies the second position in the clause. The following example is a case in point:

- (4) *vnd der Oberst befaht /*  
 and the colonel command.3SG.PST  
*man sollte jnen schellen geben*  
 one should.3SG them.DAT haddocks give.INF  
 ‘and the colonel commanded to give them haddocks’  
 (Ulrich Schmidl, 1567, *Neuwe Welt*, p. 7)

In addition to finite complement clauses, *befehlen* could already select for infinitives in Early New High German, too. In all attested cases the infinitive clause is accompanied by the infinitive marker *zu* ‘to’:

- (5) *der Koenig hette jm befohlen /*  
 the king have.3SG.SBJV him.DAT command.PTCP  
*in sein Schiff zu ziehen*  
 in his ship to move.INF  
 ‘the king commanded him to move on his ship’  
 (Ulrich Schmidl, 1567, *Neuwe Welt*, p. 26)

As the example given in (5) shows, the embedded infinitive appears to the right of the matrix verb (= extraposed infinitive). Infinitival complements of *befehlen* could also occur to the left of the matrix verb, as illustrated in the following example:

- (6) [*Das=selbige*]<sub>i</sub> *hatte gleich der Koenig t<sub>i</sub> zuthun befohlen*  
 the.same have.3SG.PST just the King to.do.INF command.PTCP  
 ‘The king commanded straight away to do the same’  
 (Ulrich Schmidl, 1567, *Neuwe Welt*, p. 27)

Here, the embedded verb *tun* ‘do’ occurs in the middle field of the matrix clause. Additionally, it selects the noun phrase object *das=selbige* ‘the same’. Notice, however, that this noun phrase does not occur as a part of the infinitive clause on the surface. Instead, it has been separated from the dependent infinitive, and has been placed in the prefield position of the matrix clause, probably for information structural reasons. Regardless of where infinitives appear relative to the matrix verb, we treat them, similarly to the finite clauses, as sentential complements, in line with work by Haider (2010: 272–353) and Sternefeld (2008: 567–569). We thus assume that *befehlen* selects infinitive complements which are syntactically equivalent to finite *dass*-clauses:

- (7) *Er befahl die Sicherheitsvorkehrungen zu verstärken*  
 he command.3SG.PST the safety.precautions to strengthen.INF  
 ‘He commanded to strengthen the safety precautions’  
 (DeReKo, *Rhein-Zeitung*, 12/4/2011)

There are two arguments in favour of this view. First, *befehlen* allows a negation marker in the embedded clause, even if the matrix verb itself is in the scope of another negation operator. Thus, we can modify (7) as follows:

- (8) *Er befahl nicht, die Sicherheitsvorkehrungen nicht zu verstärken*  
 he commanded NEG the safety.precautions NEG to strengthen

Second, if infinitive complements of *befehlen* are expected to behave like finite *dass*-clauses, it should also be possible to use two distinct adverbial modifications encoding opposite values. In analogy to the negation argument, the following temporal mismatch (*gestern* ‘yesterday’ versus *morgen* ‘tomorrow’) provides evidence for the sentential status of both non-finite and finite complements of the predicate *befehlen*:

- (9) *Er befahl gestern,*  
 he commanded yesterday  
*(morgen) die Sicherheitsvorkehrungen (morgen) zu verstärken*  
 tomorrow the safety.precautions tomorrow to strengthen

If we compare the Early New High German data with corresponding data from Present-day German, various differences and similarities can be observed. The most striking difference pertains to the distribution of finite and non-finite complements. As we have seen above, in Early New High German *befehlen* predominantly selects for a modalized finite clause. In Present-day German, in turn, finite clauses are still allowed as in (10).

- (10) *der seinen Soldaten befahl,*  
 who his soldiers.DAT command.3SG.PST  
*sie sollten sich in China einen Namen machen*  
 they should.3PL REFL in China a name make.INF  
 ‘(..) who commended his soldiers to acquire renown in China’  
 (DeReKo, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 30/9/2000)

However, infinitives are the preferred complement type for the object control verb *befehlen*. A small research query in *Das Deutsche Referenzkorpus* (= DeReKo) yielded exclusively hits of *zu*-complements.<sup>1</sup> No other complementation patterns were attested in this search. Interestingly enough, although *befehlen* has not changed semantically, it has developed a strong preference towards infinitival complements, while finite complements took a backseat. One of the main research questions dealing with infinitival clauses concerns the extent to which infinitives differ from and – in case there are differences – compete with their finite counterparts. If the semantics of an infinitive-embedding predicate did not change, the question arises what the driving force behind the preference for a selected complementation type could be. Not much attention has been paid to this issue from a diachronic point of view, but see Smirnova (2011) on German, Martin (2007) on Greek, and Rudanko (2012) and D’hoedt & Cuyckens (this volume), as well as references cited there, on English. What German and Greek have in common is that diachronically speaking, infinitives started to compete with finite complements. While in German infinitives ousted finite clauses, in Greek infinitives dropped out of use completely (see Joseph 1983 and Philippaki-Warbuton & Spyropoulos 2004). The disappearance of infinitival complements is not only a hallmark of the Greek complementation system, it has also been well-documented for some dialects of Romance languages, e.g. in Salentino, a southern Italian dialect (cf. Calabrese 1991, 1993) and in selected Slavic languages like in Bulgarian (cf. MacRobert 1980 and Reimann 1994; see also Dobrushina 2012 for Russian and Wiemer, this volume, for a diachronic overview of independent infinitives in Slavic). In other words, in those syntactic environments where most standard Romance and Slavic languages favour the infinitive, Greek and Bulgarian use a finite complement. Compare (11) for a volitional use of *thélo* ‘want’ and (12) for an aspectual use of *arxizo* ‘begin’ in Greek:

- (11) *O Kostas theli na odhiji*  
 the Kostas want.3SG SBJV.PTC drive.3SG  
 ‘Kostas wants (him) to drive’  
 (Roussou 2009: 1812, ex 3)

- (12) *Te pedhja arxisan na trexun*  
 the children begin.3PL.PST SBJV.PTC run.3PL  
 ‘The children began to run’  
 (Roussou 2009: 1816, ex 11)

<sup>1</sup> We extracted and analyzed the data from the subcorpora *Hannoversche Allgemeine 2009* and *Süddeutsche Zeitung 2009*.

In (11) and (12) the complement clauses are introduced by the subjunctive particle *na*.<sup>2</sup> Diachronically, the finite patterns ousted the infinitival patterns. In German, many clause-embedding predicates began embedding infinitives, at some point putting finite complements in the rear. Based on Demske (2001), Denecke (1880) and Johnk (1979) investigating infinitive complement clauses in Old High German (750–1050), we can identify approx. 250 infinitive-embedding predicates. In Present-day German there are over 1400 predicates licensing infinitives. The question arises how this happened. In-depth studies focusing on one language and covering all historical periods of this language are still missing. Nevertheless, cross-linguistically we can divide languages into two major groups: (i) languages developing infinitive complements and suppressing other complement types (e.g. all West Germanic languages), and (ii) languages reducing the number of infinitive-embedding predicates or losing the possibility to select for non-finite complements in favor of their finite counterparts (e. g. Balkan languages). As for group (i), three issues should be kept in mind. First, it does not necessarily have to be case that other complement types disappear when infinitives start to gain ground; other complement types can still be used (cf. e. g. 10 above), but they are often restricted to marked contexts (cf. e.g. Rohdenburg 1995, 2006, 2014 and D’hoedt & Cuyckens this volume). Second, if a language starts allowing the use of embedded infinitive complements in combination with specific matrix predicates, this does not necessarily mean that all clause-embedding predicates will embed infinitives at some point. Present-day German, for example, has approximately 1800 clause-embedding predicates, but only approximately 1400 of them (= 78%) can embed an infinitive clause.<sup>3</sup> Question predicates like *fragen* ‘ask’ do not allow infinitival complements:<sup>4</sup>

- (13) \**Ich<sub>i</sub> fragte*                    *–<sub>i</sub> einen Kuchen zu backen*  
       I     ask.1SG.PST            a        cake     to    bake.INF

<sup>2</sup> The presence of a finite clause entails some consequences for the interpretation of the dropped subject in the embedded clause. As noted by Constantini (2006) and Kempchinsky (2009), subjunctive complement clauses embedded under selected matrix predicates often force an obviation effect, presupposing that the subject in the dependent clause cannot be co-referent with the matrix subject. We leave aside the role of obviation effects here, but the interested reader is referred to Martin (2007), who based on diachronic data from Greek elaborately shows to what extent obviation effects occurring in subjunctive complements are related to the loss of their infinitive counterparts.

<sup>3</sup> This information comes from a clause-embedding database set up at the Centre for General Linguistics (ZAS) in Berlin.

<sup>4</sup> This restriction does not hold for languages allowing *wh*-infinitives, cf. Gärtner (2009) for a typological overview. In this case, *wh*-infinitives can be selected by question predicates.

A third observation goes along with the generalization that the availability of infinitival complements largely depends on the semantics of a clause-embedding predicate. With respect to the example given in (13) we have stated that German question predicates do not allow infinitives. However, some speakers may interpret *fragen* as a directive predicate meaning ‘request’. In this case, an infinitive complement can appear triggering an object control interpretation:

- (14) ?*Ich*<sub>i</sub> *fragte* *ihn*<sub>j</sub> <sub>-j</sub> *einen* *Kuchen* *zu* *backen*  
 I ask.1SG.PST him.ACC a cake to bake.INF  
 ‘I asked him to bake a cake’

Note that the Dutch counterpart *vragen* (lit. ‘ask’) developed the directive meaning of ‘request’ (cf. IJbema 2002: 129, Ter Beek 2008: 85, 153), enabling the embedding of infinitive complements. Thus, we can translate the example given in (14) as follows:

- (15) *Ik*<sub>i</sub> *vroeg* *hem*<sub>j</sub> (*om*) <sub>-j</sub> *een* *koek* *te* *bakken*  
 I ask.1SG.PST him COMP a cake to bake.INF

The complementizer *om* is optional. Broekhuis & Corver (2015) illustrate this variation with the following example:

- (16) *Jan*<sub>i</sub> *vroeg* *Marie*<sub>j</sub> <sub>-j</sub> *te* *komen*  
 Jan ask.3SG.PST Marie to come.INF  
 ‘Jan asked (= requested from) Marie to come’  
 (Broekhuis & Corver 2015: 605, ex 17b’)

Broekhuis & Corver (2015: 776) point out that “while it is normally always possible to omit *om* from infinitival argument clauses, it is not always possible to add it to infinitival argument clauses without *om*”.

IJbema (2002: 129) provides a tentative explanation for the optionality of *om*:

“In the course of time, the meaning of *om* has generalized so that it can appear in more contexts. (...). *Om* can follow verbs such as *denken* ‘think’ and *treuren* ‘mourn’, in which case there is a ‘movement of the mind’ around the object one is thinking about or mourning for. Following these verbs, *om* refers to the cause of or motivation for an activity. With this sense, *om* occurs in *waarom* ‘why’ and *omdat* ‘because’. The motivation for an activity is usually the wish to obtain a certain object or the wish to reach a certain goal. *Om* expresses this meaning in connection to verbs such as *roepen* (*roepen om* ‘call for’), *vragen* (*vragen om* ‘ask for’) and *sturen*, (...). Because *om* can express that one wishes to reach a goal, *om* comes into use in connection with *te*-infinitives to express this meaning.”

English patterns with Dutch, as *ask* can be used as a directive matrix predicate, too:

(17)  $I_i$  asked  $him_j$   $_{-j}$  to bake a cake

However, *ask* does not always presuppose object control when embedding infinitives. Bhatt (2006: 116) shows that as soon as *ask* selects for a *wh*-infinitive, subject control is possible as well:

- (18) a. *Stefan Arni<sub>i</sub> asked Hafdis<sub>j</sub> [<sub>-\*<sub>i</sub>/j</sub>] to leave* (object control)  
 b. *Stefan Arni<sub>i</sub> asked Hafdis<sub>j</sub> [<sub>-i/\*<sub>j</sub></sub>] when to leave* (subject control)  
 (Bhatt 2006: 116, ex 210a,b)

Based on this contrast, Bhatt (2006) concludes that  $ask_{+wh,-inf}$  and  $ask_{+wh,+inf}$  do not seem to have a unified meaning. On his view,  $ask_{+wh,-inf}$  means ‘request’, whereas  $ask_{+wh,+inf}$  can be paraphrased as ‘put a question to’. It remains to be examined why the German verb *fragen* did not acquire the meaning of ‘request’, as its Dutch and English counterparts did. We will return to this issue of *wh*-infinitives below.

Similar contrasts can be observed between two different languages with respect to the same meaning of a single clause-embedding predicate. Take modern German and modern Polish as an example. What they have in common is that both languages are members of group (i), i.e. they have developed, or are still developing, infinitive complements in combination with selected matrix predicates. However, modern Polish – unlike modern German – does not exhibit AcI constructions (cf. Dziwirek 2000), nor does it allow infinitives in connection with factive predicates like *żałować* ‘regret’ (cf. Słodowicz 2008). Instead, finite complements have to be used:

(19) \**Żałuję, nie potrafić wysoko śpiewać*  
 regret.1SG NEG can.INF high sing.INF  
 Intended: ‘I regret to be not able to sing high’

(20) *Żałuję, że częściej tu nie występuję*  
 regret.1SG that more.often here NEG perform.1SG  
 ‘I regret that I don’t perform here more often’  
 (NKJP, *Nasze Miasto Kraków*, 20/6/2002)

If we translate (19) and (20) into modern German, we end up with two grammatical sentences:

(21) *Ich bereue es, nicht hoch singen zu können*  
 I regret it NEG high sing.INF to can.INF

(22) *Ich bereue es, dass ich hier nicht häufiger auftrete*  
 I regret.1SG it that I here NEG more.often perform.1SG

Thus, it sometimes also varies from language to language whether or not a matrix verb licenses an infinitive complement (see also Schlotthauer et al. 2014 for some contrasts among European languages). What factors control this parametrization remains to be determined. One interesting cross-linguistic attempt has been made in the work by Sabel (2005, 2006, 2015). He proposes the following generalization:

(23) *The Wh-Infinitive-Generalization (WHIG)*

If *wh*-movement may terminate in the SpecCP of an infinitive in a language then this language possesses the option of filling the C-system of this (type of) infinitive with an overt complementizer. (Sabel 2015: 318)

In more theory-neutral terms, the WHIG can be paraphrased as follows: As soon as a language allows *wh*-infinitives, this language is also allowed to have complement infinitives introduced by a complementizer. What we have seen so far is that English admits *wh*-infinitives (cf. 18b). Against this background, we also expect it to license infinitives with a complementizer. This prediction is confirmed by the next example, where *for* is usually analyzed as a complementizer:

(24) *As the disease progresses, it will be increasingly hard for him to breathe as his diaphragm weakens* (COCA, *Denver Post*, 2014)

Dutch behaves like English with respect to the WHIG. In the following example the matrix predicate *vragen* ‘ask’ selects for an infinitive clause introduced by the *wh*-word *hoe* ‘how’:

(25) ... *omdat Jan vroeg hoe te handelen bij gevaar*  
 because Jan ask.3SG.PST how to handle.INF at danger  
 ‘... because Jan asked how to act in situations of danger’  
 (Ter Beek 2008: 159, ex 15a)

The example given in (15), in turn, contains an infinitive clause occupying the object slot of the matrix predicate, introduced by the complementizer *om*. German behaves differently. It neither allows *wh*-infinitives, nor does it have complement clauses introduced by the covert complementizer *um*, corresponding to Dutch *om* (but see Leys 1991):

- (26) \**Stefan fragte Saskia, wann zu gehen*  
 Stefan ask.3SG.PST Saskia when to leave.INF  
 Intended: ‘Stefan asked Saskia when to leave’

- (27) \**Er befahl um die Sicherheitsvorkehrungen*  
 he command.3SG.PST COMP the safety.precautions  
*zu verstärken*  
 to strengthen.INF  
 Intended: ‘He commanded to strengthen the safety precautions’

Sabel discusses examples from other European languages and provides more cross-linguistic evidence for the WHIG. His findings are summarized in Table 2:

**Table 2:** European languages (dis-)allowing *wh*-infinitives

Languages allowing <i>wh</i> -infinitives	Languages disallowing <i>wh</i> -infinitives
Dutch, English, European Portuguese, French, Italian, Polish, Spanish	Danish, German, Norwegian, Swedish

According to Sabel, languages allowing *wh*-infinitives are supposed to allow a covert complementizer in infinitives that are realized as one of the matrix predicate arguments. We can test this assumption by taking, again, modern Polish as an example:

- (28) *Człowiek nie wiedział gdzie uciekać*  
 human.being NEG know.3SG.PST where run.away.INF  
 ‘One didn’t know where to run away’  
 (NKJP, *Express Ilustrowany*, 28/7/2001)

- (29) *Wielu maluchów marzy żeby pójść w ślady K. Mitonia*  
 many toddler.PL dream COMP go.INF in traces K. Mitoń.GEN  
 ‘Many toddlers dream to follow K. Mitoń’s footsteps’  
 (NKJP, *Gazeta Krakowska*, 28/9/2001)

The corpus examples in (28) and (29) provide direct evidence for the validity of the WHIG. The dependent *wh*-infinitive in (28) is embedded under the negated semi-factive predicate *wiedzieć* ‘know’ and introduced by the *wh*-phrase *gdzie* ‘where’. In (29), the embedded infinitive is licensed as an argument of the verb *marzyć* ‘dream’, and headed by the complementizer *żeby* (*że* = ‘that’, *by* = subjunctive clitic). As in Dutch, the covert complementizer can be omitted without affecting the interpretation of the clause:

- (29') *Wielu maluchów marzy pójść w ślady K. Mitońia*  
 many toddler.PL dream go.INF in traces K. Mitoń.GEN  
 ‘Many toddlers dream to follow K. Mitoń’s footsteps’

Based on what we have seen so far we are bound to assume, from a diachronic point of view, that the availability of *wh*-infinitives may have paved the way for the development of covert complementizers in dependent infinitives. To the best of our knowledge, not much attention has been paid to this affinity, though. Sabel (2015: 316) assumes that “before the Middle English period no *wh*-infinitives are attested, but they are found after the Middle English period, i.e. after *for* introduces complement clauses as a complementizer.” Fischer et al. (2000: 96) show that embedded infinitival questions are first attested in Middle English:

- (30) *ant nuste hwet seggen*  
 and NEG.know.3SG.PST what say.INF  
 ‘and [he] didn’t know what to say’

Likewise, we find the first instances of *wh*-infinitives in Middle Polish (1535–1780):

- (31) *nie wiedzieli czym go zadzierzeć w żywocie iego*  
 NEG know.3PL.PST what.INS him.ACC keep.INF in life his  
 ‘they didn’t know how to save his life’  
 (M. Rej, 1558, *Wizerunek własny żywota człowieka poczciwego*)

What (30) and (31) have in common is that the dependent *wh*-infinitives are complements of the negated matrix verb *know*. Interestingly, Gärtner (2009: 25) illustrates for Middle English (for the period between 1225 and 1450) that among 20 infinitival *wh*-complements 17 examples are complements of *know*, embedded in a negative environment. It would be interesting to see if in the other languages allowing *wh*-infinitives, these constructions emerged in combination with the verb

know as well, and if so, for what reason this particular environment gave rise to *wh*-infinitives. Finally, it is worth investigating at what time covert complementizers in complement clauses appeared for the first time. In this connection, we would gain more diachronic insight not only into a better understanding of the WHIG but also into the diachrony of complementizers in general.

As pointed out above, the complementizers *om* in Dutch and *żeby* in Polish can – but need not – be used in selected infinitival complement clauses. In addition, they can also be used in infinitive adjunct clauses introducing purpose clauses (see also Lühr this volume for older Indo-European languages):

- (32) *Bernard ging naar Amerika om beroemd te worden*  
 Bernard go.3SG.PST to America COMP famous to become.INF  
 ‘Bernard went to America in order to become famous’  
 (Sabel 2015: 316, ex 20)

- (33) *Przyszliśmy, żeby zobaczyć pomnik*  
 come.1PL.PST COMP see.INF monument  
 ‘We came to see the monument’  
 (NKJP, *Dziennik Zachodni*, 28/6/2004)

Although the German complementizer *um* cannot be used in infinitive complement clauses,<sup>5</sup> it is allowed to occur in infinitive purpose clauses. Hence, we can translate the Dutch example into German as follows:

- (34) *Bernard ging nach Amerika, um berühmt zu werden*  
 Bernard go.3SG.PST to America COMP famous to become.INF

Typologically, such a situation is, to some extent, expected. Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 155) examines structural patterns encoding purposive relations in a sample of 80 languages and makes two interesting observations concerning the prominence of infinitives with respect to adverbial clauses in general (see also Wiemer this volume for the prominent role of infinitives in independent structures). Firstly, in 16 languages (= 20%), purpose clauses are the only semantic type of adverbial clause that is expressed by a non-finite construction. Secondly, in 12 languages (= 15%) purpose clauses, but none of the other adverbial clauses, employ an infinitive or an otherwise highly integrated construction. In addition, Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 158) points out that while “in 62 languages (= 77,5%)

---

5 Cf. Demske (2011) for the use of infinitival complementizers in complement clauses in Swiss German as well as Pennsylvania German.

at least one purpose clause construction shares some of its morphosyntactic properties with (certain kinds of) sentential complements, up to being completely identical with them, (...) in only 18 languages are purpose and complement constructions fully distinct.” One of the examples he refers to comes from Tzutujil (Mayan). In this language the preposition *ch(i)* ‘at’, ‘to’, ‘in order to’ introduces both purpose and complement clauses (cf. Dayley 1985: 392). It is not surprising that *om* in Dutch and *żeby* in Polish can fulfill both functions, too. It calls for an explanation, however, why this possibility did not prevail in German and has been restricted only to purpose clauses. An answer to this question is, in our view, still missing.

Another issue closely related to the dynamics of infinitive clauses refers to the presence or absence, and, if present, the role of infinitival markers, e.g. of *zu* ‘to’ in German. There is no consensus among researchers regarding the syntactic position occupied by infinitival markers, or their main function, cf. Beukema & den Dikken (1989), Biskup (2014), Christensen (2007), Leys (1985), Salzmann (2013), Wilder (1988), among many others. Different scenarios have also been proposed with respect to the historical development of infinitival markers, cf. e.g. Demske (2001) and Speyer (this volume) for German, Faarlund (2007) for Norwegian and Fischer (1995) for English. These authors convincingly illustrate that the development of infinitival complements headed by an infinitival marker cannot be attributed to a universal grammaticalization path, as has been proposed in Haspelmath (1989) or Abraham (2004). It still remains to be investigated what motivated the presence/absence of infinitival markers in earlier stages of a particular language, and what led to the processes of change resulting in a requirement for modern languages to use infinitival markers in most control environments. As we have seen above, in our small corpus study from Early New High German *befehlen* selects for infinitival complements accompanied by the infinitival marker *zu* ‘to’. No bare infinitives could be found. This might suggest that *befehlen* never embedded bare infinitives, and that it selected for a *zu*-infinitive already in earlier stages of German. Smirnova (2001), for instance, assumes such a scenario for directive predicates in German. Note, however, that this view is challenged by the occurrence of other directive predicates, e.g. *bitten* ‘request’, which used to select bare infinitives in earlier stages of German. (35) is from Old High German, (36) from Middle High German and (37) from Early New High German:

- (35) *thoh      bāt                      er nan (...) thie stéina duan zi bróte*  
 though ask.3SG.PST he him.ACC the stones do.INF zu bread  
 ‘Though he asked him to turn stones into bread’  
 (Otfrid von Weißenburg, *Das Evangelienbuch*, II, 4: 44)

- (36) *diu mich (...) der edeln künste swaere*  
 that me.ACC the noble arts.GEN importance.NOM  
*den rîchen herren künden bat*  
 the rich lords.DAT announce.INF ask.3SG.PST  
 ‘[the story] which importance of noble arts urged me to announce to the rich lords’  
 (Konrad von Würzburg, 1250–1287, *Die Klage der Kunst*, 32,8; Speyer, this volume)
- (37) *bat sye morgens herwider gon*  
 ask.3SG.PST her.ACC in.the.morning again go.INF  
 ‘[he] asked her to go [there] in the morning again’  
 (Kalenberg, p. 194)

Moreover, it remains to be explained why most Slavic languages never developed an infinitival marker. In Polish, for example, *rozkazać* ‘command’, the counterpart of German *befehlen* can embed infinitival complements as well, and is even the preferred complement type in modern Polish:

- (38) *Czesław Piątas rozkazał przerwać ćwiczenia*  
 Czesław Piątas command.3SG.PST stop.INF training  
 ‘Czesław Piątas commanded to stop the training’  
 (NKJP, *Dziennik Zachodni*, 5/4/2003)

An interesting difference between German *befehlen* and Polish *rozkazać* is that the former verb requires the presence of the infinitival marker *zu* ‘to’, whereas the latter predicate can only embed bare infinitives. Note, in addition, that the presence of an infinitival marker has no impact on the syntactic size of the embedded complement. As Polish *rozkazać* allows two independent verbal negations and distinct adverbial modifications marking opposite values, its infinitive complements ought to be analyzed as sentential complements corresponding to finite clauses:

- (39) *Czesław Piątas nie rozkazał nie przerywać ćwiczeń*  
 Czesław Piątas NEG command.3SG.PST NEG stop.INF training
- (40) *Czesław Piątas rozkazał wczoraj przerwać*  
 Czesław Piątas command.3SG.PST yesterday stop.INF  
*jutro ćwiczenia*  
 tomorrow training

Finally, it is worth investigating what role word order properties of infinitival complements play, and how they determine their syntactic status. Considering German *befehlen* and Polish *rozkazać*, we assumed that both predicates embed sentential complements. However, verbs taking infinitival complements are usually regarded as falling into two main classes, depending on the resulting clausal structure. There are infinitival patterns exhibiting monoclausal characteristics like pronoun fronting, long inversion or wide scope of negation. On the other hand, infinitival constructions allowing extraposition, the intervention of non-verbal material between matrix verb and infinitive or pied piping point to a biclausal structure (cf. e.g. Wurmbrand 2001 for German, Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004, Cinque 2006 and Haegeman 2010 for Italian, Ter Beek 2008 for Dutch and Sabel 1996 as well as Grano 2015, this volume for cross-linguistic generalizations). There is an ongoing debate focusing on present-day languages whether or not both types of constructions are derivationally related, a discussion going back to Evers (1975). For a comprehensive presentation of the most prominent accounts, see Haider (2010). Demske (2015) shows for the history of German that the distinction between monoclausal and biclausal infinitival constructions is well established in Old High German. Coherent infinitival patterns as a particular type of monoclausal infinitival constructions, however, start to arise towards the end of the Early New High German period in the 17th century.

In the following section, we briefly summarize the most important diachronic findings of the contributions collected in the present volume and show how they contribute to a diachronic typology of infinitive clauses.

### 3 The structure of the book

This volume consists of two parts, each dedicated to different aspects of infinitival syntax.

#### 3.1 Acl verbs and restructuring effects

As introduced above, verbs embedding infinitival complements can be divided into two classes, depending on the resulting clausal structure exhibiting either monoclausal or biclausal characteristics. In the present volume, the contributions by Thomas Grano, Isabela Nedelcu & Irina Paraschiv and Jerneja Kavčič address questions concerning the historical development of monoclausal versus biclausal structures.



and, on the other hand, between non-finite clauses and finite clauses, with the latter comprising indicative and subjunctive verbal forms (for more details see Section 3.2 below). A final question to be dealt with concerns the grammatical status of the particle *a* being used as a complementizer in early stages of the language, while figuring as an infinitival marker in later stages.

**Kavčič's** contribution, *A diachronic perspective on the semantics of AcI clauses in Greek*, is a corpus study on restructuring verbs embedding AcI complements in Ancient Greek, focusing on verbs of saying and thinking. Kavčič provides abundant empirical evidence showing that these predicates allow the embedding of the aorist infinitive as well as an infinitive marked for present or future tense in Classical Greek. It is illustrated that temporal relations of anteriority, simultaneity and posteriority between the matrix verb and the embedded proposition can be expressed by using the respective infinitive form. Expanding on a proposal by Thorley (1989), the author assumes that infinitival clauses tend to denote states in New Testament Greek, including the frequent use of stative verbs in non-finite clauses, and of the perfect marker with non-stative verbs when forms of the aorist are embedded. These observations carry over to concurrent sources of Greek, i.e. the non-literary papyri, all of which are taken to give insights into the development of Post-Classical Greek. Kavčič's contribution analyzes the changes affecting the temporal and aspectual distinctions in AcI constructions with respect to other changes occurring simultaneously, such as the merger between the aorist and the perfect, the disappearance of the Classical Greek future and the emergence of periphrastic future forms.

### 3.2 Infinitive structures versus other non-finite and finite patterns

Our second and even more prominent research question concerns the extent to which infinitives differ from, and compete with their finite counterparts (see Section 2 above). In the present volume, the contributions by Frauke D'hoedt & Hubert Cuyckens, Virginia Hill, Augustin Speyer, Éva Dékány, Rosemarie Lühr and Björn Wiemer deal with instances of diachronic complementation competition across different languages and show what consequences such competition had for the modern languages.

In their corpus-based contribution, following the spirit of previous work (cf. Cuyckens et al. 2014 and Cuyckens & D'hoedt 2015), *Finite, infinitival and verbless complementation: The case of 'believe', 'suppose' and 'find'*, **D'hoedt & Cuyckens** investigate four complement types embedded under the matrix verbs mentioned in the title of their contribution, in the history of English. The authors

focus on *that*-clauses, zero-complementizer clauses, *to*-infinitives and small clauses. The examples given in (43) illustrate their use with the predicate *believe*:

- (43) a. *I believe that he is a wise man*  
 b. *I believe he is a wise man*  
 c. *I believe him to be a wise man*  
 d. *I believe him a wise man*

The main objective of the study is to offer a diachronic analysis of complement clause variation from Middle English to Present-day English – with a focus on Late Modern English – and to investigate what factors co-determine this variation at the level of usage. In pursuing this aim, D’hoedt & Cuyckens use a logistic regression model, taking the following factors into account: (i) the semantics of the complement-taking predicate, (ii) the temporal relation between the matrix clause and the complement clause, (iii) the structural complexity of the complement clause, (iv) the complexity of the complement clause subject, (v) the voice of the verb in the complement clause, (vi) intervening material between the complement-taking predicate and the complement clause subject, (vii) the period of attestation and (viii) the corpus. In general, both authors state that complementation preferences are to a large extent unique for each complement-taking predicate. One of the main trends refers to the use of *to*-infinitives and small clauses in connection with *believe* and *suppose*. The authors provide empirical evidence showing that the number of both complement types decreases over time. *Find*, on the other hand, selects predominantly small clauses. With respect to zero-complement clauses, D’hoedt & Cuyckens illustrate that their number increases when embedded under *suppose*.

While D’hoedt & Cuyckens investigate differences between infinitive and indicative complements, the contribution by Hill, *Early Modern Romanian infinitives: Origin and replacement*, is concerned with the replacement of infinitives by subjunctive *să*-clauses in the history of Romanian. The author observes that the replacement of infinitives by subjunctive complements occurred very late in Romanian, i.e. in the 16th and 17th centuries, whereas other Balkan languages had replaced the infinitive much earlier (beginning around the 10th century). Some scholars working on Balkan and Romance languages take Greek as a starting point of the complementation competition and account for this displacement in terms of geographical distance (cf. e.g. Rohlfs 1933). Hill, in turn, examines this issue from a syntactic perspective and arrives at different conclusions. Contrary to previous studies, she distinguishes two infinitive forms in older stages of

Romanian: (i) the long infinitive with the ending *-re* and (ii) the short infinitive lacking an ending:

- (44) *sosiră*            *pre cel pământ cel în carele a lăcuire era*  
 arrive.3PL.PST on that land that in which.the to live.INF was  
 ‘they arrived in the land in which they had to live’  
 (*Palia de la Orăștie* – 1582; {235})

- (45) *le-au*            *poruncit a face și a cinsti Domnedzeu*  
 them.DAT-has ordered to do.INF and to rever.INF God  
 ‘he ordered them to receive and revere God’  
 (*Palia de la Orăștie* – 1582; {5})

These two forms occur in free variation and both of them were replaced by the subjunctive *sâ*-clause. Based on internal properties of both complement types, Hill associates the infinitival marker *a* and the subjunctive marker *sâ* with the same syntactic position, viz. FinP, placed in the extended C-domain as proposed by Rizzi (1997). The complement patterns differ, however, with respect to their productivity on the timeline and their phasehood properties. Whereas *a*-infinitives are productive in the 16th and 17th centuries, *sâ*-clauses start to be the preferred complementation type in the middle of the 17th century and become fixed by the 18th century. This change is attributed to the status (weak vs. strong) and the absence/presence of the full CP phase by Hill (cf. Chomsky 2001, 2006).

The contribution by **Speyer**, *Semantic factors for the status of control infinitives in the history of German*, is devoted to the distinction between ACI constructions and object control constructions on semantic grounds, working on the assumption that there is no structural difference between both constructions. In particular, the author defends the view that the morphological distinction between the bare infinitive in the ACI construction and the *zu* ‘to’-infinitive in the control construction correlates highly with the aspectual meaning of the infinitive. While the bare infinitive is used to express a punctual meaning (cf. 46), *zu* ‘to’ + infinitive refers to propositions denoting a durative aspect as well as to actions implied to have taken place at several occasions, as exemplified in (47):

- (46) *Dar nach chomen die tummen magde und baten in vf tuon*  
 there after come the dumb maids and asked him.ACC open.INF  
 ‘After that the foolish bridesmaids came and asked him to open (the door)’  
 (*Altdeutsche Predigten* 30,35; before end 14th cent.)

- (47) *und klagten in allez und bâten inz wenden*  
 and complained him.ACC all and asked him-to turn.INF  
 ‘and they complained to him about everything and asked him to undo it’  
 (Ottokar aus der Gal: *Steirische Reimchronik*, v. 63909; c. 1300)

According to Speyer, the aspectual difference between the two infinitival forms is not restricted to Middle High German (1050–1350) but still holds for the distribution in modern German, though Speyer assumes a reanalysis of the aspectual meaning in terms of temporality. Besides temporal properties of infinitival clauses and based on Fischer (1995), causativity is addressed as a second parameter driving the distribution of bare infinitives vs. *zu* ‘to’-infinitives. In contrast to widespread assumptions regarding the analysis of infinitival constructions, both control patterns and Acl patterns are considered to exhibit diagnostics for a biclausal structure in Middle High German.

In her paper, *Anti-agreeing infinitives in Old Hungarian*, **Dékány** elaborates on non-finite clauses in the history of Hungarian. Her main focus lies on agreement patterns of Old Hungarian infinitives, including so called anti-agreeing infinitives that have not yet been described elsewhere in more detail (but see Bácskai-Atkári & Dékány 2014). According to the author, the anti-agreeing infinitives occur in control, raising and ECM structures, but not in infinitives with a referentially independent dative subject. Furthermore, Dékány observes that Old Hungarian infinitives can be either inflected or uninflected. Inflected infinitives show full phi-feature agreement with their subject(s) controller), as given in (48), or they bear a default third singular ending regardless of what person and number features the infinitival subject has, cf. (49):

- (48) *ne akar-i-atoc fel-n-etec*  
 not want-IMP-2PL fear-INF-2PL  
 ‘Do not want to be afraid’  
 (*Munich Codex 42ra*)

- (49) *Ne akar-y-atok feel-ny-e*  
 not want-IMP-2PL fear-INF-3SG  
 ‘Do not want to be afraid’  
 (*Jordánszky Codex 55*)

In those contexts where anti-agreement can occur, it is in free variation with agreeing and uninflected infinitives. Dékány preliminarily assumes that if Old Hungarian anti-agreement is only possible in control, raising and ECM infinitives, the default agreement might be triggered by an A-movement.

The contribution by **Lühr**, *The emergence of expressions for purpose relations in older Indo-European languages*, is devoted to clausal patterns encoding a purposive meaning in Hittite and Vedic. The author mainly elaborates on clausal patterns allowing both a subject/object control interpretation on the one hand, and a purpose reading on the other. Observing a structural competition between finite and non-finite clauses in particular with respect to Vedic, Lühr examines the conditions under which both patterns occur and provides an account for their striking differences. One of her main observations regarding the expression of purpose is that finite patterns are preferred if a subject/object control reading would obtain as well in an infinitive clause.

The competition of non-finite clauses with finite clauses is also addressed in the contribution by **Wiemer**, *Main clause infinitival predicates and the equivalents in Slavic – Why they are not instances of insubordination*, who mainly focuses on the diachrony of independent clauses in Russian, Polish and Macedonian. (50) is an example from Russian:

- (50) *Ne opozda-t' by!*  
 NEG come-late.PFV.INF PTC.IRR  
 lit. 'If only not to be late!' ('We/I mustn't be late!')

(50) consists of the negation element *ne*, the perfective infinitive verb *opozdat'* 'come late' and the irrealis particle *by*, corresponding to the subjunctive mood in most Germanic and Romance languages. The entire clause gives rise to an optative reading. In general, root infinitives have been mainly investigated in Germanic and Romance languages (cf. Deppermann 2007, Fries 1983, Gärtner 2013, Glaser 2002, Grohmann 2000, Reis 2003, Wilder 2013), often in connection with language acquisition (cf. Gretsche 2008, Haegeman 1995, Lasser 2002, Rizzi 1993/94). Murasugi et al. (2010) and Sugiura et al. (2016) also investigate so called root infinitive analogues in Japanese. The language sample chosen by Wiemer, in turn, is interesting in several respects. First, the modal root infinitives developed into different directions in the three languages. In Russian no radical changes have taken place. In Polish, in selected environments infinitives were replaced by finite clauses. The Macedonian case illustrates a scenario in which the grammatical category of *infinitive* disappeared entirely. Second, besides some aspects that play a decisive role in the structural competition, Wiemer introduces an additional parameter: factivity versus non-factivity. One of his major claims is that whenever an infinitive occurs, it is tightly associated with non-factivity. This association, according to Wiemer, can be traced well back into pre-documented history and is largely due to the provenance of the Slavic infinitive as a *nomen actionis* in the dative.

## Abbreviations

1/2/3 – 1st/2nd/3rd person, ACC – accusative, CL – clitic, COM – comparative, COMP – complementizer, DAT – dative, GEN – genitive, IMP – imperative mood, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, IRR – irrealis, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PASS.AUX – passive auxiliary, PFV – perfective, PL – plural, PST – past tense, PTC – particle, PTCP – participle perfect, REFL – reflexive pronoun, SBJV – subjunctive mood.

## References

- Abraham, Werner. 2004. The grammaticalization of the infinitival preposition – toward a theory of ‘grammaticalizing reanalysis’. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 7: 111–170.
- Askedal, John Ole. 1998. Zur Syntax infinitiver Verbalformen in den Berthold von Regensburg zugeschriebenen deutschen Predigten. Vorstufe der topologischen Kohärenz-Inkohärenz-Opposition. In John Ole Askedal (ed.), *Historische germanische und deutsche Syntax. Akten des Internationalen Symposiums anlässlich des 100. Geburtstages von Ingerid Dal, Oslo, 27.9.–1.10.1995*, 231–259. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Bácskai-Atkári, Júlia & Éva Dékány. 2014. From non-finite to finite subordination: The history of embedded clauses. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), *The Evolution of Functional Left Peripheries in Hungarian Syntax*, 148–223. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bech, Gunnar. 1955/57. *Studien über das deutsche verbum infinitum*. København: Munksgaard.
- Beukema, Frits & Marcel den Dikken. 1989. The position of the infinitival marker in the Germanic languages. In Dany Jaspers, Wim Klooster, Yvan Putseys & Pieter Seuren (eds.), *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon. Studies in Honour of Wim de Geest*, 57–75. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 2006. *Covert Modality in Non-finite Contexts*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Biskup, Petr. 2014. *For, zu* and feature inheritance. *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 92: 423–440.
- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein & Jairo Nunes. 2010. *Control as Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2010. *Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy. Syntax and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Broekhuis, Hans & Norbert Corver. 2015. *Syntax of Dutch. Volume 2: Verbs and Verb Phrases*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 1991. The lack of infinitival clauses in Salentino: A synchronic analysis. In Christiane Læufer & Terrell A. Morgan (eds.), *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics. Selected Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XIX, Ohio State University, April 21–23, 1989*, 267–294. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 1993. Sentential complementation in a language without infinitival clauses: The case of Salentino. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and Dialects of Italy*, 28–98. Torino: Rosenberg & Selliers.
- Callaway, Morgan. 1913. *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington.

- Cardinaletti, Anna & Ur Shlonsky. 2004. Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 519–557.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1984. *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives and Gerunds*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael J. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2006. On phases. In Robert Freidin, David Michaels, Carlos P. Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Christensen, Ken Ramshøj. 2007. The infinitive marker across Scandinavian. *Nordlyd* 34: 147–165.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Costantini, Francesco. 2006. Obviation in subjunctive argument clauses and the first-personal interpretation. In Mara Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of Interpretation*, 295–320. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Coupé, Griet. 2015. *Syntactic Extension. The Historical Development of Dutch Verb Clusters*. PhD thesis, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cuyckens, Hubert, Frauke D'hoedt & Benedikt Szmrecsanyi. 2014. Variability in verb complementation in Late Modern English: Finite vs. non-finite patterns. In Marianne Hundt (ed.), *Late Modern English Syntax*, 182–203. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuyckens, Hubert & Frauke D'hoedt. 2015. Variability in clausal verb complementation: The case of *admit*. In Mikko Höglund, Paul Rickman, Juhani Rudanko & Jukka Havu (eds.), *Perspectives on Complementation. Structure, Variation and Boundaries*, 77–100. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dayley, Jon P. 1985. *Tzutujil Grammar*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Demske, Ulrike. 2001. Zur Distribution von Infinitivkomplementen im Althochdeutschen. In Reimar Müller & Marga Reis (eds.), *Modalität und Modalverben im Deutschen*, 61–86. Hamburg: Buske.
- Demske, Ulrike. 2011. Finale Marker in Infinitivkonstruktionen – Wandel und Variation. In Helen Christen, Franz Patocka und Evelyn Ziegler (eds.), *Struktur, Gebrauch und Wahrnehmung von Dialekt*, 20–46. Wien: Präsens.
- Demske, Ulrike. 2015. Towards coherent infinitival patterns in the history of German. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 5: 6–40.
- Demske-Neumann, Ulrike. 1994. *Modales Passiv und 'Though Movement' – Zur strukturellen Kausalität eines syntaktischen Wandels im Deutschen und Englischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Denecke, Arthur. 1880. *Der Gebrauch des Infinitives bei den althochdeutschen Übersetzern des 8. und 9. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: Pöschel & Trepte.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2007. *Grammatik und Semantik aus gesprächsanalytischer Sicht*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- De Smet, Hendrik. 2013. *Spreading Patterns: Diffusional Change in the English System of Complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 2009. *The Semantics of Clause Linking. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dobrushina, Nina. 2012. Subjunctive complement clauses in Russian. *Russian Linguistics* 36: 121–156.

- Dziwirek, Katarzyna. 2000. Why Polish doesn't like infinitives. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8: 57–82.
- Ebert, Robert P. 1976. *Infinitival Complement Constructions in Early New High German*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Evers, Arnold. 1975. *The Transformational Cycle in Dutch and German*. PhD thesis, Universiteit Utrecht.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 2007. Parameterization and change in non-finite complementation. *Diachronica* 24: 57–80.
- Fanego, Teresa. 1996. The development of gerunds as objects of subject-control verbs in English (1400–1700). *Diachronica* 13: 29–62.
- Fanego, Teresa. 1998. Developments in argument linking in Early Modern English gerund phrases. *English Language and Linguistics* 2: 87–119.
- Fischer, Olga. 1995. The distinction between *to* and bare infinitival complements in late Middle English. *Diachronica* 12: 1–30.
- Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman & Wim van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fries, Norbert. 1983. *Syntaktische und semantische Studien zum frei verwendeten Infinitiv*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2009. More on the indefinite-interrogative affinity: The view from embedded non-finite interrogatives. *Linguistic Typology* 13: 1–37.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2013. Infinite Hauptsatzstrukturen. In Jörg Meibauer, Markus Steinbach & Hans Altmann (Hgg.), *Satztypen des Deutschen*, 202–231. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Gast, Volker & Holger Diessel. 2012. *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Data-Driven Approaches to Cross-Clausal Syntax*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Geisler, Christer. 1995. *Relative Infinitives in English*. PhD thesis, Uppsala Universitet.
- Glaser, Elvira. 2002. *Fein gehackte Pinienkerne zugeben!* Zum Infinitiv in Kochrezepten. In David Restle & Dietmar Zaefferer (eds.), *Sounds and Systems. Studies in Structure and Change*, 165–183. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Grano, Thomas. 2015. *Control and Restructuring*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gretsch, Petra. 2008. Functions of finiteness in child language. In Veerle van Geenhoven (ed.), *Semantics in Acquisition*, 273–302.
- Grohmann, Kleantes. 2000. Null modals in Germanic (and Romance): Infinitival exclamation. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 14: 43–61.
- Grosse, Julia. 2005. *Zu Kohärenz und Kontrolle in infiniten Konstruktionen des Deutschen*. Marburg: Tectum Verlag.
- Haider, Hubert. 2010. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. Root infinitives, tense, and truncated structures in Dutch. *Language Acquisition* 4: 205–255.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. Evidential mood, restructuring, and the distribution of functional *sembrare*. In Paola Benincà & Nicola Munaro (eds.), *Mapping the Left Periphery: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 5*, 297–326. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haiman, John & Sandra A. Thompson. 1988. *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1989. From purposive to infinitive – a universal path of grammaticalization. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10: 287–310.
- Höhle, Tilman. 1978. *Lexikalistische Syntax. Die Aktiv-Passiv-Relation und andere Infinitivkonstruktionen im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Hoekstra, Jarich. 1997. *The Syntax of Infinitives in Frisian*. Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy.
- Ijbema, Aniek. 2002. *Grammaticalization and Infinitival Complements in Dutch*. PhD thesis, Universiteit Leiden.
- Iyeyiri, Yoko. 2010. *Verbs of Implicit Negation and their Complements in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johnk, Linn Dale. 1979. *Complementation in Old High German*. PhD thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keinäistö, Kari. 1986. *Studien zu Infinitivkonstruktionen im mittelhochdeutschen Prosa-Lancelot*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 2009. What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive? *Lingua* 119: 1788–1810.
- Kiss, Tibor. 1995. *Infinitive Komplementation. Neue Studien zum deutschen Verbum infinitum*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Knyazev, Mikhail. 2016. *Licensing Clausal Complements. The Case of Russian čto-Clauses*. PhD thesis, Universiteit Utrecht.
- Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in Generative Grammar. A Research Companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lasser, Ingeborg. 2002. The roots of root infinitives: Remarks on infinitival main clauses in adult and child language. *Linguistics* 40: 767–796.
- Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera. 2007. *Beyond Coherence. The Syntax of Opacity in German*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Leys, Odo. 1985. Zur Semantik nicht-satzwertiger Partikelinfinitive im Deutschen und Niederländischen. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 74: 433–456.
- Leys, Odo. 1991. Skizze einer kognitiv-semantischen Typologie der deutschen *um*-Infinitive. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 80: 167–203.
- Los, Bettelou. 2005. *The Rise of the To-Infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maché, Jakob & Werner Abraham. 2011. Infinitivkomplemente im Frühneuhochdeutschen – satzwertig oder nicht? In Oskar Reichmann & Anja Lobenstein-Reichmann (eds.), *Frühneuhochdeutsch – Aufgaben und Probleme seiner linguistischen Beschreibung*, 235–274. Hildesheim: Olms.
- MacRobert, Catherine Mary. 1980. *The Decline of the Infinitive in Bulgarian*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford.
- Mair, Christian. 1990. *Infinitival Complement Clauses in English. A Study of Syntax in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Itziar San. 2007. Beyond the infinitive vs. subjunctive rivalry: Surviving changes in mood. In Luis Eguren & Olga Fernández-Soriano (eds.), *Conference, Modality, and Focus. Studies on the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, 171–190. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martin, Roger. 1996. *A Minimalist Theory of PRO and Control*. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut.
- Mensching, Guido. 2000. *Infinitive Constructions with Specified Subjects. A Syntactic Analysis of the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moulton, Keir. 2009. *Natural Selection and the Syntax of Clausal Complementation*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Monsterberg-Münckenaу, Sylvius von. 1885. *Der Infinitiv in den Epen Hartmanns von Aue*. Breslau: Verlag von Wilhelm Koebner.

- Murasugi, Keiko, Chisato Fuji & Tomoko Hashimoto. 2010. What's acquired later in an agglutinative language. *Nanzan Linguistics* 6: 47–78.
- Noonan, Michael. 2007 [1985]. Complementation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Volume 2: *Complex Constructions*, 52–150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearce, Elizabeth. 1990. *Parameters in Old French Syntax. Infinitival Complements*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene & Vassilios Spyropoulos. 2004. A change of mood: The development of the Greek mood system. *Linguistics* 42: 791–817.
- Pires, Acrisio. 2006. *The Minimalist Syntax of Defective Domains. Gerunds and Infinitives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Reimann, Michael. 1994. *Studien über den Verfall des Infinitivs im Mittelbulgarischen*. Universität Marburg.
- Reis, Marga. 2003. On the form and interpretation of German *wh*-infinitives. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 15: 155–201.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1993/94. Some notes on linguistic theory and language development: The case of root infinitives. *Language Acquisition* 3: 371–393.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281–335. Kluwer: Dordrecht.
- Robbers, Karin Barbera Maria. 1997. *Non-finite Verbal Complements in Afrikaans. A Comparative Approach*. The Hague.
- Rochette, Anne. 1988. *Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Romance Sentential Complementation*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Rohdenburg, Günter. 1995. On the replacement of finite complement clauses by infinitives in English. *English Studies* 76: 367–388.
- Rohdenburg, Günter. 2006. The role of functional constraints in the evolution of the English complementation system. In Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Dieter Kastovsky, Nikolaus Ritt & Herbert Schendl (eds.), *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms: English from 1500–2000*, 143–166. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Rohdenburg, Günter. 2014. On the changing status of *that*-clauses. In Marianne Hundt (ed.), *Late Modern English Syntax*, 155–181. Cambridge University Press.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1933. *Scavi Linguistici nella Magna Grecia*. Halle (Saale): Hoepli.
- Roussou, Anna. 2009. In the mood for control. *Lingua* 119: 1811–1836.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 2000. *Corpora and Complementation*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 2012. Exploring aspects of the great complement shift, with evidence from the TIME corpus and COCA. In Terttu Nevalainen & Elizabeth Closs Traugott (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*, 222–232. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rutten, Jean. 1991. *Infinitival Complements and Auxiliaries*. PhD thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Sabel, Joachim. 1996. Coherent infinitives in German, Polish and Spanish. *Folia Linguistica* 33: 419–440.
- Sabel, Joachim. 2005. Infinitivische Frage- und Relativsätze im Deutschen und in anderen europäischen Sprachen. In Jean-Francois Marillier & Claire Rozier (eds.), *Der Infinitiv im Deutschen*, 83–102. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Sabel, Joachim. 2006. Impossible infinitival interrogatives and relatives. In Patrick Brandt & Eric Fuß (eds.), *Form, Structure, and Grammar. A Festschrift Presented to Günther Grewendorf on Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, 242–254. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

- Sabel, Joachim. 2015. The emergence of the infinitival left periphery. In Ulrike Steindl, Thomas Borer, Huilin Fang, Alfredo García Pardo, Peter Guekguezian, Brian Hsu, Charlie O'Hara & Iris Chuoying Ouyang (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 313–322. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Salzmann, Martin. 2013. Rule ordering in verb cluster formation. On the extraposition paradox and the placement of the infinitival particle *te/zu*. *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 90: 65–121.
- Schlotthauer, Susan, Gisela Zifonun & Ruxandra Cosma. 2014. Verbale und nominale Infinitive – Strukturelle Eigenschaften und Funktion als Subjekt. In Ruxandra Cosma, Stefan Engelberg, Susan Schlotthauer, Speranța Stănescu & Gisela Zifonun (eds.), *Komplexe Argumentstrukturen. Kontrastive Untersuchungen zum Deutschen, Rumänischen und Englischen*, 253–282. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2009. *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schulte, Kim. 2007. *Prepositional Infinitives in Romance. A Usage-based Approach to Syntactic Change*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Sevdali, Christina. 2013. Ancient Greek infinitives and phases. *Syntax* 16: 324–361.
- Stodowicz, Szymon. 2008. *Control in Polish Complement Clauses*. München: Sagner.
- Smirnova, Elena. 2011. Zur diachronen Entwicklung deutscher Komplementsatz-Konstruktionen. In Alexander Lasch & Alexander Ziem (eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik III: Aktuelle Fragen und Lösungsansätze*, 77–94. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Sugiura, Wataru, Tetsuya Sano & Hiroyuki Shimada. 2016. Are there root infinitive analogues in child Japanese? In Laurel Perkins, Rachel Dudley, Juliana Gerard & Kasia Hitczenko (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition North America (GALANA 2015)*, 131–139. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Ter Beek, Janneke. 2008. *Restructuring and Infinitival Complements in Dutch*. PhD thesis, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Thorley, John. 1989. Aktionsart in New Testament Greek: Infinitive and imperative. *Novum Testamentum* 31: 290–315.
- Warner, Anthony. 1982. *Complementation in Middle English and the Methodology of Historical Syntax*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Wiemer, Björn & Alexander Letuchiy. to appear. Clausal complementation. A status report. Introduction to a special issue of *Linguistics*.
- Wilder, Chris. 1988. On the German infinitival marker *zu* and the analysis of raising constructions. *Lingua* 76: 115–175.
- Wilder, Chris. 2013. Why don't you be an imperative? Talk and handout delivered at the Universität Potsdam, May 14.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Zinn, Marina, A. 2008. Infinitive constructions in Ket. In Edward J. Vajda (ed.), *Subordination and Coordination Strategies in North Asian Languages*, 203–214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.