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 a propositional complement (1).

(1) *They say Liège is nice.*

This paper first 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 in principle have modifying uses with all three types of complements, but that the modifications will be of different kinds. However, it is also argued that modifying uses are conditioned by the semantics of the CTP and the degree of elaboration of the CTP clause.

Subsequently, the paper addresses the issue of grammaticalization. It contrasts the grammaticalization scenario in Boye & Harder (2007) with that in Brinton (1996) and outlines a compromise which is compatible with both scenarios. Based on this discussion, it is argued that whether or not CTP-clauses can undergo grammaticalization with all three types of complements depends on the developmental path taken. If grammaticalization proceeds along the path advocated by Brinton (1996), CTP-clauses with State-of-Affairs complements cannot undergo grammaticalization.

References
Boye, Kasper & Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31 (3): 569-606.
Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.