

The syntagmatic properties of complementation patterns: Accommodating lexical and grammatical uses of CTP-clauses

International workshop



Book of abstracts

University of Liège
9-10 May 2019

Organizing committee ULiège

Lieselotte Brems, ULiège, lbrems@uliege.be

An Van linden, ULiège, an.vanlinden@uliege.be

Organizing committee: external members

Kristin Davidse, KU Leuven

Lieven Vandelanotte, UNamur

Scientific committee

Juana I. Marín-Arrese (Complutense University of Madrid)

Lieselotte Brems (University of Liège)

Kristin Davidse (University of Leuven)

Caroline Gentens (Stockholm University)

Hartmut Haberland (Roskilde University)

Mikko Höglund (Stockholm University)

María-José Loupez-Couso (University of Santiago de Compostela)

Juhani Rudanko (University of Tampere)

Stef Spronck (University of Helsinki)

Lieven Vandelanotte (UNamur)

An Van linden (University of Liège)

Jean-Christophe Verstraete (University of Leuven)

Sponsors



Keynote speakers

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.

Hedged performatives: function and grammatical status

Gunther Kaltenböck
University of Graz

Hedged performatives (HPs) are combinations of a (semi-)modal verb and a performative verb, as illustrated in (1) to (3), and were originally discussed by Fraser (1976). Despite their frequent occurrence, especially in spoken discourse, hedged performatives have received surprisingly little attention so far (e.g. Schneider 2010).

- (1) ***I have to confess***, *I don't watch Downton Abbey.* (COCA)
- (2) *Well you've you've named a whole bunch of really funny comics* ***i must say*** (Fisher)
- (3) MICHELE-KELEMEN# *Well, definitely. I mean, **I have to say**, you know, foreign countries have always sort of hedged their bets on this* (COCA)

Based on data from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and the Fisher Corpus the paper investigates a set of high-frequency HPs with high mutual information scores in spoken English, viz. *I have to/must admit*, *I have to/must confess*, *I have to/must say* with a view to exploring their use in discourse, specifically in interactive contexts.

HPs are shown not to be limited to hedging only (as suggested by Fraser). Instead, it is possible to identify three different functions: shield (hedge), emphasis (booster), and discourse maker uses. The shield and emphasis functions, illustrated in (1) and (2) respectively, are the result of a number of interacting co(n)textual parameters, notably speaker/hearer orientation and positive/negative host clause, and have different effects in terms of speaker and hearer face. The discourse marker uses are particularly prominent with *I have to say*, as illustrated in (3). In this use HPs frequently collocate with other discourse markers and function as discourse structuring devices for the purpose of stalling, turn-taking, floor-keeping etc.

With regard to position, HPs clearly prefer left-periphery, where they typically occur without a *that*-complementizer. This raises the question of the grammatical status of such initial HPs. The paper will address this issue with reference to the grammatical-lexical distinction (as proposed by Boye and Harder 2007) and the perspective of Discourse Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011, Heine et al. 2013).

References

- Boye, Kaspar and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates. Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31.3: 569-606.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1976. Hedged performatives, in P. Cole (ed.) 1974. *Syntax and Semantics 3. Speech Acts*. New York, NY: Academic Press. 187-210.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva & Haiping Long. 2013. An outline of Discourse Grammar, in Shannon Bischoff and Carmen Jeny (eds.). *Functional approaches to language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 155-206.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine & Tania Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar, *Studies in Language* 35 (4): 848-893.
- Schneider, Stefan. 2010. Parenthetical hedged performatives, in G. Kaltenböck, W. Mihatsch, S. Schneider (eds.) *New approaches to hedging*. Bingley: Emerald, 267-287.

Belief and thought complements in Australian languages: Typology and theory

William B. McGregor
Aarhus University

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 presentation I address this lacuna with 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 study is based on a corpus of about twenty 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 of a separate construction type that codes propositional beliefs or thoughts. In a number of languages the construction is employed to express mistaken beliefs or thoughts, raising the issue of whether this meaning is coded or implicated by the construction. This seems to be one dimension of typological variation in Australian languages. I also address the issue of the grammatical relation between the clause representing the thought or belief and the matrix clause. 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 particular type of grammatical relation is involved, distinct from both embedding and dependency. I outline some of the properties of this relation and argue that it is a relation belonging to interpersonal grammar.

Workshop paper abstracts

Making the case that form and meaning in English 'extraposition' and 'cleft' constructions match

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.

(1a) It was a wonder to them that I get to do all this stuff. (WB)

(1b) That I get to do all this is a wonder to them.

(2a) 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)

(2b) Cassie entered.

Against this, I advocate an analysis that treats the constructions in (1a) and (2a) as members of larger construction paradigms, i.e. complementation constructions (Davidse & Van linden forthc.) and cleft constructions in the broad sense (Davidse 2000, Lambrecht 2001), which subsume a similar 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).

(1c) He says that's no wonder, that the wedding had been postponed. (Google)

(1d) She may never match her full-brother Ollie Magern but there is no doubt PETITE MARGOT has a big race in her. (WB)

(1e) I've no doubt I'll see you at dinner soon (WB)

(2c) A: I knew the maternity hospital had closed. B: That's Fulford that's closed (WB)

(2d) Now you've got a fair sort of permanent staff now. There's Fred has been there for years. (WB)

(2e) A: you have got a member of staff working for each department? B: I've got John does the presses (WB)

The complementation constructions have matrix and complement clause as primary structural units. The matrix represents an emotional or cognitive state if a conscious participant is referred to, *to them* (1a), *I* (1e). An impersonal matrix (with *it/that/there*) may allow inferring an emotional or cognitive state, but it may also code modal (1d), mirative or evidential qualifications. On a lexical reading, the matrix is discourse primary, and the whole construction

of the reporting or factive type. On a grammatical reading, the matrix is discourse secondary (Boye & Harder 2007, 2012).

Cleft constructions are elucidated as secondary specification constructions (Davidse & Kimps 2016). They construe a specificational act, in which the specification relation is 'secondary' in the same way as the predication relation in secondary predication (McGregor 1997). The postverbal complement specifies a value for a variable 'x' with the semantic role in the SoA depicted by the cleft relative clause. This secondary specification relation obtains between the postverbal matrix complement and the cleft relative clause, the latter being dependent on both the controller and the matrix verb. In the examples with impersonal matrices (2a) and (2c), 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*, and with matrix verbs like *find* (2f), the cognitive agent is coded overtly. Matrices with subjects *it* (2a) and *that* (2c) trigger an exhaustiveness implicature for the specificational relation, which is absent in the examples with the other matrices.

(2f) After a few sham gardeners I found John who actually knows which plants will thrive.
(Google)

References

- Boye, K. & Harder P. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31: 569-609.
- Boye, Kasper & Harder P. 2012. A usage-based theory of grammatical status and grammaticalization. *Language* 88: 1-44.
- Davidse K. 2000. A constructional approach to clefts. *Linguistics*, 38 (6), 1101-1131.
- Davidse K., Kimps D. 2016. Specificational *there*-clefts: functional structure and information structure. *English Text Construction*, 9 (1), 115-142.
- Davidse K., Van linden A. 2019. Revisiting 'it-extraposition': The historical development of constructions with matrices (*it*)/(*there*) *be* + NP followed by a complement clause. In: Núñez-Pertejo P., López-Couso MJ., Méndez Naya B., Pérez-Guerra J. (Eds.), *Crossing Linguistic Boundaries*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kaltenböck, G. 2003. On the Syntactic and Semantic Status of Anticipatory *it*. *English Language and Linguistics*, 7: 235-255.
- Lambrecht, K. 2001. A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 39: 463-516.
- Langacker, R. 2002. Deixis and subjectivity. In Brisard (ed.) *Grounding: the epistemic footing of deixis and reference*. 1-27. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, R. 2017. Functions and assemblies. Plenary lecture. 14th International Conference of Cognitive Linguistics. University of Tartu, 10-14 July 2017.
- McGregor, W. 1997. *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Méndez-Naya, B. 1995. *Hit* and *thaet* Anticipating Subject Clauses in OE: True Syntactic Equivalents? *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, XCVI: 23-37

Manner components in Late Modern English direct speech reporting

Caroline Gentens
University of Stockholm

This study examines the diachronic increase in manner-of-speaking verbs taking direct speech complements (e.g. *babble, whisper, shout*) over the course of the Late Modern English period (cf. Fanego 2012). Drawing on the list of manner-of-speaking predicates provided by Levin (1993: 204-206), it focuses on tracking the pathway of change in the Corpus of Late Modern English texts, version 3.0 (Diller et al. 2011) from mainly intransitive predicates to direct, often referred to as ‘parenthetical’, reporting predicates.

The analysis will focus on two main questions. Firstly, it sets out to examine the degree to which the acquisition of a parenthetical direct reporting use involves the prior acquisition of other reporting patterns (e.g. cognate objects, reaction objects, indirectly reported clauses). This is important to establish the degree to which the attraction to the broader paradigm of reporting constructions (cf. Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970; Halliday & Hasan 1976: 132) facilitates the acquisition of the direct reporting pattern. Secondly, the study analyzes how the notion of ‘discursive secondariness’ (Boye & Harder 2012) is represented in the ‘focus/modifier’ distinction of models of event lexicalization (Erteschik-Shir 2007; Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998), and how this for the group of manner-of-speaking predicates relates to the notion of ‘manner/result complementarity’, i.e. the idea that a verb root cannot lexicalize ‘manner’ and ‘result state’ simultaneously, with a concomitant difference in argument realization.

References

- Diller, H., De Smet, H., & Tyrkkö, J. 2011. A European database of descriptors of English electronic texts. *The European English Messenger* 19(2): 21-35.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. 2007. *Information structure. The syntax-discourse interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fanego, T. 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.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Kiparsky, P. & C. Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In Bierwisch, Manfred & Karl E. Heidolph (eds), *Progress in linguistics*, 143-173. Den Haag: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Levin, B. 1993. *English verb classes and alternations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, B. & M. Rappaport Hovav. 2005. *Argument realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**From complementizing to modifying status:
On the grammaticalization of the CTP-clause *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* (cf., 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 & 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 & Méndez-Naya 2016) or quasi-adverbs (e.g. *looks like*; cf. López-Couso & 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 noun *odds* (OED s.v. *odds* n.):

- (1) 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)
- (2) With the Jerries rocking on their heels the way they were **the odds were** they'd have taken the count before he got back. (OED s.v. *odds*, n. 6.a; 1947 D.M. Davin *Gorse blooms Pale* 204)

Structures of this type, which are used to convey the meaning of probability, are recorded in the OED since the late 16th century and seem to be at the origin of examples such as (3) and (4), where the *odds are*-clause has modifying, rather than complementizing status (Boye & Harder 2007: 568). This is especially conspicuous in the case of (4), where the *odds are*-string occurs in medial position.

- (3) **Odds are** you're going to be wrong half the time -- especially when it comes to technology. (COCA, 2017, MAG)
- (4) And now, night having fallen, he's come alive, the way he always has and, **odds are**, always will. (COCA, 2005, MAG)

Drawing on data from COHA and COCA, this paper explores the development of *odds are*-parentheticals, paying attention to (i) the types of complementation structures in which the noun *odds* occurs, taking into account, among other issues, complementizer selection and its relevance for the emergence of the parenthetical; (ii) the formal indications of on-going grammaticalization, such as morphosyntactic fixation of the parenthetical clause (loss of variability in the *odds*-NP; TAM restrictions in the VP); (iii) the acquisition of subjective and intersubjective functions of the *odds are*-parenthetical; and (iv) the distribution of the construction at issue across time and register.

References

- 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*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 157-176.
- Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2007. Complement-taking predicates: Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language* 31(3): 569-606.
- 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. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 313-329.

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) (all examples are taken from the Spoken BNC2014 corpus).

- (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), for instance, grammatical CTP clauses with *imagine* display an unusually high proportion of variant forms, i.e. forms which deviate 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 (Love *et al.* 2017). 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 forthc.).

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 & 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, K., and P. 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, M. 2009. The German *mit*-predicative construction. *Constructions and Frames* 1(1): 29–55.
- Maekelberghe, C. Forthcoming. The English gerund revisited. Exploring semantic differences through collocational analysis. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2016-0054>.
- Van Bogaert, J. 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.

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

Stef Spronck
University of Helsinki

McGregor (1994, 1997) analyses the syntactic relation between the elements *a* and *b* in examples (1) and (2) as a common syntactic relation he calls 'framing' (whereby element *a* 'frames' element *b*).

- (1) [John said:]_a ["Perhaps it might rain today"]_b
(2) [John said]_a [that nobody would come tomorrow]_b

This syntactic relation is independent from more established syntactic relations, such as coordination and complementation. But they are perhaps not mutually exclusive. Indirect speech constructions as in (2) involve a structure that most linguists would characterise as a form of complementation at some level of analysis. And when we try to describe the syntax of reported speech and thought cross-linguistically (cf. Spronck & Nikitina, 2019), it becomes clear that

languages vary in the extent to which the syntactic relations of complementation and reported speech and thought/framing overlap (Rumsey, 2019).

In this paper I explore the relation between complementation and framing in three unrelated languages: Dutch, the Bantu language Kikuyu and the Australian Aboriginal language Ungarinyin. The Dutch data are extracted from the Corpus of Spoken Dutch (CGN), the Kikuyu and Ungarinyin analysis is based on newly collected primary data.

I demonstrate that in each of these languages the relation between framing and complementation differs, and argue that this has consequences for the treatment of complementation in functional linguistics. I introduce the notion of a 'primary syntactic category' and n^{th} -order syntactic categories, and classify reported speech/framing as an example of the former and complementation as a second or third order syntactic category. 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.

References

- McGregor, W. B. (1994). The Grammar of Reported Speech and Thought in Gooniyandi. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 14(1), 63–92.
- McGregor, W. B. (1997). *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rumsey, A. (2019). Response to Spronck and Nikitina "Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain. *Linguistic Typology*, 1.
- Spronck, S., & Nikitina, T. (2019). Reported speech constructions are a dedicated syntactic domain: Typological arguments and observations. *Linguistic Typology*, 1.

Grammatical uses of 'no' + noun and the hierarchy of qualifications of SoAs

An Van linden,^{1,2} Lieselotte Brems^{1,2} & Kristin Davidse²
¹University of Liège & ²KU 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 & Harder 2012). 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 a state-of-affairs, viz. absence of necessity (Van linden et al. 2011). The other strings that will be studied are *no chance* (Van linden & Brems 2017, 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, so just tell her that Jake called, ok? (Corpus of American Soap Operas)

We will investigate which types of meaning the patterns express (lexical or grammatical? (see Boye & Harder (2012) for criteria); and if grammatical: which type?), 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 latter being variants of clausal structures). The hypotheses associated with these questions assume a functional analysis of the clause (e.g. Hengeveld 1989), and relate to Nuyts's (2005) functional hierarchy of state-of-affairs (SoA) qualifications.

First we hypothesize that the distribution of to-infinitival complements, which lack deictic tense marking and typically have no subject expressed with them (cf. Bolinger 1967: 351-9) is restricted to qualificational meanings that apply to potential SoAs, such as dynamic and deontic modality (cf. Verstraete 2007: 42-46; Van linden 2012: ch. 2); the to-clause in (2a), for instance, refers to an unnecessary SoA (dynamic modality). By contrast, that-clauses are not semantically restricted and can thus be used with strings whose qualificational meaning applies to propositions, such as epistemic and mirative meaning; examples like (3) suggest that the same goes for *of*-gerundial complements, with (3) conveying epistemic meaning.

(3) [They] may dream of a theocratic US, but *there is no chance* of this coming about. (WB)

Second, we put forward 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)) (No need to keep holding; *to keep holding, no need). 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, R. (ed.), *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, 335–362. The Hague: MdG.
- Boye, Kasper & Peter Harder. 2012. Grammatical Status and Grammaticalization. *Language* 88: 1–44.
- Davidse, Kristin, An Van linden, Jacob Lesage & 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 & 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 & Lieselotte Brems. 2016. Mirativity and rhetorical structure: The development and prosody of disjunct and anaphoric adverbials with '*no*' wonder. In Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds.), *Outside the Clause. Form and function of extra-clausal constituents*, 125-156 [Studies in Language Companion Series 178]. Amsterdam: John 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*. London: Equinox. 5–38.
- 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, Kristin Davidse & Lieselotte Brems. Have/be no need: the interaction between negation and modality in verbonominal pathways of change. ICHL 20, Osaka, 25-30 July 2011.
- Van linden, An & Lieselotte Brems. 2017. Talmy's "greater modal system": fitting in verbonominal constructions with *chance(s)*. Seventh International Conference of the French Association for Cognitive Linguistics (AFLiCo 7), University of Liège, 31 May – 3 June 2017.
- Van linden, An & 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.
- Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2007. *Rethinking the coordinate-subordinate dichotomy: Interpersonal grammar and the analysis of adverbial clauses in English* [Topics in English Linguistics 55]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

E-mail addresses participants

Kasper Boye	boye@hum.ku.dk
Lieselotte Brems	lbrems@uliege.be
Kristin Davidse	kristin.davidse@kuleuven.be
Caroline Gentens	caroline.gentens@kuleuven.be
Gunther Kaltenböck	gunther.kaltenboeck@uni-graz.at
María José López-Couso	mjlopez.couso@usc.es
Charlotte Maekelberghe	charlotte.maekelberghe@kuleuven.be
William B. McGregor	linwmg@cc.au.dk
Belén Méndez-Naya	belen.mendez@usc.es
Stef Spronck	stef.spronck@helsinki.fi
Lieven Vandelanotte	lieven.vandelanotte@unamur.be
An Van linden	an.vanlinden@uliege.be