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1 Introduction

- main topic: identifying the different steps in the grammaticalization of verbs into discourse markers
- central data: imperatives of ECM-verbs in Dutch dialects

(1) Kijk die koeien es gek doen.
look those cows PRT crazy do
‘Look at those cows go crazy!’

(2) Kijk-e die koeien es gek doen.
look-PL those cows PRT crazy do
‘Look at those cows go crazy.’

(3) Kijk, die koeien doen gek.
look those cows do crazy
‘Look, those cows are going crazy.’

- main gist of the analysis: the examples in (1)-(3) illustrate three main stages of grammaticalization:
  1. lexical verbs that are inserted in their lexical position (cf. (1))
  2. lexical verbs merged in a functional position (cf. (2))
  3. functional elements merged in a functional position (cf. (3))
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2 Background: grammaticalization

Benjamin (2010); Waltereit and Detges (2007): discourse markers are typically derived from imperatives

Roberts and Roussou (1999): grammaticalization is a change from a lexical to a functional category

characteristics of functional items vs. lexical ones (see Abney (1987); Hopper and Traugott (1993)):

1. functional items can be phonologically reduced
2. functional items have a semantically bleached meaning
3. functional items permit only one complement, which is generally not an argument
4. functional items form a closed class
5. functional items can be morphologically defective

3 Properties of ECM-verbs in dialect Dutch

3.1 Introduction

→ in (dialects of) Dutch, there are two types of ECM-verbs, i.e. perception verbs and causative verbs

(4) *Kijk hem daar es staan!*
look him there PRT stand
‘Look at him standing there.’

(5) *Hoor hem es lachen!*
hear him PRT laugh
‘Listen to him laugh!’

(6) *Laat hem maar komen!*
let him PRT come
‘Let him come!’

→ ECM-verbs in Dutch dialects can show up in three imperative(-like) contexts:

regular imperatives:

(7) *Hoor die meeuwen es een kabaal maken!*
hear those seagulls PRT a racket make
‘Listen to those seagulls make noise!’

inflected imperatives:

(8) *Hoor-e die meeuwen es een kabaal maken.***
hear-PL those seagulls PRT a racket make
‘Listen to those seagulls make noise.’

imperatives as discourse markers:

(9) *Hoor(*-e) die meeuwen es een kabaal maken.
hear-PL those seagulls PRT a racket make
‘Listen to those seagulls make noise.’

(10) *Die meeuwen maken een kabaal, hoor.*
those seagulls make a racket hear
‘Those seagulls sure make a lot of noise!’

3.2 Phonological reduction

→ neither regular imperatives nor inflected imperatives are phonologically reduced >> some imperatives used as discourse markers are phonologically reduced

regular imperatives:

(11) *Kijk die koeien es gek doen!*
look those cows PRT crazy do
‘Look at those cows go crazy!’

(12) *Ik kijk naar televisie.*
I look to television
‘I watch television.’

inflected imperatives:

(13) *Kijk-e die koeien es gek doen.*
look-PL those cows PRT crazy do
‘Look at those cows go crazy.’

imperatives as discourse markers:

(14) *Zie-j it nu, zê?!
see you it now see, reduced
‘Do you see now?!’

(Lapscheure Dutch, **Haegeman** 2010)
3.3 Bleached meaning

→ regular imperatives and inflected imperatives retain the basic lexical meaning of the verb >> in imperatives used as discourse markers, the lexical meaning is lost

regular imperatives:

(15) #Kijk die koeien es gek doen zonder te kijken!
look those cows PRT crazy do without to look
‘Look at those cows go crazy without looking!’

(16) #Kijk die studenten op Ibiza es gek doen!
look those students on Ibiza PRT crazy do
‘Look at those students on Ibiza go crazy!’
[context: speaker is not able to see the students in Ibiza]

inflected imperatives:

(17) #Kijk-e die koeien es gek doen zonder te kijken.
look-PL those cows PRT crazy do without to look
‘Look at those cows go crazy without looking.’

(18) #Kijk-e die studenten op Ibiza es gek doen.
look-PL those students on Ibiza PRT crazy do
‘Look at those students on Ibiza go crazy.’
[context: speaker is not able to see the students in Ibiza]

however: inflected imperatives cannot be modified by adjuncts related to the ECM-verb:

(19) Kijk / # Kijk-e die koeien door de verrekijker es gek
look / look-PL those cows through the binocular PRT crazy
do
‘Look through the binoculars at those cows go crazy.’

imperatives as discourse markers:

(20) Kijk, je mag niet kijken.
look you may not look
‘Look, you can’t look.’

(21) Kijk, die studenten op Ibiza doen gek.
look those students on Ibiza do crazy
‘Look, those students on Ibiza are going crazy.’
[context: speaker is not able to see the students in Ibiza]

→ regular imperatives carry true imperative force >> neither inflected imperatives nor imperatives used as discourse markers have imperative force

regular imperatives:

(22) Ik beveel je: laat deze mensen naar binnen gaan!
I order you let these people to inside go
‘I order you: let these people go inside!’

(23) Laat die kinderen ophouden en stop ze in hun bed!
let those children stop and put them in their bed
‘Make those children stop and put them to bed.’

inflected imperatives:

(24) #Ik beveel je: laat-e deze mensen naar binnen gaan!
I order you let-PL these people to inside go

(25) #Laat-e die kinderen ophouden en stop ze in hun bed!
let-PL those children stop and put them in their bed

imperatives as discourse markers:

(26) #Ik beveel je: kijk, die jongens gaan naar binnen.
I order you look those boys go to inside

(27) #Kijk, die kinderen doen raar en stop ze in hun bed.
look those children do weird and put them in their bed
3.4 Lack of argument structure

→ regular imperatives have a (pro-)subject \(<<\) neither inflected imperatives nor imperatives used as discourse markers have a subject

**regular imperatives:**

(28) *Kijk pro, jezelf, es gek doen!
look yourself PRT crazy do
‘Look at yourself going crazy!’

(29) *Laat pro, die kinderen es ophouden door PRO ze te slaan!
let those children PRT stop by them to hit
‘Make those children stop by hitting them!’

(30) *Laat jij die kinderen es ophouden!
let you those children PRT stop
‘You make those children stop!’

**inflected imperatives:**

(31) #Kijk-e die koeien es paars zijn.
look-PL those cows PRT purple be
INTENDED: ‘Look at those cows be purple.’

**imperatives as discourse markers:**

(36) #Kijk, hij ziet jezelf.
look he sees yourself

(37) #Kijk, die kinderen stoppen niet door PRO ze te slaan.
look those children stop not by them to hit
(only ✓ under a PRO_{arb}-reading)

(38) #Kijk jij, die koeien doen gek.
look you those cows do crazy

3.5 Closed class

→ regular imperatives are part of an open class \(<<\) inflected imperatives and imperatives as discourse markers are part of a closed class

**regular imperatives:**

(39) {Hoor / Kijk / Laat / Voel / Zie / Doe} die meeuwen es een
hear / look / let / feel / see / do those seagulls PRT a
kabaal maken.
racket make
‘Listen to/look at/let/feel/see/let those seagulls mak(e/ing) noise.’

**inflected imperatives:**

(40) {Hoor-e / Kijk-e / Laat-e / *Voel-e / *Zie(n)-e / *Doe(n)-e} die meeuwen een kabaal maken.
those seagulls a racket make
‘Listen to/look at/let/feel/see/let those seagulls mak(e/ing) noise.’
imperatives as discourse markers:

(41) *Kijk, die meeuwen maken een kabaal, {hoor / zè / *laat / *voel
look those seagulls make a racket hear / see / let / feel
/ *doe},
do‘Look, those seagulls sure make a lot of noise, you know.’

3.6 Morphological defectiveness

→ regular imperatives have a corresponding indicative form >> neither
inflected imperatives nor imperatives used as discourse markers can be
used indicatively

regular imperatives:

(42) *Ik hoor de mannen roepen.
I hear the men shout
‘I hear the men shout.’

inflected imperatives:

(43) *Ik hoor-e de mannen roepen.
I hear-PT the men shout

imperatives as discourse markers:

(44) *De mannen roepen, ik hoor.
the men shout I hear

3.7 Data summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>regular imperative</th>
<th>inflected imperative</th>
<th>imperative as discourse marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phonological reduction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bleached meaning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of argument structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closed class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphological defectiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The core analysis: three different merge positions

4.1 [Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001)]

motion verb with a regular infinitival complement

(45) Vaju a pigghiari u pani.
go-1s to fetch-INF the bread
‘I go to fetch the bread.’ (Marsalese)

motion verb with an inflected complement

(46) Vaju a pigghiu u pani.
go-1s to fetch-1SG the bread
‘I go to fetch bread.’ (Marsalese)

→ motion verbs with inflected complements (in Marsalese, English and
Swedish) are lexical categories merged as functional heads

4.1.1 Properties of inflected infinitives

• Phonological reduction: motion verbs with an inflected complement
  are not phonologically reduced compared to their regular use, compare
(46) with (45)

• Bleached meaning: motion verbs retain their basic semantic content
  (Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 23))
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on the other hand, motion verbs with an inflected complement cannot be modified by motion-related adjuncts:

(47) *Peppe va a mangia c’a machina.
Peppe go-3SG to eat-3SG by car

(48) Peppe va a mangiarici’a machina.
Peppe go-3SG to eat-INF by car
‘Peppe goes to eat by car.’

• Lack of argument structure: motion verbs with inflected complements cannot select their own arguments:

(49) va (*agghiri a casa) a mangia
go-3SG (*towards to home) to eat-3SG

(50) va (agghiri a casa) a mangiarici
go-3SG (towards to home) to eat-INF
‘He goes towards home to eat.’

however, motion verbs with inflected complements do impose a thematic restriction on their subject in some languages, like English: it has to be agentive.

(51) The smoke fumes (*go) inebriate the people upstairs.

• closed class: motion verbs with inflected complements form a closed class

(52) a. iri ‘to go’, viniri ‘to come’, passari ‘to come by’, mannari ‘to send’
b. *acchianari ‘go up’, *scinniri ‘go down’, *trasiri ‘go into’, *curriri ‘run’, ...

• morphological defectiveness: motion verbs with inflected complements are morphologically defective

(53) Vaju a pigghiuvu pani.
go-1s to fetch-1SG the bread
‘I go to fetch bread.’

(54) *Iti a pigghiatiu u pani.
go-2PL to fetch-2PL the bread

• Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>inflected imperative</th>
<th>motion verbs with inflected complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phonological reduction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bleached meaning</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of argument structure</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closed class</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphological defectiveness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Analysis of Marsalese motion verbs with inflected infinitives:
Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001): motion verbs with inflected infinitives are merged in a left-peripheral functional head in the extended domain of the lexical verb

supporting evidence: motion verbs with inflected infinitives display monoclusal properties:
• unique person/tense/mood
• single event interpretation
• clitic climbing in Marsalese
• floating quantifiers and sentential adverbs in Marsalese
4.2 Multiple merge positions

**Proposal:** the three imperative(-like) contexts in which ECM-verbs appear in Dutch dialects reflect three possible merge positions for these verbs:

- the regular imperative is merged in $V^0$ and raises to $C^0$
- the inflected imperative is merged directly in $C^0$
- the imperative used as a discourse marker is merged in a functional head higher than $C^0$ (see also Haegeman (2010))

**This derives:**

- the fully lexical properties of the regular imperative (full argument structure, full morphological paradigm, open class, ...)
- the fully functional properties of the imperative used as discourse marker (no argument structure, no morphological paradigm, closed class, no lexical meaning, ...)
- the intermediate status of inflected imperatives: on the hand, they involve the lexical ECM-verb (secondary theta-role, basic lexical semantics), on the other, they are merged directly in a functional head (morphological deficiency, closed class, no argument structure)

**Note:** this means that in regular and inflected imperatives (cf. (55) and (56)) a different lexical item is used than when an imperative shows up as a discourse marker (as in (57)) → this is corroborated by the fact that the two morphemes sometimes differ phonologically (cf. section 3.2)

(55) Kijk die koeien es gek doen!
look those cows PRT crazy do
‘Look at those cows go crazy!’

(56) Kijk-e die koeien es gek doen.
look-PL those cows PRT crazy do
‘Look at those cows go crazy.’

5 Inflected imperatives: raising and agreement

**Note:** analyzing inflected imperatives as lexical verbs that are merged in $C^0$ doesn’t yet answer the following questions:

1. If there is no pro-subject in inflected imperatives, how does the EPP get satisfied? (section 5.1)
2. If there is no external theta-role, there is no case for the embedded ECM-subject (Burzio’s generalization), so how does that DP get case-licensed? (section 5.1)
3. Where does the agreement ending on the verb come from? (section 5.2)
4. Why can only ECM-verbs occur as inflected imperatives? (section 5.3)

5.1 Proposal and corroborating evidence

**Proposal:** in inflected imperatives the ECM-subject raises to specTP, thus satisfying the EPP. Moreover, it receives nominative case in this position.

(57) Kijk, die koeien doen gek.
look those cows do crazy
‘Look, those cows are going crazy.’
corroborating evidence:

- correlation between overt subjects and agreement: if an overt subject is present in Dutch imperatives (i.e. if specTP is overtly filled), the agreeing form of the imperative must be used (cf. Bennis (2006)):

  (59) a. *Kom*(en) jullie eens hier!
      come-AGR youpl PRT here
  b. Kom*(-t) u eens hier!
      come-AGR youpolite PRT here
  c. Kom*(-t) gij eens hier!
      come-AGR youregional PRT here (Standard Dutch)

→ the presence of overt agreement on agreeing ECM-imperatives follows from the correlation illustrated in (59): the raised ECM-subject overtly fills specTP and as a consequence, the imperative verb has to display agreement with this raised subject.

- case: if the post-verbal DP in inflected ECM-imperatives is in specTP, it should bear nominative case → this prediction is borne out:

  (60) a. Kijk-e wij es gek doen.
      look-PL we PRT crazy do
      ‘Look at us go crazy.’
  b. *Kijk-e ons es gek doen.
      look-PL us PRT crazy do
      ‘Look at us go crazy.’

→ moreover, when the imperative does not display agreement (i.e. in a regular imperative, when a pro-subject fills specTP), only the (ECM-) accusative should be allowed:

  (61) a. *Kijk wij es gek doen!
      look we PRT crazy do
      ‘Look at us go crazy!’
  b. Kijk ons es gek doen!
      look us PRT crazy do
      ‘Look at us go crazy!’

5.2 Source of the agreement
correlation: all dialects with inflected imperatives also have so-called complementizer agreement:

  (62) Ik vind dat-e we toffe jongens zijn.
      I find that-PL we fun guys are
      ‘I think we’re fun guys.’
  (63) Ik vind dat(e) ik een toffe jongen ben.
      I find that-PL we a fun guy am
      ‘I think I’m a fun guy.’

moreover: the comp-agreement endings are from the same morphological paradigm as the endings found on inflected imperatives

standard analysis of comp-agreement: there are unvalued $\phi$-features on Cº that Agree with and are valued by the subject in specTP
5.3 Why only ECM-verbs?

**question:** why do only ECM-imperatives allow raising of something other than their own subject into specTP?

→ it is that same set of φ-features that is spelled out as agreement on inflected ECM-imperatives:

(66)  
\[ \text{Kijk-e die koeien es gek doen.} \]
\[ \text{look-PL those cows PRT crazy do} \]
\[ \text{Look at those cows go crazy.‘} \]

(67)  
\[ \text{Vertel(*-e) die verhalen es.} \]
\[ \text{tell-PL those stories PRT} \]
\[ \text{‘Tell those stories.’} \]

(68)  
\[ \text{Overtuig(*-e) die jongens es om te komen.} \]
\[ \text{convince-PL those boys PRT for to come} \]
\[ \text{‘Convince those boys to come.’} \]

**assumption:** this is related to the fact that subjects in imperatives are necessarily agentive [Jensen 2003, 163):

(69)  
\[ \text{a. Go away!} \]
\[ \text{b. *Know French!} \]

**consequence:** if a DP other than the subject of the imperative verb raises to specTP (as is the case in inflected ECM-imperatives), it must bear an [AGENT]-theta role ⇒ it must be the external argument of a lower predicate + this external argument must be allowed to undergo A-movement ⇒ agentive ECM-subjects are the only DPs that can partake in this construction

**note:** this also explains why the ECM-subject in inflected imperatives bears a secondary agentive theta-role

(70)  
\[ \text{Kijk-e \{die mensen / #die tafels\} es in de weg staan!} \]
\[ \text{look-PL those people / those tables PRT in the way stand} \]
\[ \text{‘Look at those \{people/#tables\} standing in the way!’} \]

(71)  
\[ \#Kijk-e die koeien es gemolken worden. \]
\[ \text{look-PL those cows PRT milked} \]
\[ \text{be INTENDED: ‘Look at those cows getting milked.’} \]
6 Summary and conclusion

- we have discerned three main stages of grammaticalization in Dutch ECM-imperatives:
  1. lexical verbs merged in lexical positions (regular imperatives)
  2. lexical verbs merged in functional positions (inflected imperatives)
  3. functional elements merged in functional positions (imperatives as discourse markers)
- each of these stages has its own characteristic syntactic, morphological and lexical properties, which stage 2 occupying an intermediate position between the other two
- microvariational data from Dutch provide crucial insight into the middle stage of the development
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