Tanja Milićev

FRONTED VS. NON-FRONTED COMPLEMENT ORDERS IN OLD ENGLISH: PRAGMATIC AND INFORMATION-STRUCTURAL FACTORS

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET · NOVI SAD ·

Novi Sad, 2022.

Tanja Milićev
FRONTED VS. NON-FRONTED COMPLEMENT ORDERS IN OLD ENGLISH: PRAGMATIC AND INFORMATION-STRUCTURAL FACTORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this monograph is to explore to what extent variations in word order in Old English (OE) are influenced by information-structural and pragmatic factors. The investigation will be focused on two types of variation, both of which can be stated in terms of complement fronting in the verbal domain, and the optionality of this syntactic operation. The first type of complement fronting/non-fronting concerns non-finite vPs with finite modals and auxiliaries; the second type is complement/object fronting in lexical non-finite vPs themselves, yielding the famous OV/VO alternation in OE.

Unlike other similar studies of information structure (IS) and syntactic marking of its core notions in OE, the main motivation here will not be to use IS motivated word order rearrangements to hypothesize about the syntactic structure of OE. Nor is it primarily concerned with language change, in the sense that the findings should necessarily directly contribute to our understanding of how subsequent morphosyntactic changes took place in the history of English, which then stripped it off of more elaborate syntactic strategies used for the marking of IS features. It also does not rely on fine-grained statistical analyses of how one particular IS notion fares in alternating word orders. All these important issues can be addressed once we fully clear the ground regarding what IS notions are marked syntactically and what linguistic expressions are actually information-structurally marked.

While other studies give us some useful insights into the IS status of referents, or terms, predicates are rarely in the forefront of interest when it comes to IS marking. But if complement fronting is directly or indirectly driven by IS reasons, then some effect is expected to be observed on the head – the verb, especially in (relatively) free word order languages such as Old English. And this is what this study is about.

1.1 Problem

The problem addressed in this work is the alternating position of complements in the verbal domain. Two types of complements are of interest: non-finite vP complement of finite modal and auxiliary verbs and nominal complement of the non-finite lexical verb. In embedded clauses, non-finite vP complements can precede or follow the finite modal or auxiliary (1); the same can be observed with nominal objects (2).

(1)

a. þa   sona   þa   þæt   gewrit   aræded   **wæs**
    as   soon   as   the   letter   read   was

    'As soon as the letter was read'

    (coblick,LS_32_[PeterandPaul[BlHom_15]]:177.127.2268)

b.　　Gif　þu　**wilt**　his　wordum　hyran
　　　　if　you　will　his　words　hear

　　　　'If you will hear his words...'

<div align="right">(coblick,LS_32_[PeterandPaul[BlHom_15]]:183.232.2371)</div>

(2)

a.　　Gif　se　sacerd　ne　mæg　*ðam*　*læwedum*　*mannum*　*larspel*　**secgan.**
　　　　if　the　priest　not　may　to-the　lay　people　homily　say

　　　　'If the priest cannot say a homily to the lay folk, he should, at least, through the innocence of his life, set them a good example'

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_41:306.66.6963)</div>

b.　　gif　þa　yflan　ne　mihton　**ongytan**　*þa*　*oþre*　*yflan...*
　　　　if　the　evil　not　might　understand　the　other　evil...

　　　　'if the evil cannot understand the other evil...'

<div align="right">(cogregdC,GDPref_and_4_[C]:34.310.28.4641)</div>

I will assume that in (1a) and (2a) complements move leftward, while in (1b) and (2b) they do not. Movement of the non-finite verb phrase in (1a) will be then referred to as vP fronting, and movement of the NP object in (2b) object fronting. For (1b) and (2b) this entails that no vP or object fronting takes place, but no further parallels will be assumed between the syntactic derivation of alternating orders in (1) or (2). In other words, I do not necessarily assume that the sentences in (1b) and (2b) differ *only* in the lack of complement fronting.

In addition to the types of fronting illustrated above, OE can also show that objects can front higher, across the modal/auxiliary verb, while the rest of the non-finite vP remains non-fronted (3a). Or only the non-finite verb can front and precede the modal/auxiliary, while the object remains in the low, clause final position (3b).

(3)

a.　　gif　hi　**þone lofsang**　*willað*　æt　þam　wundrum　**singan,**
　　　　if　they　the　praise-song　will　at　the　wonders　sing

　　　　'and if they the song of praise will sing at the miracles...'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Swithun]:237.4375)</div>

b.　　Gif　ic　**oferswiðan**　*ne*　*mihte*　**hine**　ær　cucene,
　　　　if　I　overcome　not　might　him　earlier　alive

　　　　'If I might not overcome him formerly when living...'

<div align="center">7</div>

The alternations illustrated above have long been recognized as a challenge for syntactic accounts, as the motivation for the variation in the position of complements was not obvious. The fact that such 'preverbal' position of complements has been lost as a syntactic option in the history of English, word order alternations of this type are often assumed to reflect an ongoing syntactic change in OE. I will rather argue that fronting/non-fronting options are closely related to information-structural/pragmatic factors, and that they are interpreted differently.

The impact of IS factors on the OE clause structure has only recently become part of wider research interest. It is rather surprising that it took relatively long for the role of IS/pragmatic conditions to be recognized as factors feeding word order alternations. And alternations are present with all the major syntactic components, from the position of the verb (both finite and non-finite), to arguments (subjects and objects), to pronominal elements. Most alternation puzzles are attributed to grammar peculiarities (either in terms of mixed categories (van Bergen 2000) or mixed head-initial/head-final phrase structures (Pintzuk 1991, 1993, 1999)), which emerge as the result of an ongoing change. Discourse factors, if considered at all, are either quickly dismissed (Koopman 1998, Haeberli 2000, van Bergen 2000), or, when investigated in more detail, the results are used to show that such factors cannot be responsible for the variation of interest (Pintzuk & Taylor 2006, Taylor & Pintzuk 2012a, 2012b). However, studies such as van Kemenade & Milićev 2005/2012 and Struik & van Kemenade 2020 show that varying positions of sentence elements can be quite successfully captured as being influenced by IS.

Admittedly, giving discourse factors a primary role in the alternations in the OE clause structure makes it difficult to capture the key properties of the further developments in the later periods of English. For that reason, OE is rarely given an account which is not in a sense burdened by the issue of language change. OE being a Germanic language, any analysis is expected to be able to account for the change within the realm of almost typological syntactic properties of Germanic languages. Comparative method is by all means necessary, both from a diachronic and synchronic point of view, it should not be the only method applied. Before we can even address the issue of syntactic change, we need to understand what is actually going on in OE. Therefore, the main reason why we find it so important to tease out the influence of discourse factors on the OE clause structure is the fact that it is crucial to establish a clear difference between 'stylistic rules' and 'core grammar' rules. The stylistic rule is a component of the grammatical model is first presented in Chomsky & Lasnik 1977. Stylistic rules essentially characterize noncanonical focusing constructions and make no contribution to the LF (logical form) of sentences they apply to concerning truth conditional interpretation. Many of the focus marking moves are purely stylistic, in the sense that they do not significantly affect the meaning of the utterance, i.e. they do not change the truth conditional properties of the sentence. If we can show that the variations in the OE clause structure arise due to the application of, for example, a certain focus marking strategy, then we avoid attributing a stylistic rule to the status of ongoing grammar change. If a language is predominantly governed by stylistic/discourse rules, which encode backgrounding, discourse linking, pragmatic presupposition, or topic-focus relation at different levels, the word order patterns generated will be difficult to capture by simple and restrictive syntactic rules. This, of course, does not mean that it is impossible to incorporate or translate stylistic or discourse-related movements into the core grammar rules. It can be (and has been) done in two ways, essentially. The first one is by proposing the existence of functional categories which will check topic and focus features of elements

which show up in non-canonical positions (either in terms of a rich left-peripheral (CP) domain, as in Rizzi 1997 or a rich 'clause internal' (TP or vP) domain). The second one is by integrating IS-related features in the core functional categories. For instance, a syntactic feature such as EPP can be extended to be present not only on T, but also on C and v, and it can also be assigned the property INT (or 'new information, specificity/definiteness, focus, etc' (Chomsky 2001: 31, 33).[1] But before we can work out the way how to represent/check IS features in the syntax, we need to know what exact features are marked by a certain syntactic operation, such as complement fronting in OE.

1.2 Theoretical framework

The model of information structure is essentially the one proposed in Krifka 2008, which relies on Stalnaker's Common Ground theory of pragmatic presupposition and discourse development (Stalnaker 1973, 1974, 1978, 2002), and Rooth's (1985, 1992) Alternative Semantics account of focus. The following characterization of common ground from Potts 2015 makes an excellent introduction to the concept.

> (Common ground). The common ground for a context C is the set of all propositions that the discourse participants of C mutually and publicly agree to treat as true for the purposes of the talk exchange.

> The notion of proposition in this definition encompasses all information. Realistic common grounds will include world knowledge, more immediate information characterizing where we are and what goals we have, our beliefs about each other, our beliefs about those beliefs, and so forth. It will also include information about the nature of our language (its semantics, its conventions of use), which utterances have been made, which objects are salient, and so forth.
>
> (Potts 2015b: 2)

More details concerning common ground are given in Chapter 2, while the notion of focus is elaborated in Section 1.4.2.

Even though a precise syntactic analysis of the word order variation is not the primary concern in this study, all the reference to syntactic structure and derivation will be under a general theoretical framework of Generative Grammar (Chomsky 1981, 1993, 2001). The basic clausal structure assumed here includes the following sequence of projections: CP – TP – vP – VP.

The central proposal for OE in this study is that fronting of non-finite vP and NP/DP complements is used to arrive at [background-focus] structures, which essentially indicate how clausal and predicate focus are marked. In that way, verbal elements serve as postmark for the focused material. This view is comparable to Hinterhölzl's analysis of Old High German (2004), where the discourse status of NPs is assumed to be marked by position. Namely, backgrounded ('presupposed, prementioned or implied' (Hinterhölzl 2004: 148)) material (pronouns and bare nouns) precede the finite verb, while focused and 'heavy' material (e.g. modified DPs) follow it. My account differs in that 'background' and 'focus' applies not only to DP, or terms in general, but to predicates as well.

---

[1] Chomsky (2001: 43, fn.8) also that 'T and C [are] cover terms for a richer array of functional categories'.

Even though we do not address the issue of language change in the later developments in Middle English and Modern English, our proposal tacitly predicts that the change will proceed from a 'discourse configurational' to a strict 'syntactic' language. In that sense, again, our analysis is similar to the proposal made for Old High German by Hinterhölzl (2004), whereby stylistic rules become reanalyzed as core grammar rules. Hinterhölzl argues that the grammar provides a limited amount of optionality in the form of stylistic rules that can be exploited by speakers for their communicative purposes. These rules may affect word order (and prosodic phrasing) to derive information-structurally marked forms, which, over time, may lose their stylistic force and become reanalyzed as (obligatory) rules of the core grammar. This change is commonly understood to be conditioned by various morphosyntactic changes in the nominal and the verbal domain (for instance, by the development of a new determiner system from demonstrative pronouns (cf. Hinterhölzl 2004 for OHG, and van Kemenade, Milićev & Baayen 2008, Struik and van Kemenade 2022 for OE), and essentially refers to the old idea that availability of scrambling (as a discourse driven operation) is related to the presence or absence of category D (cf. Ross 1967)).

Unlike other studies of OE, which assume that IS/discourse marking by syntactic rearrangements is starting to be lost during the OE period due to some other ongoing morphosyntactic change, I will aim to show that OE shows no clear evidence that non-fronted orders correlate with different morphosyntactic features of the relevant domain. What is more, I will show that a language can lose certain ways of IS/discourse marking without undergoing any morphosyntactic changes.

1.3 Methodology

All of the data used in the analysis have been extracted from the York-Helsinki-Toronto Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (henceforth the YCOE), an annotated corpus of about 1.5 million words of Old English prose (Taylor et al. 2003). Translations of the examples are either taken from published translations (Godden 2000, Kelly 2003, Skeat 1881, and Sweet 1871), and modified when they contained archaic forms (e.g. suffixes such –st for 2nd person singular, or –th for 3rd person plural). Glosses and the translations of other texts are provided by me, based on Bosworth-Toller's dictionary of Old English (Bosworth and Toller 1898).

As our major assumptions regarding the variation in the VP domain concern the impact of information structure, most examples contain the context preceding the utterance with the relevant variation. These 'context' sentences are given either as just translations into (present-day) English, or as original OE with translation, when it is necessary to pinpoint certain syntactic properties of those utterances.

The problem of variation is examined based on the embedded/subordinate clause corpus, with occasional excursions to the domain of main clauses. The choice of embedded clauses is influenced by the assumption that in Germanic languages the syntax of main and embedded clauses is crucially different, and that the verb movement in main clauses is regularly to higher positions (either as V2 or V3). This additional movement step is absent in embedded clauses. Therefore, main clauses are used only when a certain more complex pattern is found in too few instances in embedded clauses.

Quantitative and statistical data are used selectively, for two main reasons. First of all, given that there are almost 12000 clauses with the variation in the position of the finite verb relative to its non-finite complement (11088 Vf-Vn and 6923 Vn-Vf clauses), and almost 2500 clauses containing the OV/VO variation (656 Vf-Vn-O, 1079 Vf-O-Vn, 738 O-Vn-Vf), it is unrealistic that the whole corpus could be examined in a reasonable amount of time, given that for each interpretation both the preceding and the following context need to be taken into account. Secondly, as our main assumption is that 'deviations' from the unmarked order are not the result of a specific interpretation of a specific element (object, for instance, in the postverbal position) but rather quite literally match the 'non-unmarked' interpretation, which covers a wider array of possible meanings/uses, statistical data is not particularly helpful. In other words, I do not find that quantifying possible interpretations of a given word order is crucial for our understanding of the impact of IS factors on word order variation. Since so many instances of topic and focus marking are regulated by general conversational principles and are often used for stylistic or rhetorical purposes, they are truly optional, as the failure of their application can only result in more or less incoherent discourse. Many cases then would involve quantifying specific style. We thus leave it for further research to establish possible correlations of a certain interpretation with clause type, object type, and other factors.

1.4 Notions of Information Structure

In this section, I will present basic assumptions regarding information structure and its basic notions: focus, givenness and topic/topicality.

1.4.1 Information Structure

On Chafe's (1976) definition, Information Structure (IS) is a phenomenon of information packaging that serves the immediate communicative needs of the participants in the discourse. It describes how information exchanged in the discourse is formally packed in the sentence. For many linguists concerned with pragmatics, IS is a sentence-level structure (Halliday 1967, Vallduví 1992), or variation of the sentence structure to modulate how the information in the current utterance relates to the information in the prior context. Krifka (2008) points out IS markings can also affect the content of the message (meaning), hence cannot be only about the way information is presented or packaged; hence, IS is also content management.[2] Therefore, IS is best characterized as a cognitive domain that mediates between the modules of linguistic competence (syntax, phonology, and morphology), and other cognitive faculties, whose function is to affect belief states by information update, pragmatic reasoning, and general inference processes (Zimmerman and Féry 2009).

The basic notions of IS are focus, topic and givenness, although primitives such as theme/rheme, focus/background, topic/link, old/new have also been shown to be relevant in the understanding of how information is organized at the sentence level. I will also adopt Krifka's model of communication as continuous change of the common ground (CG). The notion of CG, originally proposed by Stalnaker 1974 (cf. also Karttunen 1974, Lewis 1979) is a way to model the information which is mutually known to be shared and continuously modified in communication. CG primarily serves to

---

[2] It is a well-known fact that truth-conditional differences arise with certain types of focus, as the one associated with focus sensitive particles such as 'only'.

indicate the distinction between presuppositions (requirements for the input CG) and assertions (changes in the output CG). Krifka, however, argues that CG is relevant for information packaging, as the CG changes continuously, and information has to be packaged appropriately to correspond to the CG at the point of utterance. The notion of CG will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter 2.

1.4.2 Focus

As one of the main arguments in this study is that focus marking is the major factor in the word order variation in OE embedded clauses, we need to elaborate on the concepts and terminology used.

As pointed out in Zimmermann and Onea (2011), most semantic approaches to focus build upon the basic intuition that focus relates un utterance to a set of relevant alternatives (Rooth 1985, 1992, 1996, von Stechow 1991, Krifka 2001, 2006, 2008). This is view is summarized in Krifka 2008: 247 as (4).

(4) Focus indicates the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions.

There are two major semantic approaches to focus: (i) structured meanings and (ii) alternative semantics. The brief presentation of both approaches here comes from Zimmermann & Onea 2011: 1155-1157).

Structured meanings, or structured propositions (Cresswell & von Stechow 1982, von Stechow 1982, 1990, 1991; Krifka 1991, 1995, 2001) is an approach to the semantics of focus which assumes that focus creates a bi-partition of truth-functional meaning of an utterance into an unsaturated background part and focus part. The background part applied to the focus part yields again the ordinary truth-functional meaning (von Stechow 1982). Narrow focus on the object (5), for example, has the structured meaning representation (6). The presence of a variable inside the background predicate captures the semantic nature of focus as indicating alternatives.

(5) Peter invited MAry$_F$
(6) $<\lambda x \in De.$ Peter invited x, Mary$>$

In alternative semantics (Rooth 1985, 1992), focus creates an additional meaning layer on top of the 'ordinary meaning' of an expression. More specifically, the meaning contribution of focus is registered at a second semantic level, the *focus semantic value,* $[[\;]]^F$, which is computed in parallel to the *ordinary semantic value*(standard extensional meaning), $[[\;]]^0$, of an utterance. According to Rooth, the presence of a syntactic F-feature on the focused constituent (indicated prosodically by the presence of a pitch accent), generates a (contextually given) set of alternative propositions, from which the focused element is drawn. The alternative propositions differ only in the focused position and share all other material. Focus semantic value $[[\;]]^F$ of a given semantic type is thus the set containing semantic objects of the same semantic type, restricted by the context (a constraint on alternatives added in Rooth 1992). A very simplified representation for a focused object is given in (7).

(7)

[[Peter invited Mary_F]]^0 = Peter invited Mary

[[Peter invited Mary_F]]^F = {Peter invited Mary, Peter invited Ann, Peter invited Peter, Peter invited Claudia }

É. Kiss (1998), argues that there are two types of focus, information focus and identificational focus (also known as 'contrastive focus'), which differ both semantically and syntactically. Identificational focus represents a subset of the set of contextually or situationally given elements for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold; it is identified as the exhaustive subset of this set for which the predicate actually holds (È. Kiss 1998: 245). Semantically, identificational focus implies an existential presupposition. When an element with the identificational focus is negated, as in an it-cleft focus construction 'It was not a car that I bought', it implies that there exists an alternative referent for which the proposition holds (something else was bought), and cannot be followed by a sentence expressing denial of the proposition 'I didn't buy anything'. As information focus does not imply the existence of a set of alternatives, a sentence with the information focus ('I didn't buy a car'), allows the continuation 'I didn't buy anything'. So, while information focus 'merely marks the nonpresupposed nature of the information it carries, the identification focus expresses exhaustive identification (every member of the alternative set needs to be identifiable). Identificational focus requires special marking (movement), while information focus is always in situ (E. Kiss 1998: 248).

A lot of discussion has been around the question of whether contrastive focus is different from the more basic notion of focus as evoking a set of contextually salient relevant alternatives (Rooth 1985, 1992, Krifka 2008). On the alternative semantics view, any kind of focus is assumed to evoke a set of alternatives against which the focus constituent is evaluated, so contrastive focus is not different from 'non-contrastive' focus. Similarly to E. Kiss, there are other proposals which take that the mere presence of alternatives indicates either contrast or exhaustiveness, because alternatives always contrast with other by virtue of being different from each other (Vallduví & Villkuna 1998; Selkirk 2008; Katz & Selkirk 2011). For Selkirk (2008), the sentence with a contrastively focused element includes a specification that there exist alternatives to the proposition expressed by the sentence which are identical to that proposition except for different substitutions for the contrastively focused constituent. It has a direct role in determining the semantic interpretation of the sentence, affecting truth conditions and conversational implicatures (Selkirk 2008: 126). Some proponents of the view that the presence of alternatives equals contrast assume that what is sometimes referred to as *new information focus* does not involve focus, at least not in the Alternative Semantics sense. In other words, there is new information on the one hand, and 'contrastive' focus on the other (e.g. Katz & Selkirk 2011).

If we maintain the view that any kind of focus evokes a set of alternatives against which the focus constituent is evaluated, how do we account for uses of focus that are 'contrastive'? Krifka (2008) points out that the notion of contrastive focus should be restricted to uses of focus for truly contrastive purposes (for instance, in corrective discourse). The crucial assumption for contrastive focus is that it always presupposes that the CG contains the proposition with the contrastive alternative (a proposition from the focus value of the sentence – i.e. one of its focus-evoked alternatives, which differs from the proposition denoted by the ordinary meaning), or that such a proposition can be accommodated. And this is what distinguishes contrastive from non-contrastive focus. With non-contrastive focus, when a

sentence is asserted, only the ordinary meanings enter the CG. Alternative propositions evoked by focalization do not enter the CG, because being evoked via focalization does not make a proposition shared knowledge. In that sense, contrastive focus is only a type of focus, rather than an independent category of its own.

Lee (1999, 2003), on the other hand, argues that it is necessary to keep the notion 'contrastive' only for contrastive topics. For Lee, 'genuine focus' has no notion of contrast except that of Rooth's (1985, 1992) alternatives. When we focus an element, we highlight it, while other alternatives are 'shadowed and ignored or excluded at the moment of utterance', although they are evoked in the context (Lee 1999: 326). Lee further claims that uttering a focus lacks reservation, conditionality, partitioning or hedge regarding other alternatives, which is always characteristic of Contrastive Topic (Lee 1999: 327).

An opposite view is presented in Neeleman et al. 2009 and Neeleman & Vermuelen 2013, where contrast is argued to be an autonomous notion of information structure. As was first proposed in Neeleman et al. (2009) and further elaborated in Neeleman & Vermuelen 2013, the notion of contrast should be kept apart from core topic and focus notions. Contrast exists as a privative [contrast] feature, in addition to [topic] and [focus] features, as contrast can be applied to both topics and foci (for similar proposals, they refer to Vallduví & Vilkuna 1998, Molnár 2002, and Giusti 2006). According to the authors, constituents that are contrastive are understood to belong to a contextually given set out of which they are selected to the exclusion of at least some other members of the set. In Neeleman & Vermuelen 2013, this function of contrast in relation to focus is further elaborated. Contrastive focus entails the intended denial by the speaker of one of the alternative propositions evoked by focalization. That is, contrastive focus indicates that at least one proposition in the set evoked by focalization does not hold or, that what holds is the negation of that proposition. Neeleman & Vermuelen argue that the negative statement about an alternative is part of the semantics of contrast, not just a pragmatic effect, as it is not cancelable.

Zimmerman (2008) argues that what distinguishes contrastive focus from information focus is that the alternatives that play a role with contrastive focus are not just calculated relative to the semantic denotation of the focus constituent (the semantic alternatives). Instead, they are calculated relative to the focus denotation together with the speaker's suppositions as to which of these alternatives the hearer is likely to expect (the discourse-semantic alternatives). The less expected a given focus constituent is in a particular context – according to the speaker – the more likely it is to get a contrastive marking.

Finally, let us briefly comment on the notion of contrast itself. Even though intuitively a simple notion, contrast is in fact difficult to characterize. Repp (2016) starts from two dictionary definitions of contrast: contrast as 'the state of being strikingly different from something else in juxtaposition or close association' (the Oxford Dictionary of English http://www.oxforddictionaries.com), and as 'the difference or degree of difference between things having similar or comparable natures, [and] the comparison of similar objects to set off their dissimilar qualities' (the Merriam-Webster Dictionary http://www.merriam-webster.com). When these pretheoretical notions are applied to a discourse of two sentences, S_1 and S_2, S_1 and S_2, we can say that S_1 and S_2 may be construed as being in a contrastive relation if S_1 contains an element α that can be construed as an *alternative* to an element β in S_2, where

being construed as an alternative reflects the notions of *juxtaposition* and *comparison* in the dictionary definitions.' (Repp 2016:1). Typically, a sequence of two sentences with two contrastive pairs, also contain identical material, which puts them in a parallel relation (8), but sometimes the parallelism is less obvious (9), or elements can contrast within one sentence (10), as in the classical example from Rooth (1992:80). In all three utterances contrast comes from the alternativeness of constituents or their denotations.

(8) [Pete]contrast.1 went to [Rome]contrast.2. [Marc]contrast.1 went to [London]contrast.2.
(9) [Pete]contrast slept for an hour. Then it was [Marc's]contrast turn.
(10) An [American]contrast farmer was talking to a [Canadian]contrast farmer.

But contrast can be a discourse relation between two sentences, or two discourse segments as in (11).

(11) [Pete]contrast.1 went to [Rome]contrast.2 but [Marc]contrast.1 went to [London]contrast.2.

Repp argues that both the way alternatives are construed (or the issue of contrastive constituents) and the discourse relations between two discourse segments are important for a precise understanding of the notion of contrast. Discourse relation and discourse-theory notions such as CONTRAST, CONCESSION, ANTITHESIS, PARALLEL, SIMILAR(ITY), LIST, etc. contribute to the perception of contrast as a gradable notion.

I will follow the view that any kind of focus evokes a set of alternatives against which the focus constituent is evaluated. But I will still keep new information focus apart, based on the fact that it differs from other types of focus in that it only picks the focused alternative from the set, without adding any other information about the relation between the focused alternative and other alternatives in the alternative set. The main reason for having this distinction is practical, rather than theoretic, as it will allow us to tease out marked focus interpretations from the unmarked ones.

1.4.2.1 Types of focus

Focus can be marked in different ways (prosodically, structurally, and morphologically). Krifka (2008) suggests that the fact that there are different ways of focus marking actually signals different ways of how alternatives are exploited (for example, focus marking by cleft sentences often signals an exhaustive interpretation that is absent when focus is marked in situ). Therefore, it is desirable to distinguish subtypes of focus, to capture the fact that alternatives are employed in specific ways. Types of focus differ with respect to how the alternative set is organized (for instance, ranked in relation to the value of the focused element), and/or how the speaker exploits them.

We have already discussed contrastive focus. Let us first present the types of focus which are assumed to contribute to the semantic representation of the sentence containing a focused expression.

Additive focus indicates that the predication holds for at least one alternative of the expression in focus. It can also be expressed by the focus particle 'also' (5)

(12) Peter also invited Mary to dinner.

Scalar focus expresses that the alternatives for the focused expressions are ranked on a scale. With respect to this scale, the focused expression is ranked lowest. The corresponding focus particles are 'even' and 'at least'.

(13) I even like Justin Bieber.

Note that the sentence in (6) can also be used as an answer to the question 'What kind of music do you like?', where new information focus is elicited, but the respondent can assume that the addressee will be able to accommodate that, in addition to providing information regarding the kind of music he likes, he is also evoking a scale, where Justin Bieber is ranked lowest, or least likely to be appreciated musically by the speaker. The addressee does not need to be familiar with the quality of Justin Bieber's musical opus, nor with the speaker's taste in music, to be able to infer this. He just needs to recognize the speaker's intention.

Exhaustive (or exclusive) focus presupposes that the predication holds for the expression in focus, and asserts that it does not hold for any alternative. Unlike new information focus, exhaustive focus has the additional implication that the alternatives are (overtly) eliminated. The focus particle expressing the same meaning is 'only'. Exhaustive focus, even more so than scalar focus, can be successfully used to add new information to the CG and to further manipulate a focus set.

(14) I only drank tequila.

(15) a. What did you drink?
　　 b. I drank tequila. I might have drunk gin tonic as well.
　　 b'. I drank tequila (and nothing else).

Finally, we also need to distinguish subtypes of focus based on the specific uses, as it is difficult to pinpoint their impact on the meaning of the sentence. They are usually distinguished by their prosodic prominence rather than semantic contribution (Bolinger 1961, Chomsky 1971, and Rochemont and Culicover 1990). Two instances of such focalizations will be of great importance in the analysis of the OE data: parallel focus and verum focus.

Parallel focus is employed when the speaker calls attention to a parallel expression (Krifka 2008:252).

(16) a. MAry stole the COOkie and PEter stole the CHOcolate.
　　 b. An AMErican farmer talked to a CaNAdian farmer ...　　(Rooth 1992)

Krifka points out that the use of focus to express parallel structures is perhaps one of the least understood aspects of focus, as it appears to be less obligatory here than in the other cases. He suggests that parallel focus presumably assists in constructing mental models of the described scene by associating the contrasted meanings.

Dik et al. 1981 also relate parallel focus to contrast, as the main function of parallel focus is to generate contrastive pairs. However, unlike contrastive focus, the use of parallel focus does not depend on the

difference between B's statement and A's presupposition, but on the relation of contrast within the predication.

(17)   A: I know that Peter and John bought a cat and a dog, but I don't know who bought what.
         B: PETER bought a CAT, and JOHN bought a DOG.

I will also assume that the term contrastive focus can be applied to describe cases of parallel focus in the OE data.

Verum (polarity) focus, as defined by Höhle (1988:4), has the function of highlighting the truth of some proposition known from the context.

(18)   Peter DID buy a new car.

Finally, let us point out the contexts or discourse situations where the presence of focus is identified. Pragmatically, focus can be used to answer a question (it highlights the part of an answer that corresponds to the *wh*-part of a constituent question), to correct information, or to confirm information, to highlight parallels (Krifka 2008), or to indicate that certain content is unexpected (Zimmermann 2008). Such contexts then are usually taken to probe or test for focus.

The size and type of expressions under focus can vary. Most discussions of focus interpretation and focus marking are based on referents, nominal expression or 'terms', it has been shown that predicates too can be focus marked (Zimmermann 2016). A canonical word order sentence such as (19) can be felicitously used as an answer eliciting 'narrow' focus on the term ('What did Mary buy?', where 'a car' is focused), or 'broad' focus, such as predicate/VP focus ('What did Mary do?, where 'bought a car' is focused) or 'sentence'/'all new' focus ('What happened?', where the whole proposition is focused).

(19) Mary bought a car

1.4.3 Topic and topicality

Topic is the second basic notion of IS. The concept of topic is difficult to define. First of all, we need to distinguish sentence topic from discourse topic, i.e. topic as a part of sentence grammar, and topic as a continuous discourse notion. Roughly, the distinction can be stated in terms of different levels of 'aboutness': sentence topic is what the sentence/utterance is about/what is predicated of an element; discourse topic is what the (part of) discourse is about. Discourse topic is viewed as a central organizing factor in discourse, and it is also referred to as Theme (Halliday 1985), 'the issue' or question under discussion. The correlation between sentence topic and discourse topic is rather difficult to tease out; they often overlap, but that relation is not exclusive.

Sentence topic, even though reduced to the context of utterance, is also difficult to define as there are different semantic-pragmatic types of topics: aboutness topic, frame-setting topics and contrastive topics, and it often seems that they cannot be reduced to one unifying characteristic (cf. Jacobs 2001).

The most common definition of sentence topic is in terms of aboutness, or what the sentence is about (cf. Kuno, 1972; Reinhart, 1982; Gundel, 1988; Lambrecht, 1994, a.o.). Chafe (1976) points out that topics also serve as the frame in which the event denoted by the proposition takes place. "The topic sets a spatial, temporal, or individual framework within which the main predication holds (the frame within which the sentence holds)" (Chafe 1976: 50). Such topics are not what the sentence is about, but they 'limit the applicability of the main predication to a certain restricted domain'.[3] Contrastive topics (cf. among others, Büring 1997, 2003) share both features of aboutness topic and focus (in the sense that they evoke alternative expressions).

The notion closely related to that of topic is topicality. Topicality is often exploited as a factor in 'exceptional' syntactic behavior of pronouns and in scrambling (clause internal movement of objects, as well as adjuncts), and is assumed to reflect the informational status of a referent. According to Lambrecht (1994), topicality is a pragmatic *relation* that holds between a referent and the proposition expressed by an utterance. Topicality is the construal of the referent as pragmatically salient, so that the assertion is made about this referent. Therefore, topicality is not an inherent property of a referent (although there are certain correlations with the role the referent has in the preceding discourse), but depends on the speaker's evaluation of its saliency in a communicative context (or the addressee's state of interest with respect to the referent, and not necessarily the speaker's assumptions about the addressee's familiarity/identifiability of a referent).[4] Topical referents can be said to be salient (most notable and important), under discussion, and pragmatically linked in the consciousness of interlocutors (activated in the memory of the interlocutors).

Lambrecht (1994) also assumes that the topic role is not necessarily unique. At the time of utterance, more than one referent can be under discussion at the time of the utterance, and the utterance can simultaneously increase the addressee's knowledge about both of them. The communicative purpose of an utterance containing more than one topic(al) element is to increase the addressee's knowledge about the relationship between two salient entities.

Dalrymple & Nikolaeva (2010) argue that two topical referents are not of the same rank with respect to saliency, hence it is necessary to distinguish 'primary topics' and 'secondary topics'. A similar distinction is present in Vallduví's (1992) model of IS. He distinguishes 'focus', as new information, and 'ground' as old information. Ground is further subdivided into 'link' (informationally more prominent material) and 'tail' (informationally less prominent material). Erteschik-Shir (2007:13) also argues for the existence of different 'topic types'. According to Dalrymple & Nikolaeva, an utterance with a primary and secondary topic conveys a relation that holds between two salient participants. They further assume that the primary topic is closely associated with the subject function, while the secondary topic is often realized as the second argument of a transitive verb: the object (cf. also Givón 1984).

Crucially, the relation between elements in 'complex topic' structures is a pragmatic association between the two referents established by the previous context. A speaker uses a 'secondary' topic, when

---

[3] Jacobs (2001: 656) defines the frame-setting function as: "In (X,Y), X is the frame for Y if X specifies a domain of (possible) reality to which the proposition expressed by Y is restricted".
[4] Topicality, especially when applied to objects, is also often assumed to correlate with specificity, definiteness, and animacy (cf. Diesing 1992, de Hoop 1992, Ritter & Rosen 2001, among many others). Semantic factors undoubtedly play an important role, but topicality cannot be reduced to them.

he assumes that the addressee is familiar with the referent and with its relation between the 'primary' topic, and that the addressee can expect this relation will be commented on in further discourse.

1.4.4 Givenness

Givenness is a notion which essentially covers the distinction between 'old' and 'new' information in the discourse. How certain interpretation is 'old' or 'new', however, depends on the model of discourse organization. Givenness can then be viewed from two perspectives, as text-givenness (previously mentioned in the discourse) and context-givenness (salient in the discourse).

Halliday, who was among the first to assume the existence of an independent level of information structure, which is related to discourse and where expressions in a sentence are assigned 'given' and 'new' features, defines 'given' information as being treated by the speaker as 'recoverable either anaphorically or situationally' (1967:211).

Chafe (1976), on the view that discourse is organized according to the system of speaker and hearer beliefs (or the consciousness of speaker and hearer), and not the semantic content of linguistic expressions, extends the notion of givenness to cognitive statuses of expressions (specifically, referents of nouns).

> Givenness. What is it? The key to this distinction is the notion of consciousness (...). Given (or old) information is that knowledge which the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance. So-called new information is what the speaker assumes he is introducing into the addressee's consciousness by what he says. (Chafe 1976:30)

Chafe also suggests that the term 'given', being misleading, should perhaps be substituted by the term 'activated', which is more appropriate in this sense. So the status of referents can be new (inactive at the point of their introduction into the discourse) or given (active in the consciousness of the interlocutors).

Clark & Haviland (1977) also follow this line of reasoning, According to them, given information is 'information [the speaker] believes the listener already knows and accepts as true', and new is 'information [the speaker] believes the listener does not yet know'.

Prince (1986, 1992) offers a detailed taxonomy of 'given' and 'new' cognitive statuses, capturing the effects of both text-givenness and context-givenness and the recognition of these statuses from the perspective of the speaker and the hearer. The details of Prince's account will be presented in Chapter 2, Section 2.4, as well as other models of cognitive statuses, such as Gundel et al. 1993, and Birner 2006.

On the CG model of discourse organization, Krifka (2008) defines 'givenness' in the following way:

> A feature X of an expression α is a Givenness feature iff X indicates whether the denotation of α is present in CG or not, and/or indicates the degree to which it is present in the immediate CG.

As pointed out by Rochemont (2016), such a definition allows two different interpretations of givenness: it can be a cetegorial feature (given vs. not given, i.e. new), or a scale that expresses the degree of discourse salience.

The view that givenness is a categorical feature is present in Schwarzschild 1999, where it is assumed to be marked prosodically, by deaccentuation. Givenness on Schwarzschild's view is a requirement on constituents that are not focus marked (F-marked) to be given ('GIVENness: If a constituent is not F-marked, it must be GIVEN'). F-marking itself is subject to the constraint AVOID F ('F-mark as little as possible, without violating GIVENness') (Schwarzschild 1999:151).

Gundel (1988, 1999) argues that we can distinguish two distinct senses of givenness-newness: referential and relational. Referential givenness describes a relation between a linguistic expression and its state in the speaker/hearer's mind, the discourse, or some real or possible world. The relevant parameters for referential givenness are existential presupposition (e.g. Strawson 1964), preferentiality and specificity (e.g. Enç 1991), the familiarity condition on definite descriptions (e.g. Heim 1982), the accessibility levels (Ariel 1988, 1990), the activation and identifiability statuses (Chafe 1994, Lambrecht 1994), the familiarity scale (Prince 1981), and the cognitive statuses of (Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski 1993). Relational givenness-newness, on the other hand, involves a division of the semantic/conceptual representation of a sentence into two complementary parts, X and Y, where X is what the sentence is about (the topic, theme, ground, logical/psychological subject) and Y is what is predicated about X (the comment, rheme, focus, logical/psychological predicate). X is given in relation to Y in the sense that it is independent, and outside the scope of what is predicated in Y. Y is new in relation to X in the sense that it is information that is predicated about X. Unlike referential givenness, relational givenness is a relation between two elements on the same level of representation, and can be independent of a speaker's assumptions about the hearer's knowledge or attention state. In that sense, relational givenness corresponds to topichood and topicality.

All these characterizations of givenness will prove to be useful in the identification of this notion in our data. As we need to establish that we have properly captured the effect of givenness in the interpretation of various expressions under our investigation, we leave open further theoretical refinements.

1.4.5 A multi-layered model of Information Structure

In their discussion on the methodology of IS research on historical data, Petrova & Solf (2009) propose that it is necessary to decompose information structure into at least three functional layers, to capture different properties of information structural categories (cf. Molnár 1993 and Krifka 2008).

(20)
  i. the pragmatic status of sentence constituents, i.e. the distinction between given vs. new information in discourse as seen in the classical opposition of theme vs. rheme
  ii. the predicational structure of the utterance, essentially dividing the sentence into two parts:

starting point/topic and a predication/comment on this topic

iii. the distinction of focus vs. background in terms of communicative weight or relevance for the development of the discourse.

The three layers of information structure function independently in language, but also interact with one another, thus yielding 'the full picture of the information-structural shaping of an utterance' (Petrova & Solf 2009:133). This approach, Petrova & Solf argue, has an advantage over others because it can account for cases where IS notions which should be mutually exclusive or incompatible are allowed to overlap. Thus, for instance, on a simpler model, topic and focus should exclude one another, but in fact there exist elements which have properties of both, such as contrastive topics. If, however, the notions of topic and focus pertain to different layers of information structural segmentation, they will be allowed to overlap. Petrova & Solf also point out that a multi-layered model also avoids linking notions of topic and focus with contextually given, or old information, and new information, respectively. What Petrova & Solf emphasize are rather well-known facts. But many studies of IS on historical data often focus on one layer and disregard or backside the others, which then limits their insights and predictions. In this study, we will try to keep clear the multi-layered perspective of IS, as much as possible.

1.5 A quick overview of the major word order patterns in OE embedded clauses

Two points in the syntax of OE have been of special interest in most word order accounts: the position of the finite verb and the position of the complement with respect to the verb. The first issue is concerned with the asymmetry in the position of the finite verb in root and non-root clauses, as well as the variation in verb position within non-root clauses. The second issue is the position of the complement in the VP and TP domain, or the question of headedness of VP and TP. If complements precede the head, this reflects a head-final structure; if complements follow the head, the structure of the phrase is head-initial. This view is obviously based on the assumption that the variation in the position of the complement yields no interpretational effects, i.e. that both complement-head and head-complement orders in OE are unmarked.

The asymmetry between root/main and non-root/embedded clauses is taken to be with respect to the position of the finite verb. In root clauses the finite verb is relatively high in the clause structure, usually exhibiting the V2 (21a) or V3 (21b) effect.

(21) a. XP – **Vf**…
      b. XP – (YP) – **Vf**…

In non-root clauses, the verb is typically lower in the clause (2a), but it can also appear in higher positions (22b).[5]

(22) a. XP…. **Vf**
      b. XP – (**Vf**) – YP- (**Vf**) – ZP (**Vf**)

---

[5] The verb is rarely in the absolutely final position as it can often be followed by PPs and various 'heavy' material (presumably extraposed there).

When it comes to complement positions, the major word order patterns involving non-finite vP complements and nominal complements (i.e. objects) in OE subordinate clauses are the following:[6]

(23) a.   [O Vn] Aux[7]
      b   [O] Aux [Vn]
      c   Aux [O Vn]
      d   Aux [Vn O]
      e   [Vn] Aux [O]
      f.   * [Vn O] Aux

The OE word order patterns in (23), resemble the relative ordering of object, non-finite verb and auxiliary/modal found across other Germanic languages, both synchronically and diachronically. The patterns are usually taken to illustrate a mix of head-initial and head-final orders. These are listed in (24) (taken from Biberauer, Holmberg & Roberts 2008).

(24)

      a.   **O-V-Aux** or consistently head-final order in VP and TP: German and dialects of German, Dutch and its dialects, Afrikaans; Old English, Old Norse
      b.   **O-Aux-V** or so-called *verb-raising*/VR structures: Swiss German dialects, Dutch and its dialects, Afrikaans; Old English, Old Norse
      c.   **Aux-O-V** or so-called *verb projection-raising*/VPR structures which involve a head-initial TP and a head-final VP: Swiss German dialects, Dutch dialects, spoken Afrikaans; Middle Dutch, Old High German, Old English, Old Norse
      d.   **V-Aux-O**: required for CP-complements in German, Dutch, Afrikaans and their dialects; possible with PP-complements in Dutch and Afrikaans and, to a lesser extent, German; also possible with DPs in Old English [*leaking structures*] and Old Norse
      e.   **Aux-V-O** or consistently head-initial order in VP and TP: English, Mainland Scandinavian, Icelandic; also possible in Old English and Old Norse

The existing syntactic analyses of the word orders in (3 & 4) can be divided into three types: uniform head-final (most notably, van Kemenade 1987), mixed head-final and head-initial (Pintzuk 1991, 1993, 1999; Haeberli 2001), and 'Kaynean' uniform head-initial (Roberts 1997, Biberauer & Roberts 2005).

On the uniform head-initial approach, following Kayne's (1994) antisymmetry hypothesis, which is the one I will assume here, all cases previously recognized as head-final must be derived by a variety of leftward movements. For OE, Biberauer and Roberts (2005) offer such an account. As their analysis is rather elaborate, here I will only briefly present the derivation of verb final orders, as an illustration of the inventory of movements which need to take place to derive a structure where both complements – vP and O – precede their verbal heads. According to Biberauer & Roberts, S-O-V-Aux order is derived

---

[6] The common practice is to focus on non-root clause as they are not affected by verb movement to a higher position, as in root clauses.

[7] 'Aux' here covers both auxiliaries and modals.

by the following movement operations: V movement to v, VP-movement to (inner) Spec, vP, and vP-movement to SpecTP. Note that vP can have multiple specifiers. The inner one is responsible for EPP/D features, the outer one is where the subject is generated.

(25) a. head-initial merger in VP: [$_{VP}$ V O]
       b. merger of v: v [V O]
       c. movement of V to v v+V [tV O]
       c. movement of remnant VP [tV O] to inner SpecvP
       d. merger of the subject in the outer SpecvP
       e. merger of auxiliary (in T^0)
       f. vP movement to SpecTP

Leaking orders (32d) are derived in a similar way, only the object is exempt from moving out of VP, so consequently only the remnant vP moves, creating S-V-Aux-O order. Other orders where the non-finite verb follows the finite verb are assumed to involve more structure (specifically, because the finite verb in them is a restructuring verb taking a defective TP as its complement). Even though there are some empirical facts that seem to raise questions about certain details of their account (cf. Milićev 2016). Biberauer & Roberts offer a most systematic, most principled and comprehensive analysis of the syntactic options in OE, and their general line of reasoning will be assumed in this study as well.

1.6 The organization of the book

The remainder of this study is organized in the following way. In Chapter 2 we analyze the interpretations of vP fronted orders in temporal and conditional clauses, to test whether the interpretational inferences associated with the word order O-V-Aux/Mod indicate a specific discourse status of the proposition. The alternating word order, without vP fronting is discussed in Chapter 3, where we aim to establish what leads to non-fronting of vPs in such propositions, and how we are to understand why a syntactic operation such as vP fronting or non-fronting leads to essentially a pragmatic effect. The discussion of the second type of complement (non-) fronting, object (non-) fronting opens in Chapter 4. We systematically investigate the interpretations of non-fronted orders, or VO patterns with nominal objects. The alternating OV order is inspected only for NP-types that have been left out in other analyses of the influence of IS factors on OV orders. Chapter 5 expands the investigation of the 'postverbal' area, and brings an analysis of other types of postverbal material (pronominal objects, adverbs and combinations of adverbs and objects). Chapter 6 is dedicated to the interpretation of the word order where the verbal part of the vP complement is fronted, while the object remains in a lower position (S-Vn-Aux/Mod-O or leaking orders), where we raise the question of the conditions giving rise to 'splitting' of the non-finite vP complement material. In Chapter 7, complement fronting as a syntactic way of marking discourse and IS status is inspected beyond OE. Namely, we look at the patterns with vP and object fronting in earlier stages of Serbian. The fact that a language such as Serbian has not undergone any grammatical change that would limit the use of syntactic options for discourse/IS marking, but has stopped using complement fronting to get interpretational effects similar to the ones observed in OE, indicates that a language can lose a 'type' of discourse packaging, and not necessarily specific syntactic options for discourse/IS marking. Chapter 8 concludes this study.

2. FRONTED NON-FINITE VP ORDERS: PRAGMATIC PRESUPPOSITION

In this chapter, we investigate the interpretation of fronted non-finite vP orders in OE. Fronting or not-fronting the non-finite vP yields the effect of word order variation, as the position of the finite verb in embedded clauses can then be clause final or non-clause final. Our central assumption is that word order variations in OE largely reflect IS/pragmatic considerations. This is not a novel or an unusual suggestion. However, this is, to the best of my knowledge, the first attempt to account for the variation in the position of the finite verb in embedded clauses, resulting from fronting or not-fronting the non-finite vP, in terms of IS/pragmatics. For embedded clauses, the central claim is that the position of the finite verb serves to indicate the pragmatic status of the whole proposition – how what is expressed by a certain clause integrates into the global discourse. Put simply, the position of the finite verb indicates the discourse status of a proposition.

The position of the finite verb is generally taken to illustrate the asymmetry between main and subordinate clauses, which is, simply put, reflected as the verb-high and verb-low position. But the finite verb in embedded clauses is not always 'low' or clause final. If the position of the finite verb is taken as one of defining properties of subordinate clauses, the fact that it can vary undermines its defining power. I will claim that what feeds the variation in the position of the non-finite VP with respect to the finite modal/auxiliary is of pragmatic and/or information-structural nature. More precisely, the set of factors assumed to be responsible for the variation seems to be most closely related to the notions of pragmatic presupposition and assertion. Namely, subordinate clauses with vPn-Vf orders are added to the discourse as pragmatically presupposed or non-assertive. Vf-vPn order, on the other hand, indicates that in a given context, the propositional content cannot be delivered as presupposed, or is not intended to be used that way by the speaker.

Relating the word order variation to pragmatic issues is not an easy task, especially for a dead language. Any such investigation is necessarily restricted to observation of contexts where certain word orders are found, without the availability of negative evidence. However, under the hypothesis that the differences in word order do not reflect free syntactic variation, a careful examination of the texts can help us discover certain regularities, which are not incidental and should be taken seriously.

OE has long been known for its (relatively) free-word order syntax, and it comes as a surprise that the correlation between free word order and IS/pragmatic consideration has not been (fully) explored for OE. The strictly syntactic approaches essentially assume that the variation is due to two competing syntactic options, reflecting a state of an ongoing change. For Pintzuk (1991, 1993, 1999), it is a competition between INFL-medial vs. INFL-final structure, with Vf-Vn orders reflecting the first grammar, and Vn-Vf the second one. Biberauer & Roberts (2005) see it as a competition between the pied-piping and non-pied piping option for satisfying the EPP feature on T° (OE T either attracts the subject (giving **S**-Vf-Vn order) or the non-finite vP to its specifier (giving **S**-**Vn**-Vf). Both accounts crucially rely on the assumption that the finite verb (i.e. auxiliary or modal) is always in T°. Biberauer &

Roberts take that the verb is base-generated there, while Pintzuk assumes that it moves to T° due to its strong features.

Under the syntactic approaches, the syntactic variation should not bring about interpretative differences (while this is in a way tacitly assumed in Biberauer & Roberts, Pintzuk's double-base hypothesis clearly predicts that). Upon a closer inspection, however, we see that these two orders do not quite mean the same, or more precisely, do not have the same pragmatic uses. In addition, one of the two orders is associated with subordinate clauses only, while the other is a feature of main clauses as well. In Biberauer & Roberts, this fact is obliterated, as their analysis covers only subordinate clauses, while main clauses are deliberately left aside, presumably due to their 'special' syntax. However, outside the special (operator or operator-like) contexts, which involve verb movement to projections higher than T°, it is difficult to maintain that main clauses involve a derivation that is crucially different from the one(s) responsible for verb fronting patterns in subordinate clauses. If the modal verb/auxiliary can be in T° in main clauses, then we also need an answer to the question why the pied-piping option (vPn-Vf) is never available in main clauses.

Before we can see the effects of the pragmatic status of a proposition on the word order, we need to first address the issue of pragmatic presupposition and assertion. This is done in Section 2.1. Section 2.2 is dedicated to the Stalnakerian view of pragmatic presupposition (and assertion), as well as the discussion of alternative views of discourse organization. In Section 3.3 we set the scene for non-finite vP fronting in OE, where we describe the properties of embedded clauses in OE that essentially makes them different or similar to main clauses. vP fronting as an 'embedded clause phenomenon' is compared to 'main clause phenomena' such as embedded topicalization, to show which embedded clause types are least main clause like, and where non-finite vP fronting would be the strongly preferred option and correlated with their internal syntax peculiarities. A description of the pragmatic presuppositional interpretation of vP fronting in conditional and temporal clauses is given in Section 2.4. The final section 2.5 summarizes the observed effects

2.1 Pragmatic presupposition: definitions and general issues

On a broad characterization, the presuppositions of an utterance are the pieces of information that the speaker assumes (or acts as if he assumes) in order for his utterance to be meaningful in the current context. Depending on a particular type of analysis, it can include everything from general conversational norms to how specific linguistic expressions are construed (cf. Potts 2015). Generally, two types of presupposition are distinguished: pragmatic and semantic. The lack of presupposition is often identified as assertion. The exposition of their differences in 2.1.1 essentially follows Potts 2015.

2.1.1 Pragmatic vs. semantic presupposition

The theory of pragmatic, or speaker/conversational presupposition is attributed to Stalnaker (1970, 1973, 1974, 2002). On this view, presuppositions directly relate to linguistic interaction, norms of turn-taking in dialogue, and conversational plans and goals, as they provide crucial preconditions or information relevant to these components of communication. Therefore, pragmatic presuppositions cannot easily be traced to specific words or phrases, but rather seem to arise from more general properties of the context and the expectations of the discourse participants.

Semantic (conventional, lexical) presuppositions, on the other hand, are part of the encoded meanings of specific words and constructions, called presupposition triggers (cf. Frege 1892/1980, Strawson 1950, Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 1990, and Heim & Kratzer 1998). Potts (2015) points out that although the label 'semantic' suggests a clean split from pragmatics, even semantic presuppositions are pragmatic in the sense that they must be evaluated in the discourse participants' common ground; most presuppositions hold only in specific contexts, so one always needs to know at least what the background store of knowledge is in order to evaluate them. The correlation between the two types of presupposition is of concern to Karttunen (1974) and Soames (1982), who try to capture the mix of semantic and pragmatic properties in terms of utterance presupposition.

Semantic accounts are potentially compatible with pragmatic ones, in the sense that using a presupposition trigger is an excellent way to achieve the speaker's action of presupposing. However, the semantic view at least allows for the possibility that a speaker's utterance could presuppose a proposition p (as a matter of convention), even as that speaker did not intend to presuppose p (Soames 1982:486; Levinson 1995), whereas this is impossible on an account based entirely on speaker intentions.

Semantic and pragmatic presupposition also have different outcomes in cases of their failure. On the semantic account, presupposition is a relation holding between a sentence and a proposition; if a presupposed proposition fails to be true, the result is a lack of truth value, or undefinedness for the presupposing sentence. On the pragmatic account, presupposition is as a relation holding between speakers and/or utterances and propositions, and failure results in infelicity or anomaly.

Presupposition is in opposite relation to assertion. Assertion is commonly understood as the main point of the utterance, what the sentence/utterance is about and what the speaker publicly commits to. Assertive propositions mainly correspond to the main clause of the uttered sentence, while presupposed propositions, again only typically, correspond to embedded clauses. Assertion is then often linked to the Force of a sentence. The opposition between presupposition and assertion, however, is not so clear-cut or easy to capture, on either account.

2.1.2 Presupposition projection

One of the core properties of presupposition is the so-called projection. It has been long noted that presupposed content typically survives when the presupposition triggering expression occurs under the syntactic scope of entailment-canceling operators, or in entailment canceling contexts. These contexts include negation, modals, conditional antecedents, and interrogative operators. They constitute what is commonly referred to as 'family of sentences' tests, and are typically used as a diagnostic for presupposition (cf. Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 1990, Geurts 1999, and Karttunen 1973).[8] So, if B is a presupposition of A, then B should survive if the initial utterance A is embedded under negation, a question operator, an epistemic modal, or if it constitutes the antecedent of a conditional. For instance, in a sentence such as (1), there are two propositions: (i) Sam smokes, (ii) Sam quit it.

---

[8] These context are also known as 'presupposition holes' (Karttunen 1973).

(1) Sam quit smoking

When the family sentence tests are applied, only the truth of (i) 'survives', despite the presence of entailment-canceling operators.

(2)   a. Sam didn't quit smoking.
       b. Sam might quit smoking.
       c. If Sam quit smoking, he'll be grumpy.
       d. Did Sam quit smoking?

As the truth of the presupposed proposition is taken for granted, the operators can target only what is being 'asserted'. While projection is a property of presuppositions, it is not an exclusive property of presuppositions, as the material which is not 'presuppositional' (at least not on the usual characterizations of presupposition SHARED/KNOWN/TAKEN FOR GRANTED) can also project.

2.1.3 Presupposition/assertion – Embedded/Main Clauses

The concepts of presupposition and assertion have often been employed in accounts of the (a)symmetries between main and embedded clauses. Presupposition is especially used as an explanation of the syntactic variation found in the embedded clauses.[9] More precisely, the presence or absence of the main clause or root phenomena in embedded clauses has been related to the presence or absence of presupposition. The idea that certain syntactic operations are allowed only in main clauses ('root transformations') goes back to Emonds (1970). Topicalization, for instance, would be a typical example of a root transformation, as it (generally) occurs in main/root clauses.

(3)   This book, you should read.

Hooper & Thompson (1973), however, show that certain embedded clauses also allow root transformations (topicalization in (4a)), while others reject them (4b).

(4)
a.   John believes that this book, Mary read.
b.   *John regrets that this book, Mary read.

Based on the possibility of licensing embedded root phenomena (ERP), Hooper and Thompson divide verbs with sentential complements into five classes. What allows a complement clause to exhibit root transformations, according to Hooper & Thompson, is assertion. ERP are possible only in asserted environments. For instance, it is possible in the complements of verbs of saying and thinking such as *say*, or *suppose*, because such embedded statements have the characteristics of (direct or indirect)

---

[9] The notion of presupposition was first used to characterize the fact that definite descriptions come with the 'existence assumption', i.e. that definite descriptions presuppose the existence of the referent which cannot be cancelled even when the proposition containing it is negated (Strawson 1950, based on Frege's insight (1892, 68ff). Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) transport the notion of presupposition to clausal complements, in their discovery of 'factive' and 'non-factive' verbs. Factive verbs such as 'regret' or 'know' trigger the presupposition that their clausal complements are true.

assertions. In example (5) from Hooper & Thompson (1973:474), the predicate *explain* selects a complement that expresses reported discourse. Such embedded clauses even express the main assertion in the utterance.

(5)   The inspector explained that each part he had examined very carefully.

In contrast, factive predicates such as *regret* or *be strange* select a sentential complement which is presupposed and therefore cannot undergo root transformations (6).

(6)   *It's strange that this book, it has all the recipes in it.   (Hooper & Thompson 1973:479)

Besides the complements of factive and non-factive predicates, the analysis is also adopted for relative and adverbial clauses. According to Hooper & Thompson (1973), non-restrictive relative clauses are not presupposed and, consequently, admit ERP. In contrast, restrictive relative clauses on definite heads express presupposed content, therefore, ERP are blocked.

Hooper & Thompson do not provide an absolute definition of assertion. They state that the assertion of a sentence is "its core meaning or main proposition," and that it "may be identified as that part which can be negated [and] questioned by the usual application of the processes of negation and interrogation" (Hooper and Thompson 1973:473). Sentences may contain more than one assertion (in coordination, for example). Crucially, some subordinate clauses are asserted, and this is what allows them to exhibit root phenomena.

Green (1976) provides evidence that disputes Hooper & Thompson's claim that root phenomena can occur in all asserted clauses and asserted clauses only. First, she points out that their claim about assertion of a particular clause is based on a circular argument, as (some) assertive clauses are identified as such only on the basis of the grammaticality of root transformations occurring in them (root transformations occur in assertive clauses, assertive clauses are those that allow root transformations). Also, she notes that some root phenomena are possible in the complements of the counterfactive verb 'pretend' and performatives, such as 'bet', 'promise', and 'predict' (1976:390–391), which, semantically, should be presupposed. Green's solution to these issues is in terms of a pragmatic hypothesis. Embedded root phenomena are licensed "just in case the proposition they affect, and therefore emphasize, is one which the speaker supports" (1976:386). She further argues that this is only one constraint out of many which may affect the acceptability of ERP.

Lambrecht (1994) offers evidence that the main-embedded clause distinction cannot be reduced to assertion-presupposition.[10] Although in an utterance, main clauses generally add new content and update the common ground, and subordinate clauses are 'backgrounded', if not entirely presupposed,

---

[10] Lambrecht also emphasizes that pragmatic presupposition/assertion should not be identified with semantic notions of presupposition and assertion (the clash between the two is found in factive complements that essentially have a (narrowly) focused element. His definition is in terms of shared knowledge, but he does not dismiss the role of semantic presupposition ('lexicogrammatical'): "Pragmatic presupposition is the set of propositions lexicogrammatically evoked in a sentence which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered." (Lambrecht 1994: 52).

still the correlation between pragmatic assertion/presupposition and a type of clause is not so strict. Lambrecht refers to the familiar cases where the relation is inverted, when an embedded clause presents material that crucially updates the common ground. The temporal clause in (7), when used, for example, as an answer to the (implicit) question 'When will you clean your kitchen?', is the most informative part of the utterance.

(7)   I'll do it when I have more time.

Also, there are cases where neither the main nor the embedded clause brings in 'new information' to the common ground. In (8), both propositions are 'familiar' or 'known' to both the speaker and the addressee. The fact that the sentence is still informative is because what is asserted is the relation of causality between two presupposed propositions, which were previously unrelated.

(8)   I did it because you're my friend.

Most of the recent work translates the semantic concept of assertion and presupposition into more pragmatic terms, by claiming that only embedded clauses which have their own illocutionary force potential allow root transforms. In part, the approaches establish a connection between syntax and semantics by assuming that illocutionary force is encoded in a syntactic head Force (Haegeman 2003, 2006).

2.2 Pragmatic presupposition on Stalnaker's Common Ground Theory

The notion of pragmatic presupposition is originally stated by Stalnaker (1973, 1974), who argues that presupposition is not a property of linguistic items, but rather of utterances. As pointed out in 2.11, the pragmatic view of presupposition crucially differs from the semantic view in that presupposition is not seen as bearing on the truth conditionality of sentences. Rather, presupposition deals with constraints that utterances impose on contexts in which they may be uttered appropriately. Contexts themselves are viewed in terms of speaker's beliefs about the common ground of a conversation.

According to Stalnaker's pragmatic analysis: "A proposition P is a pragmatic presupposition of a speaker in a given context just in case the speaker assumes or believes that P, assumes or believes that his addressee assumes or believes that P, and assumes or believes that his addressee recognizes that he is making these assumptions, or has these beliefs." (Stalnaker 1974:473).

In Stalnaker 1978:321, he introduces the notion of common ground as the key defining property of presupposition: "Presuppositions are what is taken by the speaker to be the COMMON GROUND of the participants in the conversation, what is treated as their COMMON KNOWLEDGE or MUTUAL KNOWLEDGE." When uttered assertively, sentences are meant to update the common ground. When accepted by the participants, the proposition of a sentence is added to the common ground. On this view, sentences can have pragmatic presuppositions in the sense of imposing certain requirements

on the common ground. These requirements center around the speaker's assumptions or beliefs that the proposition he/she utters has the same cognitive status in the mind of the hearer.

As for the question of the source of presupposition within the pragmatic account, Stalnaker leaves it open that some presuppositions still remain to be conventional properties of particular words or sentences ('semantic presupposition'). But the key notion of understanding presupposition is in terms of conversational inference ("one can explain many presupposition constraints in terms of general conversational rules without building anything about presuppositions into the meanings of particular words or constructions" (Stalnaker 1974:212)).

Von Fintel (2000) elaborates and further clarifies Stalnaker's point: "One natural source of pragmatic presuppositions may be semantic presuppositions associated with the sentence: conditions that need to be satisfied for the sentence to have a determinate semantic value. Stalnaker assumes that a sentence cannot be used to update a common ground unless it has a determinate semantic value in all of the worlds in the context set described by that common ground. If a speaker asserts such a sentence and intends for it to successfully do its job of updating the common ground, that speaker can do so only if he assumes that the semantic presuppositions of the sentence are entailed by the common ground."(von Fintel 2000:2).

While the tests including semantic operators (a family of tests) probe for semantic presupposition (which always projects, unlike assertion, which is targeted by these operators), an appropriate test for detecting pragmatic presupposition is the 'Hey, wait a minute' test (cf. Shanon 1976, von Fintel 2004). The test works under the assumption that the hearer may complain or express surprise if the speaker has uttered something he treats as a fact (a presupposition) if it has not been established before the speaker's utterance. Assertions, on the other hand, do not trigger complaints or surprise on the part of the hearer. In (9), the addressee can use 'Hey, wait a minute' only to respond to the presupposed part of A's utterance (the content of the relative clause), but not to the asserted part (the main clause predicate, the mathematician being a woman).

(9)
    A: The mathematician who proved Goldbach's Conjecture is a woman.
    B: Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that someone proved Goldbach's Conjecture.
    B': #Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that that was a woman.   (Von Fintel 2004: 217)

2.2.1 The problem of informative presuppositions and accommodation

It has been often pointed out that the common ground theory of presupposition runs into problems when it comes to the content which the speaker presents as presupposed, even though it is not part of the common ground. The common argument is that in the standard cases of presupposition triggers, one often finds propositions which cannot be treated as part of the common ground. The problem has been recognized early by Stalnaker himself (Stalnaker 1974: 480, fn. 3), and the classic example which illustrates this effect is given in (10).

(10)

> A: Are you going to lunch?
> B: No, I've got to pick up my sister.

The definite NP such as *my sister* involves a presupposition of the existence of a denotation. According to the common ground view, the utterance can be felicitous only in a conversation where the hearer knows that the speaker has a sister. Obviously, this does not need to be the case, since the speaker can rather appropriately and successfully deliver such utterances in the contexts where the hearer is unfamiliar with the existence of the speaker's sister.

Abbot 2000 is a good source of other cases where conventional, or as she calls them 'grammatical', presuppositions are informative, i.e. cannot be treated as part of the shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer.[11] In addition to definite descriptions, constructions which trigger presuppositions which are not part of the common ground are it-clefts, embedded announcements/complements of factive verbs and non-restrictive relatives. For it-clefts, Abbot refers to Prince's (1978) example of an 'informative-presupposition it-cleft'.

(11)   The leaders of the militant homophile movement in America generally have been young people. IT WAS THEY WHO FOUGHT BACK DURING A VIOLENT POLICE RAID ON A GREENWICH VILLAGE BAR IN 1969, AN INCIDENT FROM WHICH MANY GAYS DATE THE BIRTH OF THE MODERN CRUSADE FOR HOMOSEXUAL RIGHTS. (PG, p. 16) [= Prince 1978: ex. 41b, small caps in Prince's paper; PG = Pennsylvania Gazette]

Prince characterizes this construction in the following way: "...not only is the hearer not expected to be thinking about the information in that clause, but s/he is not expected even to KNOW it. In fact, the whole point of these sentences is to inform the hearer of that very information" (Prince 1978: 898).

Complements of factive verbs containing announcements are given in (12).

(12)

> a.   We regret that children cannot accompany their parents to commencement exercises. (= Karttunen, 1974: ex. 26a)
> b.   We regret that H.P. Grice is ill and will be unable to attend the conference. (= Horn, 1986: ex. 54)

(13) illustrates that complements of factive complements can also contain propositions which are not common knowledge prior to the utterance (recall that the content is presuppositional due to the fact that it 'survives' under negation and question operator).

(13)

> a.   I bet Mary isn't sorry that she stocked up on supplies before this snow storm.

---

[11] The problem is also recognized in Hooper (1975: 117) in terms of 'weak presupposition': "I must say that either presupposition needs to be redefined to exclude this weaker type of presupposition, or we must admit that weakly presupposed propositions may also be asserted."

b. I wonder whether you realize that Bahle's is closed today.
c. Do you think it's odd that that guy over there is trying to flag down a bus?

Finally, non-restrictive relative clauses can often contain new information. According to Abbot, the problem is that non-restrictive relative clauses are backgrounded or parenthetical to the main assertion of the sentence, and thus should be always understood as presupposed.[12]

The existence of informative presuppositions, according to Abbot, clearly shows that grammatical presuppositions cannot be simply reflections of the common ground (again, understood as common, mutual or shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer), and the crucial question is then where they come from.

A standard response to the issue of informative presuppositions within the common ground view of presupposition is accommodation. Namely, speakers can presuppose things that have not already been established as part of the common ground. In such cases, the speakers are implicitly asking the addressees to accommodate (Lewis 1979) that information, by adding it to the common ground, or at least by adding to the common ground that the speaker is publicly committed to that information.[13] The hearer recognizes that the speaker has presupposed something as if it was common ground, and adjusts his common ground accordingly.

Potts (2015) points out that accommodation happens with ease when the speaker is known by the hearer/addressee to be knowledgeable and trustworthy, and the information is straightforward. Untrustworthy sources and surprising information (for example, when a student offers as an excuse a statement such as 'My giraffe ate my homework') will not be easy to accommodate. Thomason 1990 is an excellent source of arguments for the process of accommodation. According to Thomason, the social and communicative reasons which trigger the speaker's use and the addressee's acceptance of accommodation include the need to speed the exchange of information along, to indicate that certain information should be adopted as uncontroversial, and to be discrete or polite as part of a broader negotiation.

While accommodation seems to be an easy and natural process, the question that arises, however, is how exactly, and at what point accommodation takes place. How exactly can the speaker have beliefs or assumptions that the hearer/addressee will be willing or able to share those beliefs or assumptions about the common ground status of a proposition? Or, how do we recognize the social and communicative factors mentioned above?

Stalnaker was immediately aware of the problematic cases of informative presuppositions, and the fact that the speaker is clearly not actually assuming that the presupposed proposition is already part of the common ground. His first solution to the problem (Stalnaker 1973, 1974) is to treat such examples as

---

[12] For an elaborate account of the non-presuppositional nature of non-restrictive (supplemental) relative clauses see Potts 2003, as well as the crucial difference between being non-presupposed and being 'at issue'.

[13] The exact formulation of Lewis' rule of accommodation for presupposition is given in (i).

(i) If at time t something is said that requires presupposition P to be acceptable, and if P is not presupposed just before t, then – ceteris paribus and within certain limits – presupposition P comes into existence at t. (Lewis 1979: 340).

involving a kind of pretense. The speaker is pretending to make this assumption, he is acting as if he is making the assumption.[14] In his later work, Stalnaker (1978: 321) follows up on the pretense-theory and defines presupposition as following: "A proposition is presupposed if the speaker is *disposed to act* as if he assumes or believes that the proposition is true, and as if he assumes or believes that his audience assumes or believes that it is true as well." This definition makes it possible for the speaker to make a presupposition although he does not take the presupposed proposition to be common ground material. On this view, presupposing is simply pretending that or acting as if the presupposed proposition is common ground.

While the pretense-view offers a description of what the speaker might be occasionally doing when presupposing new material, it still does not offer a satisfactory solution to the problem of the hearer. It is difficult to maintain that in cases of informative presuppositions the hearer is already presupposing the relevant proposition, even if they are disposed to act as if the proposition is true as soon as the speaker presupposes it. On a closer inspection, it soon becomes obvious that the assumption of pretense or exploitation does not seem to be valid for the speaker himself either, as there are many cases where no pretense or exploitation can be noted on behalf of the speaker.

Stalnaker considers the suggestion offered by Sadock (who was the first to point out the problem examples with informative definites) that the common ground should be revised so that the speaker no longer needs to assume that the addressee *believes* that P, but rather only assume 'that the addressee *has no reason to doubt* that P'.[15] However, Stalnaker immediately points out a problem with such definitions of presupposition. It would mean that anything that the speaker assumes to be uncontroversial for the addressee is automatically a presupposition of the speaker. If that were the case, the pragmatic principle that one should not assert what they already presuppose would not hold. In other words, the weakened criterion on common ground obliterates the distinction between presupposition and assertion. "If what you presuppose is what you assume your addressee has no reason to doubt, then you would be prohibited from asserting many things" (von Fintel 2008: 150). To illustrate the point, Stalnaker offers the example of "a routine lecture or briefing by an acknowledged expert. It may be that everything he says is something that the audience has no reason to doubt, but this does not make it inappropriate for him to speak" (Stalnaker 1974: 480, Fn. 2).

Soames (1982) believes that the phenomenon of informative presuppositions "undermines all definitions which make the presence of presupposed propositions in the conversational context *prior* to an utterance a necessary condition for the appropriateness of the utterance" (Soames 1982: 461, Fn. 5). He does not adopt Stalnaker's pretense-definition of speaker's presupposition but retains the simpler notion that presuppositions are 'assumed' to be common-ground. He argues that in the cases of informative presuppositions, "a speaker's utterance presupposes a proposition, even though the speaker himself does not presuppose it" (Soames 1982: 487). Soames also believes that the crucial property of

---

[14] Pretense of communication occurs in situations in which the speaker's assert common knowledge. In the so-called phatic communication, which often occurs among casual acquaintances or strangers (Beautiful day, isn't it!, 'We sure need rain') the speaker does not intend to communicate any particular information, other than that human beings should in principle not ignore one another, even when they have no information to exchange (Stalnaker 1974: 474).

[15] Abbot (2008) points out that a similar explanation is also offered by Grice: 'So the supposition must not be that it is common knowledge but rather that it is noncontroversial, in the sense that it is something that you would expect the hearer to take from you (if he does not already know). (Grice 1981: 274).

utterance presupposition is that a proposition is uncontroversial. The exact formulation of utterance presupposition is given in (14).

(14)

An utterance U presupposes P (at t) iff one can reasonably infer from U that the speaker S accepts P and regards it as uncontroversial, either because

a.   S thinks that it is already part of the conversational context at t, or because

b.   S thinks that the audience is prepared to add it, without objection, to the context against which U is evaluated.

(Soames 1982: 430)

Sentence presupposition is then defined as follows: "A sentence S presupposes P iff normal utterances of S presuppose P."

Von Fintel (2000) points out the problem with defining sentence presupposition in terms of utterance proposition. He argues that in Soames' definition it is left open "why one would be able to reasonably infer that the speaker thinks that the audience is prepared to add the presupposed proposition P, without objection, to the context against which U(tterance) is evaluated. We can't say that that is because the sentence presupposes P, since sentence presupposition is defined in terms of utterance presupposition. Somehow, the semantics of the sentence would have to directly stipulate the fact that it gives rise to utterance presuppositions" (von Fintel 2000: 8).

Stalnaker (2002) offers a way to maintain the common ground view of presupposition in terms of common belief. His crucial step is to extend the notion of the common ground of an utterance to include information contained in the utterance itself which may not have been believed to be commonly accepted by the interlocutors *prior* to the utterance. Stalnaker summarizes the argument as follows: "I have argued that, in general, if it is common belief that the addressee can come to know from the manifest utterance event both that the speaker is presupposing that *p*, and that *p* is true, that will suffice to make *p* common belief, and so a presupposition of the addressee as well as the speaker. (Stalnaker 2002: 710).[16]

This view has received a lot of criticism as the process of accommodation is left 'mysterious' (Burton-Roberts 1989, Gauker 1998, Simons 2003, a.o.). Von Fintel (2000, 2008) provides arguments in defense of the view that the common ground theory can be maintained,[17] and that informative presuppositions can be handled. He points out that presuppositions are requirements that the common ground needs to

---

[16] Stalnaker (1998) supports this idea with an analogy to the interpretation of indexicals: "Suppose Phoebe says "I saw an interesting movie last night." To determine the content of her remark, one needs to know who is speaking, and so Phoebe, if she is speaking appropriately, must be presuming that the information that she is speaking is available to her audience – that it is shared information. But she need not presume that this information was available before she began to speak. The prior context that is relevant to the interpretation of a speech act is the context as it is changed by the fact that the speech act was made, but prior to the acceptance or rejection of the speech act." (Stalnaker 1998: 101).

[17] Von Fintel insists that on an important difference between his view and that of Stalnaker. "For him, pragmatic presuppositions of sentences are requirements on the speaker's presuppositions, not on the common ground. I beg to differ from this. I find it much easier to think of the presuppositional component of the meaning of a sentence as being a requirement on the information state it is used to update. Since the information state of a sentence is used to update in the ideal case is the common ground, the presuppositional requirements are imposed on the common ground.".

be a certain way for the sentence to do its intended job, namely updating the common ground. Thus, the common ground must satisfy the presuppositional requirements before the update can be performed, not actually before the utterance occurs. He claims that an utterance will affect the common ground in two steps: (i) first, the fact that the utterance was made becomes common ground (and the participants may immediately draw inferences based on that fact, and perhaps adjust the common ground accordingly), (ii) then, assuming that the proper (implicit) negotiation has occurred, the asserted proposition is added to the common ground. On this two-stage picture of utterance interpretation, presupposed content is added to the common ground prior to the acceptance or rejection of the utterance as a whole.

Von Fintel gives more precise details on how accommodation is usually handled. Informative use of presupposition may be successful in two particular kinds of circumstances: (i) the listeners may be genuinely agnostic as to the truth of the relevant proposition, assume that the speaker knows about its truth and trust the speaker not to speak inappropriately or falsely; (ii) the listeners may not want to challenge the speaker about the presupposed proposition, because it is irrelevant to their concerns and because the smoothness of the conversation is important enough to them to warrant a little leeway.

Still, it is not clear what the utterance needs to be like to be able to be recognized by the addressee as presupposed by the speaker. For Simons (2003, 2006) this seems to be the major problem for the common ground view of pragmatic presupposition. She points out that on the common ground view of presupposition, accommodation can be achieved only if the speaker is relying on the conventional properties of the utterance for the hearer to be able to recognize that the speaker is treating it as presupposed. Even though Stalnaker himself does not dismiss the influence of 'general conversational rules' on getting presuppositional information, Simons argues that such rules are incompatible with the common ground theory. "To give an account of conversationally generated presupposition on the common ground view, we must now construct some conversational reasoning that has as its primary conclusion that utterance of S is appropriate only if the speaker has the belief that some proposition p will be common ground immediately after the utterance. But why should *future* common ground determine the conversational appropriateness of an utterance? What grounds could a speaker have for such a belief except that the utterance she has made constitutes evidence of her utterance-time belief that p?" (Simons 2006: 14). She argues that presupposition should rather be defined in terms of conversational inferences. Conversationally generated inference is "an inference about intended interpretation which is due in part to general principles governing reasonable, rational conversation, such as those posited by Grice (1967), or the interpretational heuristics posited by Levinson (2000). In generating conversational inferences, an interpreter relies on these principles together with observations about the literal content of the utterance, or of some part of the utterance, or the form in which that content is expressed, and observations about the situation of utterance, the goals of the conversation, and so on" (Simons 2006: 2).

I will leave it open to what extent these issues represent a problem for the common ground theory. Clearly though, as presuppositions can contain 'new information', common ground should not be understood strictly as 'shared/mutual knowledge', but also as shared beliefs and assumptions of the speaker and the hearer that the set of propositions in the common ground of a conversation is taken for granted and not subject to (further) discussion (cf. von Fintel 2000, 2008).

2.3 Assertion

On the common ground view, assertion is seen as update of the common ground. Stalnaker (1978: 323): "(...) the essential effect of an assertion is to change the presuppositions of the participants in the conversation by adding the content of what is asserted to what is presupposed." Thus an act of assertion reduces the context set, i.e. the set of worlds representing the shared assumptions among discourse participants, to the worlds in which the asserted proposition holds.

> "[...] To make an assertion is to reduce the context set in a particular way, provided that there are no objections from the other participants in the conversation. The particular way in which the context set is reduced is that all of the possible situations incompatible with what is said are eliminated." (Stalnaker 1978: 323)

The condition on assertion – "no objections from the other participants in the conversation" - is further elaborated on in Stalnaker 1999, where an act of assertion is defined as a proposal on part of the speaker to reduce the context set. This proposal can be accepted or rejected by the hearer. The context set will be affected only if the proposal is accepted.

Even though the notion of 'update' is not fully explicated in Stalnaker's account, many people understand that 'update' should correlate with new information, i.e. something that is not part of the mutual/shared beliefs/assumptions between the speaker and the hearer, or part of the common ground of conversation.[18] The main problem then is that assertion, whose function is to update the common ground, should correlate with new information, but, as we have seen before, new information is not restricted to assertion (i.e. can occur in the so-called informative presuppositions).[19] Also, assertion itself does not always correspond to new information. Recall the example from Lambrecht 1994: 58, where both the proposition found in a subordinate clause and the one in the main clause are known both to the speaker and the addressee, and where what is asserted is the new relation between the two 'old' propositions.

(15)
      A: Why did you do that?
      B: I did it because you are my friend

Abbott (2000, 2008) provides a number of arguments why assertion/presupposition cannot be viewed as contributing new/old information. Just as there are informative presuppositions (non-restrictive relative clauses, for instance, contain new information, but are still somehow backgrounded to the main assertion, or complements of factive verbs of emotion ('regret') in announcements), there are assertions which do not provide new information. Such are 'assertions of common knowledge' ('Linguistics is a

---

[18] When compared to presupposed propositions, the effect of 'more relevance' is noted for assertion. Hooper (1975:97), for instance, uses the term assertion "to mean a declarative proposition or a claim to truth that, on at least one reading, may be taken as the semantically dominant proposition in the discourse."

[19] Abbott (2008) argues that the most problematic part of the common ground view of presuppositions is that it blurs the distinction between assertions and presuppositions, as they do not map onto the new/old information distinction.

science – I need hardly remind this group of that'), as well as are reminders (assertions of propositions the speaker assumes the addressee has not thought about for a while ('You have a dentist appointment next Tuesday'), or propositions which *are* in the addressee's consciousness, but not 'at the current forefront or property in focus' ('But I've just agreed that I'll pick Sue up')). Assertions with old information are also often used when speakers (especially politicians, preachers, etc) repeat assertions for a rhetorical effect to gain maximal impact from them. Logical truths ('It ain't over till it's over', 'Either you saw him or you didn't') often get asserted, without an intention to be informative, but rather with different functions (excuses, comforting, warnings, and so on) (Abbott 2008: 533).

Based on such evidence, Abbot proposes that presuppositions should simply be viewed as non-assertions. In Abbott 2000: 1431 she explicitly proposes that "(...) what is asserted is what is presented as the main point of the utterance - what the speaker is going on record as contributing to the discourse." For Abbott, an ideal assertion is 'one atomic proposition, consisting of one predicate', typically, but not necessarily corresponding to the main clause in the sentence.

2.3.1   Assertion vs. main point of utterance

Simons (2007) argues that assertion cannot be equated to the main point of the utterance (MPU): "The main point of an utterance U of a declarative sentence S is the proposition p, communicated by U, which renders U relevant" (2007:1035). MPU can be detected if the content can serve as an answer to a question (thus making the utterance relevant). Assertion, on the other hand, is the part of utterance to which the speaker publicly commits. While these two notions often overlap, they are not the same. Simons shows this by the denial test. Only when assertion is targeted by denial, the utterance gets rejected (as the speaker's commitment gets canceled). Denial of MPU does not lead to the rejection of the utterance. This can be verified when the MPU is found in the embedded clause, as in (10B).

(16)
    A: Why isn't Louise coming to our meeting these days?
    B: Henry thinks that she's left town.
    C: a.   But she hasn't. I saw her yesterday in the supermarket.
           b.   No, he doesn't. He told me he saw her yesterday in the supermarket.

The MPU in (16B) is the proposition of *that*-clause as it directly provides an answer to the question in (16A). While it is possible to reject this proposition as an explanation, we still do not reject the utterance as a whole. However, when the main clause proposition is denied, the whole claim is rejected. Therefore, even though the MPU is in the embedded clause, the speaker commits to the proposition in the main clause, and this kind of commitment accompanies assertion.

2.3.2   Assertion and At-issueness

Another way of avoiding the standard problems of the presupposition-assertion distinction is the notion of 'at-issueness'. 'At-issue' is a kind of meaning necessary to distinguish in order to account for the fact that it is possible to get projection with propositions that are not presupposed. Namely, it has been noted that propositions which do not contain old, background information are able to project, i.e.

survive under the syntactic scope of entailment canceling operators and in entailment canceling context (Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 1990; Potts 2005; Roberts 2006; Roberts, Simons, Beaver & Townhauser 2009). As the family of sentences tests are normally taken to detect presupposed meaning, either the definition of presupposition as old/background information is wrong, or these tests target different kinds of meaning, and we can no longer maintain that correlation between survival under embedding and presupposition is absolute.

Potts (2005) was the first to use the label '(not)at-issue' in his analysis of appositives, which are not presupposed/contain new information, but still project, unlike true assertive content. This is illustrated with appositive relative clauses, as in (17) from Chierchia & McConnel-Ginet 1990. In (27b), the appositive clause contains new information (as the person 'Jill Jenson' has been introduced in the discourse for the first time) and cannot be considered to be presupposed in this context. Yet, the appositive clause shows typical projection behavior in all the familiar tests (18).

(17)
    a.   Let me tell you about Jill Jenson, a woman I met while flying from Ithaca to New York last week.
    b.   Jill, who lost something on the flight, likes to travel by train

(18)
    a.   embed under negation:
        Jill, who lost something on the flight, doesn't like to travel by plane.
    b.   embed under interrogation:
        Does Jill, who lost something on the flight, like to travel by train?
    c.   embed under a modal:
        Jill, who lost something on the flight, might like to travel by train.
    d.   embed in the antecedent of a conditional:
        If Jill, who lost something on the flight, doesn't like to travel by train, she should buy a car.

Despite their ability to project, non-restrictive clauses cannot be treated as presupposed, as they (typically) deliver new information, and in that sense cannot be considered part of the common ground. Potts (2005) argues that appositive material *must* include new information, and that they must obey the antibackrounding requirement, which is typical of asserted content.

(19)
    Lance Armstrong survived cancer.
    # When reporters interview Lance, a cancer survivor, he often talks about the disease.
                                                    (Potts 2005)

Appositives are not asserted either.A standard test for assertion is direct response/denial, which cannot target non-at-issue material.

(20)

      Edna, a fearless leader, started the descent.

      #Edna is not a fearless leader

<div align="right">(Potts 2005:111)</div>

The main test for at-issueness is direct denial (Roberts et al. 2009, Beaver et al. 2009), as it identifies the speaker's commitment to a proposition. If replying with 'no' can deny the truth of the clause, the proposition in it is at-issue. If direct denial does not affect the truth of the clause, the proposition is non at-issue.

(21)

      Jill, who lost something on the flight, likes to travel by train

      A: #No (that's not true). She didn't lose something on the flight

      B: No (that's not true). She doesn't like to travel by train.

Non-direct responses, such as the 'Hey, wait a minute' test (Shanon 1976, von Fintel 2004), are typically taken to identify pragmatically presupposed material (as opposed to semantic presuppositions and assertions), as in (22), where the response can only target the presupposition of the sentence (i.e. that some mathematician proved the Goldbach's Conjecture) but not its assertion (i.e. that this mathematician was a woman).

(22)

      A: The mathematician who proved Goldbach's Conjecture is a woman.

      B: Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that someone proved Goldbach's Conjecture.

      B': # Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that that was a woman.

<div align="right">(von Fintel 2004)</div>

The same test, as well as other indirect response types (e.g. hedge such as 'Well...', 'Actually...', as pointed out by Koev (2013), can also be used as an indirect rejection of non at-issue content.

(23)

      Jill, who lost something on the flight, likes to travel by train.

      A: Hey, wait a minute! She didn't lose anything on the flight.

So, it is clear that appositives/appositions are exceptional in that they share both properties of presupposition (projection, indirect responses only) and assertion (antibackgrounding, new information).

2.3.2.1 Discourse topic approach to at-issueness

One property of at-issue material, as carrying the main themes of a discourse (Potts 2005: 7) is elaborated further in Roberts et al. 2009 and Simons et al. 2010, in the discourse topic approach,

according to which the discourse status of semantic content is best captured in its relation to the main topic of conversation. Roberts (1996) offers a model of information flow in discourse, according to which the main role of discourse is information exchange. The felicity of an utterance is constrained by the so-called intentional structure of discourse exchange. Roberts assumes that two basic discourse moves (essentially, speech acts) are questions (which establish immediate discourse goals) and assertions (which lead towards the accomplishment of these goals). Assertions are subject to Gricean Relevance constraint as they need to address the question established as the immediate goal of the discourse. This question is the current Question Under Discussion, or QUD. And assertions need to be relevant to the QUD.

(24)   **Relevance to the QUD**

a.   An **assertion** is relevant to a QUD iff it contextually entails a partial or complete answer to the QUD.

b.   A **question** is relevant to a QUD iff it has an answer which contextually entails a partial or complete answer to the QUD.

Relevance of at-issue content to the QUD is best tested via the yes/no question associated with a proposition (?p, or 'whether p').

  "A proposition p is at-issue relative to a question Q iff ?p is relevant to Q" (Simons et al. 2010: 317).

To show how an at-issueness test works, I will present two examples from Antomo 2012. The utterance in (25) contains the embedded clause which projects (p= *Marge had her hair done*). It can be assumed that QUD is the reason for Marge's being angry, and that A's utterance provides an answer to it.

(25)
        QUD: Why is Marge so angry?
        A: Homer didn't notice that she got her hair done.

To test the contribution (relevance) of the proposition in the embedded clause, it needs to be established whether the question ?p = *Did Marge get her hair done?* has any complete or partial answer relevant to the QUD. In (21) it does not, and the proposition is not at-issue. Non-factive complement clauses, on the other hand, can entail an answer to the current QUD (the answer to ?p= *Will they be able to buy a car?* contributes to the QUD, i.e. reason for Marge's sadness). In (26A) then, the proposition in the embedded clause is relevant with respect to the QUD.

(26)
        QUD: Why is Marge so sad?
        A: Homer said that they won't be able to buy a car.

Non-restrictive/appositive clauses are not at-issue in the same way. Neither ?p = *Did Jill lose something on the flight*, with the answers p = *Jill lost something on the flight*, nor ¬p = *Jill didn't lose something on the flight*, entails an answer to the QUD, and consequently, the proposition is not at-issue.

(27)

      QUD: Will Jill take the car or will she take the train?
      A: Jill, who lost something on the flight, likes to travel by train.

Thus, what makes semantic content not at-issue is the fact that it does not address the QUD. In contrast, at-issue content has to address the QUD.

The discourse topic approach or relevance to the QUD also accounts for why non-at-issue content shows projection behavior. Unlike the CG approach, Roberts et al. (2009) argue that projection is not tied to presupposition but to discourse structure. Propositions/semantic material show projective meanings when they have a particular discourse status: they are not part of the main point, i.e. they are not-at-issue.[20] Assuming that operators such as negation target the main point of an utterance/the QUD, meanings, which are not part of the at-issue content, are ignored by operators and hence project.

(28)

      "<…> projection is a consequence of the scope of sentential operators such as negation,
      conditionals and modals typically being limited roughly to what is understood as the main point,
      or, in the terminology we will use, the at-issue content of the utterance. Whatever does not
      belong to the main point — the not-at-issue content — is left out of the scope of the operator,
      and hence projects." (Roberts et al. 2009).

(29)

      "Our hypothesis claims that material projects if and only if it is actually not-at-issue" (Roberts et
      al. 2009).

At-issue content is content that either addresses the QUD or raises another QUD which is relevant to the present one, or is used to make a suggestion (via an imperative). Non at-issue content, on the other hand, is the additional material in an utterance, which, although it may be new and of interest to the interest, and as such may add to the information store of the addressee, it still does not move the conversation forward in the direction established by discourse goals.

At-issueness as defined on the discourse topic approach is not conventionally triggered but depends on the actual use in discourse. However, there are cases where the effect of conventional triggers of not at-issueness, such as appositives, can override the relevance of such propositions to the QUD. Thus, a non-restrictive relative clause cannot be felicitously uttered as an answer to QUD even if the content of the relative clause is at-issue (30).

---

[20] Roberts (1996) calls it 'proffered' content, which, like 'at-issue', helps to convey that hearers will expect this information to constitute the speaker's central message

(30)

    QUD: Why is Jill upset?/Did Jill lose something on the flight?

    A:.#Jill, who lost something on the flight, likes to travel by train.

The same holds for other types of clauses. Even though the proposition of the embedded clause (that it is raining) is directly relevant to the QUD, still the whole utterance as an intended answer is unacceptable (31).

(31)

    QUD: What's the weather like?

    A: #Bob realizes/doesn't realize that it's raining.

Therefore, both non-restrictive and factive complements conventionally rule out at-issueness. However, in certain cases, utterances with projective meanings that can be used as relevant to the QUD are in fact possible. This is illustrated in (32), where the propositions of non-restrictive relative clauses seem to be able to provide answers to the QUD.

(32)

    QUD: Who's coming to the dinner tonight?

    A: Well, I haven't talked to Charles, who probably won't be able to come, but I did talk to Sally, who is coming.

To account for such cases, Simons et al. (2010) revise the original definition of at-issueness (33), and propose that the crucial point in examples such as (32) above is the lack of the speaker's intention. Namely, in such cases the content of the p= Charles won't be able to come and p=Sally is coming is not intended by the speaker as an answer to the QUD. Therefore, Beaver et al. propose a more complex (and less clear-cut, in their own admission) characterization of at-issueness which now include the intention of the speaker.

(33)   REVISED DEFINITION OF AT-ISSUENESS (Simons et al. 2010: 323)
    a.   A proposition p is at-issue iff the speaker intends to address the QUD via ?p.
    b.   An intention to address the QUD via ?p is felicitous only if:
        i. ?p is relevant to the QUD, and
        ii. the speaker can reasonably expect the addressee to recognize this intention.

Thus at-issueness is determined by speaker intention, which is constrained by (a) the relevance to the QUD, and (b) the need for the addressee to be able to recognize the intention. Simons et al. assume that such cases arise when a proposition is 'linguistically' marked as being not at-issue: "if some proposition is linguistically marked as not-at-issue, then, as long as the resulting interpretation is felicitous in other respects, the addressee will take it that the speaker does not intend to address the QUD via that proposition." (Simons et al. 2010: 323). In (26), the fact that the propositions potentially relevant to the QUD are delivered by appositive relative clauses (which are now seen as conventional

markers of non-at-issueness) serves as an indication to the addressee to treat them as not-at-issue in the speaker's utterance.

2.3.2.2 The update-type of approach to at-issueness

Koev (2013, 2018) points out that relevance to discourse topic (the QUD) is just one approach to at-issueness. In fact, at-issueness can be also captured in terms of Stalnakerian discourse model, i.e. via properties of associated with assertion. Koev (2018) conveniently uses two characterizations of at-issue content from Potts to illustrate the point. At-issue can be seen as (i) content that "carr[ies] the main themes of a discourse" (Potts 2005: 7, which reflects the discourse topic approach), and as (ii) content that speaker is "most expecting to have to negotiate with their interlocutors before it is accepted into the common ground" (Potts 2007: 666). Koev (2013) calls the latter view the 'update approach' to at-issueness.

The update approach takes as central Stalnaker's definition of the act assertion as a two-stage process which consists of a proposal and an acceptance.

> "An assertion can then be understood as a **proposal** to alter the context by adding the information that is the content of the assertion to the body of information that defines the context, or equivalently, by eliminating from the context set—the set of possible worlds available for speakers to distinguish between—those possible worlds in which the proposition expressed in the assertion is false." (Stalnaker 1999: 99)
>
> "[...] the addressee **accepts** or **rejects** the proposal either adding the content of the assertion to the contextual information, or leaving the context as it was [...]." (Stalnaker 1999:102)

AnderBois et al. (2010), in their analysis of the contribution of appositives (typical non-presupposed, not-at-issue content) to CG update, propose that both at-issue and not-at-issue asserted content update the context set, only the at-issue content does so indirectly (with the addressee's approval), while the non-at-issue content does so directly (without the addressee's approval). So, whereas main clauses introduce proposals that can be accepted or rejected by the addressee, appositive content comes with an instruction that it should be directly added to the context set (and no direct responses are felicitous). The difference in information status between regular asserted content and appositive content boils down to a difference in update type.

The update approach to at-issueness is most clearly distinguished from the discourse topic approach in Koev 2013. Following up on Stalnaker's (1978, 1999) view of assertion, Koev takes that the basic notion is that of an update proposal, or a proposition which a discourse participant (the speaker or the hearer) has publicly committed to. A proposal counts as accepted if the context set has been updated with it, and it counts as rejected if there is a counterproposal to it. Accordingly, at-issue content is a proposal that has been introduced but has not yet been accepted or rejected at the given stage of the conversation. Koev (2013) points out two important consequences of this definition. First, at-issue content is not an absolute notion but is relative to the given stage of the conversation. Second, it helps us divorce not-at-issue content from conventional marking, because now content can simply be not at-issue at a given stage just because it is no more at-issue at that stage. Both of these assumptions are necessary in order for him to account for why the not-at-issueness of appositives changes when an appositive relative clause is in the clause final position.

2.4   Pragmatic presupposition and givenness

Finally, we need to see how pragmatic presupposition correlates with the IS notion 'givenness', as both, broadly speaking, rely on the knowledge states of the participants in the discourse and the cognitive status of elements in the discourse. Despite the problem of 'informative presupposition' and the fact that assertive propositions need not contain new information, still, at the core of the distinction between presupposition and assertion is the opposition between givenness and non-givenness/newness (in whatever relevant sense or perspective). If one treats propositions as discourse entities, whose cognitive states are directly or indirectly indicated by certain word order patterns, it would be useful to see how referentially simpler discourse entities (nominal expressions) behave in the discourse context, i.e. how the notions of givenness and newness are mapped on them, and what characterizations and descriptions of 'being new/given' in discourse apply in those cases.

As pointed out by Prince (1981), the distinction between 'given' and 'new' discourse states has been stated in several different terms. For Clark and Haviland (1977), the distinction between given and new is in terms of shared knowledge: given is the information that the speaker believes the listener already knows and accepts as true, whereas new is that information which the speaker believes that the listener does not yet know (Clark and Haviland 1977: 4). Chafe (1976) explains the opposition between given and new in the sense of cognitive activation/salience: "Given (or old) information is that knowledge that the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance. So-called new information is what the speaker assumes he is introducing into the addressee's consciousness by what he says" (Chafe 1976: 30). Kuno (1978) argues for the distinction between given vs. new in the sense of predictability/recoverability: "An element in a sentence represents old, predictable information if it is recoverable from the preceding context; if it is not recoverable, it represents new, unpredictable information"(Kuno 1978: 282–283).

Prince (1981) argues that none of the explanations of the given/new distinction – either in terms of cognition (the cognitive state of the interlocutors) or in terms of discourse status on the basis of the immediate context - is sophisticated or elaborate enough to cover all the instances of the interpretations given/new. She proposes a scalar model in which features 'given' and 'new' are further subcategorized. In her model, three pragmatic states are distinguished: (i) new, (ii) inferable, and (iii) evoked. Each is further subdivided. The notion of 'newness' covers (a) brand new items, or items whose existence in the mental world of the listener is being created at the time of the utterance, and (b) 'unused' items which are 'known' to the hearer but not activated at the time of utterance. Brand-new referents can be (i) 'anchored' or (ii)'unanchored', depending on whether or not a brand-new item is linked/anchored to another entity that is not brand-new itself. This occurs e.g. in the case of modified NPs like *a person I know* or *a girl I work with*.

On the opposite end of the scale are entities already evoked in the discourse model. They can be (i) evoked textually, i.e. they are explicitly mentioned in the previous context, or they are (ii) evoked situationally, e.g. when they refer to the interlocutors themselves, or to referents which are salient in the communicative situation.

In between the two are the so-called inferable entities. An inferable entity is a referent that may be inferred by the addressee from other information that has already been given Inferables are new in the

discourse model, in the sense that their existence has not been given prior to the utterance, but the addressee can logically infer the referent from other entities already evoked in the context. Here, one subclass is represented by the so-called 'containing inferables', i.e. by referents staying in a set-member relationship (*picnic supplies-beer*), and another one is formed by the so-called 'noncontaining inferables', i.e. by referents staying in an analogy relation to one another (*bus-driver; party-music,* etc.).

In Prince 1992, she refines the analysis and distinguishes between three types of new/old information:

DISCOURSE NEW vs. DISCOURSE OLD INFORMATION: "[A]n NP may refer to an entity that has already been evoked in the prior discourse-stretch, or it may evoke an entity which has not previously occurred in the prior discourse-stretch." (Prince 1992: 7)

HEARER NEW vs. HEARER OLD INFORMATION: "Information, by which is here generally meant 'entities'/referents, may be old/new with respect to (the speaker's beliefs about) the hearer's beliefs." (Prince 1992: 6)

INFERABLE: "[W]hen a speaker evokes some entity in the discourse, it is often the case that s/he assumes that the hearer can infer the (discourse) existence of certain other entities, based on the speaker's beliefs about the hearer's beliefs and reasoning ability." (Prince 1992: 8)[21]

Birner 2006 extends and refines this analysis, particularly the status of inferable entities, which she classifies further into three types: (i) identity inference, (ii) elaborating inference, and (iii) bridging inference. Bridging inference is actually the type of information that is not predicted on Prince's account - 'discourse old/hearer new'. Birner argues that discourse old information can be 'old' via discourse-mention, but also by discourse-link and inferences such as part/whole, type/subtype, temporal precedence, entity/attribute, spatial proximity, and so on.[22]

---

[21] In (1), the NP 'the Bastille' is discourse new but hearer old for the addressee(s) (assuming that the denotation of 'the Bastille' is part of general knowledge for most speakers); 'the door' in the second conjunct is discourse old ('the door of the Bastille' in the first conjunct), and thus also hearer old. In (ii) however, 'the door' is discourse new, but still treated as known to the hearer, i.e. inferrable via being 'contained' in the discourse old 'the Bastille'.

(i) He passed by the door of the Bastille and **the door** was painted purple.
(ii) He passed by the Bastille and **the door** was painted purple.

[22] (i) illustrates identity inference, (ii) elaborating inference, and (iii) bridging inference.
(i) I told the guy at the door to watch out, but **the idiot** wouldn't listen. (Birner 2006: 38)
(ii) She got married recently and at **the wedding** was the mother, the stepmother and Debbie. (Birner 2006: 40)
(iii) Mary took the picnic supplies out of the trunk. **The beer** was warm. (Birner 2006: 40)

	Hearer-old	**Hearer-new**
Discourse-old	EVOKED: IDENTITY/ELABORATING INFERABLE (inferentially linked, and known to hearer)	BRIDGING INFERABLE (inferentially linked, not known to hearer)
Discourse-new	UNUSED (not referentially linked but known to hearer)	BRAND-NEW (not inferentially linked, not known to hearer)

Table 1. Birner's (2006: 45) taxonomy of given/new information

Another influential approach to givenness/newness is by Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski (1993), who propose six cognitive statuses (memory and attention states) of referring expressions, conventionally signaled by determiners and pronouns. These statuses are implicationally related in the Givenness Hierarchy (34).

(34) **The Givenness Hierarchy**

in focus >	activated >	uniquely familiar > identifiable >	referential >	type identifiable
it	*this/that/ this* N	*that* N	*the* N	indefinite *this* N	*a* N

The Givenness Hierarchy is originally proposed to account for the distribution and interpretation of referential/referring expressions, but Gundel (2003) points out that they could play a role in other aspects of language as well.

An attempt to apply the notions of cognitive/discourse statuses on propositions has been made by Dryer (1996), who discusses the cases of what he calls 'activated propositions'. He points out that the distinction between pragmatic presupposition and assertion goes beyond the strict definition in terms of 'shared beliefs' and 'common knowledge', and that notions such as 'activation' and 'representation' are also relevant.[23] Propositions do not only differ with respect to whether they are believed or not, but also whether and how much they have been activated before the utterance, and how they are represented in the mind of the speaker and the hearer. Dryer argues that something can be part of common knowledge/believed by the speaker and the hearer, and still be used as asserting because it has not been activated in the discourse at the point of utterance. With the parameter of mental representation, the notion of 'knowledge or shared knowledge' goes beyond including only those propositions that are believed.

In the discussion of the interpretations associated with Vn-Vf orders in embedded clauses, I will make recourse to these concepts and descriptions. Adopting a version of the cognitive/discourse status of

---

[23] Dryer's main concern is the proper characterization of non-focus in a simple sentence. He discusses pragmatic presupposition as relevant for the understanding of what the 'complement of focus' is.

terms/referential expressions makes it easier to discuss interpretational characteristics of a particular word order. The intention is not to make an explicit claim that propositions should be treated on a par with individual discourse referents, but rather to make use of correlations, which certainly can be found.

We will also rely on descriptions from other models of discourse structure, such as 'not-at-issue', 'not part of the main point' and 'no relevance to discourse topic', if they seem to be more appropriate in capturing the interpretational effects of non-fronted orders in temporal and embedded clauses.

2.5   Complement fronting as an embedded clause phenomenon in OE

Non-finite vP fronting is possible only in embedded clauses in OE. A very small percentage of main clauses exhibit the effect of having the finite verb (Vf) in the clause final position (according to Koopman 1995, figures across texts range from: 0.5 to 6 percent). The rather overwhelming presence of vP fronted/Vf-final word orders in embedded clauses, especially in certain texts such as Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, has been the main reason why Vf-final orders are taken to be a hallmark of embedded clauses, so that their syntax has often been characterized as head-final in the IP/TP domain (as in van Kemenade 1988 or Pintzuk 1991, a.o). On this view, orders such as (35a) are default/base word order, while ( ) were seen as being derived via rightward movement of the non-finite VP (Verb Projection Raising; van Kemenade 1988) or as indicating an alternative base order with a head-initial IP/TP (Pintzuk 1990). Orders such as (35b) are then either derived by a rightward movement of the non-finite verb material (Verb Projection Raising, van Kemenade 1988) or they illustrate the option of having an alternative head-initial base order (Pintzuk 1990). On the uniform head-initial approach of Biberauer and Roberts 2005, the two orders in embedded clauses arise due to the two ways the relevant features of T (EPP and D)are satisfied. The preferred pied-piping or vP movement option, yields (35a), while the non-pied-piping options or DP movement to Spec, TP creates (35b).

(35)

a.	S (O) Vn Vf	base order or preferred vP movement to Spec, TP
b.	S Vf (O) Vn	Verb Projection Raising or DP movement to Spec, TP

Any analysis of the variation in (29) needs to capture the fact that orders such as (29b) resemble main clauses, where vP fronting is generally disallowed. The question of the status of embedded clauses with non-fronted vPs (non-Vf-final) gained special attention after Pintzuk's influential proposal that they reflect a competing syntactic option: head-initial IP/TP. So, while the head-final IP/TP is truly asymmetrical with main clauses with respect to the position of the finite verb, the head-initial IP/TP is symmetrical. Head-initial TPs, according to Pintzuk, have one more feature of matrix clauses– they allow topicalization in their left-periphery.

The asymmetry between matrix and embedded clauses in terms of the position of the finite verb is not as neat as one might expect from a comparative Germanic view. The first complication for OE is that it is not a V2 language. In main clauses, the position of the finite verb is not the same in operator contexts (questions, negative and *þa/þonne* clauses) and topic-clauses (clauses with fronted objects or

adjuncts). While the first type of main clauses shows the V2 effect and subject-verb inversion across the board, in topic clauses, V2 is observed only with nominal subjects, while pronominal subjects yield the V3 effect. This forces the assumption that in such sentences the verb is in a lower position than in the operator contexts. Subject-initial main clauses introduce further complications in having not only pronouns but also certain adverbs causing the 'verb-lower' effect. Crucially, only pronouns and certain adjuncts are allowed to intervene between the clause initial XP and the fronted finite verb, and in reality the verb is rarely lower than V3 and occasional V4 position.

(36)

    a. XP_{topic} S_{pro} V_f

    b. XP_{topic} O_{pro} Vf S_{NP}

    c. S_{NP} O_{pro} V_f

Embedded clauses with fronted finite verbs, on the other hand, allow more material to intervene between the subject and the finite verb, and often the finite verb is adjacent to the non-finite verb, which is taken to be in its base position.

(37)

    $NP_{subject}$ XP_1 XP_2 XP_3 Vf Vn

When it comes to embedded topicalization, Pintzuk (1991) shows that some OE embedded clauses allow topicalization *coupled with* V2. These are the orders where the fronted XP and the fronted verb yield subject-verb inversion. Pintzuk then proposes that 'XP-Vf-Subject' orders are true instances of embedded topicalization of the kind found in main clauses. The only difference, obviously, is that V2 occurs below CP (as C-head is filled with an overt complementizer).

Van Kemenade (1997) raises concern about the identification of these instances of subject-verb inversion as 'embedded (V2) topicalizations'. She points out that the subject-verb inversion with fronted topics in embedded clauses is restricted to 'unaccusative verbs' (passives, impersonal constructions, and ergative verbs, such as 'come', 'go', 'burst', etc.). These verbs are special in that the syntactic subject/the nominative argument is merged in the position within VP other than the one reserved for agentive subjects (SpecvP), and is simply not forced to target the higher subject position, SpecTP (or SpecSigmaP on van Kemenade and Milićev's 2005/2012 analysis).[24] Subject-verb inversion observed in embedded clauses is then not the result of topicalization+verb movement, but rather an effect of a different syntactic configuration.[25]

---

[24] To these, I add verbs of saying/communication and certain experiencer verbs (such as 'hear', 'love', etc.), which can also keep their nominative arguments low. I remain neutral as for whether this special behavior stems from their special syntax.

[25] Even if we treat adjunct fronting as cases of topicalization, examples such as (i), where a transitive verb is inverted with the agent subject are extremely rare, if not exceptional.

(i)

    and he him cwæð to andsware

    'and he said to him in answer

þæt	naht	eaðe	**ne**	**mihte**	*ænig*	*camplic*	*meniu*	swilc	weorc	tobrecan
that	not	easily	not	might	any	armed	multitude	such	work	break

The restriction on subject-verb inversion in embedded clauses is even more obvious if we look for cases of V2 without topicalization. As pointed out by Haeberli (1999), the word orders whereby the fronted verb immediately follows the complementizer, are non-productive in OE.

(38) *complementizer Vf

Even though embedded clauses lack the main clause type of topicalization, some of them still allow nominal objects and adjuncts to be found in the left-periphery, namely preceding the pronominal subject.

2.5.1 Embedded topicalization in OE

Let us now consider the cases of embedded topicalization in more detail. As embedded topicalization is rarely accompanied by verb movement, the only diagnostic for topicalization in embedded clauses will have to be the movement of the nominal object across a pronominal subject. As pronominal subjects almost categorically occupy the highest position in OE embedded clauses (cf. van Kemenade & Milićev 2005/2012), instances where a nominal object precedes a pronominal subject can be viewed as mirroring the situation in main/root clauses, and such orders qualify as ERP.

(39) complementizer –XP – pronominal subject

In Milićev 2018, I show that in OE embedded topicalization is restricted to certain types of clauses. We find it in complements of bridge verbs[26] (*cwæðan* 'say', *tiðian* 'grant', etc.), comparative *swa*-clauses, extent clauses, licensed by *swa* 'so' or *swylc* 'such', *to ðan* 'to such an extent' and a degree phrase, as well as in clauses introduced by *forðæm/for þan þe* 'because' (similar observation for the special behavior *forðæm/for þan þe* clauses have also been noted in Koopman 1992 and Kroch & Taylor 1997).

(40)

a.   &   he   þæt   swa   gelæste,   þæt **þone dæl** he   Wilferðe   biscope

mid	swa	wundorlicum	hefe
with	such	wonderful	weight

that not easily could an armed multitude break in pieces such a   work of such wondrous weight'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Martin]:1235.6780)

---

[26] The following set of verbs take root-like complements: *secgan* 'say', *cyðan* 'say, make known', *tellan* 'tell, reckon, announce', *geuðan* 'grant, allow, give; wish, desire', *tiþian* 'grant, allow', *getacnian* 'mark, indicate, denote, signify, demonstrate, express', *seon* 'see', *ongietan* 'understand', witan 'know'. Even though 'bridge verbs' always escape any semantic classification (cf. Heycock 2005), we can quite clearly observe that OE bridge verbs most commonly include verbs of communication and perception.

	and	he	that	so	performed	that	the	part	he	Wilferth	bishop

for	Gode	gesealde
for	God	gave

'and he did it so, that he gave that part to Bishop Wilferth for God'

(cobede,Bede_4:18.306.25.3110)

b.	ne	hi	na	mare	don	ne	mihton,	buton	**bitere**	**tearas**	hi	simle
	nor	they	not	more	do	not	might	except	bitter	tears	they	always

aleton
shed

'nor could they do anything anymore, except that they always shed bitter tears'

(cosevensl,LS_34_[SevenSleepers]:35.28)

c.	Ac	he...	bebead ...	þæt	**þa**	**þing,**	**þe**	**hi**	**gesawon,**	hi	no	nanum
	and	he ...	ordered ...	that	the	things	that	they	saw	they	not	to-no

men	ne	asædon
men	not	said

'and he ordered that they didn't tell anyone about the things they had seen'

(cogregdH,GD_1_[H]:9.59.28.574)

d.	Nu	ge	secgað	þæt	**þæt**	ge	geseon
	now	you	say	that	that	you	saw

'now you say that you saw that'

(cowsgosp,Jn_[WSCp]:9.41.6592)

e.	forþon þe	**manega**	**tintrega**	hie	þe	on	bringað
	because	many	punishments	they	you	on	bring

'because they bring many punishments on you'

(coblick,LS_1.2_[AndrewMor[BlHom_19]]:237.140.3041)

What is interesting is that 'true' instances of OE embedded topicalization are found in typical environments for ERP in other (Germanic) languages. It most often occurs in complements of non-factive verbs and causal (because-) clauses. Degree clauses have also been noted to allow ERP (cf. for example de Haan 2001 for Frisian).

Embedded argument topicalization across the nominal subject, on the other hand, is available in more clause types, albeit under various restrictions regarding predicate types or preferentiality of the arguments. Still, two clause types seem to be most sensitive even to this relaxed view of topicalization: conditional and temporal clauses. This is not surprising, as, temporal and conditional clauses across Germanic languages are most resistant to ERP. Their general intolerance of ERP is often correlated to their semantic/pragmatic status of being presupposed or lacking 'assertion'/'assertion-like' features.

The role of assertion in the availability of ERP was first proposed by Hooper and Thomson (1973) in their Assertion hypothesis:

> As a positive environment we can say that [root] transformations operate only on Ss that are asserted. …some transformations are sensitive to more than just syntactic configurations. (Hooper and Thompson 1973: 495)

According to this view then, temporal and conditional clauses represent 'true' embedded clauses, with special syntax, semantics and pragmatics that make them 'truly' asymmetric to main clauses. And if vP fronting is a 'true' embedded clause phenomenon, temporal and conditional clauses are the contexts where vP fronting should take place the most. Conversely, when vP fronting fails to take place, this would make these clauses more 'main-clause like'. In that respect, the *lack* of vP fronting would count as a root phenomenon.

2.5.2 Conditional and temporal clauses as embedded domains which are least like main clauses

Strong resistance to ERP such as argument topicalization and the presence of speaker-oriented (SOA) and modal adverbs in temporal and conditional clauses has been addressed by Haegeman in a number of papers (Haegeman 2003, 2009, 2010).

Haegeman (2003) first observes that argument topicalization and modal adverbs are impossible in some conditional and temporal clauses, but allowed in other classes introduced by the same subordinator *if* and *while*. This is illustrated in the examples (41-44) (taken from Haegeman 2003: 332 and Haegeman 2006: 1652).

(41)
   a. *If **these exams** you don't pass, you won't get the degree.
   b. If his **SYNTACTIC analysis** we can't criticize, there is a lot to be said against the SEMANTICS of the paper.

(42)
   a. If it (***probably***) rains you may get wet.
   b. If you are **probably** going to move soon, there's no point in getting a broadband connection at home.

(43)

    a.   *While **her book** Mary was writing this time last year, her children were staying with her mother

    b.   While **YOUR book** they are using in two courses, MINE they haven't even ordered for the library.

(44)

    a.   *John works best while/when his children are **probably** doing some homework.

    b.   John is currently doing a Ph.D. in linguistics, while/when his daughter is **probably** going to study medicine.

Haegeman then argues that embedded argument topicalization and SOAs are possible only in special types of conditional and temporal clauses, which she labels **peripheral** conditional and temporal clauses. The environments blocking embedded argument topicalization and SOAs are **central** conditional and temporal clauses. The 'dual' nature of temporal and conditional clauses has long been recognized in the literature. Conditional clauses have been known to have two types, according to their contribution relative to the main clause: *event-conditionals* and *premise-conditionals*. While event-conditionals structure the event of the main clause, premise-conditionals structure the discourse, as they 'bring to the fore a proposition that is available in the discourse background' (Danckaert & Haegeman 2012: 5).

(45)

We are seeing a fall in the incidence of crime, particularly serious crime, and I think we're right to say "What's going on?" **If crime is falling**, why are we seeing a continuing rise in the prison population? (Guardian, 01.11.01, page 2, col 6)

<div align="right">Haegeman (2010: 615)</div>

It is also well-known that many clauses with temporal conjunctions can express non-strictly temporal meanings: the conjunction *while* can indicate that the main clause event is co-temporal with the event in the temporal clause it introduces, but it can also introduce an assertion which needs to be interpreted in parallel with the assertion of the main clause (similarly to 'whereas'). The temporal and concessive/contrastive *while*-clauses are illustrated in (46)

(46)

While_conc the lawsuit [challenging the legitimacy of lethal injection; LH] probably won't stop the use of lethal injection altogether, it will certainly delay its use **while_temp** the supreme court decides what to do. (*The Guardian* G2, 12.12.2003, p. 4, col. 4)

<div align="right">(Haegeman 2009:199)</div>

Central and peripheral clauses differ in their external syntax in the following way: central clauses are merged early in the derivation, as matrix vP adjuncts, while peripheral clauses are merged late in the derivation, as matrix CP adjuncts. The difference in the timing of their merger comes with a set of prosodic, semantic/pragmatic and syntactic differences (internal syntax).

As for the difference in the internal syntax of central and peripheral clauses, Haegeman (2009, 2010) assumes that the absence of argument topicalization and speaker-oriented modality is due to their blocking effect on operator movement which takes place in central temporal and conditional clauses. Specifically, she follows the line of research according to which temporal clauses are derived by the movement of an operator from the clause internal position to the left periphery (left of the canonical subject position) (cf. Haegeman 2009 and references there), and proposes that central temporal clauses involve movement of a temporal operator from TP domain to a position to SpecCP (seen as a clause-typing position).

If operator movement in temporal clauses is what blocks argument topicalization, for instance, then the same reasoning can be extended to conditional clauses. Haegeman (2010) points out that Bhatt and Pancheva (2006) offer an account on which conditional clauses too are derived by movement of an operator to SpecCP. They specifically propose that conditionals contain a World variable ('w'), which needs to be locally bound (this explains the absence of low construal with conditionals, unlike with temporal clauses, cf. Larson 2004). Hence, conditional clauses are interpreted as free relatives being definite descriptions of possible worlds (Bhatt & Pancheva 2002: 15; 2006: 655)). A conditional clause such as (34a) would be derived by the leftward movement of a World operator (47b):

(47)
a.   If John arrives late
b.   [CP **OP$_w$** C° [John arrives late **in t$_w$**]]

(Bhatt & Pancheva 2002: 15; 2006: 655)

A similar proposal is found in Arsenijević (2006, 2009), who analyzes conditionals as restrictive relative clauses, whereby the proposition in the conditional clause restricts the set of worlds compatible with the proposition in the matrix clause. In the syntax, modification applies via the functional projection WorldP, which specifies the truth value of clauses as [actual] and [possible],
.
For central conditional clauses, Haegeman (2010: 606) assumes that the relevant operator originates in MoodP$_{irrealis}$, with values [real]/[unreal], (cf. Cinque's (1999) hierarchy of functional projections), and from there it moves to the left-periphery in conditional clause (crucially, above MoodP$_{speech-act}$). Any material found in the area left of MoodP$_{irrealis}$ (speech act adverbials, evaluative adverbials, evidential adverbials and epistemic adverbials) will block this movement (48).

(48)   *[**MoodP**_{speech act} > MoodP_{evaluative} > MoodP_{evidential} > ModP _{epistemic} >

$$\text{TP}_{(Past)} > \text{TP}_{(Future)} > \text{OP } \textbf{MoodP}_{\textbf{irrealis}}$$

⟵───

If operator movement is what limits the presence of argument topicalization and modal/speaker-oriented adverbials in central adverbials, for peripheral adverbials, consequently, either (a) there is no operator movement, or (b) the operator is different.

Arsenijević (2018) offers an analysis of adverbial clauses which can also help us understand better why temporal and conditional clauses are set off from the rest of adverbial clauses. Arsenijević proposes that all embedded clauses are in fact relative clauses, only in adverbial clauses they relate to the 'topic situation' of the main clause. He follows the view that speech-acts are about situations, and proposes that speech-acts are about 'topic situations'. 'Topic situations' are distinguished from 'described situations', which correspond to the eventuality projecting the clause. Topic situation is represented as a situation variable, which is the argument of the speech predicate. Speech-act predicate then 'performs an operation on the relation between the topic situation and the described situation.
Arsenijević proposes that conditional, counterfactual, cause and concessive clauses all have the implication relation (p→q) from the proposition in the subordinate clause (p) to that of the matrix clause (q), and that particular values of five different properties can derive all the specific interpretation of these clause types (Arsenijević 2018: 6-7).

- **restrictive vs. non-restrictive** nature of the situation-relative,
- **the status of the implication**: is it asserted or presupposed, and is its antecedent matched with or excluded by the subordinate clause,
- **the match with the antecedent of the implication**: whether the subordinate clause presupposes it to be false, asserts it, negates it, or modally addresses it,
- the relation between the proposition in the subordinate clause and **the actual situation**: no commitment, presupposition of falsity, assertion of truth, assertion of falsity or assertion of possibility, and
- **exhaustive relevance** of the antecedent of the implication.

We will not deal here with how these five properties work independently or jointly to derive the interpretation of each clause type (for this we refer the interested reader to Arsenijević 2018: 8-19). We will only point out that other clause types differ from conditional clauses in that they are *non-restrictive* situation relatives with *their own* speech-act predicates and topic situations (which are *anaphorically* related to the topic situation in the main clause), as they *presuppose* the implication relation (p→q) and *assert* that p and q are true or false in the actual situation. On the other hand, subordinate conditional clauses are restrictive situation relatives, and the topic situation in the main clause is a free variable (hence generically interpreted). When the conditional clause modifies the generic situation in the main clause, the matrix proposition is generically asserted ('it is generally a property of described situations'),. in the domain of the restricted topic situation (for the situations in which the subordinate proposition obtains') (Arsenijević 2018: 4).

It is clear that conditional and temporal clauses have enough semantic, syntactic/pragmatic properties that differentiate them from other subordinate clauses. This fact, coupled with the observation that across Germanic languages temporal and conditional clauses do not exhibit main clause properties (ERP), will be taken as the main motivation for choosing these two adverbial clause types as a testing ground for the effect of non-finite vP fronting and the absence of it.

2.5.3 Non-finite vP fronting in temporal and conditional clauses

As we view non-finite vP fronting independently of the exact position of the finite verb, we will not be concerned with the question whether some of the Vf-VPn orders involve some additional verb movement of the finite verb. We do assume that OE is uniformly a head-initial language, and that vPn-Vf orders are derived by non-finite vP fronting, and that Vf-vPn orders reflect the order where the vPn (to the exclusion of the subject) is in its base position (along with Roberts 1994, Biberauer & Roberts 2005, Struik and van Kemenade 2022).

I will argue that the presence or absence of non-finite vP fronting in temporal and conditional clauses indicates the discourse/pragmatic status of the propositional content of these clauses. I will make use of Stalnaker's notion of pragmatic presupposition. For presupposed propositions, I will take that they come in two ways: (a) previously accepted, when a speaker's utterance presupposes some proposition that is already established as mutually accepted within a conversation; what is presupposed is *in fact* preexisting common or 'mutual' knowledge' and (b) non-controversial, the case of 'informative presuppositions' which serve to introduce new information, and what is presupposed is *treated* as mutual knowledge for the purposes of the utterance, with the (intended) effect that the presupposition then becomes part of what is genuinely mutually know (essentially, accommodation) (this summary follows the one in Harvey 2015). I propose that the interpretation of vP fronted clauses is closest to that of being pragmatically presupposed in one of the two senses above. Conditional and temporal clauses without vP fronting will consequently be 'non-presupposed' or 'assertive-like'.

I will not assume that the word order *alone* corresponds to pragmatic presupposition or assertion, as conventional properties of embedded clauses surely influence how they are interpreted in relation to the main clause and the larger discourse context. After all, it is the conventional properties of temporal and conditional clauses that make them least like main clauses, as they regularly resist ERP and seem to have the most vP fronting. And it is exactly why these clause types are selected to test the hypothesis that vP fronting correlates with the presuppositional interpretation of this order. And it is exactly the right clause type where we can best see what happens when the syntax gives a different type of signal, the one leading to non-presuppositional or assertive-like interpretation.

Despite all the challenges noted in attempts to relate syntactic differences between main and embedded clauses in terms of pragmatic assertion or presupposition, the challenges lie in the strict binary relation between these notions, not in the assumption that their syntactic options correlate with their discourse/pragmatic status. The main question for vP fronting will be whether it affects the pragmatic status of the proposition directly or indirectly. When necessary, I will use the terms 'presupposition' and 'assertion' in a relative sense, with hedges such as 'presupposable' and 'assertive-like', and draw on other theories of discourse organization if this helps achieve a better description of the pragmatic status of relevant propositions in OE. The main goal here is to capture the interpretational/inferential

differences between the two word order options in OE, and subsequent work can address potential issues for the theory of discourse.

To test the hypothesis, we will first examine verb-final orders. Then, in Chapter 3, we will see what 'non-presupposed' propositional content correlates with, i.e. whether we can speak of assertion, MPU or at-issueness in such cases.

The distribution of verb-final (vPn-Vf) and verb non-final orders in conditional and temporal clauses is given in Tables 2.1 and 2.2.

Table 2.1: Vf-Vn and Vn-Vf orders in OE conditional clauses

	Vꜰ Vɴ	Vɴ Vꜰ
Cura Pastoralis	44	13
Bede's Ecclesiastical History	7	29
Lives of Saints	52	24
Catholic Homilies	67	37
Blickling Homilies	27	6
Orosius	0	6
TOTAL	197	115

Table 2.2: Vf-Vn and Vn-Vf orders in OE temporal clauses

	Vꜰ Vɴ	Vɴ Vꜰ
Cura Pastoralis	85	43
Bede's History	13	34
Lives of Saints	17	12
Catholic Homilies	79	64
Blickling Homilies	9	14
Orosius	12	25
TOTAL	217	235

Let us briefly comment on the corpus data choice. Clearly, I have not investigated all temporal and conditional clauses in the YCOE. Rather, I have focused on what I believe are the best representatives of different periods of OE, as well as different styles and genres. Bede, even though considered controversial due to the possible influence of Latin and the translation practice, still offers an excellent insight into the features of early OE narratives. Ælfric might seem to be over-represented by two large texts; however, it is important to point out that *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints* differ significantly in a number of syntactic features, which presumably reflect different ways of discourse organization.[27]

---

[27] The two texts, for instance, significantly differ with respect to subject-verb adjacency in main clauses, as well as the use of high discourse adverbs. As opposed to *Catholic Homilies*, which is similar to other OE texts in that subject-verb adjacency is the preferred option for pronominal subject only, and where high adverbs such as *þa* and *þonne* 'then' have primarily a discourse function, in *Lives of Saints* nominal subject-verb adjacency is as frequent as with pronominal subjects, and high adverbs are more used with a temporal sequencing function (cf. Milićev 2008). I take this to signal a change in the marking of discourse or IS-related relations. It remains to be established what other areas got affected, and what the change can be

The difference in figures in individual texts in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 should not be treated as a reflection of an ongoing syntactic change from Vn-Vf to Vf-Vn. For instance, if we only compare the figures from *Cura Pastoralis* and *Bede's (Ecclesiastical) History (of the English People)*, we can conclude that Vf-Vn order is preferred in *Cura Pastoralis*, whereas Vn-Vf is more used in *Bede's History*. However, as we will show later, the pragmatic interpretation of the two word order patterns is exactly the same in both texts. Also, consider the difference in preference for Vf-Vn order in conditional clauses, as opposed to temporal clauses in *Blickling Homilies*, or *Orosius*. To me, it seems more reasonable to attribute the differences to a different style, general theme of the discourse context, etc., rather than preferences in one or the other 'grammar'.

In other words, the speaker will present content which is new to the addressee as presupposed when he thinks the addressee can successfully 'come to know' that the speaker is presupposing p and that p is true, and consequently evaluate it appropriately (accept or reject it). If this analysis is on the right track, it will shed more light on the conditions of accommodation. Hopefully, we will be able to see how the speaker's expectations on what the addressee can accommodate actually work – what content can be treated as 'common knowledge' at the point of the utterance (and not necessarily before it) – what content can make the speaker assume that the CG will entail it, and the addressee will be able to infer this assumption, when the assumptions which need to be accommodated are uncontroversial, highly plausible and subject to no further debate. In that sense, informative presuppositions are non-at-issue content

2.6   Contribution of vP fronting to the presuppositional meaning of the propositional content in OE temporal and conditional clauses

Non-finite vP complement fronting is an indicator of the pragmatic contribution of the propositional content. Moving a non-finite vP across the finite modal or auxiliary in embedded clauses is an overt instruction that the content of the embedded proposition should be treated as 'pragmatically presupposed', i.e. as known/believed/given, uncontroversial. In addition, the syntactic marking of 'secondary meaning' or non-at-issueness is employed to direct the addressee that the content of the proposition is truly secondary in terms of relevance, something that is of little further interest for the discourse development.

In this section, I will go through a number of examples to show what meanings can be identified as presupposed and how they actually arise in a given context. Since the matter of pragmatic presupposition, or non-at-issue content, is far from being settled in the literature, some theoretical issues will have to be put aside in this investigation, even though the implications of my analysis of the OE data certainly should not be treated lightly.

Again, I need to point out what other idealizations are a necessary part of this investigation. vP fronting is treated as a unique syntactic phenomenon, i.e. we take that all clauses with the ordering vPn-Vf are syntactically derived in the same fashion. The details of their derivation are, however, far from being

---

attributed to. I suggest that the comparison between these two texts by the same author can be a solid starting point into the investigation of the possible change in how IS marking is reflected syntactically.

clear. The only syntactic restriction noted for these orders is that the non-finite verb needs to be adjacent to the finite verb. But, as we have stated earlier, the exact position of the finite verb, on the one hand, and the arrangements of elements in the non-finite vP, on the other, are still in need of a better understanding. The second idealization is that IS/pragmatic factors under investigation will not be significantly affected by the syntax/semantics of clauses with complex predicates, i.e. by the peculiarities of modal(-like) verbs and aspectual or passive auxiliaries. So the reader should bear in mind that the insights we arrive at actually hold for these contexts only, and that we then assume that they can be easily translated to clauses with 'simple' predicates.

Still, if I manage to show that the variation in the position of the finite verb relative to the non-finite vP in OE subordinate clauses is not free, nor does it reflect two competing grammars, but that it correlates with a specific type of interpretation of the propositional content, all the questions and shortcomings ignored or unaddressed can be dealt with in future work

I will assume that pragmatically presupposed propositions fall into the following categories: (a) 'given', i.e. mentioned earlier in the discourse; (b) inferable, and (c) plausible. The distribution of propositions with these characteristics is given in Tables 2.3 and 2.4.

Table 2.3: The interpretation of Vn-Vf orders in temporal clauses

	GIVEN	INFERABLE	PLAUSIBLE	UNCLEAR	Total
Bede's History	18	13	2	1	34
Cura Pastoralis	26	12	4	1	43
Lives of Saints	5	4	2	1	12
Catholic Homilies	18	32	14	-	64
Blickling Homilies	4	8	2	-	14
Orosius	12	11	-	2	25
	83	80	24	5	

Conditional clauses with Vn-Vf orders distinguish a group of propositions which, for the lack of better understanding, I will characterize as 'modality' propositions. These cases will be dealt with in more detail in Section 2.4.4.

Table 2.4: The interpretation of Vn-Vf orders in conditional clauses

	GIVEN	INFERABLE	PLAUSIBLE	MODALITY	UNCLEAR	Total
Bede's History	9	10	6	4	1	**30**
Cura Pastoralis	6	1	2	1	3	**13**
Lives of Saints	7	4	5	6	2	**24**
Catholic Homilies	15	9	7	5	1	**37**
Blickling Homilies	2	1	2	1	-	**6**
Orosius	2	2	1	1	-	**6**
	41	**27**	**23**	**18**	**7**	

In what follows I will provide illustrations for the interpretation of pragmatic presupposition I assume to hold in vPn-Vf orders. I will try to provide a balance between the requirement to be precise and to the point, for the sake of theoretically relevant assumptions, and the concern with the intricacy and multitude of the corpus data. Generally, the first concern will be given priority, and the illustrative examples I provide will be the ones that are most straightforward, take the least effort to process, and require no additional considerations. The corpus certainly includes more difficult cases, which will be ignored only for reasons of space and unnecessary complications which burden the ease of exposition. I need to emphasize this because I do not want to create an impression that things are as easy as they might seem. After all, there must be a good reason why the difference in the interpretation between these two word orders has been so difficult to uncover.

2.6.1 Given propositions

Pragmatically presupposed propositions are often directly linked to the content of the preceding discourse. In (49b), for example, the temporal clause essentially repeats the proposition that David had cut off a piece of Saul's coat, given two lines before (49a), with the addition of the perfect auxiliary *hæfde* 'had'.

(49)

a.
Sua	sua	Dauid	cearf	swiðe	digellice	suiðe	lytelne	læppan	of	Saules	mentle
so	as	David	cut	very	secretly	very	small	peace	of	Saul's	coat

his	ealdhlafordes,	sua	doð	ða	ðe	hira	hlafordas	diegellice	tælað [...]
his	liege-lord	so	do	those	that	their	lords	secretly	blame

'As David very secretly cut off a very small corner of Saul's coat, his liege lord, so do those who secretly blame their lords, and yet so that it does not injure or annoy them'

(cocura,CP:28.199.10.1334)

59

b.

Forðæm	hit	is	awriten	ðætte	Dauid,	ða	**he**	**ðone**	**læppan**	**forcorfenne**
therefore	it	is	written	that	David	when	he	the	piece	cut-off

hæfde,	ðæt	he	sloge	on	his	heortan
had	that	he	struck	on	his	heart

'Therefore it is written that David, when he had cut of the piece [of the coat], struck his heart, [and very bitterly repented ever having served him so unbecomingly, although his followers had advised him before to slay him with his sword. So let anyone forbear slaying his lord with the sword of his tongue]'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:28.199.16.1336)</div>

The event repeated in (49a) and (49b) is part of the episode from the Book of Samuel 24, which tells us how David, had the opportunity to kill Saul, who unknowingly entered the cave where David was hiding; but instead of killing Saul, David only cuts off a piece of his robe. The same event is delivered twice because of its two important aspects that can be related to people today. When people oppose their masters and decide to take action against them, they should be careful not to hurt the master (David only cut off a piece of Saul's robe, even though he had a chance to kill him). But even the smallest act of opposition comes with repentance, which is exactly what happened to David after cutting off a piece of Saul's robe – it hit his heart and he repented for not being faithful to Saul).

The same can be observed in (50). The event of Elfwin (king Egrid's brother) being killed is first introduced, or asserted in the main clause (50a), and then repeated in the embedded clause (50b). In Prince's terms, these propositions are textually evoked, i.e. explicitly mentioned earlier in the discourse. The reason for delivering the same content again is obvious: now it is found in the temporal clause and serves the purpose of providing the temporal reference point for the addressee to correctly identify the 'aforesaid battle'.

(50)
a. þa wæs ofslegen in þæm gefeohte be Treontan þære ea Ælfwine Ecgfriðes broðor þæs cyninges, geong æðeling eahtatynewintre.
'Then in the battle near the river Trent, **Elfwin, brother to King Egfrid, was slain**, a youth about eighteen years of age'

<div align="right">(cobede,Bede_4:22.324.15.3253)</div>

b.

In	þæm	foresprecenan	gefeohte,	þa	Ælfwine	þæs	cyninges	broðor
in	the	aforesaid	battle	when	Elfwin	the	king's	brother

ofslegen	**wæs,**	wæs	sum	gemyndelic	wise	geworden...
slain	was	was	some	memorable	event	happened

'In the aforesaid battle, wherein Elfwin, the king's brother, was killed, a memorable fact is known to have happened, [which I think ought not to be passed by in silence]'

<div align="right">(cobede,Bede_4:23.326.1.3259)</div>

Conditional clauses show the same. In (51), the conditional is counterfactual. The content of this proposition - Mary not being martyred bodily - has been explicitly given earlier in the discourse model, and the proposition in the conditional *gif*-clause can be delivered as pragmatically presupposed.

(51)

a.　The blessed Mary **was** not slain **nor martyred** bodily, but spiritually. When she saw her child taken, and iron nails driven through his hands and through his feet, and his side afterwards wounded with a spear, then was his suffering her suffering; and she was then more than a martyr,

b.

ðon	þe mare	wæs	ða	hyre	modes	þrowung	þonne	wære	hyre	lichoman:
for	greater	was	then	her	mind's	suffering	than	was	her	body's

gif	heo	**gemartyrod**	**wære**
if	she	martyred	were

'for her mind's suffering was greater than her body's would have been, had she been martyred.'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_9:254.174.1724)

The proposition of the conditional *gif*-clause in (52b) virtually repeats the proposition given two lines before (52a).

(52)

a.

Hi	axodan	þa	heora	witan	hwæt	him	wislicost	þuhte,	hu	him
they	asked	then	their	wisemen	what	them	wiser	seemed	how	them

to	donne	wære	embe	þæt	halige	scrin,	hwæðer	hi	hit	ham
to	do	were	about	the	holy	shrine	whether	they	it	home

asendon,	oððe	hi	hit	hæfdon	þar	leng
sent	or	they	it	had	there	longer

'They then asked their wisemen what was wiser for them to do about the holy shrine, whether they should send it home or they should keep it there longer'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_22:249.3420)

b.

gif	ge	þæt	halige	scrin	ham	**sendan**	**wyllað**,	ne	sende	ge	hit	na
if	you	the	holy	shrine	home	send	will	not	send	you	it	not

æmtig,	ac	arwurðlice	mid	lacum
empty	but	reverently	with	gifts

'If you want to send the holy shrine home, do not send it empty, but reverently, with gifts'

(coaelhom/ÆHom_22:252.3422)

The effect of givenness, naturally, goes beyond the simple word-by-word repetition of a proposition. A proposition can be d-linked in other ways as well. Consider (53), where the proposition that Christ was about to ascend to heaven has already been added to the CG by virtue of the deverbal NP 'the holy ascension of our Lord' a few lines earlier.[28] The temporal clause takes this event and adds the modal *wolde* 'would' to indicate the co-temporality of his followers coming to him before ('as he was about') to ascend to heaven.

(53)

a. þonne sceolon we nu hwylcum hwego wordum secggan be **þisse halgan drihtenlican upastigennesse**, þa we nu on andweardnesse weorþiað.
'We must now in few words tell you of **the holy ascension of our Lord** that we at this present time are celebrating

(coblick,HomS_46_[BlHom_11]:117.10.1477)

b.

þa	halwendan	men	cwædon,	&	þa	geleafsuman,	þa þe	to	urum	Drihtne
the	holy	men	said	and	the	believing	who	to	our	Lord

coman	þa	**he**	**to**	**heofonum**	**astigan**	**wolde**,
came	when	he	to	heaven	ascend	would

'The holy and believing men who came to our Lord as he was about to ascend to heaven questioned [and asked him as follows…]

(coblick,HomS_46_[BlHom_11]:117.14.1481)

A similar situation obtains in (54). The deverbal NP *þa bote* 'the reparation' in the immediately preceding context facilitates the pragmatic presupposition of the conditional clause with the proposition of us repairing (*gebetan*) various distresses in our fellow beings.

---

[28] Note that the NP itself is introduced as definite. This is not only because this event is surely part of every Christian's shared knowledge, but also because it is the topic of the chapter called 'Ascension Thursday' and because *Blickling Homilies* deal primarily with the time of Lent.

(54)

Swa	we	sceolon	eac	gif	bið	an	ure	geferena	on	sumere	earfoðnysse.
so	we	shall	also	if	is	one	our	fellows	on	some	distress

ealle	we	sceolon	his	yfel	besargian	&	hogian	ymbe	þa	**bote**
all	we	shall	his	evil	lament	and	mediate	about	the	reparation

gif	**we**	**hit**	**gebetan**	**magon.**
if	we	it	repair	may

'[If one limb be diseased, all the others suffer with that one.] So also should we, if one of our fellows be in any distress, all lament his evil, and meditate concerning its reparation, if we can repair it'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_19:334.238.3817)

A given event is also commonly expressed in the presupposed clause by using a synonymous expression. This is the case in (55). The verb used in the preceding discourse is *aræran* 'raise', and in the repeated proposition, it is replaced by the synonymous verb *edcwician* 'quicken, revive, restore to life'.

(55)

a. Then appeared there Christ's Angel, and **raised the youth**,

b.

And	he	arn	þærrihte	ut,	þa	he	geedcucod	wæs,	clypigende	ofer	eall...
and	he	ran	immediately	out	when	he	revived	was	crying	over	all

'And he immediately ran out, when he was revived, crying everywhere…'

(coaelive,ÆLS[Agnes]:202.1850)

What makes the conditional clause presupposed in (56b) is the proposition given in (56a): mankind being fully leprous with divers sins in 'the inward man'; the *gif*-clause delivers the same content by changing 'the inward man' to 'soul' and 'be with' to 'seized with'.

(56)

a. In a spiritual sense this leper betokened all mankind, which was foully leprous **with diverse sins** in the **inward man**; but it inclined to the belief of Christ, and wisely conceived that it could not receive a cleansing of the soul, save through the Lord, who wrought no sin, nor was any guile found in his mouth. Loathsome is the body of the leper with many ulcers and tumors, and with divers scabs;

b. | ac | se | inra | mann | þæt | is | seo | sawul | bið | micele | atelicor |
    |-----|-----|-------|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|-----|--------|----------|
    | but | the | inward | man | that | is | the | soul | is | much | more-loathsome |

gif	heo	mid	mislicum	leahtrum	**begriwen**	**bið**.
if	she	with	diverse	sins	seized	is

'but the inward man, this is the soul, is much more loathsome, if it is seized with diverse sins'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_8:242.44.1430)

The pragmatically presupposed clause is often a paraphrase of the event/proposition introduced earlier. In (57) the proposition that Christ would become man is a paraphrase of the assertion from two sentences before – that Christ assumed the mortal life (as opposed to the immortal life), since being mortal is a property of men.

(57)

a. The one life is mortal, the other immortal. But Jesus **came and assumed the one life,** and made manifest the other. The one life he manifested by his death, and the other by his resurrection. If he to us mortal men had promised resurrection and life eternal, and yet had not been willing to manifest them in himself, who would have believed in his promises?

b. | Ac | þa ða | he | man | **beon** | **wolde** | þa | gemedemode | he | hine sylfne. |
    |-----|-------|-----|-----|----------|-----------|------|------------|----|--------------|
    | but | when | he | man | be | would | then | humbled | he | himself |

eac	to	deaðe:	Agenes	willan...
also	to	death	of-his own	will

'But **when he would become man,** then he also voluntarily humbled himself to death, [and he arose from death through his divine power, and manifested in himself that which he had promised to us]'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_15:304.126.2856)

The conditional clause from Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* can illustrate the same. The event of the sinful turning to Christ is introduced in the preceding sentence (in the conditional clause). The conditional clause in the following sentence expresses the same, only by using different lexical material (*gebugan to Criste* 'turn to Christ' – *gecyrran* 'turn/convert').

(58)

a. Now are the Jews and the shameless traitor who plotted against him, guilty of Christ's death… and none of them shall ever come to Christ's kingdom, unless they have repented of it **and turn to Christ (*gebugan to Criste*)**.

b. | Swa | milde | is | se | hælend | þæt | he | miltsian | wolde | his | agenum |
    | so | merciful | is | the | Saviour | that | he | mercy | would | his | own |

| slagum | gif | hi | **gecyrran** | **woldon**, | and | biddan | his | miltsunge, |
| murderers | if | they | turn | would | and | bid | his | mercy |

'The Saviour is so merciful, that he would have mercy upon his own murderers if they would turn and pray for his mercy'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Exalt_of_Cross]:181.5659)

The effect of givenness can also be observed when the author shifts from delivering a direct quote back to narration. This often happens in *Cura Pastoralis*, for instance, where the discussion of topics concerning moral and religious issues is always supported with a quote from the Old and New Testaments. One such case is the sentence in (59), where the author summarizes what Solomon said regarding 'the lovers of strife', and tries to clarify why Solomon refers to them as apostates and how they are related to the fallen angel, i.e. Satan.

(59)

a. Those who sow strife are to be admonished in one way, in another the peaceful. The lovers of strife are to be admonished to consider whose followers they are. Of the expelled angel it is written in the Gospel that be sowed the weed in the good fields. Therefore it was said of him "An enemy of ours did this." Of the same enemy's members is thus spoken through Solomon: "An apostate is always useless, and goes with perverse mouth, and winks with the eyes, and treads with the foot, and speaks with the finger, and does evil with perverse heart, and is always sowing strife."

b. | Her | we | magon | gehieran, | **ða** | **he** | **be** | **ðæm** | **wrohtgeornan** | **secgean** |
    | here | we | may | hear | when | he | about | the | strife-lover | speak |

| **wolde**, | ðæt | he | hine | nemde | se | aworpna; |
| would | that | he | him | called | the | apostate |

'In this passage we can bear how, when he wished to speak of the lover of strife, he called him the apostate'

(cocura,CP:47.357.22.2429)

2.6.2 Inferable propositions

Pragmatically presupposed propositions are also those propositions that are inferable from the context. The key ingredient here is the relation between something mentioned earlier on the basis of which a proposition can be logically inferred as being presupposed, or added to the CG as bringing no essential update.

I will assume that such propositions behave as discourse entities identified by Prince as inferables. In other words, the pragmatic state of such propositions resembles the one of inferable referents. Recall that discourse-familiarity can be determined by a) prior evocation in the discourse; b) inferability based on the prior discourse; c) recency of mention within the discourse. According to Prince (1981), inferables is a category that is technically inactivated (not explicitly evoked in the context) but can be identified by an addressee through its relationship to an activated element or another inferable. Referents of inferable expressions, although not present in the addressee's current consciousness, are pragmatically accessible and easier to activate than referents of non-inferable inactivated elements. Typically, the addressee can infer the discourse existence of the referent of an inferable via some independent logical or culture-based assumptions.

I believe that presupposed propositions can also be such discourse entities. Specifically, propositions can be delivered as pragmatically presupposed by virtue of being inferable if the speaker assumes the hearer can infer it, via logical or plausible reasoning, from discourse entities already evoked or from other inferables.

Inferential relations (that is, relations between the inferable constituent and information in the preceding discourse) are commonly assumed to include relations such as part/whole, entity/attribute, type/subtype, possession, set/subset, temporal ordering, and spatial proximity, or analogy (cf. Birner 2006). This is so with individual discourse referents. When it comes to propositions, matters become more complicated because of the more complex meanings expressed by propositions, compared to those of individual discourse referents. Still at the core of the relation between the proposition and the prior discourse is logical consequence. If sentence X is a logical consequence of a set of sentences K, then we may say that K implies or entails X, or that one may correctly infer the truth of X from the truth of the sentences in K (Matthew McKeon, Logical Consequence, *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* http://www.iep.utm.edu/logcon/*, retrieved on August 22, 2013*). However, the relation of logical consequence assumed to license certain propositions as presupposed is not a formal logical relation, but rather includes extra-linguistic, empirical knowledge.

Let us now go through some typical cases of what I believe include inferable propositions. The first set involves what I broadly call completion of an event mentioned earlier in the discourse. The inference of the completion of an event is influenced by extralinguistic factors such as general knowledge of the world (of human interaction, perception of time, social norms and practices, and so on).

Propositions expressing that an order given in the prior discourse has been carried out can be considered inferable, given that the context establishes that the execution of such orders is non-controversial, nor subject to uncertainty. Such propositions then are not to be added to the CG as update. So, the proposition in the temporal clause in (60b) - that Stranguilio and Dionysias were brought to the king Apollonius - is delivered as pragmatically presupposed, since the speaker can safely assume that the hearer/reader would be highly unlikely to doubt that in this context the king's order for the two men to be brought to him would not be respected.

(60)

a.	and	het	sona	gelæccan	Stranguilionem	and	Dionisiadem	and
	and	ordered	soon	seize	Strangulio	and	Dionysias	and

lædan	beforan	him
led	before	him

'and immediately ordered Stranguilio and Dionysias to be seized and led before him where he sat on his throne'

b.	ða ða	hi	**gebrohte wæron**,	þa	cwæð	he	beforan	ealre	þare	gegaderunge
	when	they	brought were	then	said	he	before	all	the	assembly

'When they were brought, then he said before all the assembly...'

<div align="right">(coapollo,ApT:50.5. 530-531)</div>

Similarly, the proposition in the temporal clause in (61) that the army (including the speaker, the subject 'we') had encamped is not asserted, since, based on the fact that the order for the army to rest and encamp has been added to the CG in the preceding line, the speaker assumes that the addressee will be able to accommodate it as part of the CG due to the high plausibility that in the military system orders are usually respected and executed.

(61)

Mid þy	we	ða	**gewicod hæfdon**	ða	wolde	ic	minne	þurst	lehtan
when	we	then	encamped had	then	would	I	my	thirst	relieve

&	celan.
and	quench

'After we had encamped there, I wanted to quench my thirst'

<div align="right">(coalex,Alex:13.3.105)</div>

Such propositions are typically associated with temporal clauses, but conditional clauses are also found to express inferable propositions. Consider (62), where the conditional clause in (62b) expresses the speaker's conviction that the request given in (62a) would be carried out.

(62)

a.	frægn	hine	þa	geornlice,	hwonon	he	wære
	asked	him	then	eagerly	from-where	he	was

'[The earl..] eagerly asked him of what origin he was'

b.　ond　him　wæs　gehatende,　þæt　he　him　noht　laðes　ne　yfeles　gedon
　　and　him　was　promised　that　he　him　nothing　harmful　nor　evil　do

　　wolde,　gif　he　him　þæt　hluttorlice　**gecyþan wolde**,　hwæt　he　wære.
　　would　if　he　him　that　clearly　say　would　what　he　was

'and promised him that he would do no harm or evil to him if he ingeniously told him who he was'

<div align="right">(cobede,Bede_4:23.328.17. 3297-3298)</div>

Propositions expressing completion of a communicative event are also inferable from the context. In (63 & 64) we see that such propositions usually follow direct speech segments (where the communicative content is expressed): completion of speech (63); completion of reading a message/letter (64).

(63)

a.　Then said our Saviour… [Quote.]

b.　&　þa　he　þis　**gecweden hæfd**e,　þa　astah　ure　Drihten　on　heofenas.
　　and　when　he　this　said　had,　then　rose　our　Lord　to　heavens

'When he had said that, our Lord ascended to heaven'

<div align="right">(coblick,LS_20_[AssumptMor[BlHom_13]]:149.191.1832)</div>

(64)

a.　"Wherefore then, you worshipful king, if you want to know now what was done concerning Christ in the land of Judea, order Pilate a letter to be brought to you…'

　　And he then commanded it to be brought and to be read before him. And it read thus: 'Pilate greets Claudius…"

b.　þa sona þa　þæt　gewrit　**aræded wæs**,　þa　cwæþ　Neron,　Saga　me,　Petrus
　　as soon as　the　letter　read　was,　then　said　Nero　tell　me　Peter

'As soon as the letter was read, then said Nero, 'Tell me, Peter…'

<div align="right">(coblick,LS_32_[PeterandPaul[BlHom_15]]:177.127.2268)</div>

Completion of a planned activity is another case of information that can be taken for granted. If the discourse establishes that one seeks learning (65a), the proposition that he ends up as 'well learned' can be quite easily inferred.

(65)

a. Se ærra wæs Æðelwines broðor Gode þæs leofan weres, se seolfa eac swilce þære æfterfylgendan eldo Hiberniam gesohte **fore intingan godcundre geleornunge.**

'The former [Etheihun] was Ethelwin's brother, a man loved by God, who also afterwards went over to Ireland to study [sought Ireland for the sake of religious learning]'

b.
Ond	þa	he	**wel**	**gelæred**	**wæs**,	þa	hwearf	he	eft	to	his	eðle
and	when	he	well	learned	was	then	returned	he	back	to	his	country

'Having been well instructed, he returned into his own country'

                                                                (cobede,Bede_3:19.242.13. 2473-2474)

Completion of transitory states, such as drunkenness, and its passing off in (66b), can be also said to be easily inferable.

(66)

a. Therefore, the woman called Abigail very laudably concealed the folly of her drunken lord, who was called Nabal,

b.
&	eft,	ða	him	ðæt	lið	**gescired**	**wæs**,
and	afterwards	when	him	the	drunkenness	passed	was

'and afterwards, when his drunkenness had passed off…'

                                                                (cocura,CP:40.295.4.1942)

We also find presupposed propositions whose content comes as a logical consequence based on the knowledge of the physical world. Thus, for example, if something is brought to someone's eyes, one can infer that it will be seen.

(67)

a. 'They are also to be admonished to bring the sins they have committed indefatigably before their mind's eye,

b.
&	ðonne	hi	hi	**gesewene**	**hæbben**,	gedon	ðæt	hie...
and	when	they	them	seen	have	prevent	that	they

' and when they have seen them, to prevent them being seen at the severe examination'

                                                                (cocura,CP:53.413.14.2850)

If the discourse establishes that someone cannot stand, it is likely that they might fall (68).

(68)

…ðætte	ða	ðe	gestondan	ne	meahton,	gif	hi	**afeallan**
that	those	that	stand	not	could	if	they	fall

scolden,	ðæt	hi	afeollen	on...
should	that	they	fall	on

'that those who could not stand, if they had to fall, might fall on the soft bed of marriage, not on the hard earth of fornication'

(cocura,CP:51.397.19.2701)

Inferable propositions are also those that involve the so-called verbs of creation. I will assume the following characterization of such predicates: verbs of creation generally denote coming into being of the referent of their direct internal argument as a result of the event named by them (Piñón 2008). The description is broad enough to include verbs of (human) coming into existence, which are of relevance here, without necessarily implying the creationist view of the world.

As the arguments of creation verbs are familiar from/given in the preceding discourse, the event of their coming into existence is delivered as presupposed/inferable, i.e. need not be asserted. This is regularly the case with the following predicates: *beon gesceapen* 'being created', *beon acenned* 'being conceived', *beon geboren* 'being born'. The interpretation of such propositions as presupposed is consistent with all clause types (69b), i.e. they always show up in the Vn-Vf orders.

(69)

a.

þæt	wæs	siþþan	**Crist**	**geboren**	**wæs**	þæt	we	wæron	of	ælcum
that	was	after	Christ	born	was	that	we	were	of	each

þeowdome	aliesde
slavery	released…

'It was after Christ was born that we were released from slavery…'

(coorosiu,Or_5:1.114.2.2372)

b.

him	wære	betere	þæt	**he**	**næfre**	**geboren**	**nære**.
him	were	better	that	he	never	born	not-were

'It would have been better for him if he had not been born'

(coblick,HomS_8_[BlHom_2]:25.198.341)

However, if the predicate, such as 'being born', contains information that cannot be taken to be inferable from the mere existential introduction of the referent (being born in a certain 'non-default' way), the proposition is delivered as non-presupposed. More details are given in Chapter 3.

The proposition of someone (existentially introduced in the CG earlier) being born is delivered as presupposed, with vPn-Vf orders even in main clauses. In the main clause in (70), the proposition of the bishop Felix being born and raised in the Sabinian tribe is added to the CG as presupposed, while the communicative intention of the sentence is emphasis (also indicated by the sentence initial adverb *soþlice* 'indeed, verily').

(70)

Soþlice	þæs	arwyrðan	lifes	wer	Felix	þære	cæstre	biscop	Portuensis,
indeed	this	of-honorable	life	man	Felix	of-the	city	bishop	of-Portuensis

in	Sabinensi	þære	mægþe	**geboren**	**wæs**	&	afeded.
in	Sabines	the	tribe	born	was	and	brought-up

'Indeed, this man of honorable life, Felix, the bishop of the city of Portensis was born and raised in the tribe of Sabines'

(cogregdC,GDPref_and_4_[C]:53.340.12.5138)

Also, propositions containing predicates which refer to stages of man's life (being a child, growing up, reaching maturity, growing old) are also delivered as inferable. Note that (71) also exhibits the effect of givenness, since the period of being a child is equated with the period of a person's baptism.

(71)

a.   Let us be mindful of what we promised to God at our baptism

b.

Nu	cweþst	ðu.	hwæt	behet	ic	**ða ða**	**ic**	**cild**	**wæs**	and	sprecan
now	say	you	what	promised	I	when	I	child	was	and	speak

ne	mihte?
not	could

'Now you say,' What did I promise when I was a child, and could not speak?"

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_3:26.246.630)

(72)

ac	þa	**he gewexen**	**wæs**,	ða	wilnode	he	&	onfeng	munuchade
but	when	he grown-up	was	then	wanted	he	and	received	monastic-life

'but when he was grown up, he wanted a monastic life, and he took it up'

(cobede,Bede_4:28.360.25.3625)

(73)

þa ða	he	**geðogen**	**wæs**.	þa	com	him	to	Godes	bebod...
when	he	grown-to-maturity	was	then	came	him	to	God's	commandment

'When he was grown to maturity, God's commandment came to him [that he…]'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_3:19.20.451)

(74)

Iohannes	ða ða	he	**gestiðod**	**wæs**	ða	wolde	he	forbugan	ða
John	when	he	grown-up	was	then	would	he	eschew	the

unðeawas	þe	menn	begað
vices	that	men	commit

'John, when he was grown up, would eschew the vices which men commit'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_3:19.14.444)

(75)

&	ðus	cwæð,	þæt	he	ða	geta	nolde	his	synna	ondettan,	ac
and	thus	said	that	he	then	yet	not-would	his	sins	confess	but

eft,	**ðonne**	**he**	**eldra**	**wære**
later	when	he	older	were

'And said that he wouldn't confess his sins then yet, but later when he was older'

(cobede,Bede_5:14.438.7.4390)

Events can be inferred based on the knowledge of customs. If someone's death has been the subject of the preceding discourse (76a), being buried afterward (76b) needs no special assertion.

(76)
a.   When he heard these words, he fell down and departed...

b.

ða þa	he	**bebyrged**	**wæs**	þa	com	his	wif	Saphira:
when	he	buried	was	then	came	his	wife	Sapphira

'When he was buried, his wife Sapphira came'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_22:357.95.4400)

In the counts in Tables 2.3 and 2.4, all the propositions whose cognitive status is interpreted on the basis of extralinguistic knowledge are under the interpretation 'inferable' because the trigger for the activation of this knowledge is more or less explicitly present in the discourse. Without it, propositions are counted as 'plausible' (Section 2.4.3).

72

The relation of logical consequence can be observed when the proposition delivers an event which is a precondition for the event given in the immediately preceding discourse. If, after a fight, someone needs to surrender (become someone's slave), then the proposition that they could not defeat their enemy is logically inferable.

(77)

&	þa	he	þærto	com,	he	wæs	VI	dagas	on	þa	burg	feohtende,
and	when	he	thereto	came	he	was	six	days	on	the	city	fighting

oþ	þa	burgware	bædon	þæt	hie	mosten	beon	hiera	underþeowas,
till	the	citizens	bade	that	they	must	be	their	slaves

þa	hi	hie	**bewerian**	**ne**	**mehton**.
when	they	them	defend	not	could

'And when he came there, he was fighting for six days, until the citizens bade that they be their slaves, when they could not defend themselves'

(coorosiu,Or_4:13.112.16.2352)

A somewhat more complex case is given in (78). Even though the possibility of the English accepting the Christian religion (the content of the conditional clause) has not been explicitly discussed in the immediate discourse segment, the information exchanged up to that point ensures that the speaker can safely assume the hearer to be able to accommodate it as part of the CG. In other words, if Augustine and his monks have been sent to England for the purpose of spreading Christianity in England, if, furthermore, Augustine has been appointed future bishop, from the perspective of the pope who initiated their mission, and the narrator who is relating his perspective, the English receiving their teaching in no way updates the CG.

(78)

Ond	þa	sona	sendon	Agustinum	to	þæm	papan,	þone þe	him	to
and	then	soon	sent	Augustine	to	the	pope	who	him	to

biscope	gecoren	hæfde,	gif	**heora**	**lar**	**onfongen**	**wære**,	þæt	he
bishop	chosen	had	if	their	teaching	received	was	that	he

scolde	eaðmodlice	for	heo	þingian	þæt	heo...
should	humbly	for	them	obtain	that	they

'And then soon they sent back (to the pope) Augustine, who had been appointed to be consecrated bishop in case their teaching was received [by the English], that he might, by humble entreaty, obtain of the Holy Gregory, that they should not be compelled to undertake so dangerous, toilsome, and uncertain a journey'

(cobede,Bede_1:13.56.6.521)

Finally, let us emphasize that in principle very few propositional contents alone are enough for the proposition to be strictly logically inferable from the context surrounding it. Inferability, even in the loose sense assumed here, definitely plays a role, but the question remains whether this is a sufficient condition for a proposition to be treated as pragmatically presupposed. It is still in essence the speaker's decision or estimation that he can plausibly assume that the hearer will be able to integrate a proposition as part of the CG. Relations between the propositional content and the preceding discourse only facilitate this decision.

2.6.3 Plausible propositions

The interpretation of plausibility is probably the most difficult to prove since it is not related to any particular linguistic expression in the discourse, but rather relies on the general context (or topic of the discourse segment) and world knowledge. Plausible propositions are those that the speaker assumes to be non-controversial, valid, likely, credible and generally acceptable, and that the speaker, given the context up to that point or given the shared knowledge, will have no difficulty integrating them as such. Recall that non-controversiality is often taken to be one of the key ingredients of pragmatic presupposition (Soames 1982, Simons 2006:16, but also von Fintel 2000, 2008, Roberts et al. 2009).

Thus, what I call plausible propositions differs from inferable ones in that the latter can be directly linked to a specific linguistic expression in the preceding discourse. This expression helps the addressee to activate the logical (or plausible) reasoning, which facilitates the integration of propositions which the speaker delivers as presupposed. With plausible propositions, the speaker can only rely on his assumptions that in a given context, with a given topic of the discourse, the addressee will be able to accept the proposition as part of the CG.

The distinction between 'inferable' and 'plausible' propositions is not always absolutely clear, especially in cases where a proposition is deemed plausible based on a given context. Whether the distinction is needed at all (recall that in Prince's (1981, 1992) model, 'inferables' cover both) is a matter of further consideration. But for the purpose of providing a detailed description of the OE cases, I will keep these two apart.

On a broad definition, plausible equals accessible through encyclopedic knowledge. Let us see in more detail what typically counts as common/shared knowledge in OE texts, and, as such, underlies the cases which represent instances of plausible propositions. Most commonly, plausible propositions express (well-known) facts regarding religious beliefs and practices. The presence of plausible propositions in texts naturally correlates with style and intended audience. For instance, a rather overwhelming number of plausible propositions are found in *Catholic Homilies*. What makes these homilies different from others is the fact that the sermons in the collection are specifically aimed at 'the

more learned in his audience and readership' (Godden 1978). It is not surprising to find so many cases where the speaker/writer assumes common knowledge regarding basic matters of religion and religious life. Therefore, in religious texts, propositions such as us Christians wanting to have heavenly land (79), follow in Christ's footsteps (80), seek God's kingdom (81), people being fordone/doomed (82), Adam having sinned (83), Christians wanting to do good (84), God being willing to offer peace (85) and so on, can rather straightforwardly be argued to be plausible in that context.

(79)

þisum	heafodleahtrum		we	sceolon	symle	on	urum	ðeawum	wiðcweðan.
these	chief-sins		we	should	always	on	our	conduct	resist

and	ðurh	Godes	fultum	mid	gastlicum	wæpnum	ealle	oferwinnan.
and	through	God's	help	with	spiritual	weapons	all	overcome

gif	**we**	**ðone**	**heofenlican**	**eard**	**habban**	**willað**
if	we	the	heavenly	earth	have	will

'These chief sins we should ever oppose in our conduct, and with God's support overcome them all with ghostly weapons, if we are desirous to have the heavenly country'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_12.2:125.542.2752)

(80)

Ac	he	forbead	þæt	gewinn.	mid	wordum	ðearle.	þæt	nan	Godes
but	he	forbade	the	battle	with	words	strongly	that	no	God's

ðeow	ne	sceolde	on	him	sylfum	truwian	ne	mid	wæpnum	winnan
servant	not	should	on	him	self	trust	nor	with	weapons	strive

wið	woruldlicum	cempum	gif	**he**	**Cristes**	**fotswaðum**	**filigan**	**wile**;
against	worldly	soldiers	if	he	Christ's	footsteps	follow	will

'But he strongly forbade the contest of his words, that no servant of God should trust to himself, nor with weapons strive against worldly soldiers, if he will follow the footsteps of Christ'

(cocathom2, ÆCHom_II,_14.1:141.109.3122)

(81)

Gregorius	papa	us	sæde.	þæt	se	man	ðe	ða	micclan	feorme	worhte.
Gregory	pope	us	said	that	the	man	who	the	great	feast	made

is	ure	hælend	Crist.	se ðe	is	God	and	mann.	on	anum	hade.
is	our	saviour	Christ	who	is	God	and	man	on	one	person

se ðe	gearcode	ðurh	his	tocyme.	us	ða	ecan	feorme	on	his
who	prepared	through	his	advent	us	the	eternal	feat	on	his

rice	gif	**we**	**ða**	**gesecan**	**willað;**
kingdom	if	we	it	seek	will

'Gregory the pope has told us, that the man who made the great feast is our Saviour Christ, who is God and man in one person, who by his advent has prepared for us the eternal feat in his kingdom, if we will seek it'

(cocathom2, ÆCHom_II,_26:213.21.4720)

(82)

We	sceolon ….	geðancian	þam	heofonlican	fæder	gode	ælmihtigum.	þæt	he
we	should	thank	the	heavenly	father	god	almighty	that	he

wolde	asendan	his	ancennedan	sunu	to	ðysum	life	for	ure
would	send	his	only-begotten	son	to	this	life	for	our

alysednysse.	ða ða	**we**	**forwyrhte**	**wæron**;
redemption	when	we	fordone	were

'We should both believe God's wonders, and also with great love thank the Heavenly Father, God Almighty, for having sent his only-begotten Son to this life for our redemption, when we were fordone'

(cocathom2, ÆCHom_II,_1:10.272.234)

(83)

ða ða	**Adam**	**agylt**	**hæfde**.	ða	cwæð	se	ælmihtiga	wealdend	him	to…
when	Adam	sinned	had	then	said	the	almighty	ruler	him	to

'When Adam had sinned, the Almighty Ruler said to him'

(cocathom1, ÆCHom_I,_21:348.83.4165)

(84)

we	magon	on	þyssum	stowum ….	gode	&	medeme	weorþan	for	urum
we	may	on	these	places	good	and	moderate	be	for	our

Drihtne,	**gif**	**we**	**nu**	**soþ**	**&**	**riht**	**on**	**urum**	**life**	**don**	**willaþ.**
Lord	if	we	now	truth	and	right	in	our	life	do	will

'We may in these place... be good and moderate for our Lord, if we now will do truth and right in our life'

(coblick,HomS_46_[BlHom_11]:127.221.1597)

(85)

Ond	he	þa	gehet,	**gif**	**Drihten**	**him**	**sige**	**sellan**	**wolde**,	þæt	he
and	he	then	promised	if	Lord	him	peace	give	would	that	he

wolde	his	dohtor	Gode	forgeofan…
would	his	daughter	God	give

'He then promised, if Lord would give him peace, that he would give his daughter to God…'

(cobede,Bede_3:18.234.31.2402)

Plausibility or non-controversiality of a proposition can stem from the common or shared knowledge of certain social conventions, practices, and habits. Consider (86). The context preceding the conditional clause describes a Jewish custom. It can be assumed that it is common knowledge that customs should be respected, otherwise social repercussions (among them, reprehension) ensue, which people generally wish to avoid. Wanting to be without reprehension is thus safely used by the speaker as presupposed.

(86)

and	sceolde	ælc	ðe	inn	come	his	handa	aðwean.	ær ðan ðe	he
and	should	each	that	in	came	his	hands	wash	before	he

gesæte.	gif	he	buton	tale	**beon**	**wolde**;
sat	if	he	without	reprehension	be	would

'[The Jews were so accustomed that they set water-vessels on the floor at their entertainments;] and every one who came in must wash his hands before he sat, if he would be without reprehension'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_4:32.79.727)

Finally, let us point out one interesting effect observed with plausible propositions. Plausible propositions often have the effect of backgroundedness (in the sense of Hopper 1979). From the perspective of information packaging, the information of plausible/non-controversial propositions is somehow secondary to the discourse, and their content is never subject to further interest. Consider (81). Arguably, it is common knowledge that in the course of life, animals (elephants, in this particular case) may or may not become crippled, and that it can have an impact on their longevity. Since the crippling-of-elephants is of no significance to further discourse, the proposition is delivered as presupposed, with nothing in it that would require the hearer's attention. Even if the speaker is aware that the content of the conditional clause in (87) is, for some reason, unfamiliar to the hearer, he still chooses to treat it as part of the CG, also as a way to instruct the reader not to dwell on this information too long.

(87)

and	þreo	hund	geara	hi	libbað	gif	hi	**alefede**	**ne**	**beoð**
and	three	hundred	years	they	live	if	they	crippled	not	be

'and they live three hundred years, if they are not crippled'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Maccabees]:569.5202)</div>

Plausible propositions which do not contribute to future discourse have the property of not being at-issue. Recall that one feature of at-issue content is that it relates to the discourse topic identified by Question Under Discussion (Roberts 1996; Simons et al. 2010). Even though not-at-issueness is usually tied to conventional properties, at-issueness can is thought to involve the speaker's intention to use a proposition to contribute something relevant to the discourse. The same effect can be noted here. Even though the speaker knows that certain propositions contain information that essentially increases the hearer's knowledge about the sentence topic/subject (in the example above, the predicate presents the possibility of elephants being (or not being) crippled, and this is something new predicated of them), but, as it is secondary, if not irrelevant, for future discourse, it is not given as CG update. The hearer/addressee can easily accommodate new information via logical reasoning. In all the examples found, the information, even though novel in the discourse exchange to that point, is never controversial and the speaker can always safely assume that, given the discourse context and common/shared extralinguistic knowledge, the addressee can accept that the speaker utters them as being part of the CG.

2.6.4 Modality propositions' in conditional clauses

Conditional clauses distinguish a special type of case where pragmatic presupposition surfaces. These are propositions that generally express some kind of modality related to the main clause proposition. The conditional clause contains the lexical verb whose meaning expresses either deontic or epistemic modality.

Conditional clauses containing (mostly, but not exclusively, passive) verbs such as *aliefan* 'grant, permit' (88) or *geþafian* 'approve of, allow, permit' (89), hypothesize about the permission for the main event to be carried out.

(88)

a.   The Holy Ghost led Jesus to the waste, that he might be tempted there. Now everyone will wonder how the devil **dared** approach Jesus to tempt him:

b.

Ac	he	ne	dorste	Cristes	fandian	**gif**	**him**	***alyfed***	**nære**
but	he	not	dared	Christ	tempt	if	him	allowed	not-were

'but he would not have dared tempt Christ if it had not been allowed him'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_11:267.29.2006)</div>

(89)

Nolde	he	syllan	ealle	his	æhta	þeah þe	he	welig	wære,
not-would	he	sell	all	his	possessions	although	he	wealthy	was

wið þan þe	he	libban	moste,	gif	man	him	þæs	**geðafian**	wolde?
provided-that	he	live	must	if	one	him	this	permit	would

'Would he not sell all his goods, though he were wealthy, provided that he might live, if one would permit him this/if he was permitted?'

<div align="right">(coaelive, ÆLS[Ash_Wed]:117.2762)</div>

(90)

Hit	wære	gelimplic	gif	þises	dæges	scortnys	us	***geþafian***	wolde	þæt	we
it	were	suitable	if	this	day's	shortness	us	allow	would	that	we

eow	þæs	halgan	apostoles	Andrees	þrowunge	gerehton:
you	this	holy	apostle's	Andreas	suffering	expound

'It would be suitable, if the day's shortness would allow us, to tell you about the suffering of the holy apostle Andreas'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_38_[App]:531.1.7806)</div>

Epistemic modality is expressed by propositions containing predicates such as *beon* 'be', *weorðan* 'be, become' and the subject *hit* 'it' or *ðæt* 'that'.

(91)

a.
Cwæð	þæt	he	mihte	ða.	ma	ðonne	twelf	eoroda	heofenlicra	engla.	æt
said	that	he	could	the	more	than	twelve	legions	heavenly	angels	at

his	fæder	abiddan.	gif	hit	**weorðan**	ne	sceolde.	swa	swa	witegan	cwædon
his	father	ask	if	it	be	not	should	so	as	prophets	said

'Said that he could obtain from his father more than twelve legions of heavenly angels from his father, if it were not to be as the prophets said'

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_14.1:140.95.3111)</div>

b.
þa	wolde	Dionisius,	gif	hit	**gewurðan**	mihte,	þrowian	martyrdom
then	would	Dionisius	if	it	become	might	suffer	martyrdom

mid	þam	apostolum,
with	the	apostles

<div align="center">79</div>

'Then Dionisius would, if it could be, suffer martyrdom with the apostles'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Denis]:109.5847)</div>

c.

Ic	wolde,	gif	hit	swa	**beon**	meahte,	ðæt	ge	wið	ælcne	monn
I	would	if	it	so	be	might	that	you	with	each	man

hæfden	sibbe	eowres	gewealdes
had	peace	of-your	power

'I would, if it could be so, that you had peace with every man, as far as is in your power'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:46.355.18.2405)</div>

d.

oðþe	gif	ðæt	**beon**	ne	meahte,	þurh	ðæt	he	wolde	Rome	gesecan,
or	if	this	be	not	could	through	that	he	would	Rome	seek

&	ða	halgan	stowe	þara	eadigra	apostola...
and	the	holy	place	of-the	holy	apostles

'[There are also in the same parts many other nations still following pagan rites, to whom the aforesaid soldier of Christ designed to repair, sailing round Britain, and to try whether he could deliver any of them from Satan, and bring them over to Christ;] or if this could not be done, to go to Rome, to see and adore the hallowed thresholds of the holy apostles and martyrs of Christ'

<div align="right">(cobede,Bede_5:9.408.24.4114)</div>

Presuppositional interpretation also characterizes conditional clauses which hypothesize about carrying out an event, with the emphasis either on completion (*ðurhteon* 'accomplish') or performance (*don* 'do').

(92)

ond	hwæðere	ðæt	mod	hæfð	fulfremedne	willan	to	ðære	wrænnesse
and	although	the	mind	has	worked-out	will	to	the	lasciviousness

butan	ælcre	steore	&	wearne	gif	he	hit	**ðurhteon**	meahte.
without	any	restrain	and	hesitation	if	he	it	accomplish	could

'although the mind is altogether desirous of lasciviousness without any restraint or hesitation if he could accomplish it'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:11.73.3.481)</div>

(93)

Ac	hie	gecyðdon	raðe	þæs	hwelce	hlafordhyldo	hi	þohton	to
and	they	said	quickly	of-it	which	loyalty	they	thought	to

gecyþanne	on	hiora	ealdhlafordes	bearnum,	gif	hi	hit	**þurhteon**	**mehten**:
say		on	their	lord's	children	if	they	it	accomplish	could

<div align="center">80</div>

'And they quickly said which loyalty they thought to say on their lord's children if they could accomplish it'

<div align="right">(coorosiu,Or_6:37.155.18.3303)</div>

(94)

&	gif	hie	þonne	þis	**gedon**	**magan,**	þu	ongytest	þæt	hie	syndon
and	if	they	then	this	do	may	you	know	that	they	are

lease	&	unlærede	men
deceitful	and	unlearned	men

'and if they can then do this, you (will) know that they are deceitful and unlearned men'

<div align="right">(coblick,LS_32_[PeterandPaul[BlHom_15]]:183.202.2348)</div>

(95)

gif	**þu**	**þis**	**don**	**ne**	**miht,**	drece	us,	loca,	hu	þu	wylle.
if	you	this	do	not	might	afflict	us	see	how	you	will

'if you are unable to do this, torture us, see!, however so you will'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS[Agnes]:114.1793)</div>

What is common to most of these clauses (with the exception of (76)) is that they contain anaphoric reference to events or propositions, and the lexical verb provides modality- or aspectual-like perspective regarding the event or the proposition.

Why such clauses are commonly given as presupposed and why they do not update the CG cannot be accounted for in terms of a specific state either in the discourse or in the minds of the interlocutors. Instead, I hypothesize that the notion of relevance is the key reason why they are not seen as updates. For some reason, propositions containing notions of permission, ability, performance and completion regarding the event in the main clause do not contribute to the discourse topic and the development of discourse.

2.6.5 Summary of interpretations of conditional and temporal clauses with non-finite vP fronted orders

The results of our investigation of the interpretation of clause final orders in temporal and conditional clauses in six OE texts confirm our hypothesis that vP fronting indicates the pragmatic status of the propositional content. It has been shown that most vPn-Vf orders represent propositions which have the properties of pragmatic presupposition. They can be 'truly' present in the CG, or more precisely, their lexical core is backgrounded, with the only 'novel' information being tense/aspect/mood (TAM) features, and modality. Or the addressee can easily infer or accept that the speaker is treating them as part of the CG, either relying on the given or salient information or general knowledge.

To obtain more details in the description of the (pragmatic) presuppositional interpretation, I have used labels such as 'given', 'inferred' and 'plausible'. These terms are typically used in the description of states of discourse entities, and as I have used them here only relatively (and often with a slight modification of their core characteristics found in various theories of cognitive statuses of discourse referents), these labels should be interpreted only as a descriptive convenience. In other words, there is no significant difference between what I call 'given' and what I call 'inferable' in the overall interpretation of verb final/vP fronted orders.

The choice of temporal and conditional clauses, which are conventionally 'least main clause like' might seem to be biased, as presuppositional interpretation is given its best shot. However, the same clause types will have to be shown *not* to be pragmatically presupposed with Vf-VPn orders, which restores the balance in the explanation.

Note also that some of the vPn-Vf orders discussed above are found in peripheral conditional and temporal clauses (cf. Haegeman 2003, 2006, 2007). Peripheral clauses should be 'more assertive', yet, the discourse status of the proposition in them is not different from the one in central temporal and conditional clauses. This supports the hypothesis that the position of the finite verb relative to the non-finite vP does not reflect how the whole clause is integrated in the discourse, but rather what the discourse status of the propositional material is.

2.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have attempted to show that embedded clauses with the finite verb in the clause final position match the interpretation which is closest to that of pragmatic presupposition (as understood in Stalnaker 1973, 1974, 1978, 2002). As our primary concern here is not theoretical in nature (in the sense that we aim to advocate for one particular theory of discourse organization), we leave room that presupposition-as-common ground can share properties of 'not-at-issueness' and of 'not-being-MPU', as all three notions are non-assertive.

To isolate the role of the variation in the position of the finite verb, we have focused on the clause types which do not allow embedded root phenomena (ERP), such as embedded topicalization. In OE, these are temporal and conditional clauses. Having looked up the interpretations of temporal and conditional clauses, we show that in OE pragmatically presupposed embedded clauses are those whose content is given in the preceding discourse (either the whole proposition (or parts of it) is repeated or paraphrased), inferable or plausible from the preceding context (inferables rely on the linguistic context, while plausibles make us of extralinguistic/encyclopedic knowledge).

In addition to their truly being part of the CG status, pragmatic presuppositional readings arise when the speaker treats certain content as CG (most 'informative presuppositions' are found within plausible propositions). We have also seen that semantic factors also play a role. This is most evident with predicates carrying existential presupposition ('being born'), which are always given in the 'presuppositional order'. What we labeled as 'modality propositions', essentially conditional clauses which hypothesize about modality of the main clause event can also be said to be pragmatically presupposed due to the semantics of permission or performance related predicates.

Matching vP fronted embedded clauses with the pragmatic presuppositional interpretation of the semantic/lexical content may be an oversimplification of the role of non-finite verb fronting in embedded clauses in OE. First, it might create an impression that the speaker extensively uses given/backgrounded propositions, and in a way communicates discourse old material, thus violating the Gricean maxims of quantity or the requirement that the contribution is as informative as required (Grice 1975). Embedded clauses with fronted non-finite vPs are not fully uninformative; even when the eventuality of the non-finite vP is 'given' or 'evoked' in the preceding discourse, in most cases TAM and modality features on the auxiliary and the modal are novel. But this novelty is not enough to be seen as update. Still, the fact that OE texts generally do contain a lot of repetition must be related to specific broader communicative goals. Repetition and paraphrase are popular cohesive devices employed by the OE authors, which primarily serve the purpose of expressing parallelisms.[29]

Secondly, vP fronting does not only take place to mark that certain content is backgrounded/CG but also to indicate that secondary contribution of the embedded proposition in the utterance, or that the clause containing such propositions is both pragmatically and syntactically subordinate. And the ultimate question is why vP fronting is used as a syntactic option of marking such status. Clearly, vP fronting creates a structure where the position of the non-finite vP relative to the finite verb contributes to the interpretation of 'secondary contribution' or pragmatic subordination. The backgroundedness effect of the non-finite vP material is not just recorded but also instructed. OE texts show an overwhelming concern of the speaker/author that novel and primary contributions are clearly separated from old/backgrounded material and secondary contributions. All available IS/discourse marking devices will be employed for that purpose. The exact effect of non-finite vP fronting cannot be pinpointed without a comparison with the effect of non-fronting. The interpretation of word orders without non-finite vP fronting is the subject of the following chapter.

---

[29] Repetition is considered to be a feature of spoken discourse, while in the written discourse it is deemed acceptable only in certain types of written texts: legal register, poetry, dramatic writing or rhetorically oriented work (Bublitz 1992). However, both repetition and paraphrase in other types of written texts (e.g. narratives) are successfully used as devices that contribute to discourse cohesion.

3. NON-FRONTED VP ORDERS

In this chapter, we examine the hypothesis that non-verb-final orders crated by non-fronting of vP in embedded clauses reflect the change in the pragmatic status of propositions contained in them. As we have shown in Chapter 2 that there is enough ground to treat verb-final embedded clauses as pragmatically presupposed, non-verb-final embedded clauses would consequently have to be pragmatically non-presupposed, if not assertive (again, assuming that we can speak of 'weaker' types of assertion without crucially undermining the definition of assertion). Using the same type of embedded clauses (temporal and conditional) as a corpus sample, we will test whether 'assertion' is indeed what underlies their interpretation.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 3.1 describes the interpretations observed in the Vf-VPn orders in temporal and conditional clauses, and identifies focus as the key factor in the speaker's choice not to front the non-finite vP. Sections 3.2-4.6 provide detailed illustrations of these interpretations. In Section 3.7 major insights are presented and discussed with respect to how the observed effects can be potentially accounted for in terms of the CG ground approach to discourse organization.

3.1 Interpretations of Vf-Vn orders in temporal and conditional clauses

Having examined the interpretation of Vf-VPn orders in temporal and conditional clauses in the same six texts as in Chapter 2, we arrive at the generalization that the main ingredient of the Vf-VPn orders is focus. Interpretations of Vf-VPn orders involve the following: (1) presence of contrastively focused element(s) in the proposition; (2) association with discourse switches ('new discourse segment'); (3) inversion of pragmatic subordination ('topic-focus switch') between main and embedded clause. Conditional clauses with Vf-VPn orders are additionally used to express requests or suggestions. Finally, those cases for which the context is not clear enough, does not provide enough information, or simply does not match any of the interpretations above, are classified as 'unclear'. The figures for these interpretations are given in Table 3.1 for temporal clauses, and Table 3.2 for conditional clauses.

Table 3. 1: Vf-VPn order interpretations in temporal clauses

	Bede	Cura	Lives	CathHom	BlickHom	Orosius
F-Vf	1	24	4	7	-	-
F-lexical verb	-	9	3	5	-	-
F-subject	2	8	0	7	3	1
F-object	-	7	-	9	2	-
F-adjunct	4	10	3	15	-	2
Parallel focus	2	5	1	8	1	2
new discourse segment	3	8	5	9	3	6
topic-focus shift	-	9	1	15	-	-
request/suggestion	-	-	-	-	-	-
unclear	-	5	-	4	1	-
TOTAL	**12**	**85**	**17**	**79**	**10**	**11**

Table 3.2: Vf-VPn order interpretations in conditional clauses

	Bede	Cura	Lives	CathHom	BlickHom	Orosius
F-Vf	3	14	30	25	14	-
F-lexical verb	-	6	7	4	-	-
F-subject	1	3	3	10	1	-
F-object	1	4	2	5	2	-
F-adverbial	-	14	6	11	6	-
Parallel focus	-	1	1	6	3	-
new discourse segment	1	2	1	1	1	-
topic-focus shift	-	-	-	1	-	-
request/suggestion	-	-	1	2	-	-
unclear	-	-	-	2	-	-
TOTAL	**6**	**44**	**51**	**67**	**27**	**0**

From the figures in the tables above, it is clear that the dominant interpretation is that of contrastive focus on one of the elements in the proposition. Before we try to correlate the influence of focus to the interpretation of Vf-VPn propositions, let us first see the details of the proposed interpretations. Again, we will need to go through a good number of examples to see how the interpretations are actually detected in the context of utterance. As we have pointed out before, IS related interpretations are quite difficult to establish (with certainty) in 'real' discourse. For each relevant sentence, we will provide enough contextual information

3.2 Contrastive focus in Vf-Vn orders

What characterizes most of the propositions with Vf-VPn orders is contrastive focus on one of the elements in the clause. The focus can be on the arguments (subject, object), adjuncts, the lexical verb and the auxiliary/modal verb. When the focus is on the lexical material, it performs its usual function of evoking alternatives (cf. Rooth 1985, 1992, Krifka 2008). When the modal/auxiliary verb is focused, it calls for the consideration of alternatives, with the addition of the speaker's evaluation of unlikelihood of the alternative containing the focused expression (Zimmermann 2008). In some cases, more elements in a proposition are compared/contrasted with the same elements in another proposition, creating parallel focus structures.

Recall from Chapter 1, Section 1.4 that I am using the term 'contrastive focus' for all focalizations where the alternative set is further exploited, i.e. for non-new information focus. Wherever it is possible/appropriate, I will refer to more specific uses of focus (focus types).

3.2.1 Focus on the subject

The most common type of interpretation with focused subjects seems to be that additive focus. Additive focus is usually taken to express that the predication holds for at least one alternative of the expression in focus. The alternative proposition can be explicitly given in the preceding discourse, as in (1). The additive focus on the subject *hi* 'they' in (1c) signals that the predication 'overcoming the devil' also holds for the alternative subject referents. In this case, it is Christ, the referent of the subject pronoun *he* 'he', in the proposition in (1a), given ten lines before (1b). Christ's overcoming the devil refers to the description of how Christ resisted the devil's temptations during his forty-day fast. The homily then elaborates on this, highlighting the important spiritual messages of the story. In the context immediately preceding (1c), the author points out that the event clearly illustrates Christ's dual nature, that of man and that of God. The devil tempted him because he saw the man in him; but his divine nature is reflected in the fact that, after the devil, having been overcome, left, angels came to serve him (1b). So just like Christ overcame the devil, and then the angels served him, the same will hold for people when they overcome the devil (angels will serve them).

(1)

a.

he	hine	mid	geþylde	oferswiðde
he	him	with	patience	overcame

'He (Christ) overcame him (the devil) with patience'

b   But in him was manifested that he was of two natures in one person—he was true man, therefore the devil dared to tempt him, he was also true God, for angels ministered unto him. We may perceive in him our frail nature, (for) if the devil had not seen him in our nature he would not have tempted him. Let us worship the Lord's divinity, for if he were not true God above all creatures, angels would not have ministered unto him'

c.	On	þisse	bysene	is	gecyþed	þæt	eallum	geleaffullum	manum	englas
	on	this	example	is	said	that	to-all	faithful	men	angels

þegniaþ,	þonne	**hi**	*habbaþ*	deofol	*oferswiþed*
serve	when	they	have	devil	overcome

'By this example it is shown that angels serve all the faithful men when they overcome the devil'

(coblick,HomS_10_[BlHom_3]:35.140. 452 & 462)

Contrastive focus on the subject can be noted when the subject referent's property is contrasted. The focus on the adjective *unclæne* 'unclean' in (2) instructs the reader to consider that a contrastive alternative property (*clæne* 'clean') should be considered as relevant in the rest of the sentence. Contrastively focused adjectives here are clearly semantically orthogonal or mutually exclusive, while the semantic overlap between the referents 'ghost' and 'house' is based on their symbolic interpretation, or the containment relation between ghost-man/house.

(2)

..but they [people] let their mind flow away into the abyss of recklessness and folly according to its desires, and to not restrain it with the labours of good works, but it is injured with the hunger of the lowest and foulest thoughts; when it avoids being restrained by fear and instruction, it is distracted with evil and useless desires, and hungers after them ravenously. Of which, again, Solomon wrote, saying: 'Every idle man lives after his own judgement.' Of same again, Truth, that is Christ, spoke in his Gospel:

ðonne	an	**unclæne**	**gast**	**bið**	*adrifen*	of	ðæm	men,	ðonne
when	an	unclean	ghost	is	driven-away	of	the	man	then

bið	ðæt	hus	clæne
is	the	house	clean

'When an unclean ghost is driven out of the man, **then** the house is clean'

(cocura,CP:39.283.21.1852)

Based on the data examined, we can note two factors playing a role in the licensing focused subjects in temporal and conditional clauses: (a) the focus interpretation is usually additive or restrictive, (b) the predicate is passive. We actually rarely find instances where the external argument has other kinds of focus interpretations. When we do, the temporal clause is peripheral, i.e. does not modify the content of the main clause, but rather introduces a parallel alternative. To illustrate this, consider (6), where the when-clause expresses contrast or opposition with the matrix clause. The contrast arises with the subject (*Crist* 'Christ') being marked for scalar focus interpretation. What (6b) delivers is that the proposition 'X not come to/ascend to heaven without tribulations' holds even for the least likely candidate, Christ (i.e. not even Christ could ascend to heaven without tribulations, let alone ordinary people).

The example in (3) is found at the beginning of the paragraph which concludes the homily about the afflicted (how people should understand their afflicted health and act accordingly), and is thus separated from the main narrative of the homily. So, as in the previous example, the position of the utterance in the larger discourse context seems to play a role, as we can again notice that some kind of shift is present. Even though the propositional content is presupposable, at least for any Christian believer, the parallel with Christ's tribulations needs to be highlighted, as this is the main point of the moral/religious lesson of practically every homily.

(3)

a.   Wite þeahhwæðere gehwa þæt nan man buton earfoðnyssum ne becymð to þære ecan reste.
        'Let every one, however, know, that **no man comes to the eternal rest without tribulations**,

b. | þa ða | **Crist** | **sylf** | nolde | his | agen | rice | buton | micelre |
    |-------|----------|----------|-----------|-----|------|---------|---------|------|
    | when | Christ | himself | not-would | his | own | kingdom | without | much |

earfoðnysse	astigan
tribulation	ascend

    'when Christ himself would not ascend to his own kingdom without great tribulation'
                                                (cocathom1,ÆHom_I,_31:450.325.6336)

Interestingly, in all the cases noted, the finite verb is adjacent to the subject. In other words, no Verb Raising constructions (S-O/A-Vf-Vn) have been observed to have this type of interpretation of the subject. Whether the noted restrictions are incidental remains to be investigated against a larger set of data.

In texts other than the ones given in Tables 3.1 and 3.2, we note instances where the subject has restrictive focus. As argued by Erteschik-Shir (1997), restrictive elements are similar to contrastive ones in that they combine topic properties (they range over a given set) and focus properties (one element or subset of this set is focused). Unlike contrastive focus, the focused element does not require contrast or elimination of other alternatives. In that sense, restrictive focus interpretation of the subject is what we find in list contexts. (4) is from the part of *The Laws of Alfred*, where different injuries involving missing a body part (usually from breaking or cutting off a body part) are listed, as criminal situations for which an appropriate fine is specified. The segment specifically focuses on the situation where one is hurt with an ax on the hand. In Erteschik-Shir's terms, in (5) the focused element is selected from a restrictive set of fingers (and parts of them).

(4)

a. Gif **se ðuma** bið of aslægen, þam sceal XXX scillinga to bote.
    if the thumb be off-struck to-it shall 30 shillings to compensation

    'If the thumb is struck off, it shall be compensated with 30 shillings'

b. Gif **se nægl** bið of aslegen, ðam sculon V scillinga to bote.
    if the nail be off struck to-it shall 5 shillings to compensation

    'If the nail is struck off, it shall be compensated with five shillings'

c. Gif **se scytefinger** bið of aslegen, sio bot bið XV scillinga;
    if the index-finger be off struck the compensation be 15 shillings

    'If the index finger is struck off, the compensation is 15 shillings'

d. Gif **se midlesta finger** sie of aslegen, sio bot bið XII scillinga;
    if the middle finger be off struck the compensation be 12 shillings

    'if the middle finger is struck off, the compensation is 15 shillings'

e. Gif **se goldfinger** sie of aslegen, to þam sculon XVII scillinga...
    if the ring-finger be off struck, to it shall 17 shillings

    'If the ring-finger is struck off, it shall be compensated with 17 shillings'

f. Gif **se lytla finger** bið of aslegen, ðam sceal to bote..
    if the little finger be off struck to-it shall to compensation

    'If the little finger is struck off, it shall be compensated[with[nine shillings]'

                                                    (colawaf,LawAf_1:60.174-181)

Even though all the elements in the propositions in (4) are part of the CG, the proposition itself has a specific function of presenting each 'cutting-off' situation separately, with a contrast between different fingers (thumb vs. ring finger, for instance) because this contrast is crucial for the amount of money that needs to be paid in compensation.

Finally, we need to comment on instances such as (5), where the subject is a resumptive pronoun, with the left-dislocated coordinated NP. Left-dislocation is often used as a means of restoring discourse topics. This is exactly the case here. In the preceding discourse - the segment explaining how in a hierarchy of authority, each member should act as a teacher to a member of the lower rank and set a good example – it is said that 'The bishop must compel the priest with love or fear rightly to observe God's law and also the community over whom they are set' (coblick,HomS_14_[BlHom_4]:45.100.569). The discourse then switches to what the king and the

bishop should do (quoting St. Paul that the king and the bishop should be shepherds of Christian people), and what happens if one of them does not do what is right. Wanting to return to the duties of the bishop and the priest, they are reintroduced as the discourse topic. Such cases resemble the ones characterized here as discourse switches, which we describe in more detail in Section 3.4.

(5)

Se	biscop	&	se	mæssepreost	gif	**hi**	mid	rihte	willaþ	Gode
the	bishop	and	the	mass-priest	if	they	with	right	will	Gode

þeowian,	þonne	sceolan	hi	þegnian	dæghwamlice	Godes	folce...
serve	then	must	they	minister	daily	God's	people

'The bishop and the priest, if they will rightly serve God, must minister daily to God's people, or at least once a week sing mass for all Christian people who have ever been born, from the beginning of this world.'

(coblick,HomS_14_[BlHom_4]:45.123.576)

It should be noted, though, that we cannot dismiss another possible interpretation of (5), and that is the one where the object *Gode* 'to God' is contrastively focused, to indicate that there is a relevant alternative in the matrix clause, *Godes folce* 'God's people'. The possibility of an alternative interpretation will remain to be a challenge for many of the cases presented here, as we are only giving our best shot at pinpointing the author's actual intention. As long as the alternative interpretation is related to contrastive focus marking, it should not crucially undermine our assumptions regarding non-fronted vP word orders.

3.2.2 Focus on the object

Before we consider the cases where the object receives contrastive focus interpretation, we need to say that 'object' here is a cover term for all complements of verbs (i.e. predicative material as well). It is also important to keep in mind that VO orders block non-finite vP fronting (recall the strong ban *Vn-O-Vf). Most contrastively focused objects in the data investigated here do come in the VO order. However, the object's position is not crucial for contrastive focus, as preverbal objects can be contrastively focused too. So, the presence of contrastive focus interpretation on postverbal objects cannot itself be the reason for the impossibility of vP fronting in such cases (we will deal with this issue in Chapter VO).

3.2.2.1 Preverbal objects with contrastive focus

First, we illustrate the focused object in the preverbal position. In (6), the object in the temporal clause, *þam menn anum* 'a man alone', is contrasted with the object *eallum gesceafte* 'all creatures' in the preceding main clause. However, the utterance in (6b) is not the one where this contrast is first established. (6b) actually repeats the content introduced earlier (cf. (6a), where it is explicitly said that 'all creatures' should be interpreted as 'man alone'). What (6b) does is re-introduce the 'old' content to summarize the

point that the apparent contradiction in the statement that a member of a set ('man alone') can represent the whole set ('all creatures') is meaningful if interpreted properly.

(6)

a.   He said, "Go over all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."... He said, "Preach to every creature:" but by that name is man alone betokened... [about stones, trees, beasts, and angels – what they have or don't have]. Now man has something of all creatures... [what he has in common with stones, trees, beasts and angels]. Man is therefore called 'every creature', because he has something in common with every creature.

b. | ðæt | godspel | bið | gebodad | **eallum** | **gesceafte**: | þonne | hit | bið | **þam** | **menn** |
|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----------|---------------|-------|-----|-----|--------|---------|
| the | gospel | is | preached | to-all | creatures | when | it | is | to-the | man |

anum	gebodad…
alone	preached

'Gospel is preached to all creatures when it is preached to a man alone [for all earthly things are created for man alone'

(cocathom1, ÆHom _I,_21:349.132.4216)

(7) delivers the legend according to which certain hostile monks wanted to poison St. Benedict, but the cup with poisoned wine broke up in pieces when the saint made the sign of the cross over it. (7b) is about the moment St. Benedict realizes the vessel broke due to its being exposed to two polar 'forces' – death and life, that the drink must be 'deadly' because it could not bear 'the sign of life' (i.e. the sign of the cross).

Clearly, the content of the proposition is presupposable (or inferable). So let us try and see what the hypothetical 'presupposed' word order (*ða ða he lifes taken beran ne mihte*) would communicate. The semantic contrast 'life-death' would be preserved, but without focus, the novelty of Benedict's realization would be lost. If the speaker had decided to use the content of the when-clause matter-of-factly, the inference would be that Benedict deliberately used the sign of the cross to test the drink, and, of course, the result of this action would confirm his suspicion – the vessel could not bear the sign of the cross because it had been poisoned. And this is clearly not the interpretation indented by the author.

(7)

a.   They [hostile monks] then began to quarrel, first among themselves, that they had prayed for his [Benedict's] superiority, and at last counselled to kill him with poison. They mingled then venom in his drink, and the servant stood at a distance with a glass vessel, in which was a drink made of wine mingled with the deadly poison. The servant then, according to monastic usage, bowed with the vessel for his blessing, and he with the sign of the cross blessed the vessel from his seat, and through the blessing it straightways burst in pieces, as if, instead of signing it with the cross, he had cast a stone on it.

þa	ongeat	se	halga	wer	þæt	se	drænc	*deadbæra*	wæs.
then	understood	the	holy	man	that	the	drink	deadly	was

þa ða	he	ne	mihte	**lifes**	**tacn**	aberan.
when	he	not	might	life's	sign	bear

'Then the holy man perceived that the drink was deadly, when it could not bear the token of life; and he straightways arose, and with cheerful spirit addressed the brothers: "Brothers, may Almighty God be merciful to you: why would ye impose these things on me? Said I not to you before, that I and you could not agree? Go now and seek for yourselves a superior according to your own habits, for ye may not henceforth have me." And he then returned to the wilderness and took care of himself.'

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_11:94.79.1925)</div>

In (8) we observe parallel focus interpretation between the direct and the indirect object, where the alternatives are constructed more locally, within the same clause and at the level of NP. In the temporal clause in (8), the property of the direct object (*eorðlicu* 'earthly') 'kingdom' is contrasted with the properties of the indirect object (*hean* 'high' and *heofonlican* 'heavenly') 'king'. Even though 'kingdom' and 'king' do not have the same referents, there is considerable semantic overlap between them to be able to function as 'complement of focus', i.e. they have some core property in their denotation in common to be able to have their properties delivered as focus alternatives.

Again, most of the propositional content of the temporal clause is already familiar to the hearer (we already know that Satan, in order to tempt Christ, has offered him all the worldly riches). (8) is a comment on the narrative of that episode. The purpose of re-introducing the 'old' content is to highlight the absurdity of Satan's proposal. This is achieved by focusing the contrast between the 'earthly' riches and the 'heavenly' nature of Christ. Note that another contrast is highlighted (which becomes obvious in the continuation of the sentence): Christ should not 'receive' kingdoms, he 'gives' kingdoms. So, the absurdity of Satan's words is evident in his attempt to relate two sharply opposing concepts: Christ *receiving* the kingdom of *lesser* worth, whereas in reality, Christ *gives* the kingdom of *highest* worth. 'Presupposed' fronted vP orders would not be able to communicate this successfully. If a proposition is delivered to CG as something that is not under further discussion, then the speaker would not be able to impose a novel layer of interpretation on the propositional content.

(8)

Ac	se	forhwyrfda	gast	spræc	forhwyrfedlice	word,	þa	he	wolde
but	the	perverted	spirit	spoke	perversely	words	when	he	would

þæm	**hean**	cininge	&	þæm	**heofonlican**	**eorþlicu**	ricu	syllan
the	exalted	king	and	the	heavenly	earthly	kingdom	give

'But the perverted spirit spoke perverse words when (**he said**) he would give **earthly** kingdoms to the exalted and **heavenly** king [- to him who shall prepare **heavenly** kingdoms for all believers]'

<div align="right">(coblick,HomS_10_[BlHom_3]:31.70.407)</div>

A similar situation is found in (9). The object *anwerdan myryhðe* 'the present mirth' is contrasted with the object of preposition *toweardan ungesælde* 'future unhappiness'. Both referents (mirth-unhappiness) and their properties (present-future) are in a parallel, contrast relation. As in the previous example, the main clause re-asserts the content already given earlier in the discourse; the content of the embedded clause is also familiar. Both are reactivated for emphasis and an overt indication of the contrast present in the content of the embedded clause. Formally, (9b) is an 'inverse' correlative structure, where the adverb *þonne* 'then' in the main clause is cataphoric and 'anticipates' the temporal embedded clause (in 'regular' correlatives, the main clause is the one introduced by the resumptive temporal adverb: [þa/þonne...]embedded – [þa/þonne...]main, cf. Links 2018 and references there). The embedded *þonne*-clause in (9b) provides exhaustive focus interpretation of the adverb *þonne* in the main clause. Essentially, what is created in (9b) is a 'topic-focus' switch in the relation between the main and embedded clause.

(9)

a. Verily this following sentence applies to the perishing soul, "On **this day you dwell in peace,** for the vengeance to come is now hidden from your eyes." The perverse soul is indeed dwelling in peace in its day, when in transient time it rejoices, and is exalted with dignities, and in temporary enjoyments is immoderate, and is dissolved in fleshly lusts, and is awed by **no fear of future punishment,** but hides from itself the miseries following after; because if it reflects on them, then will worldly bliss be troubled by that reflection.

b.
Heo	hæfð	ðonne	sibbe	on	hire	dæge	þonne	heo	nele	þa	**andwerdan**
she	has	then	peace	on	her	days	when	she	not-will	the	present

myryhðe	gewæcan	mid	nanre	care	**þære**	**toweardan**	**ungesælðe**.
mirth	afflict	with	no	care	of-the	future	sadness

'It [the soul] has then peace in its day, when it will not afflict the present mirth with any care for the future unhappiness, [but goes with closed eyes to the penal fire]'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_28:414.120.5535)

The focus status of the object in (10) is indicated by the focus particle *furðon* 'even'. Again we need to examine whether contrastive focus alone is enough to prevent non-finite vP fronting, i.e. 'block' vPn-Vf orders. The utterance in (10) is introduced by the adverb 'likewise' suggesting that it should be interpreted in parallel/comparison with something given in the earlier discourse. And it does. The chapter ('Memory of the Saints') opens with the statement that 'we may take good examples, first from the holy patriarchs, how they in their lives pleased God, and also from the Saints who followed the Saviour'. It then continues with naming individual patriarchs and saints and how God intervened in the moments of their greatest need for his help.[30] The subject referents in (10a), Shadrach, Meshach and

---

[30] 'First **Abel**... Again **Enoch**... God took him, sound in soul and body, without death, up to heaven)...Noah also, for his righteousness, overcame the great flood...**Abraham** and his son **Isaac**... Again **Jacob**, Isaac's son, for his labour was verily

Abednego, are added to this list. The content of the main clause (God helping them) is clearly backgrounded – this is what we expect – we are promised a list of examples and 'helping x' is what God did to all previous people/prophets. Consequently, the content of the temporal clause is interpreted as confirming that God also saved them and providing novel information about the manner this was manifested: when the fire could not burn them. As the content of the embedded clause, rather than the content of the main clause, is the main point of utterance, (10) again features a 'topic-focus' switch between the main and the embedded clause.

Our examples so far featured the cases where the focused object is explicitly given in the preceding discourse; *heora feox* 'their hair' in (10b) is not. It can be however easily inferred from the possession relation with the three youths ((body) part-whole (person)). Being the most easily alienable body part (in the sense that the alienation has no significant consequences for the whole), the concept of 'missing (a single) hair' is often used with scalar focus to indicate that no harm whatsoever has taken place.

(10)

a.   Likewise the three youths in the Chaldean land, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who for the true faith were bound in the **burning oven**, and **condemned to death**,

b.

ac	him	sona	cydde	God	hwylcne	geleafan	hi	hæfdon,
but	them	soon	showed	God	which	faith	they	had

þa ða	se	lig	ne	moste	**furðon**	**heora**	**fex**	forswælan	on	þam	ade
when	the	flame	not	could	even	their	hair	burn	on	the	pyre

'but God soon showed them what faith they had when the flame could not even burn their hair in that pyre, but they all went out, **uninjured**, to the king.'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Memory_of_Saints]:71.3370)

Preverbal pronominal objects can also be contrastively focused, as in (11). As in many other cases, contrast can also be noted on other elements in the clause as well. In (11), the when-clause (with reason interpretation) is in contrast relation with the preceding main clause in the polarity of the main verb (positive vs. negative), and the object (you vs. themselves).

---

blessed... **Job** the blessed – persecution, sickness, loss of his bairns – God healed him of that awful affliction... **David**...was pleasing to God... Again **Elias**, the noble prophet strove against unrighteousness until that God took him in a fiery chariot to heaven'

(11)

Hu	**magon**	hi	ahreddan	**ðe**	fram	frecednyssum,	þonne	hi	**ne**
how	can	they	deliver	you	from	perils	when	they	not

mihton	**hi**	**sylfe**	ahreddan?
can	them	selves	deliver

'How can they deliver you from perils, when they cannot deliver themselves?'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[George]:149.3160)</div>

3.2.2.2 High preverbal object (Verb Raising constructions)

Contrastively focused objects can also be found in a higher preverbal position (preceding not only the lexical verb but the finite verb as well), creating the Verb Raising structure (S-O-Vf-Vn). In (12) and (13) we give two examples from *The Catholic Homilies* with the focus particle *furþon* 'even'. In (12b), 'the creatures he [God] created' is the least likely member of the set of notions we are unable to understand, so it is of no surprise that we are unable to understand God, which is ordered highest on the scale of 'non-understandable notions'. Again, the when-clause contributes the reason why we cannot speak of God (something that is backgrounded in (12a), 'that which is unspeakable').

(12)

a. We speak of God, mortals of the Immortal, feeble of the Almighty, miserable beings of the Merciful; but who may worthily speak of that which is unspeakable? He is without measure, because he is everywhere. He is without number, for he is ever. He is without weight, for he holds all creatures without toil; and he disposed them all in three things, that is in measure, and in number, and in weight.

b.

Ac	wite	ge	þæt	nan	man	ne	mæg	fullice	ymbe	God	sprecan.	þonne
but	know	you	that	no	man	not	can	fully	about	God	speak	when

we	furþon	ða	gesceafta	þe	he	gesceop	ne	magon	asmeagan.	ne
we	even	the	creature	which	he	created	not	may	investigate	not

ne	areccan.
nor	reckon

'But know ye that no man can speak fully concerning God, when we cannot even investigate or reckon the creatures which he has created [Who by words can tell the ornaments of heaven? Or who the fruitfulness of earth?]'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_20:341.164.3999)</div>

95

(13)

Oððe	hwa	hereð	genihtsumlice	eallra	tida	ymhwyrft?	Oððe	hwa	ealle
or	who	praise	adequately	of-all	season	circuit	or	who	all

oðre	þing?	þonne	we	**furðon**	**þa**	**lichamlican**	**þing.**	**þe**	**we**	**on**
other	things	when	we	even	the	bodily	things	that	we	on

lociað	ne	magon	fullice	befoon	mid	ure	gesihðe?
look	not	can	fully	comprehend	with	our	sight

'Or who shall adequately praise the circuit of all the seasons ? Or who all other things, when we cannot even fully comprehend with our sight the bodily things on which we look? [Behold you see the man before you, but at the time you see his face, you see not his back...]'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_20:341.167.4001)

Non-referential objects/complements with contrastive focus are also found. (14) is part of the segment is dedicated to the question of Christ dual nature: he is both God and man. The temporal clause in (14) has the predicative NP *mann* 'man' contrastively focused, as it needs to be interpreted in relation to the alternative expression of Christ been God. The relation 'Christ-man' has been added to the CG earlier, hence the IS status of *mann* 'man' here is backgrounded, and the rest of the vP provides update of this relation by picking the temporal reference of his birth. All these nuances would be lost in the presupposed O-Vn-Vf order.

(14)

And	swiðe	gedafenlic	hit	wæs	ða ða	he	**mann**	wolde	beon	þæt
and	very	fitting	it	was	when	he	man	would	be	that

he	ne	geceas	na	him	wif	to	meder.	ac	geceas	clæne	mæden;
he	not	chose	not	him	woman	to	mother	but	chose	pure	maiden

'and very fitting it was, when he would become man, that he chose not a woman for his mother, but chose a pure maiden; [and also, when a maiden should bear, that she bare God Almighty, who is both God and man, one Christ. He began being what he was not, but he continued what he before had been.'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_1:4.37.28)

Another example of a high preverbal object is given in (15). The reading of the conditional clause is most likely such that the focus is on the preverbal object *soð* 'truth'. The focus relates the proposition in the conditional clause to what the context (15a) establishes as an alternative one, whereby the judge wants to hear something that does not have the property or importance associated with 'truth' (the speaker, St. Alban, finds it trivial that someone's true identity could be revealed by information about their family and social status). So, focusing the object 'truth', aspects of what underlies the concept 'truth' in the context of one's identity are contrasted (whether someone believes that a person's family

background or a person's faith corresponds to 'truth' in the process of identification of a person). 'Truth' itself is backgrounded, but St. Alban assigns it a different interpretation, evident from his answer (his identity is Christian).

(15)

a. Then asked the judge immediately, and said, 'Of what family are you, or of what rank among men?' Then Alban answered the wicked man thus: 'What does it concern you of what family I may be?

b.
Ac	gif	ðu	**soð**	wylt	gehyran	ic	þe	secge	hraðe,	þæt	ic	cristen
but	if	you	truth	will	hear	I	you	say	quickly	that	I	Christian

eom	and	Crist	æfre
am	and	Christ	wurðige

'but if you desire to hear the truth, I tell you quickly that I am a Christian, and will ever worship Christ'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Alban]:57.4031)

Here is a good moment to address the question of the external syntax or function of embedded clauses with Vf VPn orders. This is of particular relevance for the temporal clauses observed here. In most cases with contrastively focused preverbal objects, the *when*-clause functions as a cause/reason clause.[31] Even though this interpretation does not necessarily remove them from the function of modifying the main clause predicate (as is the case with peripheral embedded clauses), the change of meaning certainly contributes to opening the possibility of having a 'less presupposed' meaning as they do on their typical temporal uses. In OE, reason clauses have long been observed as the ones which have the least asymmetry with main clauses. Their non-presuppositionality or strong preference for this reading could then be assumed to stem from the peculiarities of their function. Again, as we state repeatedly, each clause type needs to be carefully examined before we can make any hypotheses which can have full explanatory potential.
.

Lastly, we note a peculiarity regarding preverbal objects. In our corpus, preverbal contrastively focused objects are found only in temporal clauses, while in conditional clauses all contrastively focused objects are postverbal. We will not further exploit this observation.

---

[31] Various descriptive grammars of English (e.g. Quirk *et al.* 1985, Huddleston *et al.* 2003) give a number of situations in which temporal clauses may introduce different meanings such as cause, result, condition, concession, comparison, contrast, etc.

3.2.2.3 Postverbal objects with contrastive focus

Before we illustrate the effect of contrastively focused postverbal objects, we need to emphasize that contrastive focus interpretation is only one of the interpretations of postverbal objects. It is very important to keep this in mind, so as to avoid making the wrong generalization that VO fronting is blocked due to the focus interpretation of the object. VO does block fronting, but there is very little evidence that this can be related to focus marking of postverbal objects.

(16) is a conditional clause with a contrastively focused postverbal object *ða godnysse* 'the goodness'. This focus denotation contrasts with the subject ('you who are evil') in terms of properties (evil – good). Here again we note that this interpretation is not the only one contributing to the non-presuppositional status of the clause. The whole conditional clause is to be interpreted in parallel relation with the main clause (you who are evil give goodness to your children – your heavenly father gives much more good spirit to the ones who ask), which is clearly the intended reading in the original source (the Bible, Matthew 7: 11) and its paraphrase in (16).

(16)

Gif	ge	cunnon	ða ðe	*yfele*	synt.	syllan	**ða**	**godnysse**	eowrum	bearnum.
if	you	can	who	evil	are	give	the	goodness	your	children

Hu	micele	swiðor	wyle	eower	heofenlica	fæder	forgifan	godne	gast
how	much	more	will	your	heavenly	father	give	good	spirit

him	biddendum.
to-them	asking

'If you can, who are evil, give to your children what is good, how much more will your Heavenly Father give a good spirit to those asking him [What are the good things that men give to their children? Transitory goods...]'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_18:319.58.3449)

The focus interpretation of the object need not be contrastive (in the strict sense, that there is some opposition between the properties/referents of two expressions). Focus can be employed to indicate the presence of an alternative expression which is in some other relevant parallel relation (i.e. where contrast/similarity is less obvious). This is the case in (17). The postverbal object *Gerusalem* 'Jerusalem', even though novel information, is contrastively focused in order to indicate the relevance of an alternative location – the village of Bethphage – an important point on Christ's way to surrender to the cross. (17) is a quote from the Book of Mathew about Christ's stopping at the village of Bethpage before he entered the city of Jerusalem on Palm Sunday (as the larger discourse segment is about the interpretation of the biblical events around Palm Sunday). Bethpage as a stopping point is important because this is where Christ asked his disciples to find him a donkey on which he would ride into Jerusalem, to send the message that he is arriving humbly, in peace, and not as a conqueror (on a horse). By focusing 'Jerusalem', the speaker directs the reader/addressee that there is an alternative

location (the village of Bethpage) which should be also considered relevant in the context of his journey.

(17)

Matheus	se	godspellere	sægde,	þa	Hælend	wolde	genealæcean	**Gerusalem**,
Matthew	the	evangelist	said	when	Saviour	would	approach	Jerusalem

þa	com	he	ær	to	Betfage.
then	came	he	first	to	Bethphage

'The evangelist Matthew said, 'As the Saviour approached Jerusalem, he first came to the village of Bethphage''

(coblick,HomS_21_[BlHom_6]:77.196.964)

3.2.3 Focus on the adjunct

In non-fronted vP orders, contrastive focus on adjuncts can also be observed quite frequently. Let us illustrate this with adjunct PPs and adverbs. In (18) the complement of the preposition, *Galliscum fyre* 'Gallic fire' in the temporal clause contrasts with *hefenisc fyr* 'heavenly fire', the subject of the following clause. The modal verb is also to be interpreted as contrastively focused (could not vs. could be destroyed). Even though on the first reading it seems that the main point of contrast is between two types of fire, and consequently the results they have on 'brazen beans and statues', the contrast is also between what the Romans believed (that their gods prevented the Gauls from destroying the city) and what the Christians believed happened on that same occasion – that it was precisely the Romans' faith in pagan gods which caused their subsequent downfall caused by the next attack on Rome by Visigoths.[32]

(18)

ðær	wæs	gesiene	Godes	irre,	þa	hiora	ærenan	beamas	&	hiora
there	was	seen	God's	anger	when	their	brazen	beams	and	their

anlicnessa,	þa	hie	ne	mehton	**from**	**Galliscum**	**fyre**	forbærnede
statues	when	they	not	could	from	Gallic	fire	burnt

weorþan;	ac	hi	**hefenisc**	**fyr**	æt	ðæm	ilcan	cyrre	forbærnde.
be	but	them	heavenly	fire	at	the	same	time	burned

---

[32] With this sentence Orosius concludes his argument against the pagan's perspective that Christians are responsible for the second sack of Rome by Visigoths, which marked the beginning of the downfall of Rome. The second sack by Visigoths is compared to the first one by the Gauls. As Rome relatively quickly recovered from the Gauls' attack (July 18, 387 BC), and continued to flourish for 800 years until the fatal Visiogths' attack in A.D 410, pagans blamed the Christians for disrespecting old, Roman gods, who then turned their back on Rome, unlike during the first sack, where they helped Rome rebuild and prosper. Orosius, however, argues that their 'brazen beams and statues', the symbols of their pagan faith could have been saved from 'Gallic fire', but not from 'heavenly fire' (Christan God). So, the responsibility for the devastating effects of the second sack lies in the pagans' refusal of the true faith.

'There God's anger was seen, when their brazen beams and their statues could not be destroyed by the fire of the Gauls, but, at the same time, fire from heaven consumed them'

<div align="right">(coorosiu,Or_2:8.52.36.1015)</div>

In (19), focus is on the adverb *utane* 'outside, externally', which contrasts with the adverb *innan* 'inside, internally' in the matrix clause. Again, similar to the previous example, the contrast in the adjuncts also triggers the contrast between the predicate *ymbhringed* 'surrounded' (in the embedded clause) and the predicate *aidlad* 'deprived' (in the main clause), as well as *ungemetlicre heringe* 'immoderate praise' and *ðære ryhtwisnesse* 'the righteousness'. Thus, (19) could easily be filed under 'parallel focus' interpretations. It is used as an illustration of a contrastively focused adjunct because this contrast is the most relevant in this utterance (while the other two have been to some extent elaborated in the preceding discourse).

(19)

Ond	ðonne	he	bið	**utane**	ymbhringed	mid	ungemetlicre	heringe,	he
and	when	he	is	externally	surrounded	with	immoderate	praise	he

bið	**innan**	aidlad	ðære	ryhtwisnesse,
is	internally	deprived	of-the	righteousness

'And when he is surrounded externally with immoderate praise, he is internally deprived of righteousness'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:17.111.8.737)</div>

In (20), the contrastive focus is on the prepositional complement (*on*) *ða lænan sibbe* '(on) the heavenly peace' with the purpose of evoking the alternative expression with contrasting properties - 'transitory peace'.

(20)

Of this same Christ spoke through himself, when he distinguished between **this earthly and the heavenly peace,** and diverted his apostles from the present to the eternal peace, saying: 'My peace I give to you, and my peace I leave with you.' As if he had said: 'I lend you this transitory, and give you the lasting peace.

Gif	ðonne	ðæs	monnes	mod	&	his	lufu	**bið**	behleapen	eallunga
if	then	the	man's	mind	and	his	love	are	devoted	entirely

on	**ða**	**lænan**	**sibbe**	ðonne	ne	mæg	he	næfre	becuman	to	ðære
on	the	transitory	peace	then	not	may	he	never	attain	to	that

ðe	hi	geseald	is
which	him	given	is

'If, then, the mind and love of man are entirely devoted to the transitory peace, he can never attain to the one which is given to him'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:46.351.14.2372)</div>

3.2.4 Focus on the lexical verb

The presence of contrastive focus can be observed on the lexical verb (infinitive or participle). The first illustration is given in (21), where the infinitive is contrastively focused. In this example, the contrast is between how one should and should not act in the presence of a dead body. One should sorrow for the dead (*besargian þone deadan*, (21b)), rather than jest (and be immoral) at dead men's corpses (*plegað æt deadra manna lice*, (21a)).

(21)

a.   menn unwislice doð þa ðe dwollice plegað æt deadra manna lice, and ælce fulnysse þær forð
      teoð mid plegan,
      'men do unwisely when they doltishly jest at dead men's corpses and introduce by their sport
      any licentiousness,'

.b. | þonne | hi | sceoldon | swyðor | **besargian** | þone | deadan, | and | ondrædan | him |
      | when | they | should | rather | sorrow | the | dead | and | dread | him |

      | sylfum | þæs | deaðes | tocyme |
      | self | the | death's | coming |

      'when they should rather sorrow for the dead, and dread the coming of death for themselves'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Swithun]:307.4414)</div>

An example of contrastive focus on the participle is given in (22). In (22b) the participle *onpennad* 'opened' contrasts with the state the subject referent (the dam) is in when it serves to prevent the water from flowing, i.e. when it is closed (expressed by the proposition in (22a) 'when the water is dammed up').

(22)

a.   When water is dammed up, it increases and rises and strives after its original place, when it
      cannot flow whither it would

b. | Ac | gif | sio | pynding | wierð | **onpennad**, | oððe | sio | wering | wirð | tobrocen, |
      | but | if | the | dam | is | open | or | the | weir | is | broken |

      | ðonne | toflewð | hit | eall |
      | then | flow-off | it | all |

      'But if the dam is thrown open or the weir bursts, it runs off'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:38.277.8.1800)</div>

The contrasting alternative can be found in the context following the proposition with the focused lexical verb. This is the case in (23), where St. Cecilia, even though she has just been married, wants to continue her life in purity and devotion to Christ only, on her wedding night, presents Valerian, her bridegroom with two alternative situations/choices. The first one contains the contrastively focused *gewemman* 'pollute, defile' (23b), whereas the alternative proposition is explicitly given in the second conditional clause (23c), where the focused verb is substituted by *lufast* 'love' ('and continue in pure virginity'). Note that the meaning input of the modal verb *wylt* 'will' in (23b) is not crucial, which is reflected in the translation where it is completely omitted. What is important is that the non-finite vP including the contrastively focused infinitive is unlikely to front across the modal. In the negotiation process with her bridegroom, Cecilia certainly does not take it for granted that Valerian would choose to defile her. After all, we are informed in the preceding discourse that Valerian, who was not a Christian at the time he married Cecilia, later himself became a saint. Hence, there is no available perspective from which the Valerian polluting Cecilia should be taken as given, accepted, granted, or non-controversial. All these factors suffice in blocking vP fronting, or making the proposition in (23b) 'non-presupposed'.

(23)

a.   'Oh, you, my dear husband, I say to you with love, I have God's angel who holds me in love,

b.

and	gif	þu	wylt	me	**gewemman**,	he	went	sona	to	ðe
and	if	you	will	me	pollute	he	goes	soon	to	you

'and if you pollute me, he will quickly turn to you (and will slay you in anger)'

c.

Gif	þu	þonne	me	lufast	and	butan	laðe	gehylst	on	clænum	mægþhade
if	you	then	me	love	and	without	evil	continue	in	pure	virginity

'If you then love me and without evil continue in pure virginity, (then Christ will love you…)'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Cecilia]:31.7128-7130)

As in the case of other contrastively focused elements, focus on the lexical verb can serve to relate the proposition of the embedded clause to an alternative one, which is not given in the strict sense, but rather present in the CG as an inference based on what the general context has established to the point of utterance. This is illustrated in (24). The focus on the participle *oftogen* 'withdrawn' (i.e. food being withdrawn from a person) indicates that this predicate contrasts with what has already been established in the discourse segment. The topic of the segment is the spiritual and material senses of the *Pater Noster* line 'give us our daily bread'. So, the context establishes that our body should be given food regularly (this is also indicated in the proposition of the comparative clause (24a), immediately preceding (24b)). Being withdrawn (*oftogen*) can thus be considered to be contrastively focused.

(24)

a.   swa swa se lichama leofað be lichamlicum mettum, swa sceal se sawul lybban be Godes lare, and be gastlicum smeagungum

'so as the body lives by bodily food so shall the soul live by the precepts of God, by ghostly meditations'

b.

Hraðe	se	lichama	aswint.	&	forweornað	gif	him	bið	**oftogen**
quickly	the	body	wastes-away	and	decays	if	him	is	withdrawn

his	bigleofa
his	food

'The body quickly wastes away and decays, if its sustenance is withdrawn from it [In like manner the soul perishes, if it has not ghostly sustenance, that is, God's commandments, on which it shall thrive and be cherished.]'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_19:329.113. 3709-3710)</div>

Contrast relation becomes overtly indicated when the clause with a focused lexical verb is followed by an adversative second conjunct explicating the alternative element. In (25), the lexical verb *aweorp* 'reject' contrasts with the participle *healdað* 'hold' in the second conjunct.

(25)

a.   The envious are also to be taught to perceive to what great danger they are exposed, and how they increase their perdition,

ðonne	hie	of	hira	heortan	nyllað	**aweorpan**	ðone	æfst,
when	they	of	their	heart	not-will	reject	the	envy

ac	hine	*healdað*
but	it	hold

'when they will not reject envy from their hearts but preserve it'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:34.233.23.1535)</div>

3.2.5 Focus on the modal/auxiliary

Finally. let us discuss the cases where contrastive focus is present on the finite verb, i.e. modal or auxiliary verb. In propositions (26b) and (26c) the modals *woldest* 'would' and *mihtest* 'might are contrastively focused. In (26b), the speaker, Basil, repeats the alderman's assessment of the possibility of him pardoning the poor woman the tax she owes him (the alderman is willing to help, because Basil asked him to do so, but cannot). The focus interpretation of *woldest* 'want, would' is, strictly speaking, emphatic, as the conditional clause in (26b) essentially repeats the proposition introduced earlier (cf. (26a), where the alderman expresses his willingness to pardon/have pity on the wrongly accused woman), and adds a novel speaker perspective (Basil's). In (26c), the focus on the modal *mihtest* 'might'

is contrastive, as the speaker (Basil) considers the possibility which contrasts with the alternative presented by the alderman (of him not being able to do it, (26a)).

Note that the emphatic focus interpretation on *mihtest* in (26b) is different from verum focus. Even though the alderman is committed to the truth of the proposition (his claim that he would help the poor woman), Basil is not; he clearly keeps open other modal possibilities and makes this overt by immediately offering an alternative possibility in the continuation of the sentence.

(26)

a. Basil then wrote for the poor woman a writing to the alderman, with this purport: "This poor woman sought me, saying that I could intercede for her to you, therefore shew not, I pray, if I may [prevail] as well with you as the woman trusts. Then the alderman read the letter, and sent to him in return immediately in writing, saying, that he **would** pardon the woman for his intercession, but nevertheless **could not** remit the tax which she had to render. Then the bishop sent to the aforesaid alderman again another writing, with this purport:

b.
Gif	þu	**woldest**	myltsian	and	swa þeah	ne	mihtest,	þær	is	sum
if	you	would	pity	and	nevertheless	not	could	there	is	some

beladung	on	þære	sægne
excuse	in	the	assertion

'If you would pity and nevertheless could not, there is some excuse in your assertion'

c.
Gif	þu	þonne	**mihtest**	myltsian	and	noldest...
if	you	then	could	pity	and	not-would

'If you, however, could pity but would not…'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Basil]:182.572-573)

A similar effect can be observed with finite auxiliaries, as in (27). The element bearing contrastive focus (it seems prosodically too) is the participle *geopened* 'opened', but it has the effect on the whole passive predicate, which is interpreted as an unexpected/unlikely option, given that the speaker strongly disbelieves that heathen's prayer would be able to open the church door, which is locked and sealed (the relevant alternative - the more likely option - is the church door being open through Christian prayer). We will later discuss the issue of unexpectedness of contrastive focus in more detail.

(27)

a.   Then said Basil, 'Let us lock up this church, and seal the lock, and do you all afterward watch three nights, continuing in prayer

b.

and	gif	seo	cyrce	**bið**	**geopenad**	þurh	eowre	gebena,	habbað
and	if	the	church	be	opened	through	your	prayers	have

hi	eow	æfre	siððan
it	to-you	ever	later

'and if the church be opened through your prayers, you shall have it ever afterward'

(coaelive, ÆLS_[Basil]:328.670)

Most contrastively focused finite verbs in our dataset are negative modal verbs To ensure that our identification of contrastive focus is right, and not the (mis)interpretation of the opposing polarity values 'positive – negative', which constitutes 'ordinary meaning' (in the sense of Rooth 1985, 1992) as contrastive focus, we compare the interpretation of negative modals with fronted non-finite vPs with those without vP fronting.

So, in a sentence like (28), we can say that the negative modal *nellaþ* 'will not' is contrastively focused, by virtue of evoking an alternative proposition with positive polarity. In (28), this would mean that there is an alternative proposition that teachers should teach other people to be good Christians, which ideally should be part of the CG. But how do we know that the contrast here is indeed focused?

(28)

&	þa	lareowas	beoþ	syþþan	domes	wyrþe,	gif	he	**nellaþ**
and	the	teachers	be	afterwards	condemnation	worthy	if	they	not-will

þæt	folk	læron	þæt	hi	heora	synna	geswicon	&	Godes	bebodu	healdan
that	folk	teach	that	they	their	sins	cease	and	God's	commands	hold

'The teachers thereafter will be deserving of condemnation if they will not teach the people to cease from their sins and observe God's commands'

(coblick,HomS_14_[BlHom_4]:47.153.593)

How contrastively focused negative modal differs from a 'regular' negative modal can most clearly be observed when we compare their behavior in the same context. In the OE data, the most suitable context for this is the one with two juxtaposed conditional clauses (IF$_1$...IF$_2$), with a positive and a negative modal. The two propositions are presented as two different alternatives/situations, and usually require some degree of backgroundedness of the (non-finite) vP content. The position of the positive/negative modal with respect to the vP complement inside the conditionals themselves does not affect the relative ordering of the two conditional clauses (fronted vP order can be found both in IF$_1$ (29a) or in IF$_2$ (29b), and non-fronted orders can be found both in IF$_1$ and IF$_2$ (29b)

(29)

a.	IF$_1$	**POS**-Mod	VPn	...	IF$_2$	VPn	**NEG**-Mod
a.'	IF$_1$	**NEG**-Mod	VPn	...	IF$_2$	VPn	**POS**-Mod
b.	IF$_1$	VPn	**POS**-Mod	...	IF$_2$	**NEG**-Mod	VPn
b.'	IF$_1$	VPn	**NEG**-Mod	...	IF$_2$	**POS**-Mod	VPn

An example of the relevant configuration with two juxtaposed conditional situations is (30). As the role of context and is crucial in the interpretation of the two conditional clauses in (30b) and (30c), we need to describe how the discourse develops up to the point of the utterance of (30). The segment in (30) belongs to the description of events following the Philistines' captivity of the Israelite's Ark of the covenant (1 Samuel 4-6). Upon realizing that the shrine they took from the Israelites and moved from one town to another to show off is most likely responsible for the maladies and suffering that thereupon ensued in those towns, the Philistines deliberate whether to keep the shrine or to send it back to the Israelites. (30a) is what the priest and magicians suggest as the best way to test their hypotheses: choose two cows that have just had calves and that have never worked in the fields, put the calves back in the pen, and tie the cows in the wagon with the shrine. Based on which of the two possible hypothetical situations actually takes place (cows willing to go and cows not willing to go), they will know whether the shrine is the cause of their trouble or not. The two contrasting hypothetical situations are given in (30b) and (30c) as two contrasting conditional clauses, varying in the position of the non-finite vP relative to the modal. They have the same core lexical predicate (cows go forth pulling a cart) and positive and negative modal (will – not will). The negative modal in (30c), even though it clearly contrasts with the positive modal in (30b), is in the clause final position; the non-finite vP is fronted and this should correlate with the presuppositional interpretation of the proposition. In (30b), we have the positive modal and the non-fronted VPn. According to our assumptions so far, this order is non-presupposed and should contain a focused element. Both conditional situations are relatively backgrounded or inferable from the preceding context: cows are chosen to take the shrine away in the cart, and the possibility (or their willingness) of them going forth with the cart should not need a special introduction to the CG (as we have often noticed to be the case in fronted vP$_{nf}$). This is reflected in the order in (30c) where the cows' unwillingness to go is delivered as a matter-of-fact. In (30b), conversely, their willingness is introduced as a focus alternative. In (30c) the speaker commits to the negative modality,[33] while in (30b) the positive modality lacks the speaker's commitment and is presented as something that needs to be negotiated before it is added to the CG. But the cow's willingness is not presented as an 'unmarked' focus alternative (from an open set of alternative modal values), but rather carries a strong implication that the speaker finds this alternative unlikely. Recall that this is argued to be one of the defining properties of contrastive focus (cf. Zimmermann 2008 and his proposal that contrastive focus comes with the speaker's concern that the hearer will not be able to quickly accept

---

[33] Presuppositions are generally recognized as commiting the speaker (to the truth of) the presupposed proposition. The same notion of speaker's commitment is also used in the characterizations of assertions, where it is taken that the speaker can be commited to the truth of a proposition via a communicative act. To avoid terminological confusion and possible theoretical implications, I will assume that assertion involves '**public** commitment', which is to be understood as liability, frankness ('how the speaker is to be') and fidelity ('what the speaker is to do'). A speaker is liable to being correct or incorrect. Being liable, the speaker is not obliged to making the proposition true - the speaker can be right or wrong depending how things are independent of the utterance (cf. Green 2017).

something they find unlikely, so the speaker uses special marking to 'alert' the hearer)). Using contrastive focus on the modal *willað* 'will' in (30b), the speaker indicates that under the circumstances discussed so far, it is not expected that the milch cows which, furthermore, have never been under yoke, would abandon their calves and start pulling the cart with the shrine. The opposite, on the other hand, matches both the speaker's and hearers' belief (or knowledge of the world), and this proposition is given as presupposed. Such high unlikelihood of the situation in (30b) is exactly what is necessary for the Philistines to realize that stealing the ark/shrine was an offense to God and that it should be returned to the Israelites.

(30)

a.   and nimað twa geonge cy, þe under iuce ne comon, þæt hi þæt halige scrin ham ferian magon mid þam gyldenum lacum þe ge Gode geoffriað, and healdað þa cealfas æt ham getigede
'Take two young cows, that have not been under yoke, **so that they can take the holy shrine with the golden gifts that you offer God**, and keep their calves at home tied'

b.
þonne	mage	ge	tocnawan,	gyf	þa	cy	**willað**	**gan**	forð	on	þone	weg
then	may	you	know	if	the	cows	will	go	forth	on	the	way

fram	heora	cealfum,	þæt	hit	Godes	yrre	wæs	þe	eow	swa	geswencte.
from	their	calves	that	it	God's	anger	was	that	you	so	tortured

'Then you may know, if the cows will go forth on the way from their calves, that it was God's anger that tortured you so'

c.
Gif	hi	þonne	**gan**	**nellað**	mid	þæs	Godes	scrine	heonon,	þonne	mage
if	they	then	go	not-will	with	the	God's	shrine	away	then	may

ge	tocnawan	þæt	se	cwealm	næs	forþi,	þurh	Godes	yrre,
you	know	that	the	torment	not-was	for-that	through	God's	anger

ac	gelamp	elles
but	happened	otherwise

'if they will not go with the God's shrine away, then you may know that the torment was not because of God's anger, but happened otherwise'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_22:268.3426-3429)

(31) provides more support that contrast is not necessarily focused, if the speaker commits to the proposition, or delivers it as non-controversial at least. In (31), the proposition of the conditional *gif*-clause in (31b) contrasts with the proposition of the *gif*-clause in (31a). However, the option that the cruel judge Aegeas, who 'forced the Christians to idolatrous worship', would not believe that Christ is true God is expected, given the previous exchange between him and Andrew (the speaker, in this segment), and can be delivered matter-of-factly.

(31)

a. You have heard the mystery of the holy offering; now **if you believe** that Christ, the Son of God, who was hanged on a cross, is true God, then I will disclose to you how the lamb continues sound and undefiled in its kingdom, after it is offered, and its flesh eaten, and its blood drunken.

b.
Gif	þu	þonne	gelyfan	**nelt**.	ne	becymst	þu	næfre	to	insihte
if	you	then	believe	not-will	not	become	you	never	to	insight

þissere	soðfæstnysse
of-this	truth

'but if you will not believe, you will never come to an insight of his truth'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_38:515.229.7699)

(32) illustrates the same effect. In (32), Agatha, the speaker, is certain that heathen gods could not force the Christians to worship them (the proposition of the conditional clause in (32b)). This proposition contrasts with the possibility added to the CG in the preceding discourse, of heathen gods being able to command the Christians to worship them (32a). Even though the speaker brings in the relation of contrast to the discourse context, the fact that she commits to the alternative proposition, the proposition is delivered as presupposed, and not as a focus alternative.

(32)

a. Agatha answered him, 'The Almighty approves the minds of men rather than their great age; and faith is not in years, but dwells in prudent understandings. Let your gods be angry if they can do anything. Let themselves command us to worship them

b.
gif	þu	þis	**don**	**ne**	**miht**,	drece	us,	loca,	hu	þu	wylle
if	you	this	do	not	might	afflict	us	lo	how	you	will

'if you cannot accomplish this, afflict us, lo, how you will'

(coaelive,ÆLS[Agnes]:114.1793)

(33) is a part of the conversation between the apostle Bartholomew and the king Astryges, who turned to heathen worship. When Bartholomew challenges the king to demonstrate that the Christian God is meaningless, he certainly presupposes that this is not possible (as reflected in the Mod-final order in (33c). The conditional in (33b), with the non-final *miht* 'might' indicates that Bartholomew considers the alternative of the king being able to prove that Christian God is meaningless less likely, or even unlikely to hold. This unlikely option is delivered as a matter of fact, as content that the speaker considers not to be open to negotiation.

(33)

a.   Then said the king, 'So as you have made my brother forsake his god and believe in your god, so also I will make you forsake your god and believe in mine.' Then answered the apostle, **'The god that your brother worshipped I showed to him bound, and I commanded that he himself should break his image.**

b.

gif	þu	**miht**	ðis	don	minum	Gode	þonne	gebigst	þu	me	to
if	you	might	this	do	to-my	God	then	turn	you	me	to

þines	godes	bigencgum
your	god's	worship

'If you can do this to my God then will you incline me to the worship of your god'

c.

Gif	þu	ðonne	þis	minum	Gode	don	**ne**	**miht**.	ic	tobryte
if	you	then	this	to-my	God	do	not	might,	I	break

ealle	þine	godas
all	your	gods

'but if you cannot do this to my God, I will break all your gods [and you will then believe in the true God whom I preach]'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_31:447.220.6257-6258)

In (34), again there are two contrasting conditional clauses.[34] However, when Jesus addresses his disciples, he certainly does not commit to the proposition that they will *not* follow his instruction. This option is unlikely in the Christian system of belief, and consequently, the proposition is not added to the CG as non-controversial, but rather as a contrastive focus alternative.

(34)

a.   Jesus said, **'If you forgive** those men who sin against you, then will your heavenly Father forgive you your sins:

---

[34] The original OE is not given here because the conditional clause does not contain a modal/auxiliary verb, and the position of the lexical verb here is not very informative with respect to the pragmatic status of the proposition

b.

Gif	ge	þonne	**nellað**	forgifan:	Nele	eac	eower	fæder	eow
if	you	then	not-will	forgive	not-will	also	your	father	you

forgifan	eowre	gyltas
forgive	your	sins

'but if you will not forgive, your Father will not forgive you your sins'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_3:203.137.584)

Even though the unlikelihood interpretation associated with contrastive focus is often attributed to the hearer's perspective (the speaker uses contrastive focus marking to prepare the hearer that the content is unlikely or unexpected). Often, however, contrastive focus only reflects the speaker's perspective on the likelihood/expectedness of a described situation. The speaker uses contrastive focus to motivate or remind the addressee that he should treat the propositional content as unlikely, or as something the hearer should hold as expected or desirable in a given situation, based on the speaker's system of belief. This is illustrated in (35). When St. Paul addresses Nero and presents him with the conditional situation in which Nero wants to hear the words of Simon Magus, the sorcerer, he has little reason to think that from Nero's point of view this option is necessarily unlikely, as, after all, Nero allows Simon to challenge St. Peter and St. Paul's belief in God by performing God-like miracles. Rather, the speaker, St. Paul imposes his view or perspective that the words and deeds of a sorcerer, accomplished through 'devil's wisdom' should not be believed.

(35)

Gif	þu	**wilt**	his	wordum	**hyran**	&	his	bebodu	læstan,	þu
if	you	will	his	words	hear	and	his	commands	do	you

forleosest	þin	rice	&	þines	sylfes	feorh
lose	your	kingdom	and	your	self's	money

'If you will hear his words and obey his commands, you will lose your kingdom ad your own money'

(coblick,LS_32_[PeterandPaul[BlHom_15]]:183.232.2371)

So far, we have only looked at conditional clauses, but the same effect can be found in temporal clauses. In (36b), the contrastive focus on the negative modal *noldon* 'would not' indicates that it is unlikely or unexpected, or even inappropriate, that after God had sent his invitation twice (first through prophets, then through apostles), the people, being so 'decisively invited', would still not come to celebrate the marriage between Christ and the Church, and that God needs to invite them for the third time.

110

(36)

a. God sent his messengers, that he might invite everyone to this marriage. He sent once and again; for he sent his prophets, who announces his Son's humanity to come, and again, afterwards sent his apostles, who announced his advent accomplished, as the prophets had first prophesied it.

b | ða ða | hi | **noldon** | **cuman** | to | þam | gyftum. | þa | sende | he | eft |
    |-------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|-----|---------|-----|-------|-----|------|
    | when | they | not-would | come | to | the | marriage, | then | sent | he | again |

þus	cweðende
thus	saying

    'When they would not come to the marriage, he sent again, thus saying'

                                                                    (cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_35:477.51.6939)

Due to the unexpectedness and the unlikelihood interpretation, contrastive focus is often found in rules associated with certain moral expectations. When a proposition expresses something opposite to what rules of moral conduct impose, it is delivered as a contrastively marked alternative. Thus, for instance, the negative modal *ne willað* 'not want' in the temporal clause in (37b) does not only evoke the set of alternatives ('woman wanting to abstain from her husband' and 'woman not wanting to abstain from her husband'), but also adds the evaluation that the focused proposition should not hold, as it violates the obligation of women to take proper care of their children all the time.

(37)

a. Husband shall not enter his wife's bed, before the baby is weaned from the breast. A culpable habit indeed has arisen in places between the married pair, that the woman neglects to feed her child, that she has borne, and hands it over to others to feed

b. | þæt | is | þonne | gesegen | gemeted | fore | intingan | unforhæfdnisse | anre, | forþon, |
    |------|-----|-------|---------|---------|------|----------|----------------|-------|---------|
    | that | is | then | said | found | for | reason | incontinence | alone | because |

þonne	heo	**ne**	**willað**	ahabban	from	heora	werum,	þætte	heo	forhycgað
when	she	not	will	abstain	from	her	husband	that	she	neglects

fedan	þa	ðe	heo	cennað.
feed	those	that	she	bore

    'Now this seems to occur through incontinence only, for they neglect to feed their own babies, when they **will not** live apart from their husbands.'

                                                                    (cobede,Bede_1:16.76.31.713)

Similarly in (38), when Christ addresses his followers, he assumes that they will forgive those who have sinned against them, so the negative possibility is unexpected, unlikely and inadvisable.

(38)

a. Se hælend cwæð. Gif ge forgyfað þam mannum þe wið eow agyltað þonne forgyfð eow eower heofenlica Fæder eowere synna.

'The Saviour said, If you forgive the men who sin against you, then the heavenly father will forgive you your sins.'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_3:203.135.583

b.

Gif	ge	þonne	*nellað*	*forgifan*:	Nele	eac	eower	fæder	eow
if	you	then	not-will	forgive	not-will	also	your	father	you

forgifan	eowre	gyltas
forget	your	sins

'If you will not forgive them, neither will your father forget you your sins'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_3:203.137.584)

In sum, when the finite verb is focused, the lexical content of the proposition is usually backgrounded (often explicitly given in the preceding discourse), and the focus on the modal does not merely pick an alternative from an open set (as new information focus is often viewed as doing). It picks one from a closed set having two contrasting elements, and in addition, marks the selected member as unlikely or unexpected.

3.2.6 Parallel focus structures

Many Vf-VPnf orders are instances of 'parallel focus'. Parallel focus is involved 'when Focus is assigned to corresponding constituents in parallel constructions' (Dik 1989: 282) or to highlight parallels in interpretation (Krifka 2008).

Earlier we have presented cases of parallel focus within the same clause. Also, some temporal clauses especially, when used for introducing contrast relation with the main clause, resemble parallel focus structures. What we annotate as 'parallel focus' cases are roughly those where more than one element in the embedded proposition is in the parallel relation with some other contextually salient proposition. It is quite difficult to provide a meaningful classification of parallel focus uses. In the illustration of the use of parallel focus in OE, I will keep track of where the clause parallel to the conditional/temporal clause is and which element is common to both propositions.

In (39b), the content of the conditional clause is to be interpreted parallel to the content of the main clause. The subject (the priest), the indirect object (the lay people) and the predicate (say/give an example from) in both clauses are the same, while the modal and the complement are interpreted in parallel/contrast with the corresponding elements in the main clause, introduced by the focus sensitive adverb *huru* 'at least' in its left-periphery. The elements in parallel contrast relation are: cannot – should; [say/give an example from] a homily - [say/give an example from] his life, where the contrast pertains to the fact that 'homily' is 'a prophet's/saint's life', as opposed to 'priest's own life'.

(39)

a.   It is written, 'The foolish will not be corrected with words'

b. | Gif | se | sacerd | **ne** | **mæg** | **ðam** | **læwedum** | **mannum** | **larspel** | **secgan.** |
|-----|-----|--------|--------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| if | the | priest | not | may | to-the | lay | people | homily | say |

huru	he	sceal	þurh	his	lifes	unsceððignysse	him	wel	bysnian;
at-least	he	shall	through	his	life's	example	them	well	exemplify

'If the priest cannot say a homily to the lay folk, he should, at least, through the innocence of his life, set them a good example'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_41:306.66.6963)

In (40), the whole utterance in (40b) is parallel to the utterance in (40a), which is overtly indicated by the presence of *sua* 'so' at the beginning of (40b). Just as David with his song/his harp soothed Saul's mind (which was brought to madness by an evil spirit), so shall we soothe the mind of the rich men (when they are turned to anger) with our words. The elements in common are the predicate 'alleviate/soothe', and the object 'mental state of anger/madness', while the contrasting elements are the subject (David – we), object (Saul – rich men) and instrument (with song/harp – with words).

(40)

a.   Therefore, when the unclean spirit came on Saul, David with his song alleviated Saul's fit of madness.

b. | Sua | ðonne, | ðonne | ðæt | mod | ðara | ricena | for | upahæfenesse | **bið** |
|-----|--------|-------|-----|-----|------|--------|-----|--------------|---------|
| so | then | when | the | mind | of-the | rich | for | pride | is |

to	ierre	gehwierfed,
to	anger	turned

'So, when the mind of the rich through pride is *turned to anger*, [it is proper for us to heal their mind by soothing them and *restoring them to tranquility* by our talk, as David did Saul with the harp']

(cocura,CP:26.185.5.1221)

A similar case is given in (41). The proposition of the conditional clause in (41b) - 'the mind of the sinful being touched by fear of the heavenly doom' - is compared with the proposition in the preceding discourse 'bier being touched by the Lord' (cf. again 'so also' introducing the second utterance). The lexical verb ('touched') is the same in both, what is compared/contrasted is the theme argument (the bier vs. the sinful) and agent/cause argument (God vs. fear of heavenly doom).

113

(41)

a.   When the Lord touched the bier, the biermen stood still

b.

swa	eac	gif	þæs	synfullan	ingehyd	**bið**	gehrepod	mid	fyrhte	þæs
so	also	if	the	sinful's	mind	is	touched	by	fear	of-the

upplican	domes.	þonne	wiðhæfð	he	þam	unlustum
heavenly	doom	then	withstands	he	the	evil-lusts

'So also, if the mind of the sinful is touched by fear of heavenly doom, then he withstands evil lusts...'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_33:460.54.6595)

In (42), the only common element in both propositions is the theme argument (he; implicit in the main clause), while the agent arguments (men-dogs) and the verbs (reject- approach) contrast.

(42)

Ac	þa ða	he	wæs	**fram**	**mannum**	*forsewen*	þa	*genealæhton*	**ða**	**hundas**
but	when	he	was	from	men	rejected	then	approached	the	dogs

'when he was rejected from men, then the dogs approached (and licked his wounds)'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_23:367.59.4575)

In (43), the conditional clause contrasts with the preceding main clause with respect to the temporal adjuncts (later, future life vs. here/now) and the object (the more evil vs. the good), while the lexical verb is the same in both ('receive').

(43)

a.   About this same it was also said of the rich man, of whom it was said that he suffered in hell; it was said:: 'You have received all your good here in the world.'

b.

Forðæm	anfehð	se	yfla	auht	goodes	on	ðisse	worulde	ðæt	he
therefore	receives	the	evil	portion	of-good	in	this	world	that	he

eft	ðy maran	yfles	on	ðæm	toweardan	life,	gif	he	**her**	nolde
later	the more	evil	in	the	future	life	if	he	here	not-would

for	**ðæm**	**goode**	to	Gode	gecierran.
for	the	good	to	God	turn

'The evil man receives a portion of good in this world, that he may hereafter receive the more evil in the future life, if here he would not for the good turn to God'

(cocura,CP:50.391.15.2657)

114

3.3 New discourse segments

Non-fronted vP orders have been observed to occur at the beginning of new discourse segments. The identification of what counts as a new discourse segment is rather intuitive and unsophisticated, i.e. without reference to any particular theory of discourse organization and segmentation. I will assume that new discourse segments correlate with basic units of textual organization: new chapter, new section, and new paragraph. New discourse segments presumably arise with changes in the discourse aboutness topics, as well as changes in discourse participants. None of these factors alone is a sufficient condition for the non-presuppositional interpretation of a proposition, but the correlation is strong and worth taking seriously.

Propositions are quite regularly given as non-presupposed at the beginning of a direct speech segment. The proposition 'anyone be afflicted with any sins' is the first sentence that opens St. Paul's quote in (44). Even though the propositional content itself (people being prone to sin) is at least highly plausible in the given context, by virtue of opening a new discourse segment, the proposition is delivered as non-presupposed.

(44)

Be	ðæm	suiðe	wel	Paulus	us	manode,	ða	he	cuæð:	Gif	hwa
about	it	very	well	Paulus	us	admonished	when	he	said	if	one

sie	**abisegod**	mid	hwelcum	scyldum,	ge	ðonne	ðe	gæsðlice	sindon
be	afflicted	with	any	sins	you	then	who	spiritual	are

gelærað	ða	suelcan	mid	monnðwærnesse	gæste
instruct	the	such-ones	with	humanity	spirit

'Therefore Paul admonished us very well, saying: "If any one be afflicted with any sins, you who are spiritual instruct such ones with the spirit of humanity"'

(cocura,CP:21.159.9.1081)

Propositional content can be closely related to the general topic of the discourse segment, as in (45), where the quote in (45b) directly contributes to the situation of interest in the preceding discourse (bringing offering to God), and could qualify as being part of the CG. The introduction of another source of information – Christian books – makes this move infelicitous.

(45)

a.   The quarrelsome are to be told to know, that as long as they keep aloof from the love of their neighbours, and are at variance with them, they cannot bring anything good to please God.

b.

Be	ðæm	is	awriten	on	Cristesbocum:	Gif	ðu	**wille**	ðin	lac
about	that	is	written	in	Christ's-books	if	you	will	your	offering

bringan	to	ðæm	wiofude,	&	ðu	ðonne	ryhte	ofðence	hwæthwugu

115

| bring | to | the | altar | and | you | then | well | remember something |

| ðæs | ðe | ðin | niehsta | ðe | wiðerweardes | gedon | hæbbe |
| that | your | neighbour | you, | against | done | has |

'Of which is written in the books of Christ: "If you will bring your offering to the altar, and there remember well something that your neighbour has done against you [leave your offering before the altar, and go first after him; reconcile yourself with him and before your offering; then bring your offering"'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:46.349.8.2358)</div>

The influence of the shift from narration to direct speech on the possible presuppositional interpretation of a proposition is rather straightforward. Insertion of quoted speech essentially involves change of the speaker, i.e. introduction of a new speaker's perspective. If common ground building is viewed as a cooperative act between the speaker and the hearer, it is no surprise that the introduction of the perspective of a 'third party' in the discourse would disrupt what has been established, agreed upon, or believed to be shared at a particular point in the discourse.

Non-presupposed temporal clauses at the beginning of a new discourse segment also correlate with the change of discourse topic. Even though in (46) the propositional content of the temporal clause (Simon making a prophecy about Christ) has been activated (twice), and is part of the CG, it opens a new paragraph as non-presupposed. This is because the new paragraph establishes a new discourse topic. We are no longer interested in Simon and his prophecy. Rather, the main clause introduces a new discourse participant, a widow called Anna, and the discourse continues about her. Simon's prophecy only serves as a temporal frame. The non-topical status of Simeon and the cancellation of the link with the preceding discourse can also be verified by the lack of pronominalization. Even though Simon is present in the preceding discourse, a referential expression rather than a pronoun is used. As it has been often emphasized, the presence and distance of a referent in the preceding discourse alone is not a sufficient factor for the choice of a pronoun. Topichood is also highly relevant (Ariel 1990, Reinhart 2004: 299). For a referent to be resumed by a pronoun, it needs to be highly accessible, and accessibility is affected by the topicality of the referent.[35]

(46)

a. Then **said the old Simon** to the blessed Mary, 'His sword shall pierce through your soul'. The sword betokened The blessed Mary was not slain nor martyred bodily, but spiritually. When she saw her child taken, and iron nails driven through his hands and through his feet, and his side afterwards wounded with a spear, then was his suffering her suffering; and she was then more than a martyr, for her mind's suffering was greater than her body's would have been, had she been martyred. **The old Simeon said** not that Christ's sword should pierce through

---

[35] This does not mean that every referential personal pronoun is of the same topic-strength. Different degrees of topicality can be marked in a number of ways: from the choice of pronoun form (stressed or unstressed) to the position in the sentence structure – lower pronouns of the same type are generally interpreted as less topical (cf. van Kemenade & Milićev 2005/2012 for the distribution of weak object pronouns).

Mary's body, but her soul. Christ's sword is here set, as we said, for his passion. Though Mary believed that Christ would arise from death, her child's suffering went, nevertheless, very deeply into her heart.

ða ða	se	Simeon	**hæfde**	**gewitegod**	þas	witegunge	be	Criste:
when	the	Simeon	had	prophesized	this	prophecy	about	Christ

þa	com	þær	sum	wuduwe	seo	wæs	Anna	gehaten.
then	came	there	some	widow	who	was	Anna	called

'When Simeon had prophesied this prophecy concerning Christ, then came there a widow, who was called Anna'

(cocathom1, ÆCHom_I,_9:254.181.1728)

The topic change effect can also be observed in texts outside our investigation here, such as *Gregory's Dialogues*. (47) is found at the beginning of the episode illustrating one of the holy Bishop Fortunate's' miracles, as required from one of the discourse participants of the other (47a). The episode then opens with the introduction of Goths traveling near the city of Tuderti (established earlier as the hometown of the bishop), with two boys, who have been accused of stealing in that area. Even though Bishop Fortunate is a topic of the larger discourse unit, in this particular episode, he is (re-) introduced in the temporal clause (47b). In addition, nothing said earlier makes it possible for one to infer the proposition that the news of the previous event is communicated to the bishop. Therefore, it needs to be asserted.

(47)

a.   'Then I beseech you', said I, 'tell me whether you know of any miracles which he did, and because I am very desirous, let me understand what manner of man he was'. 'This man,' said he, 'was far different from all those which live in our days; for he obtained at God's hands whatsoever he requested. One of his miracles which comes to my mind, I will now tell you'

b.   Certain Goths, upon a day, travelling not far from the city of Tuderti, as they were in their journey to Ravenna, carried away with them two little boys from a place which belonged to the said city.

c.	þa þa	þis	**wearð**	**gecyðed**	þam	halgan	were
	when	this	was	made-known	to-the	holy	man

þa	sende	he	sona…
then	send	he	soon

'When this was made known to the holy man Fortunate, then he soon sent…'

(cogregdH,GD_1_[H]:10.80.10.793)

117

As can be seen from figures in Table 4.2, conditional clauses are rather rarely found at the beginning of new discourse segments in the texts investigated. There are, however, other texts where the effect of new discourse segment/new discourse situation evidently correlates with the change in the word order. Generally speaking, this effect is found in instruction books, such as the handbooks on herbal remedies and leechcraft (*Herbarium*, *Leechdoms*, and *Remedies* (*Lacnunga*)), on the one hand, and books of laws (*Laws of Inne*, *Laws of Alfred*, *Laws of Æthelred*, and so on). The structure of these texts is often such that the sentence initial conditional clause introduces a new situation or scene (malady, illness, criminal act, social situations), and the main clause then provides instruction as to what is to be done in that situation.

(48)

Gif	ðu	þonne	**wylle**	mannes	wambe	**þwænan**	þonne	nim	ðu...
if	you	then	will	one's	womb	clean	then	take	you

'If you will clean one's womb, then you should take ...'

(coherbar,Lch_I_[Herb]:2.7.154)

(49)

Gif	man	**scyle**	mugcwyrt	to	læcedome	**habban**,	þonne	nime	man	þa
if	one	shall	mugwort	to	healing	have	then	take	one	the

readan	wæpnedmen	&	þa	grenan	wifmen	to	læcecræfte.
red	males	and	the	green	females	to	leechcraft

'If one will use mugwort for healing, then one should take the red males and green females for leechcraft'

(colacnu,Med_3_[Grattan-Singer]:178.30.805)

(50)

Gif	þu	**wille**	lim	**aceorfan**	oððe	**asniðan**	of	lichoman	þonne	gesceawa...
if	you	will	limb	remove	or	cut-off	of	body	then	inspect

'If you will remove or cut off a limb from the body, you should inspect…'

(colaece,Lch_II_[1]:35.3.9.1058)

(51)

Gif	mon	**sie**	on	þa	herðan	to ðam swiðe	**wund**,	þæt	he	ne
if	one	be	on	the	testicles	so-much	hurt	that	he	not

mæge	bearn	gestrienan	gebete	him	ðæt	mid	LXXX	scillinga
may	children	conceive	compensate	him	that	with	80	shillings

'If one's testicles are so injured that he cannot have children, compensate him with 80 shillings'

(colawaf,LawAf_1:65.192)

(52)

Gif	ðeof	**sie**	**gefongen**,	swelte	he	deaðe,
if	thief	is	caught	suffer	he	death

'If a thief is caught, he should suffer death'

Again, the lack of presupposition in the cases described above is fairly straightforward. It would be highly unlikely that the speaker, or the one who gives instructions, would expect the reader to treat propositions introducing new situations/scenes as being part of the common ground. One might argue that the context of the whole discourse in the book is thematically fixed to the discussion of various illnesses, herbal remedies, relatively fixed set of social conduct, so the reader can be assumed to be able to accommodate each illness as activated, inferable, or part of the general shared knowledge. However, developing discourse on such assumptions would certainly lead to incoherence. Considering the vast number of different situations discussed, and presumably, the non-strict-expert orientation of the book, the speaker/writer's choice to pragmatically assert a new situation is well justified. Importantly, not all conditional clauses found in instruction texts are of this type. If the illness/malady condition/situation describes an event inferable from the preceding discourse, it will be delivered as presupposed.

(53)

a.

...læt	him	blod	on	þam	winestran	earme	of	uferran	ædre,
...let	him	blood	on	the	left	arm	of	upper	artery

'...let the blood out of the artery on his left arm'

b.

gif	þu	þa	**findan**	ne	**mæge**	læt	of	þære	midmestan	ædre
if	you	it	find	not	may	let	of	the	middle	artery

'If you can't find it, let the blood out of the middle artery'

(54)

a.

ride	þam	ealdormen;	bidde	hine	fultumes
ride	to-the	alderman	ask	him	for-help

'ride to the alderman and ask him for help'

b.

gif	he	him	**fultuman**	ne	**wille**,	ride	to	cyninge…
if	he	him	help	not	will	ride	to	king…

'If he will not help him, ride to the king'

The cases presented above involve propositions without any contrastive marking in them. We have seen though that clauses with contrastively marked elements are often found at similar points in the

discourse as the ones labeled 'new discourse segment', so both factors often seem to work hand in hand when presupposable content is not fronted.

3.4 Topic-focus switch or reversed discourse subordination

With respect to its relation to the main clause, embedded clauses are typically interpreted as 'backgrounded', and their syntactic subordination often corresponds to their discourse subordination, irrespective of the actual cognitive status of the proposition they contain. However, at some points in discourse development, this relation can change, and the embedded clause will be used to present content which is 'more informative/important/relevant' from the point of view of the broader discourse context. This effect is often addressed in the discussion of assertion, main point of utterance and at-issueness, and correlation, or lack of it, between new information and assertion.

In our data, temporal clauses exhibit non-fronted vP orders when the typical 'topic/background-focus' configuration between the embedded and main clause is reversed. In such cases, the proposition in the main clause presents content that is already in the CG, while the proposition in the embedded clause updates the CG. The contribution of the temporal clause is typically an elaboration of the content of the main clause. Let us present some examples of this effect. The main clause in (55b) (the whelps eat the crumbs that fall from their master's table) virtually repeats the proposition added to the common ground four sentences earlier (55a). With respect to this content, the temporal clause provides new information (how these words are to be interpreted more spiritually) and updates the CG.

(55)

a. 'The woman said to Christ, "Yea, dear Lord, yet the whelps eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table"'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_8:70.99.1418)

b.

Soðlice	æfter	gastlicum	andgite.	*þa*	*hwelpas*	*etað*	*ða*	*cruman*	*þe*	*of*
truly	after	ghostly	sense	the	whelps	eat	the	crumbs	that	of

heora	*hlaforde*	*beode*	*feallað.*	þonne	ða	ðeoda	þe	on	hæðenscipe
their	master's	table	fall	when	the	nations	which	on	heathenism

ær	lagon.	nu	**sind**	mid	geleafan	to	heora	scyppende	gebigede
before	lay	now	are	with	belief	to	their	Creator	turned

'But in a ghostly sense the whelps eat the crumbs that fall from their master's table, when the nations, which before lay in heathenism, are now with belief turned to their Creator'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_8:70.104.1422)

As we have shown in (9), 'inverse' correlative temporal clauses can also be used in discourse subordination shifts. Another example of this is (56). The proposition of the main clause in (56b), that the elbow is supported with a pillow and the neck with a bolster, has been added to the CG in (56a).

The temporal clause is used to elaborate on under what circumstances the propositional content of the main clause holds.

(56)

a.   'Woe to those who wish to **lay a pillow under each elbow and bolster under each neck** to catch men with' He lays a pillow under every man's elbow who with soft flatteries wished to doctor those who sink into the love of this world, until they fall from their righteousness.

b.

ðonne	*bið*	*se*	*elnboga*	*underled*	*mid*	*þyle*	*&*	*se*	*hnecca*	*mid*
then	is	the	elbow	supported	with	pillow	and	the	neck	with

bolstre,	**ðonne**	ðæm	synfullan	menn	**bið**	oftogen	ðæt	hine	mon
bolster	when	the	sinful	man	is	relieved	that	him	one

stiðlice	arasige
severely	rebukes

'The elbow is supported with a pillow and the neck with a bolster when the sinful man is not sternly rebuked.'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:19.143.17.970)</div>

In all the examples above we also observe that the proposition of the temporal clause enters into parallel relations with other clauses, or that the propositional content is 'negatively' evaluated by the speaker that, according to his point of view, it should not hold.

Conditional clauses, generally, are not used to introduce 'novel frames' for the 'old' matrix clause content. An example such as (57) could count as an instance where the main clause emphasizes something that is already in the CG, and the conditional clause adds a novel situation which restricts the domain of availability of the main content to this situation. The matrix clause content, that Mary can do much for us through her child, Christ, is already common-ground (Mary, giving birth to her son, did the most for us – opened the gate of heaven's kingdom). The conditional clause then informs us that this holds only if we pray to her ('fervently remind her'). But from the continuation of the sentence, we see that the conditional clause serves another purpose – it is used as an invitation for us to pray, or a strong suggestion that this is what we should do. This use of conditionals is presented in more detail in the next section.

(57)

Let us also be mindful of how great dignity is the holy maiden Mary, the mother of Christ; she is blessed above all women; she is the heavenly queen, and the comfort and support of all Christian men. Our old mother Eve shut to us the gate of heaven's kingdom, and the holy Mary opened it again to us, if we ourselves by evil works shut it not against us..

Micel	mæg	heo	æt	hire	bearne	abiddan.	gif	heo	**bið**	geornlice
much	may	she	of	her	child	obtain	if	she	is	fervently

to	gemynegod;
thereof	reminded

'Much may she obtain of her Child, if she be fervently thereof reminded. [Let us, therefore, with great fervour, pray to her, that she mediate for us to her own Child, who is both her Creator and her Son, true God and true man, one Christ, who lives and reigns with Father and with Holy Ghost, those three one God to all eternity. Amen]'

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_1:11.298.246)</div>

3.5 Requests and suggestions

Finally, let us address a minority type of interpretation noted in conditional clauses only. Namely, some *gif*-clauses have the function of introducing polite requests or suggestions. Presumably, in such cases, the speaker avoids imposing presuppositional content on the speaker. Whether this is related to a politeness strategy, is a matter of discussion.

(58)

a.   We have also to consider, that the holy housel is both the body of Christ and of all believing people, by a ghostly mystery, as the wise Augustine said of it,

b.

Gif	ge	willað	understandan	be	Cristes	lichaman.	gehyrað	þone
if	you	will	understand	about	Christ's	body	hear	the

apostol	Paulum.	þus	cweðende;
apostle	Paul	thus	saying

'If ye will understand concerning the body of Christ, hear the apostle Paul, thus saying...'

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_15:157.227.3482)</div>

In this section, we have identified a number of factors leading to non-vPnf fronted orders in temporal and conditional clauses. We have taken for granted that these clauses are conventionally 'presupposed', even though it is often hard to treat them as propositions which are strictly speaking part of the CG. Still, their general backgroundedness and dependence on the matrix clause, as well as their projectiveness could justify such treatment. Here it seems useful to take a glimpse into how other types of presuppositional content behave with respect to one word order option (vP fronting) and the other (no vP fronting). This is done in the following section, where we examine the behavior of a predicate which is conventionally presupposed.

3.6 Presupposition cancelling: focus + predicate 'being born'

In Chapter 2, Section 3.2.4, it has been pointed out that certain predicates, such as 'being born', are always added to the discourse as presupposed, when the subject referent has been existentially introduced in the discourse. This effect is observed in all embedded clause types, and even some main

<div align="center">122</div>

clauses. In (59a) the subject *hi* 'they' refers to the sons of Saturn (*his suna* 'his sons'), given in the preceding clause. The same can be observed in (59b), where the subject *he* 'he' has clearly been present in the CG, since the referent has been pronominalized in the preceding clauses (*æt him* 'from him' and *hine* 'him').

(59)

a.
Saturnus	þe	abat	his	suna	**þonne**	**hi**	**geborene**	**wæron**,	swa	swa
Saturn	who	devoured	his	sons	when	they	born	were	so	as

his	biggengan	on	heora	bocum	awriton
his	worshippers	in	their	books	wrote

'Saturn who devoured his sons when they were born, even as his worshippers have written in their books'

<div align="right">(coaelive, ÆLS_[Chrysanthus]:103.7391)</div>

b.
and	deoplice	undernam	Drihtnes	lare	æt	him,	oð þæt	se	halga	apostol
and	deeply	received	Lord's	lore	from	him	until	the	holy	apostle

hine	gehadode	to	bisceope	to	þære	Atheniscan	byrig	**þær**	**he**
him	consecrated	as	bishop	to	the	Athenian	city	where	he

geboren	**wæs**
born	was

'and deeply received the divine lore from him, until the holy apostle consecrated him as bishop of the Athenian city where he was born'

<div align="right">(coaelive, ÆLS_[Denis]:72.5833)</div>

When a proposition, however, also includes a secondary predicate, no vP fronting takes place. Even though the main predicate is both semantically and pragmatically presupposed, the secondary predicate constitutes new, non-presupposed information, and the proposition is delivered as non-presupposed.

(60)

a.
þa	brohte	sum	man	his	dohtor	him	to,	seo	wæs	**dumb**	geboren,
then	brought	some	man	his	daughter	him	to	who	was	dumb	born

twelf	wintre	maiden
twelve	years	mæden

'Then a certain man brought his daughter to him, who was born dumb, a maiden of twelve winters'

<div align="right">(coaelive, ÆLS_[Martin]:1103.6690)</div>

b. and he sona wearð hal beorhte locigende, se ðe **blind** wæs geboren
    and he soon became whole clearly seeing he who blind was born

    'and immediately he was made whole, seeing clearly, who had been born blind'
                                                    (coaelive, ÆLS _[Apollinaris]:179.4668)

c. Mitte þe hit þa þære eadegan tide nealæhte þætte Dryhten **lichomlice**
    when   it then to-the blessed time neared that Lord bodily

    wolde wesan geboren...
    would be born

    'When it neared the time that the Lord would be born bodily..'
                                                    (coverhom,HomU_10_[ScraggVerc_6]:16.985)

What is the nature of focus in such cases? It delivers novel information, but it should not be equated with new information focus. The alternative with the focus expression is always given in contrast with the 'default' way of being born (people are generally born with hearing, sight; Christ does have dual nature, but the dominant one is God-like/divine rather than human).

The second case where a semantically presupposed proposition is delivered as assertive is when it is at a new discourse segment. In (61b) the proposition does not introduce Joseph existentially. However, the proposition seems to open a new discourse segment (accompanied by a discourse topic switch from God in (61a) to Jacob (61b)).

(61)
a. Witodlice God gehyrde Racheles bene, & he gestrynde be hyre Iosep.
    indeed God heard Rachel's prayer and he begat in her Joseph

    'Indeed, God heard Rachel's prayer and he begat Joseph in her'

b. ða Iosep **wæs geboren**, þa bæd Iacob hys sweor þæt he
    when Joseph was born, then bade Jacob his father-in-law that he

    lete hyne faran to hys lande
    let him go to his land

    'When Joseph was born, then Jacob bade his father-in-law that he would let him go to his land'
                                                    (cootest,Gen:30. 22.1224-25.1226)

Finally, we also note the role of contrastive/emphatic focus on the lexical verb. In (62) the referent of the predicate 'being born' has been introduced in the discourse earlier. However, the predicate itself is focused, as the speaker indicates that it needs to be interpreted with respect to an alternative VP. More

precisely, the VP 'being born of her (his mother, Mary)' and the VP 'create his own mother' in the preceding clause are in parallel relation, with the purpose to emphasize the logical impossibility of the two situations: Christ first created his own mother and then was born of her. The effect, which seems to be rhetorical, would be lost if the proposition was rendered as presupposed.

(62)

Soðlice	swa	swa	he	**gesceop**	his	agene	moder	Marian.	and	siððan
verily	so	as	he	created	his	own	mother	Mary	and	later

wæs	**geboren**	of	hire.	swa	eac	he	forgeaf	þæt	fulluht	IOHANNE
was	born	of	her	so	also	he	gave	the	baptism	to-John

'All things are wrought through Christ] Verily as he created his own mother Mary, and was afterwards born of her, so also he gave baptism to John, [and was afterwards baptized by John]'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_3:25.203.594)

We have seen that semantic presupposition can be canceled in the same contexts and by the same strategies we see in Vf-vPnf embedded temporal and conditional clauses. Focus as a presupposition suspending device has been recognized in the literature (cf. Abrusan 2016). Much more research is needed to establish to what extent the word order change affects conventional presuppositions in general.

3.7 Discussion

In this section, we first summarize the main insights from non-fronted vP orders in temporal and embedded clauses. Then we turn to the question of the relation between vP fronting/non-fronting, focus and pragmatic (non) presupposition.

3.7.1 Main insights

INSIGHT 1: non-fronting correlates with altering the function of the clause

We have observed that many temporal clauses acquire cause/reason or concession/contrast meanings with non-fronted vP orders. But as we have emphasized at various places earlier, the difference in the clause type does not play a crucial role in the use of one word order or the other. There is only a strong correlation between a clause type and vP-(non)fronting. No clause type necessarily blocks vP fronting. Still, the fact that non-fronted vPs often change the external syntax of temporal and conditional clauses is worth exploring in future research.

INSIGHT 2: contrastive focus plays a significant role in non-fronted vP orders

Contrastive focus in temporal and conditional clauses serves to highlight that an element in the clause is in contrast relation with some other element which is part of the CG or contextually salient. Contrastive focus interpretation has been observed to go beyond highlighting semantic contrast between two expressions. The most interesting finding is that certain propositions with non-fronted vP orders always come with an inference of unlikelihood, while in the same context, fronted vP order shows no additional interpretation. This effect is due to the contrastive focus on the modal/auxiliary in vP fronted orders. Contrastive focus on the modal/auxiliary is shown to be accompanied by the speaker's perspective or evaluation which of the alternatives in the set is unlikely to hold in a given context. Or more precisely, that the focus alternative is unlikely or unexpected to hold. This is, according to Zimmermann 2008, the main function of contrastive focus. Zimmermann argues that what sets contrastive focus as an independent IS category apart from a more general notion of focus is that it indicates that particular content or a particular speech act is unexpected for the hearer from the speaker's perspective. 'One way for the speaker to direct the hearer's attention, and to get him to shift his background assumptions accordingly, is to use additional grammatical marking, e.g., intonation contour, syntactic movement, clefts, or morphological markers' (Zimmerman 2008: 348). Consequently, contrastive focus marking does not primarily indicate the presence of contrasting alternatives, but also the contrast between the information conveyed by the speaker and the assumed expectation state of the hearer. The speaker uses contrastive focus to overtly mark the content he finds unlikely to be expected by the hearer, and thus facilitates faster update of the CG.

With other elements in the clause, semantic contrast has been used to identify the element under contrastive focus (lexical verb, object, adjunct). But interestingly, in conditional clauses, the presence of the relevant contrasting set of alternatives evoked by focus on these individual elements influences the interpretation of the whole proposition. Contrast inside the lexical vP often adds the component unlikelihood, which has been observed to be the interpretation of the propositions with a contrastively focused finite verb. This is most obvious with contrastively focused participles, which always affect the auxiliaries too, and such proposition comes with the speaker's evaluation of being unexpected or unlikely. Other contrastively focused elements often lead to the same effect. Temporal clauses, on the hand, do not come with this 'projection of unlikelihood', at least not as obviously as conditional clauses do.

When it comes to the unlikelihood contribution of contrastive focus, we need to point out that a speaker can use it to impose his own view on the hearer that he *should not* accept the content as likely. We observe in our data that this is a strategy used in moralizing discourse, where the speaker in a way 'warns' the hearer that he should treat the content as unexpected based on some moral and social norms. This is the reading we get with contrastively focused infinitives and modals, which is a favorite strategy used in religious discourse, such as homilies and moral treatises. Such propositions are not treated as unlikely by the speaker; quite the opposite – because they *are* likely to hold in a given context, the speaker 'warns' the hearer that it should not be treated as something 'expected' or 'likely', let alone 'taken for granted', according to some religious and moral norms. Temporal clauses with a contrastively focused finite verb quite often shift to expressing contrast rather than temporality (this is especially prominent in *Cura Pastoralis,* for instance, which has the highest figures for contrastively focused verbs in temporal clauses).

126

INSIGHT 3: non-fronted vP orders are used for parallel focus

It has been also established that there is a rather clear correspondence between non-fronted vP orders and parallel focus interpretation. As pointed out in Krifka 2008, the use of focus to highlight parallels in interpretation is similar to (contrastive) focus uses in that focus evokes a set of alternatives, and these alternatives are evoked in the immediately surrounding context. The additional requirement of parallel focus is that the parallel expressions must have the same set of alternatives. In our dataset, such parallel focus structures are identified based on semantic contrast. In reality, focus marking of multiple semantically contrasting expressions is not obligatory, and when such expressions *are* focus marked, this is indicated by the presence of prosodic cues. As lack of vP fronting in conditional and temporal clauses has been observed to correlate with other, more regular uses of contrastive focus, I will take that the non-fronting option is employed as a strategy to mark parallel focus too.

INSIGHT 4: non-fronted vP orders are favored after discourse switches

Discourse shifts in narratives in some cases correlate with non-fronted, 'assertive-like' orders. However, discourse shifts alone do not require non-fronted vP orders. Shifts are usually coupled with other factors that 'prevent' the inclusion of presupposed/presupposable content as part of the 'mutual knowledge'. One obvious factor influencing the emergence of non-fronted vP orders with discourse shifts, is when a shift involves a change from one speaker's perspective to another's (swathes from narrative to quoted speech and vice versa). Another point where the shift needs to be overtly marked by an 'assertive-like' order in the temporal clause whose content is presupposed/presupposable is when the narrative shifts to a new episode. Again, episode shift needs to be of a special type, as it seems that new episodes introducing new discourse referents are the ones that need a clear cut-off point from the preceding episode.

We will not try to formalize the description of the role of new discourse segments any further. The factors observed could pertain to some independent principles of textual segmentation of discourse. Moreover, we have not been able to establish with certainty all the possible factors leading the author to use temporal and conditional clauses with 'assertive-like' orders at these specific points of discourse. A more careful investigation of both 'presupposed/presupposable' and 'assertive-like' orders needs to be carried out before we can fully understand when a new episode is compatible with one word order and not the other.

INSIGHT 5: non-fronted vP accompany switches in discourse subordination and indicate the main point of utterance (MPU)

Temporal clauses with non-fronted vP orders are observed in cases of discourse subordination shift, i.e. when the 'given' content of the main clause is elaborated in the syntactically embedded clause. Even though the main clause content is 'old', it is re-activated to be considered from a novel frame of interpretation provided by the temporal clause. However, this does not seem to be a sufficient condition as we again note the presence of parallels and/or inferences of the unlikelihood of propositions in 'assertive-like' temporal clauses. These are essentially the same effects we observe with contrastive focus.

All the factors observed are compatible with the view that the general view that IS/pragmatic factors underlie non-fronted vP orders and are aligned with concerns regarding discourse organization. If fronted vP orders are pragmatically presupposed (either being already part of the CG or treated as such, when 'informative'), does the lack of vP order corresponds to non-presupposition (in the sense that it decreases, suspends or cancels presuppositional effects) or does it make the proposition more assertive-like? The most significant factor observed in non-fronted vP order is focus. Relating focus directly to assertion is tempting, as focus has generally been understood as an assertion-creating device (Lambrecht 1994), but linking focus to the 'assertion'-effects in temporal and conditional clauses would be an oversimplification. The contribution of focus as CG update is relatively straightforward when focus brings in new information and when all this takes place in conventionally assertive clauses (main clauses). But even in such cases, it seems, as argued by Zimmermann & Onea (2011), focus influences common ground indirectly, as focus is a device that guides the hearer in the updating of the common ground.

Secondly, we observe that in temporal and conditional clauses it is always *contrastive* focus interpretation that non-fronted vP orders come with. In addition to the presence of alternatives, the inference is also that the focused alternative is less likely. And the crucial question is whether this intervention on the part of the speaker qualifies the content he delivers as 'proposal to update the common ground'. The answer to that question obviously depends on how we understand the formulation 'proposal to update'. On the strict interpretation, where proposal is accompanied by negotiation and is subject to acceptance or rejection, propositions with contrastively marked elements do not update the CG. Negotiation seems to be absent, as contrastive focus only serves the speaker as a way of instructing the hearer that the content he is communicating has an additional layer of meaning – focus meaning, and that the hearer should also accommodate these inferences as well. The unaffectedness of the presuppositional status of propositions containing contrastive focus is most obvious with the predicate 'being born' in Vf-VPnf orders, where the presence of focus does not affect the existential presupposition. But other propositions with more informative content, even though of low frequency in our corpus, still seem to leave space for the possibility of some kind of update. A different way to look at update is to assume along with AnderBois et al. (2010) and Koev (2013), that update can be also done directly or indirectly, or at different points of an utterance, and this is what projective, novel information contributing meanings do.[36] Such direct updates are updates which are *imposed* on the CS (not *proposed*), and as such cannot be negotiated by normal means. (AnderBois et al. 2010).

Parallel focus structures, which are significantly represented in our corpus, would be even more difficult to be 'treated as CG content', if for no other reason than for the fact that multiple sets of relevant alternatives need to be considered. Propositions in embedded and temporal clauses forming parallel focus structures can contain both old and new material, which adds to the complexity of the phenomenon, both in terms of focus marking and discourse status.

The only cases which rather easily fare as 'assertive', or 'at issue' material are temporal clauses which take over the main role in contributing to the main topic of the discourse ('topic-focus switches'). Such

---

[36] Both accounts involve one particular type of non-at-issue meaning, appositives.

propositions express what is relevant to the question under discussion (QUD), which is how their at-issue status is detected (Simons et al. 2010; Beaver et al. 2017).

The observed change in function of temporal clauses – from modifying the temporal reference in the main clause to expressing cause, reason, concession or contrast – can in principle point out to their different syntax and semantics, which in turn could account for their 'assertive-like' behavior (alongside Arsenijević's (2018) distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive situation relatives, where non-restrictive situation relatives have their own 'topic situations' and their own speech-acts). This issue certainly deserves attention, but even when the presence of focus correlates with such changes, we cannot state that whenever focus is present, this would change the external syntax of the temporal or conditional clause. Danckaert & Haegeman 2012 show that central conditional clauses in English, for example, allow polarity focus (and conclude that polarity focus is not necessarily a main clause phenomenon). So we cannot say that focus can only be licensed in embedded clauses that have their own 'topic situation', or more elaborate left-periphery, which then leads to a 'more assertive' interpretation (richer structure – more assertive/less 'presupposed').

I will not go further in trying to pinpoint the right way to characterize the pragmatic status of the propositional content with non-fronted word orders. What they all seem to have in common is that such propositions cannot be taken for granted, and/or are not uncontroversial. And the main reason for making them non-presupposed or non-presupposable is focus. To what extend they remain 'secondary' information, and when they acquire more assertive-like, at-issue like properties is a matter of future research, which will ideally include more clause types.

All the effects and factors causing them, noted in non-fronted vP orders in temporal and conditional clauses seem to point out that the alternation in the vPn position affects the way the proposition in the embedded clause is integrated into the discourse, as well as its relevance for the discourse topic. But neither 'assertion' nor 'at-issueness' can be so easily applied as a way of formalizing the insights gained. The main reason why I feel it is still early to make such an attempt is that our findings here are still very robust.

3.7.2 The relation between vP fronting/non-fronting, focus and pragmatic (non) presupposition

Let us now see why operations at the clausal level (reordering) affect the discourse status of a proposition, and how focus marking fits into the picture. So far we have seen that the interpretation of a certain clause correlates with the position of vP material *relative* to the finite modal or auxiliary verb.

Let us start first with presupposed fronted vP orders. The default case in vPn-Vf orders is when the vPn is 'given' (in the broadest sense). If vPnf is fronted because it is 'given' or 'backgrounded', it either moves because it has to be interpreted as such in an area specialized for 'given'/'backgrounded' material, or because it needs to escape the position where it is interpreted differently. The latter option seems to capture non-default cases when the eventuality is not strictly 'given', and when the content is relatively informative, but the speaker treats it CG material. Such vPs are then fronted to create a configuration where the actual informativeness of the content is overridden. The effects of vP fronting quite clearly indicate that the position to the right of the finite verb is key to some IS/pragmatic interpretation of the propositional content. Let us follow the intuition that the specialty of the position

is related to focus. And let us call it clausal focus (I will not use the term 'sentence focus', as it is often used to refer to all-new sentence focus). So, vP fronting would be movement out of the clausal focus area (63a). The first obvious question is the IS status of the finite verb. Is it also part of the clausal focus area (c) or somehow 'unmarked' (b)?

(63)
a. vP_{nf} ... [$_{CLAUSAL\ FOCUS}$ t_{vPnf}]
b. vP_{nf} Mod/Aux [$_{CLAUSAL\ FOCUS}$ **t_{vPnf}**]
c. vP_{nf} [$_{CLAUSAL\ FOCUS}$ **Mod/Aux t_{vPnf}**]

In presupposed propositions, the finite verb can and often does provide *some* new information. Auxiliaries can add functional information (e.g. aspectual information, when completeness of an event is what is contributed by the aspectual auxiliary); modals, obviously add modality-related information. But even when such information is indeed novel, the absence of the lexical material expressing the eventuality to the right of the modal or auxiliary reduces its 'informativeness'. Essentially, this is what creates the presuppositional effect – it serves as an instruction that the content is 'backgrounded', 'old', 'part of CG', 'taken for granted', 'non-controversial', 'non-negotiable', 'not at-issue'.

I will have to leave aside the question of the semantic and informational contribution of modals to the whole proposition and keep the idealization that it does not significantly affect IS and pragmatic properties of propositions. Any kind of focus interpretation of the modal in (64) configuration will be on TAM component of the modal. I cannot in principle exclude the possibility that the modality itself can be, for instance, emphatically focused. As I have not encountered such cases in my corpus, I will continue to think that no contrastive focus marking takes place on modals with fronted non-finite vPs

I will then propose that the only informative part in presupposed propositions is, roughly, that the eventuality described has taken place, or that it has been 'instantiated'.

(64)   vPnf   **Mod/Aux$_{FOC}$** t_{vPnf} focus on the instantiation of the vPn event

When the non-finite vP does not front, the presence of vP in the clausal focus position affects both the interpretation of the vP and the interpretation of the finite verb.

(65)   Vf [$_{CLAUSAL\ FOCUS}$ vPn]

In this configuration, the finite verb can be contrastively focused or some elements in the vPn are contrastively focused. In the latter case, it seems that contrastive focus on one element alone is not a sufficient condition for the lack of vP fronting. Even though the propositional content itself is rarely fully novel, in the sense that the eventuality described is first mentioned in that utterance, factors such as discourse switches (switch topics, shifts from one segment to another...) also lead to the vP remaining in the clausal focus area.

It should be emphasized that 'clausal focus' should not be understood as new information. Even when a proposition contains novel material, this information is always inferable from the preceding discourse.

Quotes from the Scriptures, a good source of non-fronted vP orders, often seem to be informationally novel (in the sense that, for example, some novel referents or predicates are used), but as the main purpose of these quotes in the narrative is to provide a symbolic situation from the Scripture for the situation in which certain moral and spiritual meanings are under discussion, essentially, they are not new information. Introduction of new discourse referents is often the type of novelty that can prevent vP fronting, but it often needs to be coupled with other factors. And it is in fact quite remarkable that OE authors structure their discourse so that truly novel information can not be easily proffered in conditional and temporal clauses

As with presupposed, vP fronted orders, the contribution of the finite verb alone in non-fronted vP orders could be that of novel information (although it does not have to be). But now, the focus potential of the finite verb is 'reinforced' by the presence of vPn material in the clausal focus area, and the whole complex predicate can make the proposition 'open' for establishing more complex relations in the wider discourse context, it can create parallel focus structures, it can inverse discourse subordination with the main clause, it can open new discourse segments, introduce new discourse referents, accommodate switch topics, and so on.

These observations are still far from being able to account for how complex predicate (predicate with two verbs) focus is assigned/marked. They only show that the area following the finite verb is crucial in the interpretation of a proposition. In temporal and conditional clauses, the absence of the vP material in the position we label 'clausal focus' marks the proposition as presupposed/presupposable, while the presence of the vP material in the clausal focus area gets the proposition a non-presupposed, at-issue-like or assertive-like flavor. What the effects of vP fronting are in other embedded clause types remains yet to be established, and before this has been thoroughly investigated, no further speculations seem to be in place.

Still, some predictions regarding contrastive focus can be made. If the correlation between contrastive focus, especially parallel focus and the position of the vP in the clausal focus area is as strong as our data from temporal and conditional clauses show, then contrastive focus marking should not be possible in fronted vP orders. While this obviously holds for temporal and conditional clauses, the question is whether all clause types with fronted vPs impose this restriction. I anticipate that, generally, they do not. We should not ignore the likely possibility that the syntax and semantics of different clause types also play a role in how vP fronted and vP non-fronted orders relatively correspond to 'presupposed' and 'non-presupposed' readings. vP fronting in other clause types is expected to come with some backgroundedness flavor, but to what extent, and under what conditions, remains yet to be seen. And vP fronted orders, though not necessarily incompatible with contrastive focus, are expected not to be favorite domains for contrastive focus marking.

Finally, we need to address an obvious issue. The interpretational difference between two word orders is present only when embedded clauses *do* show the variation. In certain texts, embedded clauses predominantly show up in fronted vP orders. Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* is so notoriously famous for 'verb-final' structures, that it is often excluded from investigations of word order. So it is quite clear that vP fronting is not used just for marking the backgroundedness of the non-finite vP but as a less constrained strategy of creating 'background structures' in general. If we want to maintain that vP fronting is always pragmatic in nature, then we must view it as a general device for creating background

structures which is somehow linked to a particular type of discourse, or a particular style, or a way of packaging information. On a most general interpretation, in clauses with compound predicates, vP fronting marks the meaning of a proposition as secondary, and yields the effect of matter-of-factness. This seems like a trivial reinterpretation of the fact that in OE vP fronting is restricted to embedded clauses, and that these clauses are typically discourse subordinated to main clauses. In Chapter 6, I will try to show that a similar situation obtains in the earlier stages of Serbian (namely, early-mid 19th century Serbian), where the use of non-finite vP fronting option with compound tenses and raising predicates correlates with 'discourse style'. Comparing two types of texts - historical textbooks and newspaper articles - from the first half of the 19th century, we see that in historical narratives vP fronting is used much more extensively in embedded and coordinated clauses when compared to newspaper articles, where it seems to be more restricted.

To properly understand the role of non-finite vP fronting, we need to go beyond Germanic, where either vP fronting or non-fronting has been reinterpreted as a syntactic 'rule' for embedded clauses. Some crucial effect must underlie all cases when a non-finite verb fronts across the finite verb, but its exact interpretation is difficult to arrive at mostly because IS/discourse status of predicates, and even more so of complex predicates and whole propositions, is still not in the forefront of systematic research. Moreover, the syntactic domains where non-finite verb or non-finite vP fronting takes place are varied and each comes with its own independent peculiarities.

4. VO/OV ALTERNATION - LACK OF OBJECT FRONTING

In this chapter, we will deal with the variation between OV and VO orders. On the assumption that OE is head initial, VO language, OV arises via some type of complement fronting. Just as it has been shown in Chapter 2 that vP fronting is largely conditioned by a kind of 'givenness'/ 'backgroundedness' I called 'pragmatic presupposition', so it has been shown that object fronting is triggered by referential givenness (Struik and van Kemenade 2020). As I originally did in Milićev 2016, I will again look at the cases where object fronting does not take place: VO orders. But unlike Milićev 2016, here I will take for granted the findings in Struik and van Kemenade 2020 regarding OV orders, and re-examine the contexts where object fronting does not apply.

The chapter is organized as follows. In the introductory part (Section 4.1) we briefly present the status of OV/VO alternation in previous accounts and justify the domain of investigation of object non-fronting (embedded clauses). Interpretations of VO orders are given in Section 4.2.

4.1 Introduction

For about thirty years now, syntactic accounts of the OV/VO alternation have been concerned with the question which of the orders is 'base order'. On the one hand, there are uniform headedness approaches, on which either VO (Roberts 1997, Biberauer & Roberts 2005, Struik and van Kemenade 2022) or OV (van Kemenade 1987) is taken to represent the VP structure from which the alternative is derived. On the other hand, the double base hypothesis (Pintzuk 1991, 1993, 1999) provides an account in terms of a mixed phrase structure system, which allows both head-final and head-initial VPs. While the uniform headedness accounts need to address the additional types of movement in the alternative structure derivation, especially their motivation, the 'mixed headedness' approach is relatively free of such concerns, as both OV and VO orders can be unmarked.

The idea that interpretation is a factor in the variation of the object position is present in accounts such as Roberts 1997 and Biberauer & Roberts 2005. In Roberts 1997, postverbal objects are essentially analyzed as 'focused'. The strongest criticism of this assumption comes from Pintzuk (Pintzuk 2002, Pintzuk & Taylor 2006, and Pintzuk 2005). She argues that the increasing frequency of postverbal objects which can be noted in later periods of English is a problem for any account which links the postverbal object position with focus. She points out that it is not likely that at some point speakers would simply start using more focused objects.

In Biberauer & Roberts 2005, a different solution is offered. First of all, they argue that OV orders in Germanic are derived by an EPP feature on v° which triggers remnant VP (i.e. object, as V° moves to v°) movement to Spec, vP. In OE, however, this feature came to be reanalyzed, so it is obligatory only when it is [+Op], i.e. when it probes for elements bearing [+Op] feature, namely, negative and quantified objects. EPP feature can also be optionally present, and in such cases it comes with a change in interpretation. When it is present, it is related to defocusing.

Defocusing is seen as motivation to escape the default, nuclear stress position, which, as Biberauer & Roberts suggest, changed from preverbal to postverbal. The problem with this view is the fact that certain elements which are inherently non-focused/defocused, such as pronouns, are allowed to remain in the postverbal position, as in (1). (1b) poses an additional problem: both the non-finite verb and the postverbal pronominal object precede the adverb *giet* 'yet, still'. If adverbs are seen as a diagnostic tool for movement, then (1b) seems to involve movement of both the verb and the pronominal indirect object.

(1)

a.

æfre	se	ðe	awent	oððe	se	ðe	tæcð	of	Ledene	on	Englisc,
ever	that	who	translates	or		that	who	interprets	from	Latin	to	English,

æfre	he	sceal	gefadian	**hit**	swa	ðæt	ðæt	Englisc	hæbbe	his	agene	wisan
ever	he	shall	translate	it	so	that	the	English	has		his	own	sense

'the one who translates or the one who interprets from Latin to English, he should always translate it so that English has its own sense'

(coprefgen,ÆGenPref:93.67)

b.

Forðæm	ge	sint	giet	cilderu	on	eowrum	geleafan,	ðy	ic	sceal	sellan	**eow**
because	you	are	yet	children	on	your	faith	that	I	shall	give	you

giet	*mioloc*	*drincan,*	nalles	*flæsc*	*etan*
yet	milk	drink	not	meat	eat

'Since in your faith you are still children, I must still give you milk to drink, not meat to eat'

(cocura,CP:63.459.17.3315)

Even though VO orders are found in both main and embedded clauses, I will focus only the latter type. Embedded clauses (with an overt subject) include 656 instances of VO orders (as opposed to 738 with OV orders).

The main reason why main clauses are excluded is that they are default assertive, with a rich left-periphery, which serves as an additional, specialized domain for the expression of IS-related notions, which is absent in embedded clauses (recall that embedded topicalization is not only rare in embedded clauses, but it is also never accompanied by verb movement, as in main clauses). It is plausible that the rich CP domain in main clauses will reflect on the IS marking in the lower, (extended) vP domain.

Also, the finite verb position in main clauses is more obviously linked to IS/discourse marking. Given that finite verb movement is obligatory in main clauses, and given that main clauses are always assertive, the link between the 'high(err)' verb position and assertion is difficult to ignore. In addition, the specific position of the finite verb in the higher clausal domain can reflect differences in interpretation. In topicalized main clauses, for example, the alternation between V2 and V3 orders is

related to the IS status of the subject. Also, in subject initial main clauses, the position of the finite verb starts to replace the role of discourse adverbs, such as *þa/þonne*, as IS/topic-status markers. If we focus on the role of these discourse adverbs in subject initial main clauses, we can note that their role changes from 'any topic' marker to 'switch topic' marker. This is especially evident in pronominal subject initial clauses. The latter pattern in (3), evidenced in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, clearly shows that the finite verb begins to serve as an indicator of unmarked topic (cf. Milićev 2008).

(2) earlier pattern:
　　Spro – *þa/þonne* – Vf　　- subject can be both continued and switch topic

(3) later pattern
　　a. Spro – *þa/þonne* – Vf　　- subject is a switch topic
　　b. Spro – Vf – *þa/þonne*　　- subject is a continued topic

For all these reasons, I must leave open the option that in *some* main clauses, VO comes with an interpretation different than the one(s) in embedded clauses. It remains to be established what factors exactly could be responsible for these differences.

4.2 Interpretation of VO orders in OE embedded clauses

The main goal in this section is to show that VO orders have special pragmatic inferences. In VO orders, we find contrastive focus on one of the VP elements (object or lexical verb), or VP lacks focus altogether, in which case the focus is on other sentence elements (the finite verb, the subject, or the adverbials).

As in Chapter 2, I will use the term contrastive focus as a cover term for focus markings where in addition to evoking alternatives, focus also comes with an indication of how these alternatives are exploited. In other words, 'contrastive focus' understood this way is kept apart from 'information focus', which only indicates the presence of alternatives, but no other interpretational or pragmatic inferences regarding the alternatives are present. Thus, 'contrastive focus' interpretation on O and V can be truly contrastive, exhaustive/identificational, emphatic, additive, exclusive or scalar. In rare cases, focus on the object could be analyzed as information focus. Pragmatically, contrastive focus will be shown to be used to provide answers or to highlight the part of an answer that corresponds to the *wh*-part of a constituent question, to correct or confirm information, and to highlight contrast or parallels in interpretation.

The identification of focus without prosodic cues is not a straightforward matter. The alternatives evoked by focus, which need to be relevant for the interpretation of the focused expression, can be present in the discourse or discourse salient in a variety of ways. Sometimes they are overtly or explicitly given in the context. Often times the alternatives need to be inferred from the CG content. We know that the alternative denotations have to be comparable to the denotation of the expression in focus, that is, they have to be of the same type, and often of the same ontological sort, and they can be more narrowly restricted by the context of utterance (Krifka & Musan 2012: 8). And the alternatives need to be relevant for the speaker to emphasize or highlight them. Obviously, for us to recognize this inattention of the speaker, we really need to fully understand the wider context of an utterance

containing a contrastively focused element. Even though this seems to be a logical prerequisite for any type of analysis of IS factors, in practice, especially in OE texts, the relevant context can stretch over several passages, and misinterpretations can often happen if enough context is not taken into consideration. In addition, our understanding of the author's indented message and communicative goals also requires thorough acquaintance with discourse topics central to a particular text and its relevant subparts (chapter, section, paragraph, etc.). So one really needs to dig deep into the discourse context to find justification for a particular type of focus analysis. For instance, an exposition of events from a saint's or prophet's life in a homily will often have different pragmatic or communication goals than a sequence of events from a saint's life in texts dedicated solely to increasing our knowledge of the saint in question through a description of his life events. For that reason, I will always provide the relevant context so that the reader can verify themselves how certain interpretations are arrived at. This is very important because even for an OE expert reader to properly understand an OE utterance, they need to refer to the text (either via the YCOE corpus or published editions) and obviously not their intuitions. The downside of this approach is that the reader is faced with a collection of examples, whose details can make it difficult to follow the main point of the argument. Patience in this case will pay off because there will be very little space left for the reader to wonder whether they have all the relevant information at hand to evaluate the findings presented.

As a corpus sample in the examination of the interpretations of VO orders, we have chosen, more or less, the same texts as in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, only the range of clause types is expanded. Whereas the effect of pragmatic presupposition/assertion has been investigated in temporal and conditional clauses, the interpretation of VO orders has been looked at in all clause types, occasionally even including main clauses.
In what follows, we will present evidence for the pragmatic inferences we have proposed for VO orders in OE.

4.2.1 Focus on the object

The idea that postverbal objects are somehow related to focus has been around for quite some time, not only for OE, but for earlier stateless of other Germanic languages (for example, Early New High German, as argued in. Bies 1996 on Early New High German). For OE, advocates of focus-related approaches to VO take as crucial the finding of Kroch & Pintzuk's (1989) that postverbal objects in *Beowulf* are focused. Pintzuk herself later abandons the assumption that VO arises due to focus marking of the object, when it was established that the rate of VO orders increases with time (i.e. VO orders are more frequent in later texts; Pintzuk 2002). For that reason, VO orders are taken to reflect an ongoing change in the OE phrase structure. While it is true that not *all* VO orders involve focused objects, it is also true that a great number of them *do* feature focused objects. Let us go through a number of examples to see what types of narrow focus are found, and how they are obtained.

The example in (4) illustrates the classical question/answer test for focus. The postverbal object *anum sutere* 'one shoemaker (dative)' provides the answer to the explicit wh-question 'for whom the buildings were designed' (4a). Hence, the information conveyed by focus is new. However, before we assign (new) information focus interpretation to the object in (4), we need to examine the larger context first, to see how 'neutral' this answer is. First of all, the buildings in question are not ordinary buildings, but buildings made of beaten gold; in addition, the workers were building them only on Saturdays. It is

quite obvious that the buildings are special, and the information that they are designed for a shoemaker must come as a surprise. The context following (4) makes it clear that a shoemaker indeed is not a likely benefective of such a building. Inspecting the context further, we do indeed find out that the shoemaker was of modest means, but nevertheless, he never failed to give alms to the poor, and he would do it every Saturday. The buildings of gold are thus a reward for his devotion to the Christian principles.[37] Having all this in mind, it is very unlikely that the information provided by the answer 'for one shoemaker' is delivered neutrally, as new information focus. The implication of unlikelihood/unexpectedness that comes with contrastive focus (Zimmermann 2008) makes this type of focus interpretation more likely in this context.

(4)

a. He   befran ða   **hwam** ða   gebytlu   gemynte wæron, swa mærlice   getimbrode?
    he   asked   then whom   the   building designed were   so   gloriously constructed

    'He inquired for whom the buildings so gloriously constructed was designed'

b. Him   wæs   gesæd. þæt   hi   wæron gemynte   **anum**   **sutere**
    him   was   said   that they were   designed to-one   shoemaker

    on   Romana   byrig
    in   Rome   town

    'They told him that it was designed for a shoemaker in Rome'
                                                        (cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_23:203.121.4501)

The object *mannan* 'man' in (5b) is contrastively focused. The relevant alternative containing the element with which the object contrasts is given in the preceding line. (5a) establishes that God had first made a great angel, but after losing him, he decided to make something more modest – man, of earth.

(5)

a. God did not create him as the devil: but when he was wholly fordone and guilty towards God
    [ ] then he changed to the devil, who before was created **a great angel**. Then would God supply
    and make good the loss that had been suffered in the heavenly host,

b. &   cwæð þæt   he   wolde   wyrcan **mannan** of   eorðan
    and   said that he   would   make   man   of   earth

    'and said that he would make man of earth'
                                                        (cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_1:180.62.59)

---

[37] Ælfric himself as does give more precise information on the identity of the shoemaker, but makes a clear reference to *Gregory's Dialogues* as a source of this story; in the *Dialogues*, it is explicated that the shoemaker is Saint Deusdedit.

The contrastive focus interpretation on the object *Marian lichoman* 'Mary's body' in (6) is overtly indicated by the adversative conjunct *ac hyre saule* 'but her soul'. The contrast is indicated in the preceding context (6a). (6b) only summarizes it.

(6)

a.   Then said the old Simeon to the blessed Mary, "**His sword shall pierce through thy soul**." The sword betokened Christ's passion. The blessed Mary was not slain nor martyred bodily, but spiritually. When she saw her child taken, and iron nails driven through his hands and through his feet, and his side afterwards wounded with a spear, then was his suffering her suffering; and she was then more than a martyr, for her mind's suffering was greater than her body's would have been, had she been martyred.

b.

Ne	cwæð	na	se	Symeon	þæt	Cristes	swurd	sceolde	þurhgan
not	said	not	the	Simeon	that	Christ's	sword	should	pierce

Marian	**lichoman**:	ac	**hyre**	**saule**
Mary's	body	but	her	soul

'Simon did not say that Christ's sword should pierce pierce Mary's body but her soul'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_9:254.176.1725)

In (7) the postverbal object *ðone gesinscipe* 'the marriage' in the concessive clause indicates that there are relevant alternatives to consider with regard to the predicate *beflogen* 'escape, and in the following main clause, this alternative (*ða byrðenne* 'the burdens') is given. Again, the contrast is backgrounded. The whole segment is about the relation between marriage, lust and faith, or how to deal with the fact that marriage, even though it is a good way to control lust, cannot be disassociated from it. Servants of God, who have refused marriage, should be extra careful to keep themselves away from 'worldly cares' because escaping marriage does not guarantee that they will not be tempted by its 'burdens' (lust).

(7)

Forðæm,	ðonne	se	Godes	ðiow	on	ðæt	gemearr	ðære	woruldsorga
because	when	the	God's	servant	on	that	hindrance	of-the	worldly cares

befehð,	ðeah	he	ðonne	hæbbe	beflogen	**ðone**	**gesinscipe**,	ðonne
engage	although	he	then	have	escaped	the	marriage	then

næfð	he	no	beflogen	**ða**	**byrðenne**
not-has	he	not	escaped	the	burdens

'[Because earthly troubles and cares grow out of marriage, the noble teacher of nations incited his subjects to a better life, lest they should be bound with earthly cares;] because, when the servant of God lets himself be impeded by worldly cares, although he has avoided **marriage**, he has not escaped (its) **burdens**'

(cocura,CP:51.401.20.2745)

In (8b), the postverbal object *unforboden flæsc* 'unforboden flesh' clearly contrasts with 'forbidden flesh' (pork), which Eleazar was earlier offered to eat (8a).

(8)

a. 'Then would Eleazar manfully die rather than he would transgress God's law, and would not swallow the bit of the bacon which they stuck in his mouth, because Moses forbade (them) to eat swine; as we before said.'

b.
þa	bædon	ða	cwelleras,	for	heora	eald	cyððe,	þæt	hi	moston
then	bade	the	executioners	for	their	old	acquaintance	that	they	might

him	beran	**unforboden**	**flæsc**...
him	bring	unforbidden	flesh

'Then the executioners prayed him, for old acquaintance sake, that they might bring him unforbidden flesh, [and he should do as if he ate of the sacrifice-bacon, and so with that deception save himself]'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Maccabees]:90.4871)

The focused object *þa soðan lare* 'the true lore' in (9b) contrasts with non-Christian lore ('the wisdom which the Greek doctors knew hot to teach'), Basil studied for fifteen years (9a).

(9)

a. Then Basil dwelt with the philosopher during his learning, fifteen years in all, and wonderfully searched into all the wisdom which the Greek doctors knew how to teach him. But the teaching which was without faith could not inform the studious youth concerning his Creator whom he was seeking, though that teaching could not tell him.

b.
Him	becom	þa	on	mod	þurh	mynegunge	Godes	þæt	he	sceolde
him	came	then	to	mind	through	warning	of-God	that	he	should

secan	**þa**	**soðan**	**lare**	on	cristenum	bocum	be	his	scyppende.
seek	the	true	lore	on	Christian	books	about	his	Creator

It came then into his mind, through the warning of God, that he ought to seek the true lore concerning his Creator in Christian books.

(coaelive, ÆLS_[Basil]:29.465)

139

Contrastive focus usually requires that the contrasting alternative is part of the CG. In (10), we see that the contrasting antecedent is more local, i.e. introduced in the same clause. The postverbal argument *ures mægenes* 'our kinsmen' contrasts with the subject *fremde* 'strangers', which itself is also focused. Clauses with multiple instances of focus usually require a parallel structure with the same contrast relation. Here the parallel proposition is found in the second conjunct, which contrasts 'our toil' with 'other man's power', keeping the containment relation the same as in the previous clause (be filled with – be in).

(10)

Ond	eac	cuæð	Salomonn	ðæt	**fremde**	ne	scolden	beon	gefyllede
and	also	said	Solomon	that	strangers	not	should	be	filled

ures	**mægenes**,	&	**ure**	**gesuinc**	ne	scolde	beon	on	**oðres**	**monnes**
of-our	kinsmen	and	our	toil	not	should	be	in	other	man's

anwalde
power

'Solomon also said that strangers were not to be filled with our resources, and our toil should not be in the power of another'

(cocura,CP:36.249.25.1639)

A similar case is given in (11), where the postverbal object *ðæm lifiendan breðer* 'the living brother' in the comparative clause contrasts with the possessor in the subject NP, *ðæs gefarenan broðor* 'the departed brother's'.[38] The parallel proposition follows in the main clause, where the situation from the embedded clause (taking care of a brother's widow) is compared to taking care of the holy Church (the second parallel paraphrases the content of the first proposition, and it seems that this slight burden on the hearer's processing of the parallel relation between the two propositions serves a rhetorical effect).

(11)

Sua	sua	**ðæs**	**gefarenan**	**broðor**	wif	on	ðære	ealdan	æ	wæs	geboden
so	so	of-the	departed	brother	wife	in	the	old	law	was	offered

ðæm	**lifiendan**	**breðer**	to	onfonne,	sua	is	cynn	ðæt …
to-the	living	brother	to	take,	so	is	proper	that …

'As in the old law the wife of the brother who had died was offered to the living brother that he might take her, so it is proper that the care of the holy Church, that is the assembly of Christ's people, be offered to him who can superintend and rule it well'

(cocura,CP:5.43.22.248)

---

[38] The postverbal position for the object could also be influenced by the presence of the to-infinitive. Objects, even pronominal ones, often appear in clause-final positions when followed by to-infinitives and special kind of PPs ('to/on') (cf. Marelj & Milićev 2006).

In (12), the relevant contrast relation for the contrastively focused object *ece ræste* 'eternal peace' is established locally, with the complement in the prepositional phrase 'in this short time'. Here the complement clause is in no parallel focus relation with any other clause. In the discourse context, (12) is delivered as a concluding remark, so the contrast between our short time here on earth with eternal rest in the afterlife must be part of the CG.

(12)

We	witon	ful	geare	þæt	we	sceolan	on	þisse	**sceortan**	tide	geearnian
we	know	ful	well	that	we	should	on	this	short	time	earn

ece   **ræste,**
eternal   rest

'We know ful well that we should in this brief time earn eternal rest'

(coblick,HomS_21_[BlHom_6]:83.292.1030)

(13) is also an instance of parallel focus structure, and the parallel proposition for 'the people wanting to avenge the apostle' is in the immediately preceding discourse 'an idolater wanting to avenge the insult to his god' done by the apostle.

(13)

Then cried the idolaters and furiously roared, and one of them immediately slew the apostle with a drawn sword, saying that **he would avenge the insult to his god**;

and	se	cyning	gewende	þanon,	forþan þe	þæt	folc	wolde	wrecan
and	the	king	went	thence	because	the	people	wanted	avenge

þone   **apostol.**
the   apostle

'and the king went there thence, because his people desired to avenge the apostle'

(coaelive, ÆLS_[Thomas]:411.7804)

Postverbal objects, such as *ænne sprot* 'one sprat' in (14), can also have scalar focus interpretation. This interpretation is made explicit in Skeat's (1881) translation by the use of the focus adverb 'even'. Note also that there is a contrast between the subject ('they *all*') and the object ('*one* sprout'), strengthening the interpretation here as unambiguously scalar.

(14)

a. On Easter-days he would eat fish if he had it. Then, on a certain Easter-day, he asked the steward whether he had fish for the festival

b.

and	he	to	andsware	cwæð,	þæt	hi	*ealle*	ne	mihton,	ne	fisceras

and	he	to	answer	said	that	they	all	not	could	neither	fisherman

ne	**he**	**sylf,**	**gefon**	**ænne**	**sprot**
nor	he	himself	catch	one	sprat

'and he said in answer that they all could not, neither the fishermen nor himself, catch *even* one sprat'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Martin]:1268.6802)</div>

Postverbal objects can have novel referents, but they are introduced as contrastively focused. In addition to the example (17) in 3.2.2.3, we find (15), where contrastively focus Zion evokes the alternative location. As the sentence is a quote from the Bible, specifically Isaiah 40:9, this is where the relevant alternative 'other place' is found: "You who bring good news to Zion, go up on a high mountain. You who bring good news to Jerusalem, lift up your voice with a shout, lift it up, do not be afraid; say to the towns of Judah, "Here is your God!"" Even though the verse itself, as well as the whole segment, is particularly elusive, and the reference to places is not entirely clear (is Zion the same as Jerusalem, for example), the presence of alternatives is – Zion should be at least interpreted relative to 'other towns of Judah'. In the preceding verses, there is enough indication that the predicate 'preach/give good news' is backgrounded.

(15)

Bi	ðæm	wæs	gecueden	ðurh	ðone	witgan:	ðu	ðe	wilt	godspellian
about	this	was	said	through	the	prophet	you	who	will	preach

Sion	astig	ofer	heane	munt
Zion	climb	over	high	mountain

About this the prophet said: "If you wish to preach to Zion, ascend a lofty mountain."

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:14.81.11.530)</div>

The same holds for (16). The monk Martyrius comes upon a leper, lying on side of the road 'all chapped, and having no power of his feet', and the leper asks him what is given in (10). The object 'his hut' is novel information, but contrastively focused. The contrastive alternative is not overtly given, but it is clear that the location 'his hut' should be interpreted parallel to the place he is at the moment – the side of the road.

Struik and van Kemenade (2020) give this particular example to illustrate their coding of nouns of alienable possession with a possessive adjective as 'new' rather than 'bridging inferables' ('While *his hut* is linked to *the leper* because of the use of the possessive pronoun, the introduction of the hut itself cannot be inferred from the leper'). While 'hut' is certainly not the same as 'house', for example, which is known to behave very much like nouns of inalienable possession, it is still strange that 'the hut' here refers to a specific type of location/building the leper wants to reach. If that were so, Martyrius' decision, as we learn later, to take him to his monastery instead might seem odd. In addition, the leper is not an ordinary leper, nor is the hut in question an ordinary dwelling place. The episode is highly

symbolic, as the leper is in fact Christ himself, and the place he wants to reach is Heaven (this is exactly what happens when 'the leper' dies upon reaching the gate of the monastery and reveals himself as Christ). What leper/Christ communicates in (16) is that he wants to change location, rather than go to the dwelling place he owns, with specific structural properties ('hut').

(16)

…cwæð	ðæt	he	wolde	genealæcan	**his**	**hulce**	gif	he	mihte
… said	that	he	wanted	reach	his	hut	if	he	might

'… [the leper] said that he wished to reach his hut, if he could'

<div align="right">(cocathom1: ÆCHom_I,_23:369.136.4634)</div>

Quantified objects can also be postverbal under contrastive focus. In the literature, the concern is often present that quantified and negative objects are different from referential objects. They are often shown to be more frequent in the preverbal position than referential objects. Moreover, they are among the last object types to stay in the preverbal position in the later development of English (van der Wurff 1997). To account for the special behavior of non-referential objects, Taylor & Pintzuk (2012), for instance, argue that quantified and negative objects are syntactically different from referential NPs. Struik and van Kemenade (2022) show that when non-translated texts are taken into count, there is no significant difference between object types, neither in terms of their distribution nor frequency, so there is little reason for them to be treated differently from other nominal objects. Under contrastive focus, quantified and negative objects are perfectly fine in the postverbal position. The key contrastive focus contribution with QPs is exhaustiveness. This is the case in both (17) and (18). In (17) the quantified object *ælcne wætan* 'every fluid' is contrastively (exhaustively) focused. The quantifier 'every' alone should in principle be enough to express the desired exhaustive interpretation in its otherwise preferred preverbal position (*þæt he wile* **ælcne wætan** *oferstigan*), yet the speaker's choice is to emphasize or highlight it by contrastive focus marking.

(17)
a. They had all lamps, but they had not all oil. The oil betokens the true love, that never **fails**.

b.

Eles	gecynd	is.	þæt	he	wile	oferstigan	**ælcne**	**wætan;**
oil's	nature	is	that	it	will	rise-above	every	fluid

'It is the nature of oil that it will rise above every fluid [Pour oil upon water or on another fluid, the oil will float above. Pour the oil first, pour it after, it will ever overcome the other fluid'

<div align="right">(cocathom2, ÆCHom_II,_44:328.49.7376)</div>

Similarly, contrastive focus on postverbal QP *ænigne miltsunge* 'any mercy' serves to emphasize the devil's conviction the wicked never deserve any mercy, not even when they repent them.

(18)
a. Then Martin answered the wicked devil, and said that the old sins might be blotted out by their conversion and better life, and through God's mercy they might be absolved from their sins

when they ceased from evil. Then the devil cried and said openly what the sin of each of them had been.

b   and cwæð him togeanes, þæt þa leahterfullan næron **nanre miltsunge**
     and said him to   that the wicked   not-were **no mercy**

     wurðe, and þa þe æne   aslidan, þæt hi eft ne sceoldon æt
     worthy and when once relapsed that they later not should at

     Drihtne habban **ænigne miltsunge**
     Lord   have   **any mercy**

'retorted upon him, that the wicked were not worthy of **any mercy,** and, when they once relapsed, that they later should not have **any mercy** from the Lord'

(coaelive, ÆLS_[Martin]:738.6439)

While we have successfully pinned down the contrastive focus interpretation of the postverbal object, nothing has yet been said about the IS status of the lexical verb. Contrastive focus always requires a 'background part', but the question is whether every lexical verb with contrastively focused objects is truly backgrounded in discourse context. And, in most cases, it is indeed so; if not explicitly given, the lexical verb is easily inferable from the preceding context. Some lexical verbs, on the other hand, are not strictly backgrounded or inferable, and seem to contribute novel information (overflow each liquid, being filled with, be given to). Still, the novelty of the predicate is decreased as they denote processes and relations inherently associated with their arguments – containment, possession, and natural physical processes. This seems to be enough to allow contrastive focus interpretation on the postverbal object when the predicate itself is not already part of the CG.

4.2.2 Focus on the verb

The second context for VO orders is when the lexical verb is marked for contrastive focus. The easiest cases to identify are those where the alternative expression is found in the immediately surrounding context. In (19a), the verb *fylian* 'follow' is contrastively focused, which is evident from the second conjunct which introduces the focus alternative with which the first verb contrasts. The same scenario is present in (19b).

(19)
a.   Swa eac gehwylc mann: hæfð agenne cyre. ær þan þe he syngie: hwæðer
     so   also any   man   has   own   choice before   he sins: whether

     he wille **fylian** deofles willan. **oððe wiðsacan**
     he will   **follow** devil's will   **or   withstand**

'In like manner everyone has his own choice, before he sins, as to whether he will follow the

144

devil's will or withstand it'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_14.1:294.115.2658)</div>

b.
Eac	sint	to	læranne	ða	**æfstigan**	ðætte	hie	ongieten	under	hu	micelre
also	are	to	learn	the	envious	that	they	perceive	under	how	much

frecenesse	hie	liecgað,	&	hu	hie	iceað	hira	forwyrd,	ðonne	hie	of
danger	they	lay	and	how	they	increase	their	perdition	when	they	of

hira	heortan	nyllað	**aweorpan**	ðone	æfst,	ac	hine	**healdað**
their	hearts	not-will	reject	the	envy	but	it	hold

'The envious are also to be taught to perceive to what great danger they are exposed, and how they increase their perdition, when they will not reject envy from their hearts but preserve it'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:34.233.23.1535)</div>

Both contrast relations in (19a) and (19b) are backgrounded. In (19a) the relation between the subject (people) and the object (the devil and his will) is part of the CG, as choosing God over the devil is the general topic of the segment. The main point of (19a) is that people alone, by their own will or liking choose who to follow or withstand. The context immediately preceding (19a) gives an example: no one can become king by their own will, but people have to choose him according to their liking. Similarly, the devil himself has no power to impose himself on people without people choosing to follow him. So the contrast in (19a) is delivered parallel to the contrast in the preceding sentence.

A similar situation is found in (19b), where 'not rejecting but preserving envy' is given parallel to the devil's choice to be envious ('But the envious are to be told that, unless they guard against envy, they will be plunged into the old unrighteousness of the cunning fiend, through whose envy it is written that death case on the whole earth. Having lost heaven of his own fault, he was grieved at men being created for it, and increased his own sin with his envy, so that he strove to seduce men, that they might be lost, as he was.').

The contrastive focus on the verb *gemiltsian* 'compassionate/mercy' evokes the contrasting alternative of 'punishing the robber' (20a). Note that the death sentence of the robber is also assumed in (20b), it is not that the robber will be not slain if Christ shows mercy to him. The real punishment is that the robber is sent to hell after his death, if he does not repent, which is the condition for Christ's compassion and escape from hell. Note also the object is given, referential, and rather topical in the segment.

(20)

a. **The robber will be slain now,** and ignominiously punished, and his miserable soul afterwards shall **journey to hell** to the everlasting torments, in swart chains

b.
We	wenað	swaðeah	þæt	se	eallwealdenda	hælend	wille	**gemiltsian**
we	think	nevertheless	that	the	all-ruling	saviour	will	mercy

<div align="center">145</div>

þam	manfullan	sceaðan,	gif	he	mid	eallre	his	heortan	and	incundre
the	wicked	robber	if	he	with	all	his	heart	and	inward

geomerunge	clypað	to	ðam	ælmihtigan	Gode	and	his	arfæstnysse	bit...
lamentation	cries	to	the	Almighty	God	and	his	mercy	it

'We ween nevertheless that the Allruling Saviour will compassionate the wicked robber, if he, with all his heart and inward lamentation, cries to the Almighty God, and beseeches His mercy before the sharp sword may sway to his neck; and if he bemoanes his sins more than his [loss of) life, and, with weeping, desires the Almighty's compassion.'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Alban]:181.4106)

In (21b) the contrastive focus on the verb *awegan* 'relinquish' indicates that it should be interrelated relative to the alternative common ground proposition - Claudius' one hindered and seventy soldiers are ordered to be punished because they all received faith and became Christians (21a). Even though there is no explicit contrasting antecedent in the form 'keep their faith', it can be easily inferred from the context to give the predicate 'relinquish' contrastive interpretation (if one hundred and seventy soldiers decided to follow Claudius and become Christians, their desire to 'keep their faith' is strongly implied). In addition to contrast, here we also see quite clearly the implication of unlikelihood, or even preposterousness of the predicate 'relinquish', certainly from the narrator's perspective (Ælfric's), the readers' perspective, and quite possibly from the speaker's (Numerianus') perspective as well.

(21)

a.   Numerianus, the emperor, the persecutor of the Christians, when it became known to him that **Claudius believed, and all the soldiers had become Christians,** then he commanded to take Claudius and lead him to the sea, and throw him out bound to a hewn stone

b.

He	het	beheafdian	siððan	þa	hundseofontig	cempan,	butan	heora
he	ordered	behead	later	the	hunderderd-seventy	soldiers	unless	of-them

hwilc	wolde	**awegan**	his	geleafan
any	would	relinquish	his	faith

'He bade them afterwards behead the one hindered and seventy soldiers, unless any of them would relinquish his faith'

(coaelive, ÆLS_[Chrysanthus]:227.7459)

It is also possible to have the emphatic/confirmative focus on the lexical verb. In (22), in his message to Pope Gregory, Augustine uses the emphatic focus on the participle *onfongen* 'received' in the proposition of the English receiving Christ's faith, because he himself had doubts as to whether he would be able to accomplish the mission of converting the English to Christianity (cf. Chapter 23, How Pope Gregory sent Augustine, with other monks, to preach to the English nation, and encouraged them by a letter of exhortation, not to cease from their labor).

146

(22)

a.   & sona sende ærendwrecan to Rome, þæt wæs Laurentius mæssepreost & Petrus munuc, þæt heo scoldan secgan

'and soon sent messengers to Rome, that was Laurentius priest and Peter monk that they should say'

b.

&	cyþan	þam	eadigan	biscope	Sancte	Gregorii,	þætte	Ongelþeod		
and	tell	to-the	holy	bishop	Saint	Gregory	that	English-people		

hæfde	**onfongen**	Cristes	geleafan	&	þætte	he	to	bioscope	gehalgad	wære
had	received	Christ's	faith	and	that	he	to	bishop	ordained	were

'He (Augustine) sent Laurentius the priest, and Peter the monk, to Rome, to acquaint Pope Gregory, that the nation of the English had received the faith of Christ, and that he was himself made their bishop'

(cobede,Bede_1:16.62.29.592)

Note that in the messengers' report in (22), focus is present only in the first complement (that-)clause, resulting in the Vf-VPn order, while the second one (*þætte he to bioscope gehalgad wære*) is given as pragmatically presupposed. As opposed to the first part of the message (that the English had received the faith of Christ), the proposition that Augustine became bishop could be taken for granted because this was what the pope intended for him if they succeeded in their mission. If the English have accepted the faith, it follows that Augustine is their bishop.

Sometimes it takes more effort to recover the alternative proposition relevant for the focused expression. The verb *asceotan* 'lance' with respect to the object *þæt geswell* 'the tumor' in (23b) is contrastive, but it is not immediately clear how this interpretation is to obtain since the preceding discourse merely establishes that there was an abbess who was afflicted with a large tumor. However, upon a closer look, we notice that the abbess believes that the tumor is a way of redeeming her sins, and she is in fact grateful to God for the illness, as it will cleanse her guilt of being vain in her youth. In other words, she wants to endure the pain and wants nothing to be done with the tumor. Her companions, however, are concerned and afraid for her, and they call for a leech to do the opposite of what the abbess wants – lance the tumor, and try to get rid of it. We can then see that 'lance the tumor' contrasts with 'keep the tumor'. The relevance of the abbesses' strong belief can be verified from what follows – lancing the tumor was a bad decision, as she died three days after it was opened.

(23)

a.   Then in the eighth year after she was made abbess, she was grievously afflicted, as she had herself foretold; for a large tumor grew on her throat just under her chin-bone, and she earnestly thanked God that she suffered a pain in her neck, saying: 'I know verily that I am well deserving that my neck should be afflicted with so great a malady, because in my youth I dorned my neck with manifold neck-chains, and now it seems to me that God's justice may cleanse my guilt, since now I have this swelling, which shines instead of gold, and this scorching heat

instead of sparkling gems.' Amongst that faithful band there was a certain leech named Cynefrith,

b. | and | hi | cwædon | þa | sume | þæt | se | læce | sceolde | **asceotan** | þæt | geswell; |
    |-----|-----|--------|------|------|------|-----|-------|---------|-----------|------|----------|
    | and | they | said | then | some | that | the | leech | ought | lance | the | tumor |

'and some of them said that the leech ought to lance the tumor'

c. '...he did so forthwith, and there came out matter. They thought then that she might recover, but she gloriously departed out of this world to God on the third day after the tumor was opened, and was buried, as she herself had asked and bidden, amongst her sisters, in a wooden coffin.'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Æthelthryth]:61.4177)</div>

The final example in (24) serves to show that the contrastive focus can 'anticipate' the alternative proposition in the following utterance. Specifically, Elijah's ability to 'deny rain' in the complement clause in (24b) should be interpreted in relation to his ability to also 'give rain', in the complement 'that'-clause in the following utterance (24c). By focusing the participle *forwyrned* 'denied' the speaker instructs the reader that they should expect the relevance of a contrasting alternative. I will assume that such uses of focus are exploited for rhetorical purposes when the speaker instructs the hearer to anticipate a contrasting expression in the following discourse.

(24)

a. Elijah the prophet was like to us men, passable as we,

b. | and | he | swa ðeah | abæd. | þæt | ren | wæs | **forwyrned**. | ðam | wiðerweardum |
    |-----|-----|----------|---------|-----|-----|-----|---------------|--------|--------------|
    | and | he | nevertheless | obtained | that | rain | was | denied | to-the | perverse |

folce.	to	ðreora	geara	fyrste.	and	syx	monða	fæce;
people	to	three	years	time	and	six	months	time

'and he, nevertheless, obtained by prayer that rain was denied to the perverse people for a space of three years and six months'

c. 'He obtained afterwards by prayer from the true God, that he **gave rains** and earthly fruits.'

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_21:189.277.4178)</div>

To sum up, contrastive focus on the verb in most cases requires a backgrounded contrasting alternative. Sometimes, the focus on the verb can serve as an instruction for the anticipation of the relevant alternative.

4.2.3 Backgrounded/defocused VP

The third prominent interpretation found with VO orders in non-finite VPs is rather unusual, and therefore receives the similarly unusual characterization as 'backgrounded/defocused'. Such VPs are those where none of the core VP elements – lexical verb and object – essentially updates the CG, or when its 'novelty' contribution is decreased due to their being already anchored in the discourse.
The VP content is given in the preceding context/CG, or can be inferred as such. With backgrounded/defocused VPs, focus is consequently on some other element in the clause (subject, adjuncts or finite verb). It is very important to distinguish such cases from those where the whole vP is fronted due to its 'givenness' or 'presuppositionality'. To keep the distinction clear, for backgrounded/defocused VOs, we will refer to a smaller verbal structure, VP, as it seems to be most convenient if we wish to exclude reference to external arguments or adjuncts. Some rather obvious problems with this terminological technicality are that if the subject is for instance contrastively focused, more than just VO (verb-complement) is backgrounded; also, when an adjunct bears contrastive focus, the subject can be backgrounded together with the 'VO' material; in many cases, the modal too has the backgroundedness flavor. Hopefully, the reader will be able to bear with these terminological imperfections.

Let us first illustrate the cases where the contrastive focus on the subject yields defocused VP interpretation. In (25), of all the lexical material, only the subject *seo wyln* 'the servant' provides new information in the embedded clause. The predicate 'tell the judge how it was done' is backgrounded: Eugenia (the subject of the main clause) has been asked to tell the judge what happened between her and her false accuser. Instead of giving an explanation herself, she first asks the accuser's servant to say what happened. Even though *seo wyln* is in principle new information, it should be interpreted as an alternative to Eugenia. The backgroundedness/novelty of the modal *sceolde* 'should' is not straightforward. Eugenia and the servant are both under obligation to tell what happened, but for the servant, the obligation is issued by Eugenia, rather than the judge, and we will assume that this suffices to treat the modal here as 'novel'.

(25)

þa	bæd	Eugenia	þæt	**seo**	**wyln**	sceolde	sæcgan	þam	deman	hu	hit
then	bade	Eugenia	that	the	servant	should	tell	the	judge	how	it

gedon	wære,
done	were

'Then Eugenia bade that the servant should tell the judge how it came to pass'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Eugenia]:211.316)

A similar case where additive focus on the subject triggers a defocused VO order is (26). Karish, the kinsman of king Mazdai, tries to convince his wife Migdonia to consume marriage with him, but when his efforts fail, he asks the king to help him by sending the queen, Migdonia's sister to speak to her. The subject *seo cwen* 'the queen' is introduced in the proposition relative to the proposition of somebody else talking to the referent of the object (Migdonia). Even though the referent is 'old', when the

backgrounded VP is 'reactivated', this introduces a change in the perspective: here Migdonia is referred to as 'her sister' because it is through the relation with the subject 'the queen' that we should understand why the queen is selected to be the one who should also talk to Migdonia. So, even though their backgroundedness decreases their contribution to the informativeness of the proposition, they still play an important role as lexical predicates.

(26)

a.   After this came her husband to the king Mazdai,

b.
and	bæd	georne	þone	kyning	þæt	**seo**	**cwen**	moste	gespræcan	hire
and	bade	earnestly	the	king	that	the	queen	must	speak	to-her

swuster,	cunnian	gif	heo	mihte	hire	mod	gebigan	þæt	heo	his
sister	try	if	she	might	her	mind	incline	that	she	his

gebedda	wære;
consort	be

and earnestly prayed the king that the queen might speak to her sister, and try if she could incline her mind that she might be his consort: [' I cannot entice her nor by fear compel her..]

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Thomas]:300.7726)

Another example of this effect is (27), part of the quote from the Song of Songs. The bridegroom speaks to the bride who is 'in a friend's orchard' and asks to hear her voice. At first sight, the content of *that*-clause seems to be delivered as unmarked. This is because this translation of the verse does not render the fact that the bride is in the orchid/garden, talking with her friends (cf. the English Standard Version: O you who dwell in the gardens, with companions listening for your voice; let me hear it). So, the proper interpretation is that 'listening to your voice' is backgrounded, and that the subject *ic* 'I' has additive focus interpretation.

(27)

a.   Hear also what is written in the Song of Songs, how the bridegroom spoke to the bride: "listen here, you who dwell in a friend's orchard

b.
&	gedoo	ðæt	**ic**	mæge	gehiran	ðine	stemne
and	make	that	I	may	hear	your	voice

'and make me able to bear your voice."'

(cocura,CP:49.381.12.2577)

Focused adverbials behave quite similarly. In (28c), the adverbial *her on life* 'here in life' contrasts with 'eternal life' in the preceding utterance. The VP 'having good days' is backgrounded because the verb 'have' here is used existentially. It is not about possessing good days at a different point in time, but about somebody wanting that there exist good days in this life, which they could benefit from.

150

In a number of works by Taylor and Pintzuk (2012a, 2012b, 2014), the postverbal object *gode dagas* 'good days' in this sentence is treated as new (as pointed out by Struik and van Kemenade 2022). This is extremely curious, as 'good days' are obviously in the CG. Why this fact is ignored is rather mysterious. Struik and van Kemenade 2020, 2022 assign it the cognitive status 'Inert' because, as they argue, even though in the very same sentence 'good days' are referred back by a pronoun, this relation is not necessarily anaphoric, as there is no unique specific referent 'good days' (no specific antecedent), so 'the reference cannot be fixed'. While it is true that postverbal objects in defocused VPs are generally 'inert', in the sense that their contribution to the development of the CG is secondary, and that 'referentially loose' objects are best candidates for such VPs, more 'referentially fixed' objects are also licit in defocused VPs.

(28)

a.   Every man who eats or drinks untimely in the holy Lent, or on appointed fast-days, let him know in sooth that his soul shall sorely abye it, though the body may here live sound.

b.   We should ever desire the eternal life, because in that life **there are good days** (not however many days, but one which never ends)'

c.
þeah þe	hwa	wille	**her**	**on**	**life**	habban	gode	dagas,	he	ne	mæg	hi
though	who	will	here	in	life	have	good	days	he	not	may	them

her	findan	þeah þe	he	sy	welig	forðan þe	he	bið	oþþe	untrum	oððe
here	find	though	he	is	wealthy	for-that	he	is	either	sick	or

hohfull,	oþþe	his	frynd	him	ætfeallað	oðð	his	feoh	him	ætbyrst.
full-of-care	or	his	friend	him	away-fall	or	his	wealth	him	escapes

Oððe	sume	oðer	ungelimp	**on**	**þysum**	**life**	him	becymð,	and	þærtoecean
or	some	other	mischance	in	this	life	him	becomes	and	thereto

he	him	ondræt	his	deaðes	symble.
he	him	dreads	his	death	ever

'Nevertheless whoso will here in life have good days, he can not find them here, though he be wealthy, for that he will be either sick or full of care, or his friends will fall away from him, or his wealth will escape from him, or some other mischance in this life will come to him, and in addition thereto he will ever dread his death'

(coaelive,ÆLS[Ash_Wed]:82.2748)

In (29), the emphatic focus on the adverb *ahwær* 'anywhere' yields the effect that the people looking for St. Edmund's head (which was, as Hingwar's instructed, hidden in the thick brambles where it could not be found and buried) have exhausted the possible locations where they could find the head. And indeed, it was not until the head miraculously cried its location ('Here, here'), that they had any chance

of finding it in the wood, well secured by a wolf, sent by God to protect the head. The VO part of the predicate 'finding the head' is backgrounded, as it is the main reason for their extensive search.

(29)

a.   Then after a space, after they were gone away, came the country-folk, who were still left there, to where their lord's [Edmund's] body lay without the head, and were very sore at heart because of his murder, and chiefly because they had not the head with the body. Then said the spectator who previously beheld it that the seamen had taken the head with them, and it seemed to him, even as it was quite true, that they had hidden the head in the wood somewhere about.

b.
Hi	eodon	þa	secende	ealle	endemes	to	þam	wuda,	secende	gehwær
they	went	then	seeking	all	at-last	to	the	wood	seeking	everywhere

geond	þyfelas	and	bremelas	gif	hi	***ahwær***	mihton	**gemeton**
among	thorns	and	brambles	if	they	anywhere	might	find

þæt	**heafod**.
the	head

'Then they all went seeking at last in the wood, seeking everywhere among the thorns and brambles if they might anywhere find the head'

c.   There was eke a great wonder, that a wolf was sent, by God's direction, to guard the head against the other animals by day and night. They went on seeking and always crying out, as is often the wont of those who go through woods; ' Where art thou now, comrade ?' And the head answered them, 'Here, here, here.' And so it cried out continually, answering them all, as oft as any of them cried, until they all came to it by means of those cries. There lay the gray wolf who guarded the head, and with his two feet had embraced the head, greedy and hungry, and for God's care durst not taste the head, but kept it against (other) animals.

(coaelive, ÆLS_[Edmund]:142.7046)

Contrastive focus on the modal is what licenses most defocused lexical VPs in our sample. In (30b), the VP *cyðan his hlaforde* 'make known to his lord' is a paraphrase of the VP in the preceding line *abude him* 'report to him'. The modal verb *wolde* is focused in the sense that it contributes the willingness of the speaker to do what he has been asked to, but, in addition, the modal *wolde* also contrasts with the modal *(ne) durste* 'not dare' in the following clause. The servant (the speaker in (30b)) actually responds that he cannot make it known to his lord before he has considered whether it would be worse for him if he hid the information from his lord.

(30)

a.   Then the smith went there awestricken, and in the market-place met a serf of this Eadsige and told him exactly what Swithhun bade him, and earnestly prayed him to report it to him [Eadsige]

b.
He	cwæð	þæt	he	hit	**wolde**	cyðan	his	hlaforde,	ac	ne	**dorste**

he	said	that	he	it	would	make-known	to-his	lord	but	not	dared

swa ðeah	hit	secgan	æt	fruman	ærþan ðe	he	beþhohte	þæt	him	ðearflic
however	it	say	at	first	before	he	bethought	that	him	well

nære	þæt	he	ðæs	halgan	hæse	forhule	his	hlaforde
not-be	that	he	the	saint's	behest	hid	his	lord

'He [the serf] said that he would make it known to his lord, but however he durst not tell it at first, until he bethought him that it would not be well for him if he hid from his lord the saint's behest'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Swithun]:78.4264)</div>

Similarly, in (31), the modal *moste* 'might' is in contrast relation with the inability of the archdeacon to hear the heavenly music (*and ne mihte nan þing þisesre myrþe gehyran* 'could hear nothing of that mirth'), which the bishop Severinus was able to hear first.

(31)

a.   A certain bishop Severinus, in the city of Cologne, a man of holy life, hear in the early morning a very loud song in the heavens, and therewith he summoned to him his archdeacon, and asked him **whether he had heard the voice of the heavenly rejoicing. He answered and said that he had heard nothing of it.** Then the bishop bade him to hearken more carefully; so he stood and listened, leaning on his staff, and **could hear nothing of that mirth**.

b.
þa	astrehton	hi	hi	begen	biddende	þone	ælmihtigan	þæt	he
then	prostrated	they	themselves	both	praying	the	Almighty	that	he

moste	gehyran	þone	heofonlican	dream
might	hear	the	heavenly	dream

'Then they both prostrated themselves, praying to the Almighty that he might hear the heavenly mirth'

<div align="right">coaelive,ÆLS_[Martin]:1394.6890)</div>

So far, we have presented contrastively focused modals. Auxiliaries too can be contrastively marked. The examples in (32) and (33) illustrate this for the auxiliary 'be' and 'have', respectively. In (32) focalizing the negative passive auxiliary *nære* 'were not' in the proposition 'Martin was not thrown to the army', relates it directly to the command made by the emperor that Martin be thrown into the battle with heathens without weapons (32a). Note also that the subtle change in the word order between (32a) and (32b) in the position of the secondary predicate *wæpenleas* 'weaponless' indicates that the denial in (32b) is not about Martin being thrown into battle 'weaponless' – after all, as Martin told the emperor, for him it was enough to have the cross to protect himself. Rather, Martin was not thrown into battle because God did not want him to be exposed to death and suffering, which was the reason why Martin did not want to go to battle in the first place.

(32)

a. Then the impious man bade them seize the saint, that he might be thrown, all weaponless, among the heathen (*þæt he wurde wæpnlæs aworpen þam hæðenum*). On the next day the heathen so did that they proffered peace, and themselves too, to the emperor and put all their property at his disposal.

b.
Hwam	twynað	la	forði	þæt	þæs	geleaffullan	weres	wære	se	sige,
who	doubts	lo	because	that	of-this	believing	man	was	the	victory

þa þa	him	wæs	getiþod	þæt	he	wæpenleas	*nære*	**aworpen**	**þam**
when	to-him	was	granted	that	he	weaponless	not-were	cast	to-the

here?
army

Lo! who can doubt that it was because of this believing man that the victory was gained, since to him was granted, that he might not be cast, all weaponless to the army?

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Martin]:121.6041)

c. Although, indeed, the beneficent Lord might easily have prevented His champion safe and sound, He prevented that battle, that Martin's eyes might in no way be stained by other men's death

In (33), the auxiliary *hæfde* 'had' is focus marked as it emphasizes the fact that Apollonius has found his wife, which is now the reason for people celebrating and rejoicing.

(33)
and	þæt	word	sprang	geond	eal	þæt	land	þæt	Apollonius,	se	mæra
and	the	word	sprang	around	all	the	land	that	Apollonius	the	great

cyngc,	**hæfde**	funden	his	wif
king	had	found	his	wife

'and the word sprang around all the land that Apollonius, the great king, has found his wife'

(coapollo,ApT:49.9.521)

The motivation for the use of defocued VPs in written discourse is not always easy to detect, especially when contrastive focus interpretation on the modal or auxiliary is not so obvious. Such cases are illustrated by (34). The content of *that*-clause in (c) virtually repeats the content of (a). To arrive at the correct interpretation of the VO order in this clause, we need to carefully examine the broader context in which it occurs. The utterance in (34) is preceded by a discussion of how sick people should understand the importance of 'wounds of the body' because they lead to 'the repentance of the afflicted

mind'. As support for this claim, the author then refers to an external source of the same idea, Solomon's Proverb 18.8, where Solomon speaks of the wounds inside the belly ('The words of a talebearer (gossip) are as wounds, and they go down the inner parts of the belly), given as a paraphrase in (34a). The author then explains why Solomon speaks of the belly, and how digesting bad food in the belly correlates with digesting sorrows in the mind. To further support this allegorical interpretation (that the belly should indeed be interpreted as signifying the mind), he takes another proverb ('It was from the Proverbs of Solomon') where Solomon more directly relates the belly to the mind (Proverbs 20.27; delivered in the temporal clause ('when he said...'). As (34) involves the author's cross-referencing the same topic, the most likely reason for essentially repeating the same proposition in (23b) is to add the certainty flavor via the modal *sceolde* 'should' and highlight that this interpretation is well supported in the Scripture.

(34)

a. **ðære wambe nama getacnað ðæt mod**, forðæm sua sua sio wamb gemielt ðone mete, sua gemielt ðæt mod mid ðære gescadwisnesse his geðeahtes his sorga.

'[Solomon also said that the same is the case with the wounds inside the belly.]
The word "belly" signifies the mind, because, as the belly digests food, so does the mind digest its sorrows with wise reflection'

b.

Of	Salomonnes	cuidum	we	namon	ðætte	**ðære**	**wambe**	**nama**	**scolde**
of	Solomon's	proverbs	we	take	that	the	belly's	name	

tacnian	**ðæt**	**mod**,	ða ða	he	cuæð...
signify	the	mind	when	he	said

'It was from the Proverbs of Solomon we gathered that the word "belly" signifies the mind, when he said : ['Man's life is God's lantern; God's lamp investigates and illuminates all the secrets of the belly].'

(cocura,CP: 36.259.5.1689-36.259.7.1690)

For our understanding of defocused VO orders, it is important to note that the discourse relevance of the object referent in defocused VOs plays an important role. We find similar contexts where the VP repeats the content given in the preceding discourse, and is in a sense 'defocused', but the order is OV. Consider (35), which occurs in the segment narrating the Acts of John, specifically the episode where St. John teaches two brothers an important lesson about material wealth.

> PRECEDING CONTEXT: summary
> The two brothers, Atticus and Eugenius, being true Christians, sell all their possessions and give the money ('the gold and gems') to the poor. But when they see their former servants in 'silken robes and shining in glory of this world', they regret their decision to give up their wealth. The apostle John, having perceived the influence of the devil on the two brothers, offers to compensate them for their 'loss', and turns pieces of wood into gold and pebbles into gems. The brothers soon realize the error of their judgment, that material wealth is only appealingly

valuable, and now want to renounce the meaninglessness of the material wealth and want their golden rods and gems to be restored to what they actually are (wood and pebbles), and now beg the apostle to intercede with God for them.

(35a) is John's command to them. In the temporal frame of (35b), the temporal clause, the VP content is repeated, and the negative modal is added – the brothers could not restore the rods and the gems to their former nature after they prayed for thirty days, as John has told them. The negative modal *ne mihton* 'could not', however, is not contrastively focused. While from the brothers' perspective the impossibility of the result they hoped for might be unexpected, which would justify the contrastive focus marking on the modal, this is not what the author wants to communicate. The author does not want to deliver the impossibility as 'non-controversial', 'taken for granted' or 'matter of fact', which we have seen to be the inferences of vP fronting in temporal clauses (presuppositional effects). Neither does he want to deliver it as an unexpended or unlikely alternative (the inference often present with contrastively focused modals). The discourse switch from (35a) to (35b) is enough to have the modal verb with information focus interpretation (from the author's perspective, the alternative modality set is open). Now the question is why the modal with information focus does not take the lexical VP as defocused VO. If the episode revolving around golden rods and gems were to stop here, VO order would probably be felicitous. However, as golden rods and gems continue to be of interest in the following discourse, it is clear that their discourse topicality status is preserved in (35b), which is indicated in their preverbal position.

(35)

a. The apostle then commanded the two brothers that they for thirty days in penitence should sacrifice to God by penance, and in that space should earnestly pray that the **golden rods might be turned again to their former nature, and the gems to worthlessness.**

b.

æfter	þrittigra	daga	fæce	þa ða	hi	**ne**	**mihton**	mid	heora	benum	*þæt*
after	thirty	days'	space	when	they	not	could	with	their	prayers	that

gold	*&*	*þa*	*gymstanas*	to	heora	gecynde	awendan:	þa	comon	hi
gold	and	the	gemstones	to	their	nature	restore	then	came	they

mid	wope	to	ðam	apostole	þus	cweðende
with	prayer	to	the	apostle	thus	saying

'After thirty days' space, when they could not by their prayers restore the gold and the gems to their nature, they came with weeping to the apostle, thus saying...'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_4:212.163.779)

c. "Ever hast thou taught mercy, and that one should have mercy on another; and if one have mercy on another, how much more will God show mercy to and pity men, his handiwork! The sin which we have committed with covetous eyes, we now with weeping eyes repent." Then answered the apostle, "Bear **the rods** to the wood, and the **stones to the sea-strand: they shall be restored to their nature**." When they had done this they again received God's grace,

so that they drove out devils, and healed the blind and the sick, and performed many miracles, in the Lord's name, as they before had done.'

In many cases involving defocused VPs, it is the 'irrelevance' or decreased relevance of the object referent for the discourse that helps obtain the 'defocused' effect of certain VO orders.

Defocused VO orders quite successfully interact with other VO-order interpretations. contrastive focus on the object and the contrastive focus on the lexical verb. We will present two examples illustrating how defocused VO orders are used with V-O$_{FOC}$ and V$_{FOC}$-O orders. The example in (36) is from *Gregory's Dialogues*. Because its interpretation heavily depends on our proper understanding of the preceding context, we will first present it with all the relevant details.

> PRECEDING CONTEXT: summary
> The topic of the Chapter 33 (Book 4) of *Gregory's Dialogues* is 'that in heaven the good know the good: and in hell the wicked have knowledge of the wicked'. Gregory opens the dialogue with Peter about this topic by referring to the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus: the rich man does nothing while alive to help Lazarus, a poor beggar, and when both of them die, the rich man goes to hell, whereas Lazarus goes to Abraham (i.e. heaven). While in hell, the rich man asks Abraham for some relief, but Abraham declines, in the same way that the rich man did nothing to help Lazarus. He also asks Abraham if he can go and warn his brothers of what awaits them if they continue to be concerned with material things only and their material well-being, but once again is declined, as his brothers have the prophets to listen to.

One can easily observe that the whole parable develops around a number of parallel relations (Lazarus, poor man – the rich man; Abraham – Lazarus, the good man, Abraham – the evil rich man; the evil rich man – his evil rich brothers), but the main point Gregory wants to draw from this parable is that just like Abraham recognized Lazarus as good, so did the rich men recognize his brothers as evil/wicked. In his words to Peter, he takes 'Abraham recognizing Lazarus' and generalizes it to all good people (36a). The following clause, (36b) takes the same predicate (rephrased as 'understand') and provides contrasting arguments – the evil ones, creating a parallel focus structure, where the object, being contrastively focused is postverbal. (36c) and (36d) offer alternative possibilities. The alternative situation for 'the good recognizing the good' is given via referring back to the parable, Abraham and Lazarus, and proposing the situation in which Abraham did not recognize Lazarus. The alternative for (36b) simply takes the proposition in (36b) but now the negative modal is contrastively focused.

(36)

a.

Openlice,	Petrus,	mid	þam	wordum	hit	is	gecyþed,	þæt	þa	godan	men
clearly,	Peter	with	these	words	it	is	said	that	the	good	men

magon	**þa**	**godan**	**oncnawan**
are-able	the	good	recognize

'Clearly, Peter, with these words it is said that the good men are able to recognize the good'

b.

&	eac	þa	yflan	magon	*ongytan*	**þa**	**oþre**	**yflan**
and	also	the	evil	may	understand	the	other	evil

'and also the evil may understand the other evil'

(cogregdC,GDPref_and_4_[C]:34.310.22. 4638-4639)

c. Soðlice gif Abraham **ne ongæte** Lazarum, ne spræce he nænigra þinga swa to þam weligan men, þe in þam tintregum wæs, be Lazares þære agnan geswencnesse, þa þa he cwæð, þæt he onfengce manige yfel on his life

'Indeed, if Abraham did not recognize Lazarus, he would not have spoken any such things to the wealthy men who were tortured, about Lazarus's own suffering, when he said that he received many evils in his life'

(cogregdC,GDPref_and_4_[C]:34.310.24.4640)

d.

Swa	eac	gif	þa	yflan	**ne**	**mihton**	*ongytan*	þa	oþre	yflan…
so	also	if	the	evil	not	might	understand	the	other	evil…

'So also, if the evil cannot understand the other evil…'

(cogregdC,GDPref_and_4_[C]:34.310.28.4641)

In (37a), the focus is on the lexical verb *demenne* 'judge', and it contrasts with the verb in the second conjunct *gehælenne* 'heal'. In (37b), however, the modal verb *wolde* 'would' is contrastively focused, and the non-finite VP only repeats the VP from (37a), i.e. is defocused.

(37)

a.

ac	he	ne	com	na	to	**demenne**	mancynn	swa swa	he	sylf	cwæð.
but	he	not	came	not	to	judge	mankind	as	he	self	said

ac	to	**gehælenne**
but	to	save

'[The Savior is the Judge of all mankind] but he did not come to judge mankind, as he himself said, but to save'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_22:359.132.4432)

b.

Gif	he	þa	**wolde**	deman	mancynn	þa ða	he	ærest	to	middanearde	com:
if	he	then	would	judge	mankind	when	he	first	to	earth	came

Hwa	wurde	þonne	gehealden?
who	would	then	be-saved

'If he then would have judged mankind, when he first came on earth, who would have been saved?'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_22:359.134.4433)</div>

Finally, consider the two purpose clause in (38), whose propositional content is the same, but the word order inside the VP is different. Both sentences come from the same chapter ('The first Sunday in Lent'), only the first one is found in the *Second Series of Catholic Homilies*, while the second one in the *First Series*. Both have the same meaning/function: they express the purpose of Moses' forty-day fast.

(38)

a.
to ði þæt	he	moste	**Godes**	**.æ.**	**underfon**
in-order-that	he	might	God's	law	receive

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_7:60.10.1189)</div>

b.
To ðy þæt	he	moste	**underfon**	**Godes**	**æ:**
in-order-that	he	might	receive	God's	law

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_11:272.182.2139)</div>

'in order that he might receive God's law'

Even though both embedded clauses are used to express the purpose of Moses' fasting (he fasted in order to receive 'God's law', i.e. the ten commandments), the main clause predicate which they modify is not the same. (38a) is found in the introductory part of the chapter 'The First Sunday in Lent'. The chapter opens up with a general introduction to the concept of Lenten Fast. What follows is a list of people who also underwent the forty-day fast. It starts with Moses, who first established this tradition. Moses as a discourse referent is introduced in the embedded temporal *ða ða* clause, and in the immediately following purpose of clause, Moses continues as the topic ('he'), to which the lexical VP with OV order is given as a comment (at the level of 'topic-comment' marking). This comment matches new information focus, in the sense that it is to be interpreted as a 'neutral' way of informing us about the reason why Moses underwent the fast (and this is the only sense to which we ascribe the notion 'new information focus' here). Note that the way the whole proposition is added to CG matches the relative order of the lexical VP with the modal – the reason is not given matter-of-factly, as is often the effect of pragmatically presupposed Vf final embedded clause; rather, Moses' need to receive God's law seems to be appropriately highlighted or foregrounded in the given context, as it also explains Moses' motivation for fasting.

(39)

Witodlice	þis	feowertigfealde	fæsten	wæs	asteald		on	ðære	ealdan
manifestly	this	fortyfold	fast	was	established		in	the	Old

gecyðnysse.	ða ða	se	heretoga	Moyses	fæste	feowertig	daga	and	feowertig
Testament	when	the	leader	Moses	fasted	forty	days	and	forty

nihta	tosamne	to ði þæt		he	moste	**Godes**	**.æ.**	**underfon**

<div align="center">159</div>

nights together in-order-that he might God's law receive

'Manifestly this fortyfold fast was established in the Old Testament when the leader Moses fasted forty days and forty nights together, in order that he might receive God's law'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_7:60.10.1189)

In (38b), however, Moses' fast, together with the reason (receiving God's law, i.e. the ten commandments) is not given independently, but in overt comparison relation with the fasting of Christ, which has been elaborately presented in the preceding discourse (39). The reason for Moses' fast is the same: receiving God's law, but now this comment is given in VO order. The motivation for presenting the same content as defocused is because of its decreased relevance for the context. The main concern of this section is to highlight the difference in how Christ and Moses endured the temptation – Moses had God's help, while Christ relied on his own divine powers. Elijah's fasting is also brought up, again pointing out that he too fasted through God's power, unlike Christ. The reason for Moses' fasting is not important when this event enters the parallel/comparison relation with other events in the story-line, which is the current topic of the discourse segment

(39)

a. We have heard in this gospel that **our Lord fasted forty days and forty nights together**. When he had fasted so long he manifested the great power of his godhead, by which he might, in all this present life, without earthly food, have lived, if he had been willing. Afterwards, when he was hungry, he manifested that he was a true man, and therefore required food.

b.
Moyses	se	heretoga	fæste	eac	feowertig	daga	&	feowertig	nihta.
Moses	the	leader	fasted	also	forty	days	and	forty	nights

To ðy þæt	he	moste	**underfon**	**Godes**	**æ**:
in-order-that	he	might	receive	God's	laws

'Moses the leader fasted also forty days and forty nights, in order that he might receive God's law'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_11:272.182.2139)

c. ac he ne fæste na þurh his agene mihte: ac þurh Godes.
'but he didn't fast through his own power, but through God's'

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_11:272.182.2140)

d. The prophet Elijah also fasted as long through God's power, and was afterwards, without death, taken from this life.

The effects of decreased relevance, either of one of the elements of a proposition containing a defocused VP (object) or the whole proposition, as subtle as they might be, are important for our understanding of what it means for a VP to be defocused and what licenses such interpretations. In our

corpus sample, we have not found enough examples which would help us get a better grip on this issue. Nor do we yet have the adequate tools to measure a predicate's relevance, as clause types vary, as well as contexts or discourse situations in which they are found.

4.2.4 VO and new information (focus)

The dataset we have selected for investigation rather clearly shows that VO orders are always somehow specially marked. The markedness effect is contingent on the assumption that certain order is 'unmarked' if it is the most efficient way of expressing new information focus (recall though, that this is just a tendency observed for information focus marking). And new information focus in VO orders is difficult to find. Many of the propositions containing contrastively focused objects are backgrounded. Even when the object introduces novel interpretation to the CG, or a new discourse referent, it is still interpreted as contrastive focus rather than information focus. Now the question is: do we ever see new information focus on postverbal objects? The answer is positive. But to find such cases, we had to expand our search to other texts.

The examples present below are from two medical texts (the Lacnunga ('Remedies') and Bald's Leechbook), and the object in them is interpreted as contributing novel information, i.e. as information focus in the postverbal position. Note, however, that what contributes to this interpretation is the lexical predicate type: in both conditional clauses, the predicate existentially introduces the object's referent ('make' in (40a) and 'have, develops' in (40b).

(40)

Gif	þu	wille	wyrcean	**godne**	**drænc**	wið	ælcum	yfele
if	you	want	make	good	drink	against	every	evil

'If you want to make a drink against every evil [malady]...'

(colacnu,Med_3_[Grattan-Singer]:155.1.741)

b.

&	gif	se	hala	ferþe	wille	habban	readne	hring	ymb	þa	wunde...
and	if	the	healthy	skin	will	have	red	ring	around	the	wound

'and if the healthy skin has a red ring around the wound, [know you then that you can't heal it]'

(colaece,Lch_II_[1]:1.15.5.104)

Another verb type compatible with information focus on the postverbal object is ditransitives, or verbs which in addition to the theme NP in the accusative, also have a dative recipient or benefactive NP. Consider (41) now, where all VP elements are focused. The proposition in the complement clause is given as an answer to the immediately preceding question. Namely, upon seeing the (disguised) devil, St. Benedict asks him 'whither he was going'; the devil's answer - that he wanted to bring a drink to his brothers - only partially answers the question; however, the brothers being the 'location' of 'drink-bringing, even though inferable from the CG, provides an answer to 'whither', so it should be the focal

161

part of the answer. The VP 'bring a drink' is not backgrounded in the sense that it is given or inferable, or even plausible, and so appears to be new information content. Moreover, the object 'a drink' is introduced here as a new discourse referent, and it will continue to be highly topical in the further development of the story.

(41)

Se	deofol	cwæð	þæt	he	**wolde**	beran	drincan	his	gebroðrum;
the	devil	said	that	he	would	bring	drink	to-his	brethren

'The devil said that he wanted to bring a drink to his brethren'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_11:104.435.2240)

In (42), the postverbal accusative object *þæt abbotrice* 'the abbacy' is not novel, as it has been, to some extent, under discussion in the preceding discourse. Nor does it contrast with anything. The dative object, however, introduces a novel discourse referent. And the effect is as if the novelty of the dative argument 'cancels' the relative givenness of the accusative argument, and leaves it in the postverbal position. This is an effect we often see whenever a dative recipient or benefective is present, and has been long observed for postverbal objects (that is why ditransitives are often excluded from investigations of VO orders as 'exceptional').

(42)

þæt	wæs	forðan þet	hi	herdon	sæcgen	þet	se	cyng	heafde	**gifen**
that	was	because	they	heard	say	that	the	king	had	given

þæt	abbotrice	an	Frencisce	abbot	Turolde	wæs	gehaten.
that	abbacy	to-one	French	abbot	Turold	was	called

'that was because they heard people say that the king had given the abbacy to a French abbot, who was called Turold'

(cochronE,ChronE_[Plummer]:1070.11.2576)

The syntax/semantics of ditransitive constructions is special enough to be able to offer us possible avenues for under sting this effect. As the lexical verb is also informative, these cases are the closest to the focus projection interpretation – where the whole VP is interpreted as information focus.

4.3 Summary of the major insights into the interpretational effects in VO orders

After this rather lengthy exposition of the interpretational effects observed in VO orders, let us summarize the main insights and discuss what the implications might be.

INSIGHT 1: object is contrastively focused in VO orders

In Section 4.2.1 it has been shown that one of the interpretations of VO orders is contrastive focus. This finding is significant because in other analyses of postverbal objects in terms of IS, focus has not been specified as contrastive (or non-new information).

The first question related to this insight is whether contrastive focus marking is a sufficient condition for having objects in the postverbal position. Or, is contrastive focus always assigned to objects in-situ (on the view that OE VP is head-initial)? The answer is no. We already know from the literature that contrastive focus can be assigned to preverbal objects (Petrova & Speyer 2011).

Let us first sort out the context where contrastively focused preverbal objects are found. In Chapter 3, Section 3.2.2.1, we have seen that contrastively focused preverbal objects, just as contrastively focused postverbal objects, provide interpretations incompatible with 'presupposition' in conditional and temporal clauses, which is then reflected in the syntax through the lack of vP fronting. When we look in other embedded clause types, again the majority of contrastive preverbal objects are indeed in non-fronted vPs. In addition to focus adverbs, such as *huru* 'only' or *furðum* 'even', indicating the presence of contrastive focus on the element in their scope, scrambling across vP adverbs also detects objects with contrastive focus interpretation. Consider (43), for example, where the object *heofonan rice eðel* 'the country of heavenly kingdom', scrambled across the adverb *symle* 'always' has contrastive focus interpretation, evoking the contrasting alternative *þyssere worulde ydelnysse* 'this world's vanity', which is given in the continuation of the clause. As the non-finite verbs are also contrasted (*gewilnian* 'desire' – *forseon* 'despise'), the coordinated vPs create parallel focus structures.

(43)

God	ælmihtig	bebytt	mannum	þæt	hi	sceolon	**heofonan**	**rices**
God	almighty	commands	men	that	they	should	heavenly	kingdom

eðel	symle	*gewilnian.*	and	**þyssere**	**worulde**	**ydelnysse**	*forseon*
country	always	desire	and	this	world's	vanity	despise

'God Almighty commands men constantly to desire the country of heaven's kingdom, and to despise this world's vanity'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_13:130.82.2846)

Focus particles, however, are not frequent with preverbal objects.[39] In addition to the one presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.2.1 (example (10), we have found only two other instances, one with *huru* 'only' and one with *furðon* 'even'.

(44)

a.   Near to the foresaid city of Ancona there is a church of the blessed martyr St. Stephen, in which one called Constantius, a man of venerable life, did serve there for clerk, who for his virtue and

---

[39] Or at least elements which are morpho-syntactically annotated as such in the corpus.

holiness was famous far and near, being one that utterly despised all worldly things, and with the whole power of his soul thirsted after the joys of heaven.

b.

Soþlice	sume	dæge,	þa þa	on	þære	ylcan	cyrcean	wæs	elewana,	&	se
indeed	some	day	when	on	the	same	church	was	oil-lacking	and	the

forecwedena	Godes	þeow	næfde,	þæt	he	mihte	**furðon**	þa
foresaid	God's	servant	not-had	that	he	could	even	the

leohtfatu	onælan,
lamps	light

'Upon a certain day, it fell so out that there wanted oil in the church, by reason whereof the foresaid servant of God had not wherewith to light the lamps: [whereupon he filled them all with water, and, as the manner is, put a piece of paper in the midst, and then set them on fire, and the water did so burn in the lamps as though it had been very oil]'

(cogregdH,GD_1_[H]:5.44.9.447)

(45)

a. 'He [Martin] was attacked by the fever for very many days, but he nevertheless never ceased from God's work, but he sometimes all night kept a vigil in holy prayers; and though his body was so much afflicted by his sickness, nevertheless his mind was firm and joyful in the Lord. And when he rested himself, his noblest bed was on his chest, or else on the naked earth.'

b.

þa	bædon	hine	his	discipulos	þæt	hie	mostan	**huru**	sume	uncyme
then	asked	him	his	disciples	that	they	might	at-least	him	paltry

streownesse	under	gedon	for	his	untrumnesse;
bedding	under	do	because	of-his	illness

'When his disciples asked that they might put under him [at least] some paltry bedding on account of his sickness, [then he replied, Children, do not ask that. It is not befitting a Christian man to do otherwise, except to lie upon ashes and upon dust]'

(coblick,LS_17.1_[MartinMor[BlHom_17]]:227.283.2912)

In the Verb Raising order (S-O-Vf-Vn), there are 3 focused particles with preverbal objects. In addition to the two examples already presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.2.2 (temporal clauses in (12) and (13) from *Catholic Homilies*), we find (46).

(46)

'It [knowledge] had so completely declined in England that there were very few on this side of the Humber who could understand the services in English, or even render a letter from Latin into English, and I think that there were not many beyond the Humber

Swæ	feawa	hiora	wæron	ðæt	ic	**furðum**	**anne**	**anlepne**	ne	mæg
so	few	of-them	were	that	I	even	one	single	not	could

.

geðencean	besuðan	Temese	ða ða	ic	ærest	to	rice	feng.
think-of	south-of	Thames	when	I	first	to	kingdom	took

'There were so few of them that I cannot think of even one to the south of the Thames when I became king'

(coprefcura,CPLetWærf:17.7)

Focus particles/adverbs are even rarer with postverbal objects, and seem to be restricted to the *buton* 'only' and the predicate *habban* 'have'. We have found two such instances, one of which is given in (47).

(47)

Næbbe	se	mæssepreost	na	ma	þonne	ane	cyrcan,	þe ma þe	se	wer
not-have	the	mass-priest	not	more	than	one	church	as much as	the	man

mot	habban	**butan**	an	wif.
must	have	only	one	wife

'A mass-priest is not to have more than one church, just as a man must have only one wife'

(cochdrul,ChrodR_1:65.1.880)

In Chapter 3, we speculated that contrastive focus marking should not be present in vP fronted clause. This prediction is borne out to the extent that focused object identified by the presence of focus particle or scrambling are rare. Some exceptions do exist. In (48), the object *his oðer mægen* 'the rest of his power' scrambled across the adverb *þy eað* 'more easily' has additive focus interpretation: 'the rest of his powers' evokes the alternative expression 'one instance of his power' in the preceding context. It should be noted that this example comes from Bede's *History*, the text well-known for the overwhelming presence of finite verb final structures. I presume that the presence of contrastive focus in other texts would affect the vP fronting option, and that they would yield 'more assertive' orders with the non-finite vP following the finite verb. Even so, the fact that contrastive focus can appear in 'presupposed' propositions, shows that the impact of focus marking on the CG is not direct.

(48)

Sculon	we	ane	cyðnesse	his	mægenes	secgan,	þæt	we	**his**	**oðer**
should	we	one	testimony	of-his	power	say	that	we	his	other

mægen	þy	eað	ongytan	magon
powers	more	easily	understand	may

'We should relate one instance of his power so that the rest of his power may be more easily understood (from which the rest may be inferred)[40]

(cobede,Bede_2:7.118.1.1118)

The same goes for focus particles – they are rare but possible in fronted vP orders. It is often difficult to disambiguate whether the particle scopes over the entire predicate or the object inside it. In (49), both the object 'the island' or the predicate 'regaining the island' could be under the scope of the adverb *furðum* 'even' (though there seems to be a slight preference for the latter interpretation). Irrespective of which element is actually in focus, contrastive focus is present, and it does not affect vP fronting. Even though the example again comes from Bede, and perhaps reflects a less preferred option of tolerating contrastive focus in fronted vPs, it should not be fully dismissed as exceptional, because it still illustrates that one concern for discourse/pragmatic marking (vP fronting) can override the other (contrastive focus).

(49)

Mid ðy	we	ða	swiðe	longe	wið	ðæm	winde	&	wið	ðæm	sae
when	we	then	very	long	against	the	wind	and	against	the	sea

holonga	compadon	&	wunnun,	ða	æt	nestan	locadon	we	on	bæcling,
in-vain	stove	and	fought	then	at	last	looked	we	on	back

hwæðer	woen	ware,	ðæt	we	ænige	ðinga	**furðum**	**ðæt**	**ealond**	gesecan
whether	hope	were	that	we	in-any	things	even	the	island	regain

meahton,	ðæt	we	ær	ut	of	gongende	wæron.
could	that	we	earlier	out	of	going	were

'Now when we had for a long time striven and struggled in vain against wind and sea, then at last we looked back to see whether there was any hope of even regaining the island in any way, from which we had previously put out'

(cobede,Bede_5:1.384.23.3834)

Another example we have found is (50), where the object under the scope of the focus particle *huru* 'only' receives exhaustive focus interpretation. It is also scrambled across the adverbs *þanon* and *forð*.

(50)

a monk without a monastery should go to a shire bishop and commit himself to a monastic life there;

&	trywsige	hine	sylfne	wið	God	&	wið	men,	þæt	he
and	pledge	him	self	in-front-of	God	and	in-front-of	men	that	he

---

[40] The translation as passive tries to keep the topicalized interpretation of the object.

huru	**þreo**	**þing**	*þanon*	*forð*	*healdan*	*wille,*	þæt	is:	his	clænnesse	&
only	three	things	thence	forth	hold	will	that	is	his	cleanness	and

munuclice	scrudware	&	þeowian	his	Drihtne,	swa	wel	swa	he	betst	mæge
monastic	dress	and	serve	his	Lord	as	well	as	he	best	can

'and pledge himself in front of God and men that thence forth he will hold only three things, that is: his cleanness, monastic dress, and serve his Lord as he best can'

(colaw6atr,LawVIAtr:3.1.15)

Even though contrastive focalization in fronted vP is a rather marginal option for OE, contrastively focused preverbal objects are frequent enough and represent a genuine syntactic option of marking contrastive focus. And the question we need to address is how contrastively focused postverbal objects we have identified differ from the preverbal ones with the same interpretation.

Let us assume along with Struik and van Kemenade 2020, that all preverbal objects are essentially [–new. +referential] or [–referential] (such characterization covers given referential NPs and non-referential NPs as well). And let us exclude non-referential objects at the time being, and call the trigger for preverbal objects 'givenness', as they do. The finite verb then serves as a signpost separating the 'givenness' domain on its left, from the 'other' domain, on its right.

(51)
a.   [contrastive focus]GIVENNESS   **V**
b.   **V**   [contrastive focus]OTHER

As focus can be marked on both preverbal and postverbal objects, in the preverbal, 'givenness' domain, focus marking would occur *after* an element has moved because of the IS trigger 'givenness'. And in the 'default' VO, contrastive focus will be assigned in situ. The examples of contrastively focused preverbal objects we have presented here, as well as in the previous chapter, Section 3.2.2.1, all include cues of special interpretation: either via the presence of a focus particle/focus sensitive adverbs or via scrambling across an adverb or even higher, across the finite verb. The question still remains how easily an object can get contrastive focus in the preverbal position adjacent to the verb and without a focus-sensitive adverb. In VO orders, contrastive focus can introduce new referents and have implicit alternatives. So these are the parameters within which a better understanding of the difference between contrastive focus interpretation on preverbal and postverbal objects should be sought. With the evidence at hand, I will propose that preverbal contrastive focus, being applied to leftward moved [+given] referents needs additional grammatical means (focus sensitive adverbs or movement across adverbs or modals/auxiliaries). Postverbal contrastively focused objects need no special marking. Other than the fact that they are not fronted and so follow the verb. We thus need to assume that givenness marking is of the highest concern, so that when it does not take place, we get the effect of markedness, or a signal that a particular [+given] object should be interpreted 'differently' in its base position.

I will also follow Zimmermann (2008) in relating contrastive focus marking to the effect of unlikelihood of the proposition, which seems to be absent with focused preverbal objects. So we could

in principle hypothesize that focus marking of preverbal objects via focus particles and scrambling involves 'lexical focus', where relevant semantic features such as exhaustivity or presence of a scale are contributed, while the role of contrastive focus on postverbal objects is more in terms of 'discourse focus', or contribution in terms of discourse-pragmatic features (52a & b). If this view is to hold, we would have to assume that contrastively marked preverbal objects in parallel focus structures have 'discourse focus' (52c).

(52)
a.   O**FOC**   V   lexical focus
b.   V   O**FOC**   discourse focus
c.   O**FOC** ...   V**FOC**   discourse focus

INSIGHT 2: VO orders can introduce new referents, either via contrastive focus or via special predicate type

This insight is in line with Struik and van Kemenade's (2020) findings that VO orders contain 'new' referents. What is puzzling though is that .in VO orders in embedded clauses, we rarely find instances of new information focus, in the sense that the alternatives for the expression in focus are not further exploited, and that no contrast or other additional interpretation is present. Truly unmarked VPs, in the sense that both the verb and the object contribute novel interpretation, are found only with predicates that introduce new referents in the discourse.

Let us see now if this helps us define the characteristics of the 'Other', postverbal domain, which obviously stands in some kind of opposition with the preverbal domain, which we accept to correlate with 'givenness'. But neither [+new]/[-given] in terms of cognitive status can correctly capture postverbal contrastively focused objects. In many cases, contrastively focused objects do have the implication of 'novelty', but the problem is that they too can be 'backgrounded', as their cognitive status in the minds of the interlocutors is not necessarily new. We might altogether remain unconcerned with the characterization of the 'other' domain. If VO reflects base order, it should not be restricted to any particular interpretation. But if it is so informationally neutral, how come we find such rather heavy restrictions on new information focus, as shown in Section 4.2.4? A base order should be ambiguous if we find both marked and unmarked focal interpretations, not only given or new referents. And if we take the givenness condition on OV orders seriously, it is clear that we should not only apply it to discourse anchoring of referents. One other consequence of leftward movement of given objects is that in the configuration created they are not interred as discourse-backgrounded. Preverbal objects often have the inference of relational givenness (cf. Gundel 2003), and are interpreted in the topic-comment frame, which then creates the effect that the verb is most informative, in the sense that it updates our knowledge of the relation between the subject and the [+given] object. With a contrastively focused postverbal object, the verb comes as 'less informative', and this seems to be the consequence of not fronting the object to the position where it can be potentially interpreted as relationally given/topical. On analogy with non-finite vP fronting, we can assume that object fronting yields a similar partition into [background] and [focus], where [focus] part can be possibly characterized as predicate focus, so it covers both referential and relational non-givenness.

For any definitive answers, we need to include more data with contrastively focused objects to be able to discern the difference between the relevant givenness triggering complement fronting from the 'non-givenness' of the postverbal expressions, when they are present or inferable from the CG, but their non-novel status is overridden by other concerns. And even more importantly, we need to understand why OE employs backgrounding to such a great extent, that the effect it produces often looks like a restriction on how new information is introduced in embedded clauses with transitive verbs. New discourse referents are possible only when the predicate literally introduces them in the discourse.

At this point, we can only state that although contrastive focus plays a significant role in VO orders, contrastive focus alone is not a sufficient condition for postverbal objects. No direct impact of contrastive focus on VO orders can be claimed before we can clearly establish that preverbal contrastively focused objects are really instances of 'lexical focus', while postverbal ones have 'discourse focus', where the speaker introduces contrast and/or unlikelihood irrespective of the cognitive status of the referent itself. Only then can we speak of 'discourse focus' as a key factor capable of overriding the concern to have [+given] or [+backgrounded] material left of the verb.

INSIGHT 3: Contrastive focus on the lexical verb

We have shown that some VO orders arise when the lexical verb (infective or participle) is contrastively focused. Their relevant alternatives are in most cases explicit (present in the CG), but occasionally 'contrastive discourse relation' indicated by the conjunction 'but', is used to highlight the alternative. When the alternative is implicit at the point of the utterance of the proposition containing a contrastively focused verb, we always observe the effect of the speaker's evaluation of the focused alternative as the one which is unlikely to hold in this context.

Contrastively focused verbs in this position have consequences on the IS status of the object. Serving as the 'background' part for the focused verb, most objects are familiar and 'given', but their topicality is decreased. Even though the referents of such objects participate in the situations described in the preceding discourse, they are much lower on some topicality scale (their referents are often (not always though) inanimate, abstract). On the approach that OV equals givenness of O, contrastive focus on V will block the givenness of the object, on the condition that the object is also not topical.

(53)

$O_{\text{GIVEN, TOPICAL}}$ V

                    V_{FOC} $O_{\text{GIVEN, NON-TOPICAL}}$

The next question regards structural marking of contrastively focused verbs. Is VO the only configuration that V can get contrastive focus? The answer again depends on how we understand the role of contrastive focus. One can easily find OV structures where verbs have some kind of contrast flavor. Consider (54), for example, which has the object in the preverbal position, and the verb in the final position receives contrastive interpretation (deny Christ – call upon Christ). We can assume that the object *Criste* 'Christ' is preverbal because it is too topical or too relevant (as the main reason for Hingwar torturing king Edmond is his relation to Christ) to be overridden by the contrastive focus on

the verb. In addition, the contrast between the predicates 'deny Christ' and 'follow/believe' in Christ is in the CG (before the king was captured, Hingwar sent a messenger with the demand that the king renounces Christianity, and then the king replied that he would not deny Christ, but continue to follow him). It seems that there is no special need for this contrast to be highlighted again. While we cannot dismiss the presence of contrastive focus on *wiðsacan* 'deny' – as contrast is clearly present, together with the relevant alternative, still we note that the contrast does not come with the unlikelihood effect – knowing what we know about king Edmund, this is the expected alternative.

(54)

þa	geseah	Hingwar,	se	arlease	flotman,	þæt	se	æþela	cyning	nolde
then	saw	Hingwar	the	wicked	seaman	that	the	noble	king	not-would

Criste	**wiðsacan**,	ac	mid	anrædum	geleafan	hine	æfre	clypode
Christ	deny	but	with	steadfast	faith	him	ever	praised

'When Hingwar, the wicked seaman, saw that the noble king would not deny Christ, but with steadfast faith ever called upon Him'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Edmund]:119.7032)

Obviously, such cases of semantic contrast on the verb in OV structures need to be investigated in much more detail for us to establish whether the differences noted here hold in other cases as well. But the prediction that they are different holds. If it turns out that the lexical verb *can* be contrastively focused in the OV configuration the same way it does in the VO configuration, then we need to postulate that the topicality of the object can beat the contrastive focus on the verb, and it will be able to move to the left.

INSIGHT 3: parallel focus (V$_{FOC}$ O$_{FOC}$) is absent

Finally, we need to note that parallel focus – where both the verb and the object are focused – is not found in our sample of VO orders. This seems to be possible only with preverbal contrastively focused verbs.

(55)

a.	O$_{FOC}$	V$_{FOC}$	PARALLEL FOCUS
b.	**V$_{FOC}$**	**O$_{FOC}$**	**NOT FOUND**

INSIGHT 4: Defocused VPs

Defocused VPs (or more precisely, verb-complement) seem to be licensed when the VP material is backgrounded. The focus is consequently on some other material in the clause: the finite verb, the subject or the adjunct. The backgroundedness nature of the VPs makes it 'defocused' only *in relation to* some other more prominent element in the clause. At the topic-comment level, defocused VPs still

170

perform (or contribute to) the predicate/comment function of updating the topic. In other words, despite the non/decreased novelty of the lexical core of the predicate, these clauses always contribute to the update of the CG (to the extent that embedded clauses do). As long as the lexical part of the predicate is not fronted, no presupposition effect arises. This generalization is obviously circular. How we can more formally capture the effect of fronting vs. non-fronting of the backgrounded material (lexical predicate) remains to be seen. So far, there is a strong impression that in non-fronted orders, the 'old' VP material gets a novel frame of interpretation (via contrastive focus on modal/auxiliary, subject or adjunct), so it is in a way reactivated.

In some cases, we have also noted the effect of decreased relevance of such VPs. Just as the verb itself is 'non-novel', the object too becomes 'less topical'. All these inferences seem to indicate that whenever the lexical verb is not in the 'final' position, this affects the informativeness of the predicate.

.

4.4 VO meanings across texts & correlations with style and rhetoric

To see how the interpretations of VO orders illustrated above are distributed within and across OE texts, I have chosen five of them: *Orosious*, *Cura Pastoralis*, *Lives of Saints*, *Blickling Homilies* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. Again, the texts have been selected on the basis of the date of composition and genre. Table 4.1 presents figures regarding different types of interpretation of VO orders in subordinate clauses in these texts.

Table 4.1: Interpretations of VO orders in subordinate clauses in selected texts

	+F ON O	+F ON V	-F VP	UNCLEAR	TOTAL
Orosius	5	1	1	-	8
Cura Pastoralis	44	13	13	2	72
Lives of Saints	19	18	22	-	59
Blickling Homilies	7	1	4	1	13
Bede's History	1	1	2	-	4
					156

Let us briefly comment of the two extremes in the table: Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, with the least number of VO orders, and Alfred's *Cura Pastoralis*, with the most. I would like to suggest that what underlies the difference in the presence of 'marked' VO orders is style. The most significant feature of Bede's *History* that the style is predominantly narrative, and, generally, Bede can be considered an accomplished storyteller.[41] *Cura Pastoralis*, on the other hand, is rhetorically very complex, with the exposition of events interrupted by detailed references to the metaphorical meaning and significance of the material presented, to the point that it is often too difficult to follow.

---

[41] Bede's narrative of events is often interrupted by accounts of visions and miracles. This, coupled with the fact that the context is often not overtly given or elaborated enough, makes it difficult for the reader to follow the exact sequence of historical events. Still, Bede's exposition is 'forward-looking', and he generally avoids intricate rhetorical devices in this text.

Interestingly, both King Alfred's *Cura Pastoralis* and Bede's *History* are often attributed the influence of translation from Latin – unlike the translation of *Orosius* and *Boethius*. Brown (1969) argues that the somewhat problematic quality of the *West Saxon Pastoral Care* (which he characterizes as 'mediocre style and the monotonous handling of argument', Brown 1969: 684) is not due to Alfred's inexperience as a translator, but rather a consequence of Alfred's wish to 'render intact a book for priests' (Brown 1969: 684). Hence, Alfred's style in *Cura Pastoralis* is the result of his combining two translation methods: literal and paraphrase. Alfred is famous for the insistence on the translation technique 'according to the sense' (cf. also Sweet 1871). Brown notices that in his translation Alfred employs paraphrase when he tries to clarify what he considers to be vague, indefinite or too abstract in Gregory's original. Thus, Latin long and complex sentences are often rendered as simple in OE (Brown notices instances where three Latin sentences equal six sentences in the OE version). Alfred is clearly not concerned with rhetorical elegance, but has a more utilitarian aim – to make sure he delivers the message correctly, which he does by explicating, expanding, and essentially, repeating parts of the content. In addition, the original text itself is also stylistically and rhetorically complex. Gregory's original is full of quotations and references which need to be explained or elaborated on (for instance, there are 37 citations from the 'Book of Psalms'). Brown (1969: 682) states that Alfred tries to adapt the key feature of Gregory's rhetoric: (crisp) parallelism. Even though Alfred does not always manage to 'translate' Gregory's keen logic or his rhetorical subtlety, the work still remains Gregory's ("What we have is a dreary tract in Latin turned into a dreary tract in English"). Most importantly, Brown argues that Alfred does not use 'syntactic Latinisms'; he invents no 'new' construction based on Latin, so the syntax we see in *Cura Pastoralis* is genuinely OE, and involves syntactic options normally available in OE.

Having in mind that the main stylistic or rhetorical feature of *Cura Pastoralis* is parallelism and repetition, it is not surprising that it is this text that has most VO orders. As contrastive focus, the key interpretation of VO orders, also has the major major function of expressing parallels, and as defocused VPs are often found in repetitions for the purpose of explication, we see how IS factors, encoded in the word order, can correlate with a specific style.

Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* is another good source of VO orders. As far as Ælfric's style is concerned, Clemoes (1966) notes the exploitation of formal stylistic devices such as parallelism, patterning, rhetorical question and simile. Sato (2012) also points out the presence of parallelism and rhetorical figures such as chiasmus (inverted parallel structures/clauses) and simile (expression of comparison or likeness). Lipp (1969: 692) also adds wordplay or repetition of the same words or closely related words. He also finds that Ælfric pays close attention to "the relationships between the syntactic units of his sentences", careful paralleling of two sentences, and closely balanced antithesis in the second part of sentences.[42] Again we note the same stylistic devices which rely on functions of focus. It is therefore not unusual to find the orders which exploit more complex ways of focus marking in greater numbers in those texts which are rhetorically and stylistically complex.

Taylor & Pintzuk (2012a, 2012b) argue that OE reflects an ongoing change from OV to VO, and that this change, that can be traced to occur over time throughout OE (as previously argued in Pintzuk 2002

---

[42] Lipp also states that Ælfric's style is characterized by clarity and smoothness, with few sharp breaks or emphatic climaxes, and with subdued stylistic effects (unlike Alfred).

and Pintzuk & Taylor 2006), is independent of IS constraints. VO orders arise as a genuine syntactic innovation. As IS status, they take the dichotomy between given-new (based on Birner 2006), and show that the increase in postverbal objects in Vf-Vn structures cannot be related to the interpretation of these objects as focused/new.

First, let us consider the claim that the frequency of the VO orders increases with time. To show this, Pintzuk & Taylor compare VO orders from two periods of OE: OE1 (before 950) and OE2 (after 950). On this periodization, Alfred's *Cura Pastoralis* should exhibit fewer VO orders than later texts, such as *Blickling Homilies* or Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, contrary to the fact.

Secondly, dismissing the influence of IS factors on VO orders based solely on the distinction of *one* of the possible IS statuses of the object (given-new) is a huge oversimplification of the relation between IS and syntactic structure.

4.5 Fronting vs. Non-fronting

In this section, the finding from Struik and van Kemenade about OV orders are compared with our findings regarding VO orders. So far we have followed Struik and van Kemenade's (2020) proposal that OV orders arise because of the need to structurally encode the givenness feature of referential NPs. While this correctly captures the interpretation of referential objects in the preverbal position, two important things remained unaccounted for. The first concerns the behavior of non-referential preverbal NPs – as bare singulars, bare plurals, plurals modified only by an adjective, negative and quantified objects were left out of the investigation. The second issue is the (non-) optionality of .leftward movement. The (non-) optionality of object fronting can be addressed from two perspectives: (a) why for instance OV/VO alternation is deemed to be present in 'native', non-translated texts, while translated texts are 'more OV', following the word order patterns of the original language (Latin), and (b) why 'given' referents are allowed to stay in situ.

Struik and van Kemenade (2022) clarify some of these issues. First, they establish that the statement that quantified and negative objects are predominantly preverbal (as argued by Pintzuk and Taylor 2006 and Taylor and Pintzuk 2012) is not confirmed in their data set. In fact, QP and NegP objects occupy preverbal positions less frequently than referential objects. Hence, the authors conclude that there is no crucial difference between these object types. Second, they show that even the translated texts, originally put aside in Struk and van Kemenade 2020 as potentially deviating from the 'native pattern', show the type of variation noted in non-translated texts.

As for the question of what actually underlies the OV/VO variation for 'given' 'referential' objects, they propose that it is the structural ambiguity of OE DPs. The first step in their argument is 'that information status is indirectly encoded in the syntax, assuming a relation between IS and the morphosyntactic expression of an argument.' They follow Gundel et al's (1993) Givenness Hierarchy and the correlation of IS status with the choice of morphosyntactic marking (determiner type). As in OE the weak demonstrative has not yet acquired the status of a determiner, syntax takes part of the job, and objects front. Variation in the object position, or the existence of VO orders alongside OV, is due to the nature of the weak demonstrative pronoun, which is in the process of shifting from a demonstrative/deictic element to the definite article/determiner. This change is reflected in its varying

syntactic positions inside the DP: Spec, DP or D-head. The DP-internal position of the OE demonstrative affects the referentiality feature present in this 'big DP' structure. Without going into the exact details, the presence of the weak demonstrative in Spec, DP entails an additional layer of referentiality, which then makes object fronting obligatory. In VO orders, referential objects are DPs with the weak demonstrative in the D-head, and no movement is necessary. Their analysis correctly captures the change from OE NP/DP to the PDE DP, but the question is whether OE is where this process starts, or whether the variation between OV and VO is indeed motivated by referentiality feature checking in varying DP structures.

In their response to an anonymous reviewer's question how is the postverbal object 'the Saviour' in a sentence like (56) is different from the preverbal 'the Saviour' in (57), as the demonstrative in both cases does not seem to have deictic force, so it functions as a determiner, Struik and van Kemenade suggest that in such cases they have to assume that the determiner behaves like a demonstrative (i.e. is raised to Spec,CP), as this is what their proposal predicts. But it does not answer the question how these two objects are different. And they admit that 'the relationship between the status of the definite determiner and the position of objects that we propose here does provide a clear rationale for the variation that we observe'.

I have not systematically analyzed VO orders in Ælfric's *Supplemental Homilies*, but so far we have established some clear predictions for VO orders: either V or O is contrastively focused, or V+O is 'defocused', because there is some other focused element in the proposition. Once the larger context of (56) is checked, our predictions are borne out: the lexical verb is contrastively focused. The object referent 'the beloved Saviour' is given in the preceding discourse, it is topical (the segment discusses the dual nature of Christ: he is both God and man). (56) introduces the heretic view known as 'Arianism', so-called after Arius, who questioned the divine nature of Christ as the son of God. Belittling Christ is presented as a contrastive (and unlikely) alternative to how we should understand Christ's nature, as described in the preceding discourse.

(56)

Arrius	hatte	iu	sum	healic	gedwola,	se	wolde
Arius	was-called	then	some	proud	heretic	who	wanted

lytlian	**þone**	**leofan**	**Hælend**,
belittle	the	beloved	Saviour

'Arius was called then some proud heretic who wanted belittle the beloved Saviour'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_10:159.1489)

In (57), *ðone hælend* 'the Saviour' is preverbal in the fronted non-finite vP. On our account, such embedded clauses are pragmatically presupposed, so the content of ( ) is either backgrounded in the discourse or can be taken for granted. Judas' betraying Christ is certainly CG knowledge for all Christians. Inside the vP, the preverbal object is 'given', as the preceding discourse clearly has Jesus Christ as the main discourse topic.

(57)

'Then approached the day of his precious passion, and the Jewish elders earnestly deliberated how they might slay Jesus Christ; but they dreaded a rescue by the people. Whereupon the devil entered into Judas, one of the twelve servants of the Lord, and he forthwith went to the council of Jews, and openly asked, what money they would give him,'

gif	he	**ðone**	**hælend**	him	belæwan	mihte
if	he	the	Saviour	to-them	betray	could

'if he would betray Jesus to them'

<div align="right">(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_14.1:137.17.3037)</div>

We also need to address the question of preverbal non-referential objects. For QP and NegP objects Struik and van Kemenade 2022 maintain that they end up preverbally due to their need to check +Q or +Neg feature. But obviously, this movement is optional, as these objects, as they claim, occur postverbally more than it has been earlier presented in the literature. Similarly, bare singulars and bare plurals are coded as 'Inert', because they often do not establish discourse referents, and are therefore excluded from the investigation. Bare singulars tend to be semantically incorporated into the verb, while bare plurals in their dataset often introduce abstract concepts, not discourse referents (even though it is not entirely clear how we establish that an abstract concept is not a discourse referent). It is perfectly legitimate to focus on one type of nominals in the preverbal positions and to expect that other semantic types might behave differently. But when the situation with this specific type is generalized onto the general change from OV to VO, or rather, VO only, then questions about other types are unavoidable.

Finally, some comments about VO reflecting default, base order are in place. The main argument presented in Struik and van Kemenade 2020 for the claim that VO is indeed the base order is the fact that OV orders (with referential objects) are always associated with one interpretation – that the object is 'given'. VO orders, on the other hand, which can host both given and new objects, are found. So base orders leave the resolution of IS status to other marking strategies (in most cases prosody). However, we have seen in Section 3.2 that VO orders are not as unmarked as one would expect. The most puzzling thing is that unmarked, new information focus – both narrow, on the object, or broad, on the whole VP - is so rare in VO orders. So, while it is true that the OV configuration will always be interpreted as some kind of background-focus structure, where the verb is the most informative part, the question for the base VO is why the verb is not so informative in this order.

Tracking down the IS status of arguments (objects) in OV and VO orders, without capturing the effect it has on the predicate (verb), cannot give us a full picture of IS mapping onto syntax. Even though it is appealing to think that VO is the base order because it is not associated with a unique interpretation of the object, VO still seems to be a marked order for the interpretation of the verb. If the verb is not of the semantic type 'creation', 'possession', 'change of location/possession', it will not be able to contribute new information focus. It can only be 'backgrounded' or contrastively focused.

Finally, the option that one specific type of syntactic movement applies to resolve one specific IS feature (e.g. givenness of the object) does not seem to be appropriate for languages characterized as having a (relatively) free word order. This is especially evident in Slavic languages, where word order options often seem limitless, and in very few cases movement out of the unmarked SVO order can be accounted for in terms of one specific interpretation of the moved element. So either our understanding of IS features triggering movement is incomplete, or we must allow other factors to play a role in 'discourse configurationality'. While OE is obviously not Slavic, it is true that in the discussions of IS-syntax mapping in OE, especially in the context of OV/VO alternation, OE is often presented as less free in word order patterns than it actually is, as positions of adjuncts are typically ignored. This has been the case in this study as well. Similarly, in the preverbal area, the interaction between objects and adjuncts can make it quite challenging to maintain any account on which, for example, scrambling (I use the term scrambling for higher leftward movements, crucially across adverbs and pronouns) is motivated by some topicality feature.

4.5.1 OV as predicate focus marking

Rather than assuming that object fronting serves the marking of a certain kind of IS interpretation of the object alone, I am more inclined to think that what syntax does in (relatively) free word order languages is simply create configurations where elements are interpreted information-structurally in relation to each other. For OE, it is clear that the main signposts in this process are verbal elements. Everything to the left of the verb is interpreted as backgrounded in comparison to the IS contribution of the verb. Everything to the right of the verb is there because its contribution is equal to that of the verb, or because it exceeds the IS contribution of the verb.

What is crucial to this view are two assumptions (a) predicates are 'default foci' (the hypothesis put forward in Zimmermann and Hole 2008, as: 'Verbs are the main carriers of the semantic predication and as such they naturally constitute part of the (new) comment that is predicated of the topic'), and (b) in OE predicate focus needs to be marked. The first point, which essentially expresses the intuition that the verb is somehow the element that contributes most important information or is of most relevance for update, is further elaborated in Zimmermann 2016.

Zimmermann argues that we can (and should) speak of IS-status of predicates, just as we so often do with terms. Crosslinguistically, predicates can be marked both for backgroundedness and focus. Still, compared to the IS marking of terms, predicates are more optionally marked for focus. Zimmermann proposes that predicate focus is treated as special due to a cognitive constraint on CG management. 'The cognitive constraint governing the anchoring of new information to pre-established discourse referents creates an inherent relation between focus and predication' (Zimmermann 2016: 24).[43] As

---

[43] More elaboration of this point, Zimmermann gives as follows: 'Prototypical discourse referents are concrete individuals, things, places, etc, which are typically denoted by DP- or PP-terms... The established discourse referents fixed (unfocused, without alternatives) at the current CG-state at which information on them is requested The information requested or provided in the form of a predication about the discourse referent must be in focus since the predication would be uninformative in the absence of alternatives: the informational needs of the discourse participants would already be satisfied.' (Zimmermann 2016: 24).

verbal predicates denote properties and activities of discourse referents, or situations containing them, they are the default focus of an utterance. Default interpretation does not need to be marked in order to be properly identified as focus, hence the marking of predicate focus is optional. Terms or discourse referents do not constitute the default focus of an utterance and 'tend to require marking under focus'.

The default mapping from IS status to grammatical category is then that focus is mapped onto predicates, and background/given to terms (DPs, PPs). The default mappings usually do not need to be explicitly marked by additional grammatical means. Languages tend to employ explicit marking when non-default mapping takes place: focused terms and backgrounded/given predicates. Based on these two default marking patterns, Zimmermann formulates the following tentative implicative universals:

(58)

Implicative Universals on marking of IS-status on predicates and terms
i.   If a language marks predicate focus, it will also mark term focus
ii.   If a language marks background terms, it will also mark background predicates

In OE however, we see that these default IS mappings *do* need additional marking. This obviously holds for object-terms. If once established discourse referents are fixed ('unfocused, without alternatives', cf. Zimmermann 2016: 24), then they should not be subject to massive evacuation out of the postverbal position. In other words, they should not be specially marked as 'given' (or 'non-referential', if we maintain that these object types have to check something crucial for their interpretation in the preverbal area). But they obviously are, as they move leftward. If verbs are default foci, then their default interpretation should not be contingent on object fronting, and they would easily tolerate postverbal material of any type. And this again is not the case.

Moreover, we have seen that OE uses linguistic means to track the cognitive status of *any* meaning in a proposition, including predicate meanings, and uses word order to indicate when a predicate is backgrounded. This is what vP fronting contributes to a proposition. Nothing but some vague notion of economy prevents us from assuming that novelty of the predicate would also tend to be marked structurally. After all, not marking default mappings is registered as a crosslinguistic tendency, but there are languages, or discourses, where default interpretations will also be indicated structurally. With that in mind, let us now go back to object fronting, for which we would like to propose the following hypothesis: object fronting as a way of creating [background-focus] structure.

The motivation for object fronting is twofold: the object moves either because it needs to escape the position where it would be interpreted differently, or to ensure that the verb is unambiguously the only element in this relevant area. For vP fronting, we have labeled the area following the finite verb 'clausal focus'. Similarly, for lexical verbs, we assume that the postverbal area is again related to the focus interpretation of the relevant domain. We will call this domain 'predicate focus', where 'predicate' should be interpreted as 'comment' updating the topic in the [topic-comment] structure. If the verb is 'default focus', which we can informally label [+new], the only 'novelty' that can override the verb and be present in the predicate focus area are new discourse referents. Our VO orders showed that when new referents are introduced as internal arguments, this seems to be usually done via contrastive focus.

Contrastive focus on 'given' objects prevents these objects from fronting. Contrastive focus on the verb can have the same effect, as well as the relative backgroundedness of the VP itself. But when none of these factors are at play, the verb will be the only element in the 'predicate focus' domain, and all complements will be moved leftward. All that is necessary for an internal argument of any semantic type (referential, bare singular, bare plural, quantified and negative), to be fronted is that the meaning of the noun is 'given', 'inferred', 'plausible' in a specific context. Whether we, for example, speak of 'the turtle', 'a turtle', 'turtles', 'every/some turtle', 'no turtle' – the 'turtle-meaning' has to be CG in order to be fronted. If we are to constrain our leftward movement of objects in terms of an IS feature, then this feature should be as robust as the application of object fronting is.

4.5.2 Non-referential objects again

Let us present some more evidence that non-referential objects behave similarly to referential objects both in OV and VO orders. Take for instance (59) with a bare plural object in the preverbal position. The object *englum* 'angels' in this context receives generic interpretation. Angles are first mentioned in (59), which is a paraphrase of St. Paul's words that saints will not only judge the world but also judge angels (1 Corinthians 6:3). So, not only is the object non-referential, but 'angels' are also not backgrounded nor can be inferred via 'saints', so such cases would be treated as special (due to the question of bare plural's referentiality) or exceptional as the object qualifies as 'new' on the view that there is no some 'general knowledge' type of relationship between angels and saints. However, the exact status of 'angels' cannot be interpreted without the predicate that introduces it in the discourse. Angels here are to be interpreted in the context of judging. Once the context is narrowed down, our 'general knowledge' can step in and establish that the only 'angel-type' that needs to be judged is the fallen angel. And this is exactly how 'angels' should be understood in (59) as well. As the preceding context is about how Martin successfully drove the devils out of a possessed man, the angel-type is also truly 'given'.

(59)

As often as he desired to cast out devils from the insane, he prostrated himself on the church floor, clothed with hair-cloth and bestrewed with ashes, lying in his prayers with locked doors, and the devils afterward were immediately driven from the afflicted men with wonderful gesticulations

þæt	se	cwyde	mihte	beon	on	Martine	gefylled,	þæt	halige	menn
that	the	saying	might	be	in	Martin	fulfilled	that	holy	men

sceolon	**englum**	deman
shall	angels	judge

'that the saying might be fulfilled in Martin that holy men shall judge angels'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Martin]:1207.6769)

Similarly in (69), Eugenia ('the maiden') is not worried about how she could direct individuals of the opposite sex (men), but how she could direct the individuals of the opposite sex in her monastery, where she lived disguised as a man.

(60)

Then after three years since her conversion, the abbot, that was her elder, departed this life, and the brethren immediately began to choose Eugenia as their abbot, for her devout life, and knew not that she was a woman all the while.

ða	wearð	þæt	mæden	mycclum	hohful,	hu	heo
then	became	the	maiden	very	much	how	she

æfre	**wæras**	wissian	sceolde.
ever	men	direct	should

Then became the maiden extremely anxious how she was ever to direct men; [yet durst she not offend them all and despise their election, but accepted the office]

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Eugenia]:121.261)

In some of the examples presented in VO-interpretation, we have seen some non-referential objects (quantified, generic and plural indefinite/non-specific). Bare non-referential singulars in the postverbal position also do not in any way deviate from VO orders from other object types. To verify that, consider the following two examples. In (61), *wyrcan his lof* 'do his praise' contains a semantically weak verb, with an incorporated object. Such non-referential bare singular are assumed to occur preverbally because of some poorly understood reason, pertaining to some special semantic or other properties of non-referential objects of this type. But here we observe two factors contributing to this: the complex predicate *wyrcan his lof* ('praise') contrasts with the predicate in the second conjunct *gescyndan* 'shame'. Moreover, both predicates are backgrounded, because the people celebrate what they witnessed taking place – they only give the interpretation of the events: what God did to Martin and Defensor can be stated or evaluated in terms of praise and shame.

(61)

þæt	God	wolde	**wyrcan**	**his**	**lof**	on	þam	unscæððigan	Martine,
that	God	wanted	do	his	praise	on	the		Martin

and	**gescyndan**	Defensor.
and	shame	

'...that God desired to perfect His praise in the innocent Martin and to shame Defensor'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Martin]:280.6145)

Non-referential bare singular *rice* 'power' in (62) is part of the defocused VP *dælan rice* 'share power' which is backgrounded (discussed in the preceding context), with the focus on *hu* 'how'.

(62)

&	þa hwile þe	he	smeade	hu	he	mihte	**dælan** **rice**	wið	God...

and	while		he	mediated	how	he	might	share	power	with	God

'and while he mediated how he might share power with God...'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_1:180.38.43)</div>

Generically interpreted object *cuce nyteny* 'living cattle' is here literally existentially introduced in the context of God creating the earth and all living creatures. The reason why it is not preverbal, even though plausible and common knowledge, is that the narrative is about how everything came into existence. In addition, it is part of the list of things created by God.

(63)

&	het	ða	eorðan	þæt	heo	sceolde	forðlædan	**cuce**	**nytenu**
and	bade	the	earth	that	it	should	bring forth	living	cattle

'and bade the earth bring forth living cattle'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_1:182.104.101)</div>

Contrastive focus on the lexical verb can lead to orders where an abstract noun is postverbal. The sentence in (64) is a quote from Wisdom of Solomon 1:5. The preceding verse establishes that wisdom will not enter into a malicious soul, nor dwell in the body that is subject to sin. The next verse explains why this is so: because wisdom/holy spirit of discipline (in the OE version in (64) given as 'Holy Ghost's doctrine') will flee deceit (which is the core characteristic of malicious soul and 'body subject to sin'. So, the verb *fleon* 'flee' contrasts with 'enter' and 'dwell'.

(64)

He	cuæð	ðæt	ðæs	Halgan	Gæstes	lar	wille	fleon	**leasunga**.
he	said	that	the	Holy	Ghost's	doctrine	will	flee	deceit

'He said that the doctrine of the Holy Ghost will flee deceit'

<div align="right">(cocura,CP:35.243.14.1593)</div>

4.5.3 All preverbal objects are 'given' or 'backgrounded'?

As I have not myself investigated OV orders, all the assumptions about OV orders here on Struik and van Kemenade's (2020) findings. Here I will comment on the two cases they find potentially problematic for their proposal that all preverbal referential objects are given, and that 'new' referential objects are postverbal. In (65), their (22), the proposition of the embedded clause introduces a situation where one of Christ's apostles wants to bury his father. The object *his fæder lic* 'his father's body' is preverbal, even though neither the apostle's father nor his death has been mentioned earlier.

(65)

þa	ða	he	wolde	**his**	**fæder**	**lic**	bebyrian
when		he	wanted	his	father's	body	bury

<div align="center">180</div>

'when he wanted to bury his father's body'

<div align="right">(cocathom1: ÆCHom_I,_33:460.46.6588)</div>

Struik and van Kemenade try to explain that the presence of a truly new referent here is because 'it fits the general context of talking about the dead'. This is indeed true. The problem in recognizing this object as inferable, hence given, lies in the interpretation of the context where (65) is uttered. It is true that the event preceding (65) is the funeral of a young man in the city of Nain, as Struik and van Kemenade point out. But this is not just an ordinary event in Christ's life. The preceding segment is an account of a miracle perfumed by Christ, where he raised from the dead the son of the widow of Nain. Nor does (65) introduces a new episode where Christ attends another funeral (that of his apostle's father), as suggested by Struik and van Kemenade. It is quite the opposite – Christ does not want his disciple to go to his father's funeral. Also, the quote that follows (6) is not just one quote in 'a collection of quotes by Jesus about funeral rites'. The quote following (6) 'Let the dead bury the dead', from Luke 9:60, is what Christ said in response to a disciple who wanted to spend time at home before committing himself to the Lord. Jesus said, "'Follow me.' But the man replied, 'Lord, first let me go and bury my father.' Jesus said to him, 'Let the dead bury their own dead, but you go and proclaim the kingdom of God'" It is thus clear that both episodes/situations – the raising of the dead of the youth in Nain and the paradoxical response given to his disciple – serve the purpose of directing us to the proper Christian understanding of death (death is our salvation, as we are given eternal life through Christ, and we should not be concerned with the rites symbolizing the finality of life but be firm in our faith). Once we realize that this is the ultimate discourse topic, it becomes clear why the disciple's father's death needs no special introduction, and why it is treated or accommodated as CG or 'given' content. Arriving at the proper interpretation of (65) can also be seen as an important methodological lesson – cognitive statuses of linguistic expressions in texts such as homilies or any other that frequently make reference to the Scriptures, must always be checked against the original text, if we assume that the speaker/author assumes or believes (or acts so) that the hearer/reader is fairly familiar with the events/situations described. The subjectivity in determining cognitive/IS statuses this way is something we should accept and deal with it the best way we can. Factors influencing inferability and plausibility of 'new information' can then be independently measured in future studies.

Another seemingly problematic case with a 'new' object in the preverbal positions comes from Struik and van Kemenade 2022. Here they show that even in the translated texts they originally excluded in Struik and van Kemenade 2020 due to the possible Latin influence on word order patterns, the majority of preverbal objects are indeed given. Objects introducing new referents follow 'the native pattern' in having them in the postverbal position, and the translators quite regularly render Latin OV clauses as VO clauses when the object is new (in 66.7% of the cases). Still, they note 7 new OV objects in Latin that are translated with OV orders in OE. One example illustrating their 'genuinely new' status in the preverbal positions is (66), for which they write: "The object *þæt gyldne mynet* 'the gold coin' is preceded by a definite determiner, but it is not until the relative clause *þætte þider of Cent cwom* that the specific coin is identified. This particular coin has not been mentioned before, so it is truly new."

(66)

[preceding context]

And she [Sæburg] then humbly asked the prayers of all, and made known to them in words, that she had learnt by revelation her last day and her departure to be close at hand. She told them the revelation was on this wise; she said, she saw a great company of men white and fair enter the monastery, and she asked what they sought or wanted there.

a.

&	cwædon,	þæt	heo	to þon	þider	sende	wæron,	þæt	heo	sceolden
and	said	that	they	to-that	there	sent	were	that	they	should

þæt	**gyldne**	**mynet**	mid	him	geneoman,	þætte	þider	of	Cent	cwom
that	golden	coin	with	them	take	that	there	from	Kent	came

'They replied and said, that they were sent there to fetch the golden coin, that had come there from Kent.'

(cobede,Bede_3:6.174.9.1704)

b.

ut	**aureum**	**illud**	**numisma**	quod	eo	de	cantia	venerate
that	gold	that	coin	which	there	from	Kent	came

secum	adsumerent
with-them	take

However, upon a closer inspection of the broader context, we see that (6) is part of Sæburg's (king Æthelbert's older daughter), description of the revelation she had about her approaching death. When, in this revelation, 'a great company of men white and fair' tell her that the reason for their visit to her monastery in France is 'fetching the golden coin, that had come there from Kent', they certainly do not refer to a golden coin, but symbolically to Sæburg herself (the preceding context establishes clearly that Sæburg is a daughter of king Æthelbert of Kent, who was sent to a monastery in France to be educated and to devote herself to Christ). So, 'the golden coin...which had come from Kent to that place' does not introduce a new referent in the discourse. And it is clear to all the participants in the communication: Sæburg herself understands it, the people she is telling the revelation understand it, and the reader understands it.

Putting aside the fact that (6) was clearly misinterpreted in Struik and van Kemenade 2022, it shows that the translator of Bede's *History*, is still concerned that his preverbal objects are 'given', and the example in fact supports their main claim about givenness of OV orders. What is ultimately important here is that if we allow 'givenness' to cover any type of CG content, as I believe it does, then we obviously need to look for sources of this status outside the immediate context of utterance.

4.5.4 Complement fronting as indicator of 'background-focus' partition

On the broad view of 'givenness', OV then creates a configuration where the 'given' material is separated from 'new' material, which equals the background-focus type of partition. The same process has been observed with vP fronting across modals and auxiliaries. So it seems clear that fronting of complements, in general, creates a bipartite structure which reflects the informational dichotomy 'background-focus' (the dichotomy can be expressed in other terms, of course). The difference between them lies in what is highlighted (or in 'focus'). With vP fronting, the highlight is that an event has taken place (when TAM or modality meaning expressed on a modal or auxiliary is the only element contributing novel information). With NP fronting, the highlight is on the predicate relation (when the lexical verb updates the relation between discourse referents or between a discourse referent and non-referential but given notions). Both 'insanitation of an event' and 'predicate relation; are highlighted when the lexical verb is marked for TAM. Both the concern for marking a referent as given and highlighting the non-given part are equally important and can be seen as a motivating factor for creating the 'background-focus' structure. And both are related to the communicative goals and intentions of the speaker.

The inference of vP fronting (which can be informally stated as 'I'm instructing you that you should take it for granted that this eventuality has taken or might/should take place') is used in embedded clauses to indicate the secondary contribution of their propositional content. Highlighting predicate relation is used in discourse where update is achieved via creating a background structure with discourse participants and presenting novel information about their relations. In transitive constructions, when the object does not represent a discourse referent, the IS status of the 'object-meaning' is taken into consideration, and an 'assumed' relation between the discourse referent and 'object-meaning' is updated.

All VO orders then arise when the speaker does not intend to highlight the predicate relation (or event), and/or when the predicate is not the most informative or most relevant part in the proposition. This characterization seems to cover all the observed interpretations of VO orders. If the predicate is not backgrounded, either through given-reactivated status in defocused VPs, or as background of contrastively focused object, it is itself contrastively focused, which needs to be structurally disambiguated from 'neutral' focus. And this is possible with any object type.

What is curious is that OV seems to be an unmarked IS/discourse strategy. And this impression is based on the interpretation of VO orders presented in this study. In my dataset, I have not seen the possibility of introducing new discourse referents without a predicate of creation or a predicate that establishes some kind of possession/be-in-same-location relation between the subject and the object, or without contrastive focus. My proposal that OV also creates [background-focus] structure based on relational givenness (so, [topic-comment] relation) could make sense with referential arguments, but for non-referential preverbal objects, the notion 'topicality' would have to be tweaked to be able to justify their preverbal positions. And it seems that whenever we try to apply IS notions to meanings other than 'referential', we run into problems because the usual characterizations of topic, focus and givenness are usually given for 'referential' discourse participants. Take sentence initial topics, for example. For quite a long time it has been taken that their referents need to be definite, uniquely identifiable, given. But many languages front elements that are non-referential (cf. Lötscher 1992, for

example). As each of the non-referential NP types has its special semantic properties, it is not surprising that they cannot be so easily interpreted in IS terms. Whether some rudimentary view of givenness (or more likely, accommodation) can account for their preverbal position remains to be seen. Here it is just important to bear in mind that in OE they occur postverbally in more or less the same contexts as referential objects.

4.5.5 Peculiarities of non-fronted VO orders

Having clearly observed that novel referential objects/discourse referents are usually introduced via contrastive focus in VO orders, the question that needs to be addressed is why novel referents need to come with alternatives, or in some kind of parallel/contrast relation. I do not have an answer to why there is such a restriction. Nor do we have a full insight from VO orders from main clauses. I will thus leave open the possibility that other data exhibit the option of having a sentence such as 'Peter pushed a boy on the street', where the object is neither contrastively focused (there is no relevant contrastive alternative and no unlikelihood inference present) nor introduced via a specific predicate type, in the VO order. I will also not make any predictions regarding syntactic structure based on the observation that 'verb in focus position' strategy is an 'unmarked' way of presenting eventualities when lexical predicates update the CG, or why something that is supposed to be IS unmarked is syntactically marked.

Even though we cannot fully capture how object-meanings alternate between the preverbal and postverbal position, we *do* have a uniform interpretation of the predicate: in VO orders it is rarely 'inherent', 'neutral' or 'new'. This does not mean that capturing these special markings ('special' only in relation to how 'inherent' focus is marked) is straightforward.

Take for instance contrastive focus marking on predicates. We have seen that contrastive focus on the lexical verb precludes the givenness-related fronting of objects. As we have only looked at VO orders, where contrastively focused lexical verbs have been observed, it seems unwise to claim that contrastive focus on verbs can never be assigned to verbs in the final position. But let us assume that for a verb to be interpreted contrastively, it needs to be *non*-final. where, in addition to evoking a contrasting alternative, contrastive focus also signals the unlikelihood of the focused expression. If we want to maintain that predicate focus, particularly contrastive focus, needs special marking, then we face a situation where contrastive focus is marked by the syntactically base order (VO), whereas 'default/[+new] focus' is marked via a derived order (OV). However, it is only out of concern for economy that we are hesitant to think that contrastive focus in VO orders is marked by an additional movement step of the lexical verb out of OV orders. But we must always bear in mind that object fronting is a precondition for vP fronting in vPn-Vf orders in embedded clauses (OVn-Vf vs. *VnO-Vf). Once we accept that object fronting applies easily and widely, and that all that is needed is for object-meaning is to be CG (or to be treated as such), an additional movement step for contrastive focus marking of predicates should not be a problem. In the following Chapter 5, we discuss potential cases where non-finite verb fronting for contrastive focus marking could be justified. This, of course, does not mean that all VO orders should be derived this way. Until contrastive focus marking has been checked on a larger dataset, we will refrain from making any generalizations.

Defocused VPs with VO orders, where some relative givenness of the predicate including the internal argument is marked, clearly show that in VO the inherent focus/newness of the verbs is decreased. But the fact that such predicates still function as solid comments of, say, new subject topics, shows that when reactivated, they do contribute update, and in that sense are still informative. We know that the categories of information structure are organized along several dimensions (focus-background, topic-comment, and given-new), which are independent but also interacting, and mismatches between these dimensions are well-known to occur. So with defocused VPs, the predicate is backgrounded but 'focused' as a comment. What is unexpected or difficult to capture is how the presence of an internal argument following the verb gives us the calculation that the verb should be interpreted 'specially'. For now, all the observations regarding the interpretations of VO orders can only be viewed as factors established to take precedence over object fronting.

As a consequence, we need to view complement fronting as a general mechanism of creating relevant background-focus structures, which are heavily employed in certain types of discourse or certain discourse styles. It is a discoursed type/style where all backgrounded statuses are encoded or indicated, as well as any changes or modifications of the CG, from introducing new referents to marking sentence topic switches, new discourse segments, shifts in the narrative, parallel relations between utterances, and so. To achieve this type of coherence, authors exploit word order changes and discourse particles, and obviously tend to package information in the discourse so that the reader can sort out primary from secondary contributions, given from new information, but also more global discourse relations, such as parallel, contrast, opposition, etc.

4.6 Summary

In this chapter, VO orders in OE embedded clauses have been investigated with respect to the IS interpretation of the non-finite VP material. It has been shown that all VO orders arise because either the object, the non-finite lexical verb or some other element in the clause (auxiliary/modal, subject or adjunct) is contrastively focused. When the contrastive focus is outside the core VP (verb and object), the VP material has a 'backgrounded' flavor, and the effect is captured by the label 'defocused' VP. This somewhat confusing label is justified by the need to keep this type of backgroundedness from the effect observed with fronted pragmatically presupposed vP. Non-contrastive focus (or new information focus) has been registered only in VO orders with predicates that existentially introduce referents in the discourse and ditransitive verbs.

We have compared these insights with the ones presented in Struik and van Kemenade (2020) for OV orders with referential objects. As their central claim is that referential preverbal objects correlate with one unique interpretation - givenness, they must be derived, while VO orders, allowing both 'given' and 'new' referents must then reflect an unmarked order. While this scenario of '(un)markedness' may hold for objects/referential NPs, the interpretation of the predicate represents a problem. If VO is unmarked, the predicate should also be unmarked. This, however, is rarely the case in VO orders. The configuration where the predicate is unmarked, in the sense that it represents the most novel information, is in fact in OV orders. For that reason, I have proposed that OV orders are indeed derived, but they are IS-neutral. This is so because OE structurally marks 'default' predicate focus interpretation by applying object fronting whenever the minimal conditions on 'givenness' in the broadest possible sense are met. Object fronting then serves a dual purpose: it can mark the 'givenness'

of the moved content and it can also create a configuration where predicates are marked as focused. All other cases when the predicate is not interpreted as 'default' (most informative) focus, are marked by a lack of object fronting.

This proposal shifts the burden of explanation to the question of why a language would choose to mark structurally something that can be marked in situ. My suggestion for this question is based on a trivial interpretation of what can be observed: if the verb prefers to be in the clause final position, and this is where it is interpreted as being most informative, then the preferred way of information packaging in that language is to highlight events.

5. EXCEPTIONAL POSTVERBAL MATERIAL: PRONOMINAL OBJECTS, ADVERBS AND COMPLEX POSTVERBAL MATERIAL

In this chapter, we aim to tease out interpretations of the material which is often disregarded in the studies of the postverbal area: postverbal object pronouns, postverbal adverbs and occurrences of both objects and adverbs following the non-finite lexical verb. Even though such patterns are not frequent, they can provide additional insight into what can follow non-finite verbs and under what conditions. First off, these orders are interesting syntactically, as pronouns and adverbs strongly prefer the preverbal position, and their derivation must address additional concerns, which are not so obvious with postverbal nominal objects. Secondly, it is necessary to examine whether the same IS interpretations obtain as with postverbal nominal objects. Complex postverbal material is even more intriguing, not only because we need to account for the structural position of an IS interpretation of two elements following the verb, but also for the fact that their relative ordering can change, so we can have both O-Adv and Adv-O orders postverbally.

In Section 5.1 we address postverbal pronominal objects, while postverbal adverbs are dealt with in Section 5.2. Interpretations of two possible orderings of 'complex' postverbal, V-O-Adv and V-Adv-O, are given in Sections 5.3 and 5.4, respectively. Section 5.5 gives a summary of the observed effects and discusses a possible syntactic derivation in terms of non-finite verb fronting.

5.1 Postverbal pronominal objects (Vn–Opro)

The interpretations of VO orders identified so far in Chapter 4 involve nominal objects only. Focus has been identified as the key factor keeping the object from moving leftward across the non-finite lexical verb. Adopting the view of Struik and van Kemenade (2020) that OV orders mark the givenness of referential objects, in VO orders the relevant features for object fronting, [+given, +referential], somehow become irrelevant, and no fronting takes place. Our analysis of VO orders shows that contrastive focus is responsible for this effect. Let us now raise the level of [+givenness] of the internal argument and see how pronominal objects behave in VO orders Most OE pronouns are found in two preverbal derived positions, roughly, above or below a nominal subject (or a high adverb) (cf. van Kemenade and Milićev 2005/2012). Some pronouns, however, are allowed to occur postverbally, and it would be useful to check if the conditions 'preventing' them from moving leftward are the same we observe for nominal objects (excluding, of course, the cases where the object is introduced as a new discourse referent). Not surprisingly, they are.

Contrastive focus of the non-finite verbs preceding pronominal objects is certainly one of the interpretations we note for Vn-Opro orders. This is illustrated in (1). In Christ's invitation to his disciples and the crowd around him, the focus on the infinitive *fyligean* 'follow' evokes the alternative of not following Christ (this comes as a clear implication of Peter's objection to Christ's announcement of his sacrifice presented in the immediately preceding discourse).

(1)

þa	sæde	se	hælend	hys	leorningcnihtum,	gyf	hwa	wylle	**fyligean**
then	said	the	saviour	to-his	disciples	if	anyone	will	follow

me,	wiþsace	hyne sylfne
me,	deny	himself

[And he summoned the crowed with his disciples, and said to them,]
'If anyone wishes to come after me, he must deny himself [and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it.]

(cowsgosp,Mt_[WSCp]:16.24.1108)

The pronominal object can also be contrastively focused. In St. Vincent's words in (2), the contrastive focus on the pronominal object *me* 'me' following the infinitive *gewrecen* 'punish' ('punish me_FOC') indicates that it should be interpreted relative to the alternative of other people being punished. The 'other people' are St. Vincent's torturers, who now being punished by their cruel master because they could not inflict injury on the saint, so the cruel master is punishing St. Vincent through them.

(2)

Se	halga	wer	þa	cwæþ:	Nu	þu	gewrecst	on	him	ða	witu	þe
the	holy	man	then	said	now	you	execute	on	them	the	tortures	that

ic	þrowige	for	þinre	wælhreownysse,	swilce	þu	sylf	wille	*gewrecen*	**me**
I	suffer	for	your	cruelly	as-if	you	self	will	punish	me

on	him.
on	them

'The holy man then said: now you execute on them the tortures that I suffered for your cruelty, as if you (yourself) will punish me on them.'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Vincent]:118.7870)

We also find the 'defocused' VP interpretation associated with VO orders. In (3) the adverb *rihtlice* 'rightly' is the element marked for contrastive focus, as it evokes the alternative of how the abbot used to treat his monks before (*mishead his munecan* 'mistreat his monks'). The non-finite VP *healdan hi* 'govern them' could be said to be 'given' in the sense that it is essentially the same as the predicate 'mistreat' without the manner part. It is also interesting to note that in the second conjunct in (3b) also features the order infinitive-pronoun, but here the verb *lufian* 'love' before the accusative pronoun *hi* 'them' has contrastive focus (the abbot apparently did not love the monks before), and his which allows it to precede the pronoun. We will present examples of 'defocused' VPs containing pronominal objects in Section 5.3.2.

(3)

188

a. ærest hit com of þæs abbotes unwisdome. þæt he misbead his munecan
    first it came of the abbot's unwisdom that he ill-treated his monks

    on fela þingan
    on many things

    'First, it happened out of the abbot's unwisdom that he ill treated his monk for many things'

b. & ða munecas hit mændon lufelice to him
    and the monks it complained kindly to him

    'and the monk kindly complained to him about it'

c. & beadon hine þæt he sceolde healdan hi **rihtlice**. & **lufian** hi
    and asked him that he should govern them rightly and love them

    'and asked him that he should govern them rightly and love them'
                                        (cochronE,ChronE_[Plummer]:1083.4. 2761-2763)

Postverbal pronouns clearly show that they are subject to the same IS/discourse factors as nominal objects. They will not front if they themselves are contrastively focused, if the lexical verb is focused, or if they are part of a defocused VP. As this is not a common strategy for pronouns (since they normally move to higher clausal positions), we observe certain conditions for contrastive focus marking on the verb or the pronoun: for either of these to obtain, only 1st and 2nd person pronouns can be used. 3rd person pronouns are allowed only in defocused VPs. So we can state that contrastive focus can block movement of pronouns only with 1st, 2nd person pronouns and reflexive pronouns.

5.2 Postverbal adverbs (Vn–Adv)

Adverbs normally occupy a preverbal position, presumably being adjoined to vP. Many of them, however, can also occur clause-finally. Some of such instances seem to involve apposition (in the sense that the adverb is attached to the entire proposition, as supplemental information).[44] Other clause final

---

[44] This seems to happen most often with speech-act, subject-oriented and frequency adverbs. Such clause final adverbs are possible both in Vf-VPn (ia) and VPn-Vf orders (ib&c).

(i) a. and cwæð þæt we sceoldon symle eac habban ure eorðlican neode **þærtoeacan soðlice**.
        and said that we should always also have our earthly needs moreover indeed
        'and said that we should moreover also always have our earthly needs, indeed'
                                        (coaelhom,ÆHom_21:387.3273)
     b. and þæt is swyðe god spell, þurh Godes tocyme us to gehyrenne þæt we habban moton
        and that is very good story through God's advent us to hear that we have must
        þa heofonlican wununge mid him sylfum **æfre**
        the heavenly dwelling-place with him self ever
        'and it was a very good story, for us to hear through God's advent that we shall have the heavenly dwelling place with him ever'

189

adverbs are found postverbally for IS reasons. In fact, the interpretations arising with postverbal adverbs resemble those with postverbal object: either the adverb or the lexical verb is marked for contrastive focus (4b).

(4)

a.	Adv – Vn	unmarked interpretation of the adverb
b.	Vn – **Adv_FOC**	contrastive focus interpretation of the adverb
b.'.	**Vn_FOC** – Adv	contrastive focus interpretation of the non-finite verb

5.2.1 Narrow focus on the adverbial (Vn–**Adv_FOC**)

(5) is a reference to the Bible, namely, St Paul's address to the Galatians (Galatians 3:1-5). Paul rebukes the Galatians for being deluded, as they decide to 'observe the old law (the law of Moses), rather than continue believing in Christ (the law of the Spirit). The law of Moses consisted of many ceremonies, rituals, and symbols, with the purpose of frequently reminding people of their duties and responsibilities. It included the law of carnal commandments and performances, and in the OE religious texts, this fact is often emphasized, partly to indicate the contrast with the more spiritual nature of Christianity, or the concerns of the early Christian church regarding which practices of the 'old law' were to be kept in the new religion. In the *that*-clause in (33), the postverbal adverb *flæsclice* 'fleshly/carnally' contrasts with *gæsðlice* 'spiritually' in the preceding clause. The verb itself (*geendingan* 'destroy') seems to be treated by the speaker as backgrounded – Paul takes that the Galatians have been made aware that they are destroying their faith in Christ. What he wants to communicate here is a reminder of the sharp distinction between the two laws – Christ's law being spiritual, Moses' law being carnal.

(5)

&	eft	he	cuæð:	Sua	dysige	ge	sint	ðætte	ðæt	ðæt	ge	**gæsðlice**
and	again	he	said:	so	foolish	you	are	that	that	that	you	spiritually

underfengon,	ge	willað	geendigan	**flæsclice**
received,	you	want	destroy	carnally

'and he said again: So foolish you are, that what you received spiritually you wish to end carnally'
(cocura,CP:31.207.15.1396)

In (6) the adverb *eallunga* 'entirely' has contrastive focus; it evokes alternatives for the way we understand wisdom. The relevant alternative is given in the main clause. The two clauses form parallel

---

(coaelhom,ÆHom_8:3.1167)

c.	..þæt	gescead	þe	hi	gewysigen	sceall	to weldædum	**a**
	the	reason	that	her	direct	shal	to goodeeds	always

'the reason which should direct it (the soul) to good deeds ever'
(coaelive,ÆLS_[Christmas]:148.118)

focus structures, whereby the wisdom's ability to understand us entirely is contrasted with our inability to understand wisdom entirely. However, the interpretation of 'entirely' in the main clause is not the same as the interpretation of 'entirely' in the concessive clause. The second 'entirely', being contrastively focused, evokes the alternative of a lesser degree of understanding. The contrast between the wisdom's understanding us and our understanding wisdom is not in our inability to understand it all, but rather in our inability to understand it to the full degree.

(6)

Ac	se	wisdom	mæg	us	**eallunga**	ongitan	swylce	swylce	we	sint,
but	the	wisdom	may	us	entirely	understand	such	as		we	are

þeah	we	hine	ne	mægen	ongitan	**eallunga**	swylcne	swylce	he	is
although	we	him	not	may	understand	entirely	such	as		he	is

'But the wisdom can entirely understand us as we are, although we cannot understand it entirely the way it is'

(coboeth,Bo:41.145.10.2892)

5.2.2 Narrow focus on the verb (Vn$_{FOC}$ – Adv)

In (7) the participle precedes the frequency adverb *æfre* 'ever', which normally occupies the preverbal position. The verb *gehealdan* 'protect/save', preceding the adverb, contrasts with the verb *fordon* 'destroy' in the next clause. The verb in this position signals that the relation between us/people and God is crucially different from the relation between us and the devil.

(7)

Ures	Drihtnes	dæda	and	þæs	deofles	ne	magon	nateshwon	geþwærian
our	Lord's	deed	and	the	devil's	not	may	by-no-means	agree

ne	beon	gelice,	for þan ðe		se	Hælend	wyle	us	**gehealdan**	æfre,	and
nor	be	alike	because		the	Saviour	will	us	protect	always,	and

se	deofol	wile	us	fordon	gif	he	mæg
the	devil	will	us	destroy	if	he	can

'Our Lord's deeds and those of the devil may by no means be in agreement nor be alike because the Saviour will always protect us, and the devil will destroy us, if he can'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_4:200.631)

In the examples above the object is absent (5) or pronominal and preverbal (6 & 7). As we cannot eliminate the option that in principle these clause final adverbs are 'supplemental' (i.e. outside the main proposition), let us see how postverbal adverbs and postverbal objects interact, and what their interpretations are.

5.3 Complex postverbal material: objects and adverbs

5.3.1 Vn – O – Adv

The first order we will look at is the one where postverbal object precedes postverbal adverb. This word order is characteristic of main clauses, and is occasionally possible only in some highly assertive embedded clauses. It signals a rather complex focus marking that is dependent on the discourse independence of the utterances containing them. The dominant interpretation of this order is contrastive focus on the postverbal adverb.

As in 'simplex' Vn-Adv orders, in Vn-O-Adv, the final adverb can be truly supplemental, and used for emphasis or rhetorical effects, as in (8).

(8)

and	cwæð	þæt	we	sceoldon	symle	eac	habban	ure	eorðlican	neode
and	said	that	we	should	always	also	have	our	earthly	need

þærtoeacan	**soðlice**.
moreover	indeed

'and said that we should also have our earthy need, moreover, indeed'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_21:387.3273)

In many other cases, the focused adverb scopes over lexical predicates. Due to the relative ordering with the focused adverb, the VP material is construed as backgrounded, even though it is not strictly speaking part of the CG. Still, the semantic content should be such that it can be easily accommodated as something 'familiar' to the interlocutors (or contextually salient). In the context where aspects of marriage are discussed, the VP 'obey their husbands' in the statement in (9) can be accommodated as less 'important' than the focused manner adverb *gedefenlice* 'fittingly'. Presumably, the adverb here is to be interpreted exclusively ('only in this particular manner').

(9)

Wif	sceolon	gehyrsumian.	heora	werum	**gedafenlice**.	and	hi	symle
wives	should	obey	their	husbands	fittingly	and	them	always

arwurðian.	swaswa	agene	hlafordas;
honour	as	own	lords

'Wives should fittingly obey their husbands, and always honour them as their own lords'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_21:185.157.4082)

Focus on the adverb can be used for emphasis only. In (10), the VP 'letting go of the vineyard/his ancestor's inheritance' is backgrounded, yielding the defocused VO order, while the adverb 'so easily' is emphatically focused (it does not evoke alternatives, as it is not the case that under different

circumstances it would be easy to him to give up his inheritance; what is emphasized is the indecency of such proposal).

(10)

> There was a certain thane called Naboth, who had a vineyard hard by the king's palace; then said the king to him, "Give me your vineyard for a herb-garden, and I will at least find you another farther off, or I will acquire it for money, because it is handy to me."

þa	cwæð	Naboð	him	to,	þæt	he	ne	mihte	alætan	his	yldrena
then	said	Naboth	him	to	that	he	not	could	let-go	his	ancestors'

yrfweardnysse	**swa**	**eaðelice**	him	to	handa.
inheritance	so	easily	him	to	hand

> 'Then said Naboth to him that he could not let go his ancestors' inheritance so lightly into his hands (so he can turn it into a herb-garden)'
>
> (coaelive,ÆLS_[Book_of_Kings]:176.3786)

In some cases, the adverb seems to be contrastively focused and we note the relevance of alternatives. For instance, in (11) focus on the adverb *to swiþe* 'too much' evokes the contrastive alternative degree adverb (of a lesser degree) for our loving of the world splendor. (12) illustrates the same for the adverb *neadunga* 'forcibly'. The VP content is not strictly given, but again the larger discourse context allows the speaker to use them as 'background' for the focused adverb.

(11)

> Magon we þonne, men þa leofestan, us þis to gemyndum habban, & þas bysene on urum heortum staþelian,
> 'May we then, dearest men, have this for our mementoes and set fast this example in our hearts'

þæt	we	ne	sceolan	lufian	worlde	glengas	**to**	**swiþe**	ne	þysne
that	we	not	shall	love	worldly	splendour	too	much	nor	this

middangeard;
world

> 'so that we do not love worldly splendour, nor this world itself too much; for this world is altogether decrepit, troublous, corruptible, and unstable. And this world is altogether transitory.
>
> (coblick,HomU_20_[BlHom_10]:113.127.1451)

(12)

We	habbað	oft	gesæd	&	git	secgað	þæt	Cristes	rihtwisnys.	is	swa
we	have	often	said	and	yet	say	that	Christ's		is	so

micel	þæt	he	nolde	niman	mancynn.	**neadunga**	of	ðam	deofle
great	that	he	not-would	take	mankind	forcibly	from	the	devil

buton	he	hit	forwyrhte.
unless	he	it	forfeited

'We have often said, and yet say, that the justice of Christ is so great, that he would not forcibly have taken mankind from the devil, unless he had forfeited that. [He forfeited them when he instigated the people to the slaying of Christ, the Almighty God; and then through his innocent death we were redeemed from eternal death, if we do not destroy ourselves]

(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_14.1:296.167.2691)

When the adverb is emphatically focused, the VP material itself can enter into contrast relations. In (13), *secan cyrcan* 'seeking church' is given relative to 'praying in every place'.

(13)

'A man must pray even as he may and can, because Almighty God can understand all speech; and in every place must he magnify his Lord, and continue in prayer wherever he be.'

Man	sceal	swaþeah	secan	cyrcan	**gelome**,
one	should	nevertheless	seek	church	frequently

Nevertheless a man ought to seek church frequently, and a man may not talk nor hold conversations within God's church, because it is the house of prayer, hallowed to God for ghostly discourses.

(coaelive,ÆLS[Pr_Moses]:68.2908)

In (14b), the lexical VP content *oferswiðod swylcera gedwolena andgit* 'overcome heretic understanding' is to be interpreted as contrasting with 'spreading heretic understanding' in (14a). Note that focusing the adverb has the effect of reactivation or reminder of something that should be familiar to the interlocutors.

(14)

a.   There were certain heretics beguiled by the devil, so that they said that Christ the Son of God was not eternally dwelling with the Holy Father, but that there was a certain time (period) before He was born; but the holy Gospel has full oft surpassed the understanding of such heretics.

b.
ac	þæt	halige	godspell	hæfð	**oferswiðod**	swylcera	gedwolena	andgit
but	the	holy	gospel	has	overcome	such	heretics'	understanding

foroft.
very-often

'but the holy Gospel has full oft surpassed the understanding of such heretics'

194

In (15) the postverbal *þagit swa* 'yet so/even so' evokes the alternative ways the torturers tried to move the holy maiden (by dragging her, by tugging her with ropes) to the way least expected to fail – by using oxen to pull her away. In addition, the verb *acecgan* 'shake' is to be interpreted relative to the alternative 'move away': they could not achieve the minimal amount of body movement (shake).

(15)

ac	hi	ne	mihton	**awecgan**	þæt	mæden	**þagit**	**swa**.
but	they	not	could	shake	that	maiden	even	so

'but they could not even so shake the maiden'

In (16) the object 'our lord' is to be interpreted as related to the 'hateful wolf (i.e. the devil)'. The contrast between Christ and the devil has been under discussion in the preceding discourse.

(16)

ac	we	sceolon	gehyrsumian	**urum**	**Hælende**	**symle**,	þe	is	ure	hyrde,
but	we	should	obey	our	Saviour	always	who	is	our	shepherd

na	þam	hetelan	wulfe,	þe	þæs	anes	cepð,
not	the	hateful	wolf	who	the	one	desired

'but we should always obey our Saviour, who is our shepherd, not the hateful wolf, who desires the one thing...'

Multiple focus interpretations can also be noted. In (17), *swa hraþe* 'so quickly' and *þa git* 'then yet' are contrastively focused, because what is communicated here is not only that bishop Aidan was not fluent in the Northumbrian dialect, but that later he could quickly switch to his non-native language. The lexical verb *gebigan* 'turn, switch' also seems to evoke the alternative that bishop Aidan held on to his native language.

(17)

(The king had to act as a translator between the new bishop Aiden)

forþan þe	he	wel	cuþe	scyttysc,	and	se	bisceop	Aidan	ne	mihte
because	he	well	knew	Scottish	and	the	bishop	Aidan	not	could

gebigan	his	spræce	to	Norðhymbriscum	gereorde	**swa**	**hraþe**	**þa**	**git**
turn	his	speech	to	Northumbrian	dialect	so	quickly	then	yet

195

'because he knew Scottish well, and bishop Aidan could not turn his speech to Northumbrian dialect so quickly then/and bishop Aidan could not as yet turn his speech into the Northumbrian dialect quickly enough'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Oswald]:64.5422)</div>

5.3.2 Vn – Opro – Adv_{FOC}

Now we observe postverbal pronouns followed by adverbs. Pronominal objects in this word order configuration are relatively rare in embedded clauses. This is not surprising as pronouns generally prefer 'higher', preverbal positions. The fact that they *can* show up in the position following a lexical verb and preceding an adverb makes this order syntactically intriguing. The most frequent interpretation of this order is the one where the adverb is contrastively focused, while the VP is backgrounded.

In (18), mixing the oils together contrasts with keeping them all separately in different vessels/ampoules. The process of mixing oils has been mentioned earlier (it has been under discussion), and this gives the VP the defocused effect.

(18)

O ye mass-priests, my brethren, we will say to you now that which we have not said before; because today we have to distribute our oil, hallowed in three ways, as the book directs us [Latin]. That is Holy oil; secondly, Chrism; thirdly, Sick man's oil.

And	ge	sceolon	habban	þreo	ampullan	gearuwe	to	þam	þrym	elum
and	you	should	have	three	phials	ready	to	the	three	oils

Forþan þe	we	ne	durran	don	hi	**togædere**	**on**	**anum**	**elefate,**
because	we	not	should	do	them	together	in	one	oil-vessel,

forþan ðe	hyra	ælc	bið	gehalgod	on sundron	to	synderlicre	þenunge
because	of-them	each	is	hallowed	separately	to	separate	service

'And you should have three phials ready for the three oils. Because we should not put them together in one oil vessel, because each of them is hallowed separately for a separate ministration'

<div align="right">(colwstan2,ÆLet_3_[Wulfstan_2]:3.4)</div>

The negative temporal adverb *na leng* 'no longer' in (19) is focused to emphasize that the torturing of the good Christian woman should go absolutely no longer.

(19)

[PRECEDING CONTEXT: SUMMARY] A good Christian woman, falsely accused of adultery, after being tortured is sentenced to death. A crowd gather to watch the execution. The executioner strikes once with his sword, but the sword 'could not cut anything but the skin'. He strikes again; then the sword stood still, and did not touch the neck... Then the executioner struck at her yet

again with the sword, but the Holy Trinity held back the sword... Then he would have pierced her though with the sword, but the point bent up to the hilt

þa	cwæð	eall	seo	meniu	þe	ðær	mid	stod	ofwundrod,	þæt
then	said	all	the	multitude	who	there	with	stood	astonished	that

se	cwellere	ne	sceolde	swencan	hi	**na**	**leng**,
the	executioner	not	should	vex	her	no	long

'Then said all the multitude who stood there astonished that the executioner should vex her no longer [and drove him away with his weapon altogether]'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS[Ash_Wed]:228.2832)</div>

In (20) we observe scalar focus interpretation on the quantifying adjective *healfe* 'half' modifying the pronominal object *hi* 'them'. In YCOE, *hi healfe* is annotated as being linearly a constituent. As the referent of the pronoun is inanimate (it refers to crutches and stools from the cripples), the pronoun must be weak. Weak pronouns cannot be directly modified, so we must assume a different structure for the quantifying adjective.

(20)

> PRECEDING CONTEXT: After Swithun's miracle, all the sick men who were in front of the church were healed.
> 'The old church was hung all around with crutches and with the stools of cripples, (from one end to the other on either wall), who had been healed there,'

and	man	ne	mihte	swa ðeah	macian	hi	**healfe**	up
and	one	not	could	even-so	make	them	half	up

'and one could not even so put half of them up/and not even so could they put half of them up'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Swithun]:431.4487)</div>

Parallel focus structures with postverbal pronouns are also attested. In the complement *that*-clause in (21), the infinitive *ageldan* 'pay' precedes the pronominal indirect object *us* 'us', the temporal adverb *eft* 'later' and the direct object *þæt gemet* 'the measure'. Both the pronominal object and the adverb are focused, to provide a parallel focus structure with the preceding clause: we give good to the needy now – they should give us the same ('pay us the same measure') later'.

(21)

He	mænde	þa	þearfan,	þe	man	nu	deð	god,
he	told	the	needy	whom	man	now	does	good

þæt	hy	sceolon	ageldan	**us**	**eft**	þæt	gemet
that	they	should	pay	us	later	the	measure

'He told the needy, to whom one does good now, that they should later pay us the same measure'

Main clauses contain more cases with this ordering of the postverbal material, and an instance such as (22) suggests that in main clauses open up more interpretational effects than embedded clauses. In (21), for example, the lexical verb *þurhþyn* 'pierce' has contrastive focus, as it evokes the alternative of the executioner previous attempt to cut the woman's head off with the sword. The directional adverb *þwyres* 'across' also seems to contrast with the direction 'along' in the preceding alternative.

(22)

þa	wolde	he	**þurhþyn**	hi	**þwyres**	mid	þam	swurde,
then	wanted	he	pierce-through	her	across	with	the	sword

'Then he wanted to pierce her through with the sword'

The data inspected so far reveal that V-O-Adv orders are frequently interpreted as containing a contrastively focused adverb, with a backgrounded VP. Other contrastive focalizations also obtain, such as contrastively focused verbs or contrastively focused objects, but they seem to be limited to parallel focus structures, i.e. in such cases, the adverb is also focused. Most restrictions can be noted with respect to object focusing. With nominal objects, this is the least employed strategy of getting contrastive focus on the object. Pronominal objects are even more sensitive, as only certain pronoun types (1st or 2nd person pronouns) are exceptionally focused in this configuration

Even though it is often difficult to tease out supplemental adverbs from focalized clause final adverbs, I believe that the cases presented so far illustrate a genuine option of having objects and adverbs occurring postverbally in that order. The fact that such postverbal adverbs are contrastively focused, but the postverbal object is not, indicates that the correlation 'postverbal position-(contrastive) focus' is not so straightforward. Any syntactic derivation of V-O-Adv orders must take into account these interpretational restrictions.

5.3.3 Vn – Adv – O: interpretations

Let us now consider the option where the postverbal adverb precedes the postverbal object. These orders too are highly marked and present mostly in main clauses. Various focus marking interpretations are obtained by this configuration, often quite similar to Vn – O – Adv

5.3.3.1 Contrastive focus on the adverb (Vn– Adv$_{FOC}$ – O)

The first interpretation we will illustrate is the one where the adverb has narrow, contrastive focus. The rest of the VP is interpreted as backgrounded. In (36), the adverb *þa* 'then', found between the non-finite verb *cyðan* 'say' and the object *his synna* 'his sins', contrasts with the adverb *syððan* 'later' (36c). The event of the sick man confessing his sins (the VP content) is given in (36a). The verb *cyðan* 'say' in the

position before *þa* 'then' facilitates the narrow focus on the temporal adverb and the introduction of the alternative temporal points which are to be considered as relevant for this predicate. The relevant alternative *syððan* 'later' is introduced in the following clause. With the temporal adverbs in its 'usual' preverbal position, the intended interpretation would be difficult to obtain.[45]

(23)

a.   and bæd þæt he sceolde his synna geandettan mid soðre behreowsunge huru ær he swulte
     'and bade that he should confess his sins with true repentance quickly before he died'

b.

He	cwæð	þæt	he	nolde	cyðan	**þa**	his	synna
he	said	that	he	not-would	say	then	his	sins

     'He said that he would not confess his sins then'

c.   **ac syððan** he gewyrpte he wolde hi geandettan, þy læs ðe hine man tælde, swylce he for yrhðe
     hi geandette þa on his untrumnysse, þa ða he ansund nolde
     'but after he recovered, he would confess them, so that no one says that he out of fear
     confessed them when he was sick, and would not when he was well'

                                                      (coaelhom,ÆHom_20: 148.3013-152.3015)

It is difficult to determine why the object follows the adverb, even though the VP 'say his sins' is backgrounded, and is so a perfect candidate for defocused VP status. It seems that the fact that in most cases the V-O-Adv$_{FOC}$ configuration involves implicit alternatives, whereas in V-Adv$_{FOC}$-O the contrasting alternative is overt (it is introduced in the continuation of the discourse)

More often, the focused adverb is accompanied by other elements in contrast (parallel focus). In (38) the postverbal adverb *wiðutan* 'from outside' contrasts with the adverb *wiðinnan* 'from within' introduced in the second clause. The rest of the predicate is backgrounded, but maintains the parallel contrast established earlier. (war – hateful dissentions, from our foes – from our neighbours). (38), with a contrastively focused adverb adds a new perspective to the parallel relation between two types of suffering (from-outside – from within).

---

[45] This is not to say that contrastive focus interpretation is impossible for preverbal adverbs. Consider the same temporal adverb *ða* 'then' is in the preverbal position with a VO order in the non-finite VP. (i) is part of the segment which relates how the Israelites, led by Joshua, conquered the Gibeonites. Joshua speaks directly to God and asks him to stop the sun and the moon, so that they could conquer the city of Gibeon ('Sun, stand still over Gibeon, and you, moon, over the Valley of Aijalon'). As before, God again assists Joshua and does what he asked: the sun and the moon stand still, and the Isrealites win. So, the VP content 'help his soldiers anf fight for Israel' is backgrounded, and the VO order matches its 'defocused' itnerpretation. The adverb *ða* 'then', anaphoric to the temporal reference introduced in the preceding main clause ('the longest day ever'), is emphatically focused, to highlight that on this special day God helped the Isralelites.

(i)   'There has not been a day as long, not before, ever in this life, nor later in this world'

for ðan ðe	God	wolde	**ða**	fylstan	his	cempan	&	feohtan	for	Israhel.
because	God	would	then	help	his	soldiers	and	fight	for	Israhel

      'because God wanted to help his solders and fight for Israel then'

                                                      (cootest,Josh:10.14.5457)

(24)

a. The Lord cheered us when he said, 'When you hear of battle and strife in the world, do not be afraid.' Battle applies to foes, and strife to citizens.

b.
Mid	ðam	wordum	he	gebicnode	þæt	we	sceolon	ðolian	**wiðutan**	gewinn
with	those	words	he	indicated	that	we	should	suffer	without	war

fram	urum	feondum.	and	eac	*wiðinnan*	fram	urum	nehgeburum.	laðlice
from	our	foes,	and	also	within	from	our	neighbours	hateful

ungeðwærnyssa
dissensions

'With those words he indicated that we should suffer war without from our foes, and also within, from our neighbours, hateful dissensions'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_42:311.30.7034)

5.3.3.2 Contrastive focus on the lexical verb (Vn$_{FOC}$ – Adv – O)

The second interpretation of Vn-Adv-O order is contrastive focus on the lexical verb. Unlike in other configurations, where the focused verb is associated with a contrasting alternative, here the speaker uses contrastive focus on the verb to indicate that, according to his view, the proposition previously asserted is actually unlikely to hold. This focusing strategy is employed when the speaker is 'a third party' in the exchange, and reacts to what has been added to the CG from another source, by disassociating himself from the content or disputing it. Using contrastive focus and unlikelihood implicature yields a counterfactual-like effect, and the PDE translations of such sentences are commonly rendered them as such. This use of contrastive focus is restricted to highly assertive contexts: main clauses and *that*-complement clauses of verbs of saying.

(25) is part of a larger segment dedicated to the difference between (i) real miracles performed by saints, with the help of God, and (ii) deceptions performed by witches, with the help of the devil. The episode immediately preceding (25a) describes how Macharius, a man of faith, transformed a girl from a mare back to a human, with his prayers to God. This event is then compared to a (seemingly) similar one from the Old Testament (Having made God angry, Saul comes to the witch of Endor, hoping she would be able to tell him what future awaits him in the ensuing war with the Philistines. In (25a), the writer (Ælfric) pauses the narrative sequence, to point out the description of the events following Saul's meeting with the witch are according to 'the historians' (or more precisely, the book of Samuel). Namely, the witch summoned the prophet Samuel's spirit from the dead, so that he could advise Saul what to do. Using contrastive focus on the lexical verb *aræran* 'raise' helps Ælfric's delivery of the event as unlikely (even though from the historian's perspective, it did take place). Ælfric supports his view by referring to Augustine's denial of the possibility that Samuel could have ever been brought back from the dead (25b).

200

(25)

a.
Nu	segð	se	wyrdwritere	þæt	seo	wicce	sceolde	**aræran**	þa	of	deaþe
now	says	the	historian	that	the	witch	should	reared	then	of	death

þone	Drihtnes	witegan	Samuhel	gehaten,	haliges	lifes	mann
the	Lord's	prophet	Samuel	called,	holy	life's	man

'Now the historian says that the witch should then have raised from the dead the Lord's prophet called Samuel, man of holy life'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_30:45.4103)

b.
Ac	Augustinus	se	wisa	wiðcwyð	þyssere	leasunge,
but	Augustine	the	wise	denies	this	falsehood

'But Augustine the wise denies this falsehood'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_30:50.4105)

In (26), the author uses contrastive focus on the verb *wyrigan* 'curse' and marks it as unlikely, to emphasize that the statement made by the false witness 'that Naboth had impiously cursed God and his royal lord' is indeed false, counterfactual-like. The author is not faithfully reporting the witness' statement; quite the contrary, he wants to eliminate any chance of asserting such a blatant lie.

(26)

a. Then Jezebel straightway sent a letter to Naboth's neighbors, with this proclamation, 'Hold ye a meeting and set Naboth in the midst… and bid false witness accuse him in your assembly thus: *Naboth,* to our knowledge *has cursed God and his royal lord'*. Then the chief men did even as the hateful woman had bidden them in the writ, and summoned him to a meeting and found the false witness who belied Naboth, [saying]

b.
þæt	he	sceolde	**wyrigan**	wælhreowlice	God,	and	his	cynehlaford
that	he	should	curse	impiously	God	and	his	royal lord

'that he had impiously cursed God and his royal lord'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Book_of_Kings]:196.3805)

Similarly, in (27), the verb *gewrecan* 'avenge', fronted before the adverb and the object, signals that the speaker considers the VP (including the adverb) not to be in accordance to what he believes to be true in the given context. The segment is about Ælfric's decision not to include the apostle Thomas in his account of saints' lives. To justify his decision, he again refers to Augustine's doubt regarding one of the assumed episodes in St. Thomas' life. Namely, according to some sources, when Thomas was accidentally struck on the head ('ear') by a servant at a banquet, he told the unfortunate servant that the hand with which he struck him would be brought to him by a dog. As vengeance is hardly a trait of an apostle, both Augustine and Ælfric doubt that this ever happened.

(27)

a.   Of this **Augustine** said, 'This those read with great diligence who love vengeance;

b.

ac	**us**	is	alyfed	be	ðisum	to	*twynienne.*	þæt	se	apostol	wolde
but	us	is	allowed	about	this	to	doubt	that	the	apostle	would

gewrecan.	swa	wælhreawlice	his	teonan
avenge	so	cruelly	his	injury

'but it is allowed us to doubt in this, that the apostle would (have) so cruelly avenge(d) his injury'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_39.2:298.12.6794)

Contrastive focus on the lexical verb can also be used in antecedents of counterfactual conditional clauses. This is illustrated in (28). Contrastive focus on the infinitive *forseon* 'neglect' in Thomas' response in (28b) to Abbanes' question in (28a), contrasts with what has been established as a fact – that Thomas obeyed his lord's hest.

(28)

a.   Then said the Saviour straightway to the youth: 'I have a workman, worthy and faithful, whom
       I have often sent to various cities; and whatsoever he gets as meed of his labor he brings to me
       without fraud. This one I will send with you, if you so desire…' Then rejoiced Abbanes, and
       bowed at his knees, and the Savior committed the holy Thomas to him, to take home; and so
       they departed. Then Abbanes asked the venerable apostle: 'Tell me, in truth, if you are his slave?'

b.

Thomas	him	andwyrde,	Gif	ic	his	æht	nære,	ic	wolde	**forseon**
Thomas	him	answered	if	I	his	property	not-were	I	would	neglect

sona	his	hæsa
soon	his	hests

'Thomas answered him, 'If I were not his property, I should very soon neglect his hests; [but I am his slave, and do not the things which I myself choose, but that which my Lord tells me'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Thomas]:53.7572)

5.3.3.3 Focus on the object (Vn(FOC) – Adv(FOC) – OFOC) – parallel focus structures

Finally, Vn-Adv-O orders can be used to indicate that the object has contrastive focus. We already know that contrastive focus interpretation on the object can be obtained when the verb immediately precedes the object. So it must be that the verb preceding the adverb too creates a configuration which needs to take care of some additional IS-related concerns. Based on our insights into contrastive focus marking so far, we would expect that when a verb precedes an adverb, either the verb or the adverb is contrastively focused. So in essence this particular configuration will be used for multiple focus marking. And this is indeed the case. In Vn–Adv–O orders, in addition to the object, the verb or the adverb is contrastively focused too.

In (29), for instance, both the adverb and the object are contrastively focused. The context preceding the utterance is the following: the heathens worshiped the sun, the moon and many other gods; out of respect, they named the days of the week by their names (1st day – Sun, 2nd day – Moon; 3rd day – Mars, 4th day – Mercury, 5th day – Jove, 6th day – Venus, 7th day – Saturn). But then they decided to show more respect to gods, and named stars after them as well. The comparative adverb *arwurðlicor* is then interpreted with respect to a lesser degree of reverence, while the contrastively focused object *godas* 'gods' evokes the alternative set 'the sun' and 'the moon'.

(29)

Hi	woldan	git	wurðian	**arwurðlicor**	**þa**	**godas**,
they	would	yet	worship	more-reverentially	the	gods

'Then they wanted to worship the gods yet more reverentially'

(coaelhom,ÆHom_22:181.3380)

In (30), the speaker, having finished the exposition of an event, turns to explain the metaphorical aspects of the story. The object *þas getacnunge* 'the interpretation' is given as a focus alternative relative to what has already been said by the speaker ('regular' meaning of an event, as opposed to the metaphorical meaning). The adverb *sceorltice* 'shortly' contrasts with the lengthiness of the preceding narrative. The sentence is thus interpreted as a parallel focus structure: 'we have told you a story at some length – we will tell you shortly the meaning'.

(30)

We	wyllað	eow	secgan	sceortlice	**þas**	**getacnunge**
we	will	you	tell	shortly	the	meaning

'We will tell you shortly the interpretation'

(coaelive,ÆLS[Peter's_Chair]:96.2339)

A similar situation can be observed in (31), where emphatic focus is found on the adverb *a* 'always' (explicated in the following apposition 'either in life or in death'), and the object *his menn* 'his people', which relates it to the alternative 'a (little) bird' (even a little bird is under God's care).

(31)

a. If we are afflicted, we ought to seek, restoration from God, not from the cruel witches, and with all our hearts please our Saviour, because nothing can withstand His might. He says in his gospel that, without God's command, not even a bird falls in death

b.

Wen	is	þæt	he	wille	bewitan	**a**	**his**	**menn,**	ge	on	life,	ge	on
expected	is	that	he	will	watch-over	ever	his	men	either	on	life	or	on

deaðe,	þonne	se	lytla	fugel	ne	befylþ	on	grin	butan	Godes	willan
death	when	the	little	bird	not	falls	into	snare	without	God's	will

203

'It is to be expected that He will ever watch over His servants both in life and in death since the little bird falls not into a snare without God's will'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Auguries]:187.3610)</div>

(32b) illustrates a combination of contrastive focus on the verb and the dative NP. The verb *betæhte* 'committed' contrasts with the verb 'snatch' in the preceding sentence, while the object *engelicum bosmum* 'the bosoms of angels' contrasts with the 'their mother's breasts.'

(32)

a.   They were snatched from their mothers' breasts

b.   ac   hi   wurdon   **betæhte**   þærrihte   **engelicum**   **bosmum**
     but   they   were   committed   instantly   to-angels'   bosoms

'but they were instantly committed to the bosoms of angels'

<div align="right">(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_5:220.101.980)</div>

Similarly, in (33), *forwandian* 'respect' contrasts with the previous disrespect shown by the wicked husbandmen, and the object *minne sunu* 'my son' is to be interpreted with respect to the alternative messengers sent by the lord.

(33)

a.   Eft   se   hlaford   syððan   sende   oðre   þeowan,   micele   ma   him   to,   and
     again   the   lord   later   sent   other   servants much   more   them   to   and

     þa   manfullan   tilian   dydon   sona   embe   hi   swa   swa   embe   þa
     the   wicked   husbandmen   did   soon   about them   so   as   about   the

     oðre.   He   sende   þa   æt   nextan   his   sunu   to
     other. he   sent   then   at   last   his   son   to

'Again the lord later sent other servants, much more, to them, and the wicked husbandmen soon did the same with them as with the other. Finally, he sent his son'

<div align="right">(coaelhom,ÆHom_3:15.410-412)</div>

b.   and   cwæð,   Hi   wyllað   **forwandian**   *witodlice*   **minne**   **sunu**
     and   said   they   want   respect   indeed   my   son

'and said, They will indeed respect my son'

<div align="right">(coaelhom,ÆHom_3:18.413)</div>

 In (34), contrastive focus on the object *eowere frecednyssa* 'your perils' in the comparative clause relates it to the object *ure frecednysse* 'our perils' in the main clause. The verb *smeagan* 'contemplate' has an additive

<div align="center">204</div>

focus flavor (indicated by the adverb *eac* 'also'). That the two clauses are in comparison relation is also conventionally marked.

(34)

Mine	gebroðra	swa	swa	ge	gehyrað	**ure**	**frecednysse**	gif	we	Godes	lare
my	brothers	so	as	you	hear	our	perils	if	we	God's	doctrine

eow	ofteoð.	swa	ge	sceolon	**eac**	**smeagan**	carfullice
to-you	withdraw	so	you	should	also	contemplate	carefully

eowere	**frecednyssa**
your	perils

'My brothers, as you hear our peril, if we withdraw God's doctrine from you, so should you also carefully contemplate your perils, (for God will require from you his money with the ghostly interest)'

(cocathom2, ÆCHom_II,_43:322.121.7255)

Pronominal objects are very rare in this configuration, and are restricted to 2nd person dative pronouns ditransitive predicates. In (35) the devil, disguised as Christ, is trying to convince Martin that what he sees is indeed true.

(35)

and	ic	wolde	geswutelian	me	sylfne	**ærest**	**þe**
and	I	wanted	show	me	self	first	to-you

'and I wanted to show myself to you first'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Martin]:754.6447)

5.4 Summary

Let us summarize what licenses multiple elements in the postverbal area. Both V-O-Adv and V-Adv-O orders are used as configurations for some rather complex focus marking. This confirms that the postverbal area is OE is indeed special, and for elements, especially multiple ones, that would normally appear preverbally, to be found there, multiple focus marking must take place too.

V-O-Adv orders most often feature what has been recognized as 'defocused VPs'. Occasionally other 'meanings' of VO orders can be found (contrast on V or O), but this option is restricted. Pronominal objects are also allowed in this configuration, but this option is still of low frequency. V-Adv-O orders, on the other hand, are mostly used for multiple focus marking.

The differences between V-O-Adv and V-Adv-O can be noticed with the interpretation of the adverb. When the adverb is final, it is most often interpreted as emphatically focused, and it is often difficult to establish when its role becomes supplemental. In V-Adv-O orders, the adverb gets contrastive focus

interpretation, and the alternatives are often explicit, unlike in rare contrastive flavors of adverbs in V-O-Adv$_{FOC}$, where the alternatives are implicit. Contrastively focused objects are possible in both orders, only V-Adv-O$_{FOC}$ is more suitable for introducing new referents than V-O$_{FOC}$-Adv, where contrast is 'inherited' from the preceding context. The most significant difference is in the contrastive focus marking of verbs. In V-O-Adv orders, the verb truly contrasts, while in V-Adv-O order contrastive focus on the verb is used to create inferences of unlikelihood/counterfactuality imposed by the speaker on the content he reports.

5.5 Major insights from 'exceptional' postverbal material and their implications

Despite the relative scarcity of the data, we can draw some insights into the conditions of contrastive focus marking in multiple focus cases in the V-Adv-O order. First, we observe that when the object is contrastively focused, it can introduce a new referent. Contrastive focus on the object is always accompanied by the presence of the contrastive focus on the verb or the adverb, which is a strong indication that these word orders are used for special purposes such as creating parallel focus structures (and not just for introducing a new referent through contrastive focus, as 'simple' VO orders do). If V-Adv-O is preferred for the introduction of new referents, this accounts for the general absence of pronominal objects in this configuration (with the exception of 2nd person dative benefactives), as well as for the absence of leftward movement for givenness reasons that would normally apply.

It has been also shown contrastive focus, as expected, does not only serve the purpose of highlighting the semantic contrast between two expressions. Contrastive focus on the verb (specifically, V$_{FOC}$-Adv-O orders) can carry such a strong implication of unlikelihood that the speaker can use it to get mark the propositional content as counterfactual from his point of view.

We also obtain a clearer perspective on why the verb needs to precede the adverb to get contrastive focus interpretation. Earlier it has been established that reversing the 'neutral' order of the verb and the adverb (Vn-Adv) allows the adverb to be contrastively focused, and the same holds here – postverbal position is where adverbs are contrastively focalized. But why does the verb need to be in a special position left of the adverb to get contrastive focus? Recall the restriction established for parallel focus in VO orders: we never find VOs where both the verb and the object are contrastively focused. The non-adjacency of the verb and the object is then what enables such multiple focalizations. So, if the object is contrastively focused, the verb must move to the left to get contrastive focus itself, if multiple focus structures are to be created.

(36)
a.   Adv   *V$_{FOC}$ O$_{FOC}$
b.   V$_{FOC}$ Adv   O$_{FOC}$

Having established the motivation for the verb's position relative to the adverb, we can now put forward that in some VO orders the nonfinite verb moves leftward. And both in V$_{FOC}$-Adv and in V$_{FOC}$-Adv-O$_{FOC}$ it does so because of contrastive focus marking (37). Fronting of contrastively focused material is not an uncommon strategy in OE. In fact, cross-linguistically, it is one of the most discussed types of contrastive focus marking by structural means (word order).

(37)   LEFTWARD MOVEMENT OF NON-FINITE VERB FOR CONTRASTIVE FOCUS MARKING IN MULTIPLE
        FOCUS CLAUSES
        V_{**FOC**} Adv **t**_{**v**} O_{FOC}

Now that we know that non-finite verbs can move because of contrastive focus, we can easily capture other cases with such interpretation. So, for instance, contrastively focused verbs will move across adverbs (38) in order to escape the base position, where they could be ambiguous, as Adv-V$_{FOC}$ order would match the unmarked order of these two constituents This does not necessarily mean that contrastive focus cannot be assigned to the verb in situ. As I have only looked at marked orders, I only have available focus interpretations marked by rearrangement of sentence constituents.

(38) V$_{FOC}$ Adv   t$_v$

The next question is whether V-fronting is dependent on contrastive focus. I will propose that it is not. If the syntax makes it available for verbs (infinitives and participle) to move leftward, then this option will be used for other IS-related concerns. Take nominals for example. They can undergo leftward movement for a variety of reasons: givenness, topicality and contrastive focus. The same should hold for V-fronting, and I will assume that V-fronting also applies when an otherwise preverbal element needs to be contrastively focus marked. V-fronting then takes place to make available other contrastive focus interpretations. The precise nature of this movement, and the size of the element undergoing movement we leave for subsequent work.

Here we will try to establish whether the same V-fronting scenario holds for postverbal object pronouns. It would be appealing to maintain that pronouns are always in special preverbal positions, available to them for reasons other than the broad notion of givenness which motivates nominal object fronting. In van Kemenade & Milićev 2005/2012 and van Kemenade, Milićev & Baayen 2008, we show that there are at least two derived positions for personal pronouns: SigmaP, a projection between the complementizer and TP, and a lower preverbal position, essentially following the nominal subject. Broadly speaking, pronouns in the lower position show lesser degrees of accessibility and/or topicality.

(39) [$_{CP}$ complementizer [$_{SigmaP}$ **Spro** (**Opro**) [$_{TP}$ NP$_{subject}$ [$_{XP}$ (**Opro**) [.... [$_{VP}$]

Pronoun movement and the resulting preverbal position(s) is taken to be motivated by their structural deficiency (reflected in their phonological and semantic features), as elaborated in Cardinaletti and Starke 1999. But the so-called strong pronouns are allowed to stay in their base positions, being similar to NPs. 1st and 2nd person pronouns, for instance, often behave as strong pronouns. But some of the postverbal pronouns we have investigated have rather highly accessible and topical antecedents, and should be expected to be at least in the lower 'pronoun position'. For such postverbal pronouns then it seems that the option with V-fronting would capture their special properties, which would have to be ignored if V-Opro sequence is the order of elements in their 'base' positions.

One particular feature of weak pronouns on Cardinaletti and Starke's analysis is never found with strong pronouns – inanimacy of the referent. We note two cases with postverbal pronominal objects

that have inanimate referents (examples (18) and (20)). If pronouns with inanimate referents are always weak pronouns, and if weak pronouns must always be found in derived positions, then these V-Opro orders must involve V-fronting across the pronoun.

(40) **V** $Opro_{WEAK}$ t_V t_{Opro}

What is curious, though, is that in our data we find such postverbal pronouns only when the pronoun is followed by an adverb (41), and when the verb is semantically weak (*don* 'do' and *macian* 'do, make').

(41) V Opro *(XP)[46]

In both our examples with a postverbal weak pronoun, the adverb following the pronoun is focused, and the VO order is interpretationally 'defocused'. Clearly, here the verb does not front to get contrastive interpretation, but rather to ensure that the adverb does. Now the question is why the verb needs to move as high, across the pronoun, when we have seen that a shorter movement across the adverb can often suffice as a signal that the adverb is focused. The motivation then should be linked with the interpretation of the VO configuration, that is 'defocusing' of the verb, and decreasing the topicality of the pronominal object.

It would be tempting to assume that this type of V-fronting takes place whenever a VO order features a defocused verb and de-topicalized 'given, referential' object. Recall that the failure of +given, +referential object fronting is an enigma on the account that OV orders are derived by this IS related movement. Extending the scenario we propose for postverbal weak pronouns, we would have uniform IS-triggered object fronting, followed by V-fronting, which takes place to further mark how the verb and the object should be interpreted. This additional marking is necessary because whenever the verb follows the object, the default interpretation of such ordering is that of topic-comment relation, where the role of the verb is to provide a relevant update for the relationship between participants in an event.

(42) V O t_V t_O

An obvious question for the derivation in (42) is why two types of movement need to take place to get IS-related information, when in principle all this could happen inside the VP itself. We could try and speculate that for a defocused flavor of the VP material to obtain, the verb needs to be specially marked as being somehow 'backgrounded', and that this can only be done if it linearly precedes its complement. For this to obtain, the givenness feature of the object should be ignored, and the object will stay in situ. In our earlier descriptions of 'defocused VP' we have made use of the labels 'given' or 'backgrounded'. To avoid unnecessary confusion with the givenness feature of terms/NPs, we will now use the feature [–new] for the defocused effect on the verb. So, when the verb has its inherent +new feature, [+given] objects are regularly fronted, and the order (43a) obtains, which is the unmarked word order for]+given] objects from the IS perspective. When the verb has [-new] feature, because the VP

---

[46] Without adverbs, only 1st and 2nd person pronouns are found when contrastive focus is either on the verb or the pronoun (the only exception to this are 3rd person pronouns in coordinate vPs, as *and lufian hi* 'and love them').

content has been under some kind of discussion earlier, [+given] feature of the object is ignored, and both remain in their base positions.

(43)

a.   O_{GIVEN}   V_{NEW}   t_O   unmarked order for [+given] NP
b.   V_{-NEW}   O_{GIVEN}   [-new] feature of the verb trumps [+given] feature of NP

At this point, both derivational options seem viable, and the preference for one over the other ultimately depends on how much syntax one would like to have involved for IS marking. The only case where the V-fronting option must be involved is with postverbal weak pronouns. The special syntax of weak pronouns should not be sacrificed just because we would like to have fewer movement operations for IS reasons.

Let us now revisit the cases of contrastively focused verbs, in order to establish clearly where V-fronting is indeed necessary to mark this interpretation. With a more complex postverbal area, the verb can be focused to indicate the high unlikelihood of the vP material ('counterfactual-like') (44a). In other cases, it seems to be contingent on the presence of another focused element (44b, d), as we do not find instances of contrastively focused verb alone (44c). Nor do we find contrastively focused verbs with contrastively focused postverbal objects (d), the restriction we have observed for simpler cases of VO. If parallel focus structures involving contrastively focused verbs obtain only when the contrastively focused material to the right of the verb is non-adjacent to the verb, V-fronting can be motivated by the need for the verb to escape the illicit multiple focus configuration *V_{FOC} XP_{FOC.}

(44)

a.   **V_{FOC}**   Adv   O   counterfactual-like
b.   **V_{FOC}**   Adv   O_{FOC}   parallel focus
c.   *V_{FOC}   O   Adv   not found
d.   *V_{FOC}   O_{FOC}   Adv   not found
e.   **V_{FOC}**   O   Adv_{FOC}   only parallel focus

Let us exercise a possible derivation of parallel focus structures where we have a contrastively focused verb and a contrastively focused adverb. I will use a case where the object is pronominal, to increase the likelihood of the V-fronting option: *þa wolde he [þurhþyn_{FOC} hi þwyres_{FOC}] mid þam swurde* 'then he wanted to pierce her across with the sword'. As we have established, contrastive focus marking can trigger V-fronting. From the unmarked order in Opro-Adv-Vn, the verb can be fronted across the adverb. But this option is illicit if the adverb itself is contrastively focused too (the utterance is intended as parallel focus on the dimensional component of killing someone with a sword, as the desperate executioner is trying to kill his victim by stabbing her with the sword across her body, rather than cutting her head off). As a contrastively focused verb cannot be adjacent to another contrastively focused element, it would have to move both across the adverb and across the pronoun (which is in its special pre-vP position). The derivation of the relevant part of the sentence *þurhþyn hi þwyres* ('pierce her across') would proceed as in (45).

(45) þurhþyn   hi   þwyres
     pierce   her   across

a.   hi þwyres **þurhþyn**   unmarked
b.   hi þwyres_FOC **þurhþyn**   assign focus to adverb; but the structure is possibly ambiguous
c.   hi **þurhþyn** þwyres_FOC t_v   mark Adv_FOC structurally, front the verb; not the interpretation intended
d.   hi **þurhþyn**_FOC þwyres_FOC t_v   assign focus to verb; V_FOC-X_FOC impossible
e.   **þurhþyn**_FOC hi t_v þwyres_FOC t_v   move the verb further up, across the pronoun (which is in its usual pre-vP position); just right

An added bonus of this scenario would be that the presence of the contrastive element blocks the pronoun movement to the highest pronoun position, above TP, despite the high accessibility and topicality of the pronominal referent.

We have established that contrastive focus movement can be assumed to hold with multiple postverbal elements and multiple focus marking in such orders, in assertive (main) clauses or in assertive-like embedded clauses. It also seems to take place in more simple cases, when the contrastively focused verb precedes an adverb (V_FOC Adv).

The crucial question again is whether we need contrastive focus movement of the verb in more simplex structures, namely V_FOC O. Do we postulate an additional movement step or do we try and work out some feature competition scenario in the base order? The simplest statement of this competition would be that the contrastive focus feature on the verb takes dominance over [+givenness] marking of the object, and prevents object fronting.

(46)
        V_FOC   O_GIVEN   contrastive focus feature on the verb trumps the givenness feature
                                    of the object

If the verb is interpreted 'neutrally', which can be expressed by the feature [+new] or [-backgrounded] (whichever captures the contribution of the verb in a particular context) and [-contrastively focused], [+given] objects would be marked structurally via fronting.

But again, we only restate what we have observed and emphasized earlier: complement fronting for givenness reasons is possible only when it does not compete with contrastive focus marking. If we can work out a more meaningful calculation for the interaction of special IS related marking of the verb (contrastive focus, or defocusness) with the IS marking of the object, it would be possible to predict when 'base' orders can be structurally informative of IS readings.

5.6 Conclusion

The focus of this chapter was the postverbal material which, compared to nominal objects, is rather exceptionally found in this position. Still, the same factors licensing postverbal nominal objects can be

observed. Postverbal objects, vP adverbs and multiple postverbal material (combinations of objects and adverbs) clearly show that when the verb precedes the object and the vP adverb, or both it is always a signal that contrastive focus marking has taken place. So we confirm that almost every sentence with VO order indicates that it contains an element for which there is an alternative set in the context.

A sneak peek into the main clauses seems to point that there too the position of the lexical verb relative to the internal argument and adjuncts serves to indicate a specific interpretation where the focus is either on the verb itself or one of the elements following it.[47]

Postverbal pronouns and adverbs provide us with clear motivation to assume that such orders are derived by some type of non-finite verb fronting. This movement seems to be necessary for postverbal weak pronouns which must be in derived positions due to their deficiency. Leftward movement of the non-finite verb can be motivated by contrastive focus marking of the verb, but also by creating a configuration where some other element can be contrastively focus marked. The same type of derivation seems to be needed for postverbal adverbs as well.

---

[47] PPs intervening between the lexical verb and the object trigger similar inferences. In the two examples below we find instances of paired focus. In (i) the contrast on the lexical verb and on the temporal specification (then (i.e. now) vs. on departure; riches running before you vs. riches following you). In (ii), the contrast relation is established between the postverbal PP and the object. The adjective *ful(um)* 'foul' modifying the complement of the preposition contrasts with the adjective *clæn(an)* modifying the object.

(i) þonne   magon   eowre   æhta   yrnan   eow   ætforan   and   hi   ne   magon   folgian
     then   may   your   riches   run   you   before   and   they   not   may   follow

     on   **forðsiðe**   eow
     on   departure   you
     'then may your   riches run before you, but they not may follow on departure you'

                                                                                    (coaelive,ÆLS_[Thomas]:188.7659)

(ii) ac   ic   nelle   afylan   on   þinum   **fulum**   blode   mine   **clænan**   handa
      but   I   not-will   dirty   on   your   foul   blood   my   clean   hands
      'but I will not defile my clean hands with your foul blood [because I follow Christ…]'

                                                                                    (coaelive,ÆLS_[Edmund]:83.7012)

6. LEAKING CONSTRUCTIONS

In this chapter we examine the interpretation of the word order known in the literature as 'Leaking Constructions'. 'Leaking' embedded clauses involve a split of the VP material to positions before and after the finite verb: the object follows the finite verb, with the non-finite verb in the preverbal position.

Leaking orders have been one of the biggest puzzles in the OE syntax. The main reason for this is that from the comparative Germanic syntax perspective, this order is not expected to occur, and it is not found in any of the Germanic languages (either contemporary or in older stages).

Let us briefly presents some major syntactic accounts of this word order in OE. Those which take that underlying order in these structures is head-final, derive the postverbal objects in terms of extraposition/postposition (Stockwell 1977, van Kemenade 1987, Pintzuk 1991, 1993, 1999), or adjunction of the object to head-final TP. On the head-initial hypothesis, the object needs to move out of the vP/VP, so that it stays behind the finite verb once the remnant VP/vP is fronted before the finite modal/auxiliary verb (Roberts 1997), or it is allowed to remain inside VP, which itself does not undergo any further movements, as only the lexical verb, which has moved to v° and the subject merged in SpecvP move to SpecTP, as only the 'edge' material will be able to move once the vP phase has been completed (Biberauer & Roberts 2005). On both the extraposition and the object-in-situ accounts, it is the interpretation of the object that triggers the exceptional behavior of the object.[48] Namely, the object is focused.

In this chapter, I will claim that interpretation is indeed what licenses leaking structures and that this interpretation is related to focus. However, I will show that the focus interpretation of the object is only one of the possible interpretations of leaking orders. The main hypothesis will be that leaking orders correspond to two possible interpretations: (i) contrastive focus on the object (ii) contrastive focus on the infinitive/participle, and (iii) focus on modal/auxiliary.

We immediately note that the leaking strategies of getting focus interpretation of individual elements in the (extended) VP resemble those noted for VO orders. I will argue that what distinguishes leaking from regular VO orders is that in leaking structures the input for focus marking is backgrounded/presupposed propositions.

We have argued that whenever the non-finite VP is not fronted, i.e. follows the finite modal/auxiliary, this configuration indicates some kind of CG update, irrespective of the order inside the non-finite VP (OV or VO). On the view that the position of the material relative to the position of the finite verb indicates its interpretation in terms of 'backgroundedness/newness', the leaking patterns should then have a more complex interpretation of the VP material, as it is found both preceding and following the finite verb.

---

[48] In Roberts 1997, the motivation for why the object is allowed to remain behind the finite verb is not entirely clear.

We will again go through a number of examples to illustrate how the proposed interpretations for leaking orders are obtained, and what licensing conditions can be observed. Gaining a solid empirical base for (mostly) pragmatic uses of focus is always important, but here in addition to the identification of these effects, we need to capture the difference between the same/similar effects in other word orders.

6.1 Quantitative data and distribution across texts

Before I start discussing the IS properties of the leaking orders, let me first give some quantitative information, which will help us get a better perspective on this 'peculiarity' of OE. There are 203 subordinate clauses where an object has 'leaked' out of the fronted non-finite VP and follows the modal/auxiliary. When we eliminate those cases where the object could be analyzed as extraposed due to its 'heaviness' (object including complement or relative clauses, objects containing coordinated NPs and more than three words),[49] we are left with 110 cases. More than half of them come from Ælfric's texts. Other texts where the pattern is used with some regularity are *Cura Pastoralis* and *Gregory's Dialogues*.

The presence of leaking patterns in earlier texts, such as *Cura Pastoralis*, as well as others, albeit to a lesser degree, indicates that the pattern is not a syntactic innovation. Rather, it is an intricate rhetorical device, employed by style-conscious writers (as Ælfric, for example, most certainly is). The main reason why leaking constructions come with such a strong correlation with rhetorical complexity is that 'leaking' patterns involve a combination of pragmatic presupposition and focus, and are interpretatively very complex

6.2 The interpretation of leaking word orders

6.2.1 Focus on the object: Vn – Vf – O$_{FOC}$

Let us first discuss examples which illustrate the focusing of the object in leaking constructions. (1b) is God's response to Moses' complaint about how he (God) allows Pharaoh to torture his people (1a), so, indirectly, God is also punishing the Jewish people (by not wanting to free them). The focus on the object *Pharaone* 'to Pharaoh' in (1b) establishes a contrast relation between what God has done to his people (or allowed to be done) and what he will do to Pharaoh, with the implication that Pharaoh's punishment will be much worse than the one of the Jewish people. In other words, contrastive focus on the dative object *Pharaone* 'to Pharaoh' instructs the reader that the proposition of God doing something to Pharaoh should be interpreted relative to the alternative 'God doing something to the Jews' whereby the Jews and Pharaoh are compared or contrasted. God *wanting* to do something to his people is inferred as only God can allow or prevent Pharaoh from torturing the Jews, so his willingness to let this happen is backgrounded as well.

---

[49] The figures for the 'heavy' object types are the following: 48 objects include a relative clause, 4 have a wh-complement clauses, 26 objects are coordinated NPs; 15 objects contain more than three words.

The focused element obviously does not provide new information; on the contrary, its referent, the Pharaoh, is backgrounded and featured as highly topical in the immediately preceding context. The fact that Pharaoh's high topicality and accessibility, or salience in the interlocutors' mind is irrelevant, or ignored in God's response is indicated in the use of an NP rather than a pronoun to refer back to Pharaoh. However, this strict referential givenness is not a condition for contrastively focused leaked objects, as we will show later.

(1)

a.   Hwi sentst ðu me to Pharaone þæt ic sprece on þinum naman? He swencð þin folc, &   þu   hit
        nelt   alysan.
        'Why do you send me to Pharaoh that I speak in your name? He tortures your people, and you
        won't free them'

<div align="right">(cootest,Exod:5.23. 2519-2521)</div>

b.   ða   cwæð   Drihten   to   Moyse: þu   scealt   geseon   þa   þingc
        then   said   Lord   to   Moses   you   shall   see   the   things

        þe   ic   don   wille   **Pharaone**;
        that   I   do   will   to Pharaoh

        'Then the Lord said to Moses: you should see the thing that I will do to Pharaoh'

<div align="right">(cootest,Exod:6.1.2522)</div>

The interpretation of the order in (2c) is the one where the 'leaked' object *þa halgan Darian* 'the holy Daria' is contrastively focused. The context in (2a) establishes that two people - Chrysanthus and Daria - were ordered to be tortured. (2b) states that first Chrysanthus was tortured. (2c) switches to (an attempt of) torturing Daria. Both alternatives 'people torturing Chrysanthus' and 'people torturing Daria' have been contextually given. But note that (2b) is used to switch the narrative from what happened to Chrysanthus to what awaited Daria. The only link between the two situations is 'torture', but now with different torturers and a different martyr. From that perspective, 'Daria' is introduced as 'novel', even though her cognitive status is not strictly novel. Being non-topical in the immediately preceding segment seems to be enough for the speaker to re-introduce or reactivate 'Daria'. So, what leaking orders do here is shift the focus to an alternative group of men/torturers and to Daria. The only part indicating the 'original' presuppositional status of the proposition is the lexical verb *yfelian* 'evil', fronted across the finite verb.

(2)

a.   Then was this soon made known to the emperor, and he angrily commanded his prefect to *take Chrysanthus and Daria, and kill them by tortures*, if they would not sacrifice to the evil gods.

b.   Then the prefect bade men *stretch the holy Chrysanthus upon a rack, and with candles burn both his sides*. Then the rack burst asunder with all its machinery and the candles were extinguished

c.   Ealswa   þa   oþre   men   þe   yfelian   woldon   **þa   halgan   Darian**,

<div align="center">214</div>

so-also	the	other	men	who	injure	would	the	holy	Daria

Drihten	hi	gelette
Lord	them	prevented

'So also the other men who sought to injure the holy Daria, the Lord prevented them'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Chrysanthus]:315.7522)</div>

Note that a discourse switch can also be noted in (10), as it changes from one speaker (Moses) to another (God), and will continue to be an observable factor in many of the leaked word orders. We have already noted that discourse switch requires reactivation of 'old' propositions, which is reflected in the word order change ('assertive-like Vf-VPn').

As in other configurations where we observe contrastive focus on the object, in leaked orders too it is usually a certain property of the referent that is compared or contrasted, rather than the referent itself. Consider (3b), with the focus is on the object *eall his werod* 'all his army'. In this case the relation is established between arranging *some* members of the army and arranging *all* of the army. In the preceding context, we learn that the commander of the army, having gathered it, begins to arrange it. He selects the youngest and best-looking ones to be first in his service. What the commander arranges is a subset of the set army. Focusing the whole set the speaker evokes the alternative set of army members, the partial one. The presupposition 'the commander having arranged X-amount of the army' is backgrounded, while the focus on *eall* 'all' provides the information that the entire set was affected (i.e. arranged). The leaked object 'army' is also backgrounded, but 'quantity' is novel.

(3)

a. þa wæs eall seo fyrd gegaderod beforan him and *he hi þa getrymede, and gesette swa his þeaw wæs*. þa geseah he ongemang oþrum þa geongan cnihtas þæt hi wæron wlitige on hiwe, and lange on wæstmum gesette hi þa fyrmeste on his þenunge
'Then all the army was gathered before him, and he sorted them out and arranged them, as was his duty. Then he saw among others the young boys, that they were beautiful in form and long in growth. He set them to be the first in his service'

<div align="right">(coeust,LS_8_[Eust]:302. 318-322)</div>

b.
And	æfter þam þe	he	gefadod	hæfde	**eall**	**his**	**werod**	swa	his	þeaw
and	after	he	arranged	had	all	his	army	as	his	duty

wæs,	þa	ferde	he	to	the	gefeohte
was	then	went	he	to	þam	battle

'And after he had arranged all his army, he went to the battle'

<div align="right">(coeust,LS_8_[Eust]:305.323)</div>

In (4b) the leaked object *twam hlafordum ætsomne* 'two masters together', the numeral *twa* 'two' is contrastively focused (people can never please two masters at the same time). This sentence is a paraphrase from *The Book of Matthew* (6:24), -(English Standard version 'No one can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and money').[50] It is preceded by (4a), which is the line from the First Epistle to Corinthians 10:21 ('Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils'), which introduces the speaker's first reference to the Bible regarding the impossibility of people being devoted to (or serving) two opposing authorities. In (4a) this is expressed metaphorically via the events of consuming water from Christ's and the devil's cup. The next line (4b) generalizes this relation (pleasing any two masters), while (4c) narrows it back down to Christ vs. devil, and explicates that this should apply to us. The complex predicate (the lexical verb *gecwæman* 'serve' and the negative modal *ne mæg* 'may not') is not explicitly given in the preceding discourse, but (4a) can be still interpreted as facilitating the reception of the inability to please opposing authorities together as backgrounded.

(4)

a.   Ne mage ge samod drincan **ures Drihtnes calic and ðæs deofles cuppan** to deaðe eowre sawle
        'You cannot drink both our Lord's chalice and the devils cup to the death of your souls'

b.   and   ure   Drihten   cwæð   þæt   man   gecwæman   ne   mæg   **twam**   **hlafordum**
     and   our   Lord   said   that   one   please   not   may   two   lords

     ætsomne,   þæt   he   ne   forseo   þone   oðerne;
     together   that   he   not   despise the   other

     'and our Lord said that a man cannot please two masters at once, lest he should despise one'

c.   ne   we   ne   magon   gecwæman.   **criste   and   deofle**[51]
.   not   we   not   may   please   Christ   and   devil

     'neither can we please both Christ and the devil'

                                                            (coaelive,ÆLS_[Auguries]:216.3628-3630)

The proposition containing the focused object *his agenum slagum* 'his own executioners' in (5b) is backgrounded, since the fact that Christ would show mercy to the Jews who caused his death (on the condition they repent and turn to faith) is given in the preceding line. The focus on the object *his agenum slagum* 'his own murderers' is to point out that the proposition 'Christ' will show his mercy to people' holds even for the most unlikely alternative, i.e. to his own executioners. This scalar focus

---

[50] Contrastive focus interpretation seems to be present in the original text, as the relevant verses of Matthew 6 (19-24) deal with possessions, priorities and trust, and has three elements about two treasures, two eyes and two masters.

[51] The parallel proposition in the main clause here has Vf-VO order. This is either due to the fact that assertiveness of the main clauses does not tolerate manipulations on backgrounded propositions, or because of the speaker's intention to introduce into the discourse the subject referent as a novel sentence topic, and not a referent inferrable from the impersonal/indefinite 'you' or 'one' from the preceding lines.

interpretation stems from the focus being on the adjective *agenum* 'own' (Christ will show mercy to all people, even executioners, even his own executioners). Note again that the leaking order occurs after a discourse switch.

(5)

a. Nu synd þa iudeiscan, and se sceamlease læwa Cristes deaðes scyldige, þe syrwdon be him, þeah þe hit us become to ecere alysednysse, and heora nan ne becymð to Cristes rice næfre, butan þam þe hit gebettan, and gebugan to Criste

'Now, the Jews and the shameless traitor, who plotted against Christ, are guilty of his death, although it [his death] comes to us as eternal redemption, and none of them will never come to Christ's kingdom, except those who amend it and turn to Christ'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Exalt_of_Cross]:176.5657-5658)

b.
Swa	milde	is	se	hælend	þæt	he	miltsian	wolde	**his**	**agenum**	**slagum**
so	mild	is	the	savoir	that	he	mercy	would	his	own	murderers

gif	hi	gecyrran	woldon,	and	biddan	his	miltsunge
if	they	convert	would	and	ask	his	mercy

'The Saviour is so mild that he would show mercy even to his own murderers if they would convert and ask for his mercy (as many of them did)'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Exalt_of_Cross]:181.5659)

In (6), the object *þæt lifes tacen* 'the sign of life', or the cross written on the vessel that broke, is contrasted with 'the drink of death' which the vessel contained. The vessel not being able to bear the sign of life is given/presupposed, as we know that it broke after the sign of cross had been written on it (it is the what lead to breaking). The contrast is specifically established by the genitives *lifes* 'of life' and *deaþes* 'of death'. Even though naming the crucifix 'a sign of life' is novel (the author's intention to highlight its symbolism in comparison with 'drink of death' is clear), the referent itself is backgrounded.

(6)
On	þæs	fætes	forwyrde,	þa þa	he	Cristes	rodetacen	þær	toweard
on	that	vessel's	destruction	when	he	Christ's	crucifix	there	towards

wrat,	þa	ongæt	se	Godes	wer,	þæt	þæt	fæt	hæfde	*deaþes*
wrote	then	understood	the	God's	man	that	that	vessel	had	death's

drync	on	him,	forþon þe	hit	aberan	ne	mihte	**þæt**	**lifes**	**tacen**
drink	in	it	because	it	bear	not	might	the	life's	sign

'When the vessel broke, after he had written Christ's crucifix there, then the God's man understood that the vessel had the drink of death in it, because it could not bear the sign of

217

life'

(cogregdC,GD_2_[C]:3.105.7.1210)

The same event is also described in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (CathHom). However, here the same content is delivered without fronting of the infinitive.

(7)

a.   They [hostile monks] then begun to quarrel, first among themselves, that they had prayed for his [Benedict's] superiority, and at last counselled to kill him with poison. They mingled then venom in his drink, and the servant stood at a distance with a glass vessel, in which was a drink made of wine mingled with the deadly poison. The servant then, according to monastic usage, bowed with the vessel for his blessing, and he with the sign of the cross blessed the vessel from his seat, and through the blessing it straightways burst in pieces, as if, instead of signing it with the cross, he had cast a stone on it.

b.
þa	ongeat	se	halga	wer	þæt	se	drænc	*deadbæra*	wæs.
then	understood	the	holy	man	that	the	drink	deadly	was

þa ða	he	ne	mihte	**lifes**	**tacn**	aberan.
when	he	not	might	life's	sign	bear

'Then the holy man perceived that the drink was deadly, when it could not bear the token of life; and he straightways arose, and with cheerful spirit addressed the brothers: "Brothers, may Almighty God be merciful to you: why would ye impose these things on me? Said I not to you before, that I and you could not agree? Go now and seek for yourselves a superior according to your own habits, for ye may not henceforth have me." And he then returned to the wilderness and took care of himself.'

(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_11:94.79.1925)

The context preceding the leaking option in *Gregory's Dialogues* (GD) in (6) describes the same events: as CathHom in (7a): the monks want to rebel against Benedict, they counsel about his death, they start planning to poison the wine; when the glass vessel with the deadly drink was brought to St. Benedict for blessing, according to the monastic rules, it breaks after Benedict's makes a sign of the cross as if he had broken it with the stone. However, the delivery of Benedict's recognition of the monk's intention to poison him is different in GD and CathHom. Whereas CathHom introduces his realization as a continuation of the narrative ('Then he understood...'), in GD, the author starts from the result (destruction of the vessel), and introduces it as a frame for Benedict's realization. It is this subtle switch that allows the more rhetorical exposition of Benedict's realization. Referring overtly to the vessel's destruction increases the backgroundedness of its inability to bear the sign of life, and the leaking word order is chosen as more appropriate.

Even the object types we do not often find in 'leaking', such as negative NPs and pronouns (Pintzuk (2005a) even strongly argues that negative objects are never 'leaked'), have the same interpretation in this position. Rare as they are, they too are allowed to 'leak' if the conditions for leaking noted above

are satisfied. Let us first consider the 'leaked' negative object in (8c). The NP *nan þincg* 'nothing', or more precisely the negative adjective *nan* is contrastively focused ('not a single thing'). The alternatives relevant for this focus expression (people suffering some things/a lot of things) are found in the preceding context. (8a) establishes that people should toil (with the implication that people do not toil, at least not enough). This makes the 'leaking' proposition in (8c) backgrounded. The contrasting alternative to 'people suffering nothing', 'people suffering much/a lot' is given in (8b), which describes how much martyrs toil/suffered (they were murdered, scourged, drowned, burned, tormented for a spectacle). The discourse then switches to 'us'. As opposed to the martyrs, we are not prepared to sacrifice, and will toil absolutely nothing.

(8)

a. **We**   **sceolon**   **swincan**,   and   oferswyðan   unþeawas   mid   godre   drohtnunga
   we   should   toil   and   overcome   evil-habits with good   service

   Godes   rice   geearnian;   þæt   we   mid   þam   halgum   þe   we
   God's   kingdom   earn   that we   with the   saints   whom we

   drohtnunga   heriað   nu   blissian   moton,   þeah   we   martyras   ne   beon
   service   praise   now   rejoice   may   though we   martyrs   not   be

   'We have to toil, and overcome evil habits by a good service, to earn God's kingdom; that we may rejoice with the saints whom now we praise, though we be not martyrs'

   (coaelive, ÆLS_[Maurice]:121.5749)

b. 'We must consider how patient they were, those who for Christ's name were killed; men scourged them with whips and drowned them in the sea, or burned them in the fire, or with tortured limbs, tormented them for a spectacle with every punishment, and in every woe they were patient, and bore every contumely for the Saviour's name'

c. Nu   synd   we   swa   asolcene   þæt   we   swincan   nellað   **nan**   **þincg**   **fornean**
   now are   we   so   slothful   that we   toil   not-   no   thing   nearly
                                                           will

   ne   urum   lustum   wiðcweþan   wið þam þæt   we   moton   þa   micclan   geþincða
   nor   our   lusts   deny   in order that   we   may   the   great   dignities

   habban   on   heofonum   mid   þam   halgum   martyrum
   have   in   heaven   with   the   holy   martyrs

   'Now are we so slothful that we will not toil in hardly anything, nor deny our lusts in order that we may have in exchange those great dignities in heaven, together with the holy martyrs'

   (coaelive,ÆLS_[Maurice]:132.5757)

Contrastive focus is also what licenses 'leaked' pronouns. The object *hine* 'him' in the conditional clause in (9) is contrastively focused, or more precisely the secondary predicate *(hine) ær cucene* 'LIT. (him) before alive'. This can be verified from the following consequent clause where the alternative secondary predicate is introduced *(hine) þus deadne* 'LIT. (him) thus dead'. The proposition of Datian's (the speaker and the subject in the leaked order) inability to overcome St. Vincent (the referent of the object in the leaked order) is already part of the CG. After trying numerous tortures unsuccessfully, Datian decides to give up and release St. Vincent. Even though St. Vincent has withstood the tortures, upon his release, he succumbs to the wounds and dies in bed, recognized by the people as a martyr. This, of course, infuriates Datian, and now he wants to 'overcome' St. Vincent in death, by feeding his body to the wild beasts. In his words in (9), he takes the presupposed proposition and by contrastively focusing the object referent's property 'previously alive' indicates a new perspective on 'overcoming St. Vincent', a more successful one. Presumably, the effect that both the lexical verb and the modal verb are backgrounded would be lost if the infinitive *oferswiðan* 'overcome' followed the finite verb.

(9)

Datianus	þa	cwæþ,	se	deofollica	cwelleræ,	ofsceamod	swaþeah:
Datianus	then	said	the	devilish	persecutor	ashamed	nevertheless

Gif	ic	oferswiðan	ne	mihte	**hine**	**ær**	**cucene**,	ic	hine	witnige
if	I	overcome	not	might	him	before	alive	I	him	punish

þus	deadne.
thus	dead

'Datianus then said, the devilish persecutor, ashamed nevertheless, 'If I might not overcome him formerly when living, I will punish him when dead'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Vincent]:232.7947)

Indefinites too can be leaked, provided other conditions for leaking are satisfied. In (10b) the indefinite postverbal object *oðerra weorca* 'other occupations' is contrastively focused via the adjective 'other'. The proposition that servants of God should not be engaged in matters other than ministrations is backgrounded, as (10a) establishes that servants of the Church should not be engaged in worldly matters (i.e. matters other than those associated with their service). The object *oðerra weorca* 'other occupations' establishes a contrast relation with *ðenunga* 'ministrations' and also emphasizes that one should not engage in absolutely any other work but ministration.[52]

(10)

a.   "Let no servant of God be too much engaged in worldly matters, so that he does not offend him to whom he formerly rendered himself."; he said: "If you have to deliver judgment in worldly things, take those who are least esteemed in the household, and appoint them judges, that they may rule and arrange about earthly things who are not so greatly honoured with divine gifts."

---

[52] The adjective *oðerra* 'other' alone is sufficient to express contrast, that is why I assume that additional emphasis is at play here.

b.

ða ða	he	lærde	ðæt	ðære	ciricean	ðegnas	scoldon	**stilnesse**
when	he	directed	that	the	church's	servants	should	quietness

ðære	**ðenunga**	habban,	ða	lærde	he	hi	eac	hu	hie
of-the	service	have	then	directed	he	them	also	how	they

hie	*geæmettian*	scoldon	**oðerra**	**weorca**
themselves	free	should	of-other	work

'When he directed that the servants of the Church were to have quietness in their ministrations, he also directed that they were to keep themselves free from other occupations'

(cocura,CP:18.131.3.886)

A similar focus interpretation can be noted for the leaked indefinite object *ænige galnysse* 'any lust' in (11c). Again, the proposition of 'adders' (i.e. maiden) not being able to arouse lust in Chrysanthus with their foolish sport is backgrounded. Chrysanthus's father wants to turn him away from Christianity, and tempting him with bodily pleasures ('foolish sport'), he hopes Chrysanthus will forget Christ (11a). Chrysanthus manages to resist (11b), but still prays to God to help him to persist. By focusing the object *ænige galnysse* 'any lust', the speaker wishes to highlight that no alternative to 'no lust' can hold.

(11)

a. 'Also he [the father] soon found five maidens for him, fair and blooming, to dwell with him;'

b. and het þæt hi awendon mid heora wodlican plegan his geþanc fram Criste,
'and bade that they should turn by their foolish sport his thoughts from Christ'

c. 'and said that they themselves should pay for it, if they did not bend his mind. He sent him also frequently meats and delicacies, but the youth despised the meats and drinks, and abhorred the maidens even as one does adders. He lay in prayers and refused their kisses, and besought the Saviour that He **would preserve his chastity**, even as He preserved Joseph's in the land of Egypt. He also confessed God with all his heart,'

d.

and	cwæð,	Ic	bidde	þe,	Drihten,	þæt	þu	do	þæs	næddran	þæt	hi
and	said	I	pray	Thee	Lord	that	you	make	these	adders	that	they

ealle	slapon	on	minre	gesihðe	nu,	þæt	hi	**awræccan**	ne	magon	mid
all	sleep	on	my	sight	now	that	they	arouse	not	may	with

heora	wodlican	plegan	**ænige**	**galnysse**	on	me...
their	foolish	sport	any	lust	on	me

221

'and said, "I pray Thee, Lord, that thou will cause these adders all to fall asleep now in my sight, that they may not arouse with their foolish sport any lust in me, because I trust in Thee."'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Chrysanthus]: 51.7362-62.7371)</div>

In the cases discussed above, the preceding context provides enough evidence that the propositions containing leaked objects are presupposed. There are, however, sentences where the backgroundedness/presuppositional effect is not obvious; in fact, it can be absent completely in the context. Such is (12). It presents us a situation where seven brothers and their mother, all 'very believing' , are being punished and forced to eat bacon, against Moses' law. Eating bacon or any kind of food has not been under discussion in the preceding discourse. However, creating a structure that imposes the backgrounded interpretation of the predicate ('should eat'), intensifies the contribution of the contrastive focus on the object *spicc* 'bacon' (of course, there must be restrictions on semantic predicate types that can be taken for granted so easily as 'eat', for instance). The effect the speaker/narrator gets here is that bacon in this case is not just any item of food that they were given to eat. They were tortured and forced to eat what they should not eat; they are given the symbol of the food that Judaism forbids them: fat and pork. The focus on the object instructs the reader that the only way to properly interpret bacon in this context is via comparison to other types of food which they should eat according to the law of Moses. Without the backgroundedness interpretation of the predicate 'should' eat' (e.g. in the simplified hypothetical *þæt he sceoldon* **etan spicc**), contrastive focus on 'bacon' could evoke (and eliminate) alternative types of food, but the severeness of their punishment would be lost.

(12)

and	hi	man	mid	swingle	ðreade,	þæt	hi	etan	sceoldon,
and	them	man	with	scourging	vexed	that	they	eat	should

ongean	Godes	æ,	**spicc**
against	God's	law	bacon

'and they were vexed with scourging that they should eat bacon, against God's law'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Maccabees]:108.4882)</div>

Similarly, in (13b), the inability of finding five unsound men of the great crowd is not backgrounded. Arguably, it seems to be inferable, plausible or predictable from the preceding context, as in (13a) it is established that all of the unsound people were miraculously healed. The object *fif unhale menn* 'five unhale men' gets scalar focus 'not even five unsound men'..

(13)
a.   The burial ground lay filled with crippled fold, so that people could hardly get into the minster

b.	and	þa	ealle	wurdon	swa	wundorlice	gehælede	binnan	feawa
	and	then	all	became	so	miraculously	healed	within	few

dagum,	þæt	man	þær	findan	ne	mihte	**fif**	**unhale**	**menn**

days	that	one	there	find	not	might	five	unsound	men

of	þam	micclan	heape
of	the	great	crowd

'and they were all so miraculously healed within a few days, that one could not find there five unsound men out of that great crowd'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Swithun]:151.4307)

6.2.2 Focus on the lexical non-finite verb: Vn_{FOC} – Vf – O

The second interpretation of leaking constructions is the one where the lexical verb is contrastively focused. In (14), the lexical verb *geswican* 'desist, abandon' offers the opposite relation between the torturer Datianus and his fierceness. From (14a) we see that Datianus persists in his rage and cruelty, as he orders more and more severe torments for the holy man Vincent. The relation between Datianus and his fierceness is backgrounded (Datianus prouds himself on being fierce and inflicting hard tortures on St. Vincent). However, Vincent does not fear the tortures, but the opposite – that the tortures would stop because he knows he is suffering for God.

(14)

a. Datianus then cried out even louder, and raged with fierceness, and he raved yet more, striking his [Vincent's] torturers with rods and sticks, (and) commanded them to torment the holy man (Vincent) in the rack even more. He thought he might soften his mood by immeasurable torments; but he strove in vain, because they became tired in the tormenting, so they could no longer torment the martyr; and he constantly endured the torments nevertheless.[…] Datianus then said to the Lord's witness, "Pity yourself, and do not mar your youth, and shorten your life thus in these torments, that you may at least escape these hard tortures, at least now at last, though before you would not'. Vincent says to him thus with keen faith: "I dread not your torments nor your cruel tortures;'

b.	ac	ic	swiðor	ondræde	þæt	þu	**geswican**	wylle	þinre	reðnusse
	but	I	rather	fear	that	you	abandon	will	your	fierceness

and	swa	me	gemiltsian
and	so	me	pity

'but I rather fear that you will desist from your fierceness, and so pity me'"

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Vincent]:153.7895)

The participle *ungefandod* 'not-experienced' is focus marked in the relative clause in (15), because it needs to establish a contrast between two different groups of people – those who have experienced carnal sins (by marriage) and those who have not. The whole segment is dedicated to this distinction, as can be verified from the sentence introducing the content of this chapter (*ðætte on oðre wisan sint to manienne ða ðe gefandod habbað ðara flæsclicra synna, on oðre wisan ða ðe ðæs noht ne cunnon.* 'That those who have not

223

experienced carnal sins are to be admonished in a different way than those who could not do it'
(cocura,CP:52.403.7.2755)), so its presuppositional status is quite obvious.

(15)

Ongean	ðæt	sint	to	manigenne	ða	ðe	ðonne	giet	**ungefandod**
contrary	that	are	to	admonish	those	that	then	yet	not-received

habbað	*flæsclicra*	*scylda,*	ðætte	hie	swa	micle	swiðor	ðone
have	carnal	sins	that	they	so	much	more	the

spild	ðæs	hryres	him	ondræden	ðonne	ða oðre ...
ruin	of-the	destruction	them	dread	than	the others

Those on the contrary, who have not yet tried carnal sins, are to be admonished to dread the destruction so much the more than others [the higher they stand than the others]'

(cocura,CP:52.407.19.2803)

In some instances of leaking, the effects of contrastive focus are evident in the interpretation, but the exact mechanism of contrastive focus assignment is difficult to explicate. The way the utterance in (16) is constructed, suggests that there are at least two important parallels which need to be considered: two activities: teaching – learning (the contrast between teaching people – teaching ourselves could be said to underline the contrast between 'teaching and learning) and two force degrees of deontic modality (shall – cannot). All this content is backgrounded, i.e. discussed in the preceding line (16a).

(16)

a. Lange sceal **leornian** se þe **læran** sceal gif he nele leornian, þæt he lareow beo, he sceal beon ealdor eft syþþan gedwyldes.
   'Long should learn the one who should teach. If he doesn't learn to become a teacher, he shall later be an authority of error.'

b. Swaswa Crist sylf cwæð on sumum his godspelle. Gif se blinda man bið þæs blindan ladþeow, þonne befeallað hi begen on sumne pytt gewiss
   'So also Christ himself said on one of his gospels: If the blind man is a guide to the blind, then both will certainly fall into a pit'

(colwstan1,ÆLet_2_[Wulfstan_1]:172.238-241)

c.

Blind	bið	se	lareow,	þe	**læran**	sceal	folc,	gif	he	læran	ne
blind	is	the	teacher	who	teach	should	folk	if	he	teach	not

cann	ne	he	leornian	nele,	ac	mislæt	his	hyrimen	and	hine ,
can	nor	he	learn	not-will	but	misleads	his	followers	and	him

sylfne	forðmid	
self	at-the-same-time	

'Blind is the teacher, who should teach people, if he cannot teach, nor want to learn, but misleads his followers and himself, at the same time'

<div align="right">colwstan1,ÆLet_2_[Wulfstan_1]:174.242)</div>

Let us compare a similar propositional content in the word order with no V-fronting (Vf-VPn). As opposed to to (16), the only backgrounded part of the proposition is the non-finite VP content 'teaching people something'. (17a) considers the consequences for teachers if they do not tell people to commend themselves to God properly (seven times a day). (17b), expands the list of the teachers' obligations to people, by considering how they will fare if people are not also taught to cease from their sins and observe God's commands. The violation of the second obligation is deemed more serious, and is deserving of damnation. Still, the author does not give the possibly of teacher's not wanting to do this as backgrounded or presupposed. No VP fronting is indicative that the speaker/author does not take this for granted, but rather asserts it as a neutral possibility, which is then open to negotiation.

(17)

a.   At all events he should commend himself to God. And **if the teachers will not constantly enjoy this upon God's people** (*gif þa lareowas þis **nellaþ** fæstlice Godes folce bebeodan, þonne he wiþ God swyþe scyldige*), then shall they be very guilty before God, because God's people ought to know how to shield themselves from devils.

b.
&	þa	lareowas	beoþ	syþþan	domes	wyrþe,	gif	he	**nellaþ**
and	the	teachers	be	afterwards	condemnation	deserving	if	they	not-will

þæt	folk	**læron**	þæt	hi	heora	synna	geswicon	&	Godes
that	folk	teach	that	they	their	sins	cease	and	God's

bebodu	healdan
commands	hold

'And the teachers thereafter will be deserving of condemnation if they will not teach the people to cease from their sins and observe God's commands'

<div align="right">(coblick,HomS_14_[BlHom_4]:47.153.593)</div>

Sometimes we also find cases of contrast interpretation of both the lexical verb and the object, creating parallel focus structures. In (18), both the lexical verb *forlætan* 'let go of' and *hira blissa* 'their bliss, happiness' contrast with *onfoð* 'receive' and *unrotnessa* 'sadness, trouble' in the second VP conjunct. Moreover, the whole segment expresses the contrasting effect of death to poor people and wealthy people.

(18)

a.   Alas, Death, sweet are you to the wretched and the poor, and pleasant are you to the unhappy

<div align="center">225</div>

and the mourning

b. &   biter   eart   ðu   ðam   weligum   þisse   worulde,   for þan   hie
    and   bitter   are   you   to-the wealthy   of-this world   because   they

    forlætan   sceolon   **hira**   **blissa**   &   *onfoð*   *unrotnessa.*
    let-go   should   their   bliss   and   receive   sadness

'And bitter you are to the wealthy of this world, because they must lose their pleasures and
receive sorrows'

(coverhom,HomU_7_[ScraggVerc_22]:52.2860)

Clearly, focusing elements in presupposed propositions correlates with complex rhetorical effects.

6.2.3 Focus on the finite verb (Vn – Vf$_{FOC}$ – O)

The third interpretation of the leaking orders is when the finite verb is contrastively focused. As we
have emphasized earlier, the finite verb being backgrounded, the focus is emphatic, or verum focus. .

The crucial ingredient in recognizing the backgroundedness of leaking propositions is the
backgroundedness/presupposition of the finite verb. Consequently, the only focus interpretation
available for the finite verb is that of verum focus (Höhle 1992).

Let us briefly present some basic characteristics of clauses with verum focus. Firstly, verum focused
clauses are inappropriate as out-of-the blue utterances, as the propositions need to be 'given' in the
discourse. Secondly, verum focus clauses usually require some controverse discussion of the topic, or
some opposing propositions. Even when such propositions do not explicitly exist, they need to be
accommodated (cf. Lohnstein 2016: 13). The main function of verum focus is not so much to
emphasize the truth of the proposition, as originally proposed by Hohle, but 'to stop arguments and
discussions to the contrary' (Lohnstein 2016: 14). These characteristics are then expected to be noted in
leaking orders with contrastively/verum focused finite verb.

The rather complex example in (27) offers us two kinds of interpretation of leaking: contrastive focus
on the object and emphatic/verum focus on the finite modal verb. Even though it requires some effort
to go through, it is particularly valuable, as it offers us with a clear insight that within one segment one
can find two different types of leaking. In (27b) the leaked object *his Drihtnes wyllan* 'his Lord's wishes'
contrasts with other people's wishes, with the predicate 'want to know' backgrounded. A young man
called Julian is hesitant about his family wish for him to get married, because it might jeopardize his
faith in God. Having heard what his family and his friends wish, Julian now needs to learn what his
Lord wants him to do regarding marriage. The conditions on leaking are met: the predicate is given
(Julian wishing to find out someone's wishes), the object has contrastive focus, projected from the
possessive noun (God's will vs. his family's will). When God appears to him in a dream and tells him
that he should find himself a wife, Julian tells his friends that he indeed would take himself a wife. This
interpretation is obtained via emphatic focus on the modal verb, as Julian's words are confirmation of

226

his willingness to accept the marriage, which is expected of him, if not taken for granted. But here we note an additional interpretational flavor: there is a mismatch between 'the actual situation' (due to social norms and conventions, it is the one that matches Julian's family' and friends' belief) and Julian's view on the state-of-affairs. Focusing of the propositional truth is employed when the propositional truth or propositions polarity is at question (Davis et al. 2007), whereby the speaker convinces the hearer that the propositional truth holds. Applied to our case here, Julian convinces his family and friends that he no longer has doubts and that he accepts 'the actual situation'.

The example in (19) is also useful because here we can pinpoint the difference between leaking orders and non-fronted VO orders. For that purpose, we can compare (19d) with a more or less same proposition in (19c). In God's response (*þæt he sceolde soðlice underfon mæden him to gemacan* 'that he must verily take a maiden as a mate for himself'), the VO order (*underfon mæden*) serves to mark the contrastive focus on the lexical verb; this interpretation is reinforced by the focus adverb *soðlice* 'indeed. The modal verb *sceolde* 'should' represents new information, as it adds God's evaluation of 'Julian taking himself a wife' and establishes topic-comment/predicate focus relation between Julian and taking himself a wife. In (19d), on the other hand, the modal verb *wolde* 'would', or Julian's willingness to obey his family, adds nothing essentially new to his addressee, and itself contributes very little updating flavor, apart from the fact that verum focus on the modal resolves the controversy of Julian's decision.

(19)

a. A certain noble servant of God was called Julian in the land of Egypt, in the city of Antioch, who was nobly born of pious parents and instructed in Christ's lore from his youth. Then <u>his father desired, and all his friends likewise, that he should marry</u> (*þa wolde his fæder and his frynd ealle þæt he wifian sceolde*), when he was eighteen years old

b.

ac	Iulianus	cwæð	þæt	he	cunnian	wolde	**his**	**Drihtnes**	**wyllan**
but	Julian	said	that	he	know	would	his	Lord's	wishes

hu	he	wolde	be	him.
how	he	would	about	him

'but Julian said that he wanted to find out his Lord's wishes, how he wanted about him'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Julian_and_Basilissa]:5.937)

c. Then was he busied in his prayers for seven nights, and prayed the almighty Christ that He would preserve his chastity. Then the Saviour showed himself in a dream to the noble knight on the eighth night, and said that <u>he must verily take a maiden as a mate for himself</u> (*þæt he sceolde soðlice underfon mæden him to gemacan*), who would not sever him from his pure life, such as he had chosen, Jesus said to him, ' I myself will be with thee, and will quench in thee all desire, and will incline the maiden also to love of Me. And in your bride-bed I will be manifested to you, and through you the purity of many others shall be hallowed unto Me, and I will receive thee, with thy maiden, to heaven.' Then awoke Julian, instructed by his Lord,

d.

cwæð	to	his	freondum	þæt	he	**onfon**	wolde	**mæden**	him

said	to	his	friends	that	he	receive	would	maiden	him

to	gemacan
to	spouse

'and said to his friends that he would take a maiden for his spouse; [and they were greatly glad of it]'

(coaelive,ÆLS_[Julian_and_Basilissa]:22.949)

Finally us show that any other alternative word order for (19b) would have inferences incompatible with the CG up to the point of utterance. The 'regular' VO orders could correctly capture defocused/backgrounded nature of the non-finite VP, but then we lose the emphatic focus interpretation on the modal. If the modal verb in (19d) were non-backgrounded and contrastively focused (as in the hypothetical (19a)), it would evoke the alternative established in the preceding CG that Julian was unwilling, and now wants to eliminate this alternative. The interpretation of the hypothetical word order in (19a) would be that Julian is now willing to get married, as opposed to before when he was opposed to this idea. Julian, however, is only hesitant. (19b), with non-fronted OV order could not capture the backgroundedness of the proposition, as both the modal and the lexical verb would be interpreted as update. The fronted vP order would be infelicitous because it would present the proposition matter-of-factly, which would then defeat all the turmoil and dilemma in Julian's mind.

(20)
a.   cwæð to his freondum þæt he wolde **onfon mæden** him to gemacan
b.   cwæð to his freondum þæt he wolde **mæden** (him to gemecan) **onfon** him to gemacan
c.   cwæð to his freondum þæt he **mæden** (him to gemacan) **onfon** wolde (him to gemacan)

Another example of an emphatically focused verb in leaking constructions is (21). The proposition – Philip's willingness to free the lying widow – is backgrounded, in the form of Eugenia's request that Phillip does not condemn the lying widow, Melantia for her false accusations against her (Eugenia) (21a). Even though the presupposition is less explicit than in the previous example, Philip freeing the lying widow can be easily inferred from the conversational background. Again the emphatic focus on the modal puts the emphasis on the truth of the proposition and communicates that Phillip is indeed willing to do what has been asked of him, thus eliminating any possible doubts Eugenia might have had.

(21)
a.   Then said Eugenia that she could easily clear herself from the disgrace of adultery, and overcome by the truth Melantia's accusation, provided that *Philip would assure her by an oath that the false (female) accuser should not be condemned.*

b.	ða	swor	Philippus	þæt	he	**friðian**	wolde	**þa**	**leasan**	**wudewan**,
	then	swore	Philip	that	he	free	would	the	lying	widow

228

ðeah þe	heo	gelignod	wurðe.
though	she	perjured	be

'Then swore Philip that he would let go free the false widow, though she should prove to be perjured'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Eugenia]:209.315)</div>

Similarly, in (22b), the negative modal *ne mihte* 'could not' has emphatic/verum focus, rather than contrastive focus. The proposition 'judge not being able to overpower that holy man' has been given in the preceding context (22a). If the negative modal were contrastive, it would eliminate a contrasting alternative from the CG ('the judge being able to overpower the holy man'). The effect of verum focus on *ne mihte* 'could not' is that the judge finally realizes the truth – he could not overcome the holy man by scourging (and consequently orders that he be beheaded). Again the discrepancy between Datian's belief and the actual state-of-affairs is resolved.

(22)

a. Lo! then the judge became fiendishly angry, and commanded men to scourge the holy martyr, thinking that he might bend the steadfastness of his mind to his (own) forms of worship by means of the stripes; but the blessed man was strengthened by God, and bore the scourging exceeding patiently, and with glad mind thanked God for it.

b.
ða	geseah	se	dema	þæt	he	**oferswyðan**	ne	mihte	**þone**	**halgan**
then	saw	the	judge	that	he	overcome	not	might	the	holy

wer	mid	þam	hetelicum	witum	ne	fram	Criste	gebigan
man	with	the	severe	tortures	not	from	Christ	turn

'Then the judge perceived that he could not overcome the holy man by the severe tortures, nor turn (him) from Christ..'

<div align="right">(coaelive,ÆLS_[Alban]:80.4047)</div>

A very similar case is given in (23). The proposition of Simon's inability to reveal the apostle's secret is backgrounded. The preceding context describes how Simon challenges the apostle Peter, claiming that his magical powers would enable him to read Peter's mind and reveal the secret, which was proposed as a test. Of course, being a false miracle worker, Simon fails. Again, the negative modal is emphatically focused, and it confirms the truth of the proposition introduced earlier. The pragmatic effect of verum focus in this case seems to be related to Simon's strong conviction that the opposite would hold, or that he would be able to reveal Peter's secret. It is in relation to this alternative that the proposition is to be interpreted. The speaker emphasizes the propositional truth to indicate the relevance of the opposite. To understand the magnitude of Simons anger (the content of the main clause), it is important for the author to point out the discrepancy between Simon's strong belief and the actual truth regarding the possibility of revealing the apostle's secret.

(23)

þa	wearð	Simon	erre,	forþon þe	he	**arædan**	ne	mihte	**þæs**
then	became	Simon	angry	because	he	reveal	not	could	the

apostoles   degol.
apostle's   secret

'Then was Simon wroth because he could not reveal the apostle's secret'

<div align="right">(coblick,LS_32_[PeterandPaul[BlHom_15]]:181.177.2316)</div>

The leaking proposition in (24b), Sarah laying a child to her breast to rock it in her old age, is essentially a paraphrase of the proposition of Sarah being able to give birth to a child, despite her old age, given in the preceding context (24a). The emphatic focus on the modal *sceolde* 'should' in the proposition embedded under the verb 'believe' indicates the unexpectedness of the propositional truth in the actual world (having children at old age), which is more likely to hold, given our world knowledge. The speaker/narrator uses verum focus here as a way to contradict his previous utterance or raise doubt about what they have asserted earlier.

(24)

a.   & gefylde hys word. Swa þæt heo wearð mid cilde, & on hyre ylde acende sunu on þære ylcan tide ðe God gecwæð. Abraham ða gecigde Isaac hys sunu. & on þam eahteðan dæge hyne eac ymsnað, swa swa God him bebead. And he sylf wæs ða hundwintre. Sarra cwæð þa ofwundrod: God me worhte hlehter; swa hwa swa hyt geaxað he hlyhð mid me.

'and kept his word, so that she became with child and in her old age conceived a son at the same time that God promised. Abraham then named his son Isaac, and on the eighth day he also circumcised him, as God ordered him; he himself was a hundred years old at the time. Astonished, Sarah then said: God has brought me laughter, and anyone who asks about it, will laugh with me.'

b.

Hwa	wolde	gelyfan	þæt	Sarra	**lecgan**	sceolde	**cild**	to	hyre	breoste
who	would	believe	that	Sarah	lay	should	child	to	her	breasts

to	gesoce	on	ylde,	þæt	ðe	heo	Abrahame	on	hys	ylde
to	shake	on	old-age	that	that	she	to-Abraham	on	his	old-age

acende
conceived

'Who would believe that Sarah should lay a child to her breast to rock it, the one she conceived to Abraham in her old age'

<div align="right">(cootest,Gen:21.7.867)</div>

A similar case from the same text is given in (25). The proposition Samson being able to kill one thousand men with the donkey cheekbone is backgrounded (the whole event is carefully described; in addition, the lexical VP is explicitly given in the preceding discourse, when Samson says 'I indeed killed

one thousand man with the donkey cheekbone' in (25a)). The proposition is given in the context expressing doubt ('if anyone wonders how it might happen'), with the emphatic focus on the modal highlighting unexpectedness of the propositional truth given the 'common sense' view of the world.

(25)

a. & cwæð to him sylfum: **Ic ofsloh witodlice an þusend wera mid þæs assan cinbane**. He wearð þa swiðe ofþyrst for ðam wundorlican slege. & bæd þone heofonlican God, þæt he him asende drincan: for þam þe on ðære neawiste næs nan wæterscipe. ða arn of þam cinbane, of anum teð, wæter, & Samson þa dranc & his Drihtene þancode

'and said to himself: "I indeed killed one thousand man with the donkey cheekbone." He became then very thirsty from that miraculous blow and asked the heavenly God that he send him something to drink, because in the area there was no water. Then water ran from the cheekbone, from one tooth, and Samson then drank it and thanked his Lord'

(cootest,Judg:15.19. 5756-5761)

b.
Nu	gif	hwa	wundrie,	hu	hit	gewurðan	mihte	þæt	Samson	se
now	if	anyone	wonders	how	it	happen	might	that	Samson	the

stranga	swa	**ofslean**	mihte	**an**	**þusend**	**manna**	*mid*	*þæs*	*assan*
strong	so	killed	might	one	thousand	men	with	the	donkey

cinbane,	þonne	secge	se	mann...
cheekbone	then	say	the	man

'now if anyone wonders how it might happen that Samson the strong could kill one thousand men with the donkey cheekbone, then one should say, how it might happen that God then sent him water from the donkey's teeth'

(cootest,Judg:15.21.5762)

The interpretations presented above are the core (or most frequent) interpretations and uses of leaking orders, and the examples chosen are their best representatives. But if the word order produced by non-finite verb fronting across the modal or auxiliary to the exclusion of the rest of the vP material is always a signal of the proposition's presuppositional flavor, where some element in this proposition is marked for contrastive focus, it will be used when elements other than the object, non-finite verb and the finite verb are focused. So, leaking orders can be used in embedded wh-questions where the wh-word is contrastively focused. In (26) the fact that the Pope should choose a new archbishop who will be sent to the church of England is familiar from the beginning of the chapter. When the priest Wighard, who was sent to Rome by the kings of Kent and Northumbria, with the request that he might be ordained bishop of the church of England, was snatched away on his journey, the pope starts looking for another candidate for the see. Contrastively focusing the wh-object *hwelcne arcebiscop* 'which archbishop' indicates that it should be interpreted with respect to an alternative candidate for the archbishop, i.e. the one who was killed. The lexical predicate together with the epistemic modality is backgrounded

(26)

&	georne	sohte,	*hwelcne*	*ærcebiscop*	he	**onsendan**	meahte
and	eagerly	sought	which	archbishop	he	send	might

Ongolðeode **ciricum**
English-people churches

'and eagerly sought which archbishop he might (now) send to the English churches'

(cobede,Bede_4:1.252.23.2572)

Leaking constructions can also have contrastively focused adverbs. Again, we only look at the adverb types whose unmarked position is preverbal. In (27), the adverb *wiðutan* 'from outside' is contrastively focused, and it is in a contrast relation with the adverb *inne* 'inside' in the preceding clauses. In (28), the adverbs *þa giet* 'then yet' are focused in order to indicate the relevance of the alternative temporal point *siþþan* 'later' in the following clause. Both propositions are presupposed. In (27), the fact that God locked Noah's arch is inferable from the preceding context, specifically from God's detailed instructions of how the arch is to be built and what its purpose is to be after he sends the flood.

(27)

þa	on	ðam	eahtoðan	dæge,	ða ða	hi	inne	wæron	&	God
then	on	the	eighth	day	when	they	inside	were	and	God

hi	belocen	hæfde	**wiðutan,**	ða	yðode	ðæt	flod	ofer	eorðan.
them	locked	had	from-outside	then	ovreflew	the	flood	over	earth

'Then on the eighth day, when they were inside and God had locked them from outside, then the flood overflew the earth'

(cootest,Gen:7.10.308)

(28)

&	he	bebead	þæt	mon	acwealde	eall	Dauides	cynn,	to þon,	gif	Crist
and	he	ordered	that	one	killed	all	David's	kin	because	if	Christ

geboren	nære	**þa**	**giet**,	þæt	he	na	siþþan	geboren	ne	wurde;
born	not-were	then	yet	that	he	not	later	born	not	become

'And he ordered that all of David's kin be killed, because, if Christ had not been born then, that he would not be born later, [because wisemen said that he would come of that kin]'

(coorosiu,Or_6:9.139.10.2929)

In some cases of leaking orders, there is no apparent contrastive focus interpretation on any of the elements. In (29), for example, we can only speculate that the infinitive *gehyran* 'hear' is fronted out of the coordinated VP for some emphasis. Another possibility is that the subject is to be interpreted as contrastive/additive ('that our friend too can hear and serve God'), and the leaking configuration is created as a play on the dual nature of the predicate – it is backgrounded but used as a novel comment

on the subject. We cannot even dismiss the possibility that the emphasis on the first conjunct is here used to indicate the contrast between two phonologically similar verbs (*gehyran – herian*). This type of ambiguity is hardly problematic for our understanding of the sentence. In either of the three interpretations offered above, we recognize the speaker's intention to use presuppositional content and highlight some kind of contrast in it.

(29)

We should do the same if one of our friend cannot by himself seek of his Lord the healing of his soul with true confession – we should help him and pray for him that seeks the salvation of his soul from his Lord.

þæt	he	**gehyran**	mage	&	**herian**	**his**	**Scyppend**.
that	he	hear	may	and	praise	his	lord

'that he may hear and praise his lord'

<div align="right">(coaelhom,ÆHom_18:106.2548)</div>

6.3 Summary

Let us summarize the properties of leaking constructions. They have the properties of both presupposed and 'assertive-like' propositions. The presuppositional flavor stems from the fact that the proposition in the leaking order is always 'given' (backgrounded or inferred, or treated as such provided a more or less effortless accommodation). What makes it 'assertive-like' is the presence of contrastive focus, most often on the object and the lexical verb, or verum focus on the finite verb. The 'assertive' component in them makes them compatible with discourse switches. This mix of properties is reflected in their 'mixed' structure. The vP material is split, and the finite verb (occasionally together with some other vP material) moves across the modal/auxiliary (just like full vP fronting in presupposed propositions), while the object (occasionally with some more material) is left behind, just like in 'assertive-like' orders, in the sense that *some* vP material is present in the area following the finite verb.

6.4 Discussion

Leaking constructions offer us additional insights into the vP/V-fronting, on the one hand, and postverbal objects, on the other. All postverbal objects – whether they are found in leaking orders or 'assertive-like' Vf-Vn-O orders, are licit to follow the verb if two interpretations are at play: (a) the object is contrastively focused; (b) the lexical verb is contrastively focused. The second interpretation supports our view that the syntactic option of non-finite verb fronting is used to mark the contrastive focus on the lexical verb. However, leaking constructions are ambiguous in how much vP is actually moved. As we have referred to vP fronting in vPn–Vf orders, and V-fronting in certain Vf-Vn-O orders, for leaking, I will use the term 'remnant vP' fronting (in the sense of Biberauer & Roberts 2005, where the object is 'stranded' in the VP complement of v°, as non-edge material which cannot be fronted). This is the assumption we need to maintain before we can fully sort out the context where only the non-finite verb seems to have moved across the auxiliary/modal, to the exclusion of all other

material, and those where, for instance, an object leaks, but vP adverbs or one of the objects with ditransitive verbs move together with the non-finite verb.

Remnant vP fronting, as we have seen, does not only take place to signal contrastive focus on the non-finite verb. It is also employed to indicate the presence of contrastive focus on other elements. By now this is hardly surprising, as we have observed the absence of any clear correlation between a specific word order patterns and contrastive focus interpretation of one particular element. But here we would look into more detail the case when vP fronting is a way to get verum focus.

Why does the remnant vP need to move to get verum focus interpretation, which is usually associated with focusing the element with TAM features (in our case here, the modal or auxiliary)? And if we were to guess which element has the relevant prosodic prominence in our verum focus examples, it would most likely be on the fronted non-finite verb. If so, then in verum focused leaking clauses, the non-finite verb is actually the element focused, not the modal or auxiliary. This puzzle, however, is due to the peculiarities of marking verum focus in embedded clauses. Höhle (1992) has noted that in embedded clauses in German there are two ways to get verum focus: by placing prosodic prominence on the finite verb or by placing the focal accent on the subordinator. Lohnstein (2016: 18-19), however, argues that 'true' verum focus (in its classical understanding of operating on propositions) is bound to the left sentence periphery. Two possible positions for prosodic prominence with verum focus effects actually reflect the difference between (i) verum focus in the left periphery and (ii) predicate related verum effects in the final position. The former has an effect on the whole proposition, while the latter relates to the predicate only. When the complementizer is prosodically focused, whole propositions enter the set of contrastive alternatives (30), while with the prosodically focused auxiliary, it is only the opposite poles of a complementary predicate that form contrastive alternatives (31).

(30) contrast to right peripheral predicate focus
a. | Aber | Maria | hat | seen | **DASS** | Peter | die | Katze | gefüttert | hat |
     | but | Mary | has | seen | that | Peter | the | cat | fed | has |
     'But Mary has seen, that Peter did feed the cat.'
b.   { Peter has fed the cat | Peter has not fed the cat }

(31) contrast to leftperipheral verum focus:
a. | Aber | Maria | hat | gesehen | dass | Peter | die | Katze | gefüttert | **HAT** |
     | But | Mary | has | seen | that | Peter | the | cat | fed | has |
     'But Mary has seen, that Peter did fed the cat.'
b.   Peter { has fed | has not fed } the cat.

This also seems to be at play in leaking orders. The (contrastively) focused non-finite lexical verb provides the 'leftperipheral' verum focus, necessary to get the interpretation that the whole proposition is in the set of alternatives.

(32)

| þæt | Sarra | **LECGAN** | sceolde | **cild** | to | hyre | breoste |

Infinitives and participles fronted across vP adverbs in Vn–Adv–O orders, discussed in Chapter 5, show a similar effect, in that the contribution of a high degree of unexpectedness makes them almost counterfactive, from the speaker's point of view, in the evaluation of somebody else's assertion. So it seems that whenever the finite verb is unambiguously found outside its base position, in the sense that it precedes the material it usually follows, its 'unlikelihood' inference associated with contrastive focus increases the higher it moves. In that respect, non-finite verb fronting resembles the fronting of NPs, only with NPs what increases is their topicality.

Finally, let us address the issue of the mixed IS/pragmatic nature of leaking constructions. Even though their input is a presupposed proposition, contrastive focus marking in them and the fact that they are usually found at points of discourse shift, suggest that they are contributed as some kind of CG update, even though they are not assertive. As for the way verum focus acts on the discourse, in most cases, it is used to resolve the issue of controversiality. When propositions polarity is uncontroversial, verum focus serves to highlight the relevance of this proposition (as proposed by Romero and Han (2004: 627), for the cases when verum focus is used in answers to wh-questions as in 'A: What did she ever do for me? B: Well, she did buy you your first car'). Lei (2012) similarly proposes that verum focus of a proposition (verum(p)) signals an update of p's discourse status.

As we have said, leaking orders are used for indicating contrastive focus on the lexical verb or the object. As both leaking orders and vP-Vf orders involve pragmatically presupposed propositions, it would be tempting to use leaking as additional support for our hypothesis that contrastive focus is incompatible with presupposed propositions in vPn-Vf orders. But this holds only to the effect that it is impossible to move the whole vP if one of the elements is contrastively focused. Moreover, leaking clauses are closely associated with shifts in the discourse, and they come as 'reactivated' in a way. For that reason, it is impossible to draw direct parallels with presupposed vPn-Vf orders.

6.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have shown that leaking constructions arise as a way of marking contrastive focus on pragmatically presupposed propositions. Contrastively focalized elements in this order are the object, the lexical verb or the modal/auxiliary. The way remnant vP fronting, assumed to correspond to the 'size' of material moved, is used for marking verum focus on the finite verb supports the view that in embedded clauses propositional verum focus needs to be marked in the left-periphery (as argued by Lohnstein 2016). Fronting the non-finite remnant vP equals (or possibly involves) prosodic prominence necessary in the left-periphery of embedded clauses for verum focus interpretation.

Leaking orders show us that additional focus marking is possible on presupposed/presupposable propositions. The only way to combine focus marking and presuppositional content is to 'split' the VP material. As this is a rather complex strategy, it is restricted in use and is employed only by authors who exploit the limits of available IS mechanisms for rhetorical and stylistic purposes.

In terms of their discourse contribution, we can then assume that the essential effect of leaking constructions is to take a backgrounded proposition and 'foreground' it because some contrast needs to be indicated as relevant for the development of the discourse.

Leaking completes the inventory of fronting chunks of material containing the predicate: vP fronting (out of 'clausal focus' are following the finite verb, creating presupposed propositions), V-fronting (movement of the non-finite verb out of the area where it is interpreted as neutral, new information focus, i.e. when it is 'contrastively focused' or 'defocused') and remnant vP movement (out of the 'clausal focus' area, to mark that the proposition is backgrounded or CG content, 'leaking' the object in the 'clausal focus' area to indicate that the proposition is reactivated for expressing some kind of contrast.

We conclude this chapter with some general observations regarding the interaction of two core IS notions: (contrastive) focus and givenness in OE. Both predicates (verbal elements) and terms can be marked for some kind of backgroundedness; with terms, it is a broad notion of givenness; for verbs, the effect comes as 'decreased focus'. When the lexical vP is backgrounded, it has the effect on the entire proposition, which then becomes marked as pragmatically presupposed. The difference in the backgroundedness flavor between terms and predicates stems from the inherent focus nature of predicates, which makes it difficult to properly characterize backgroundedness/'givenness' of predicates.

Both predicates (verbal elements) and terms can be marked for contrastive focus. What is curious is that the same orders signal the presence of contrastive focus on one of these elements. This has been observed with Vf-V-O, Vf-V-O-Adv, Vf-Vn-Adv-O orders in previous chapters, and in Vn-Vf-O order in this chapter. There is one thing they all have in common: the non-finite lexical verb is not in the clause final position. And this is indeed the only signal that *something* is contrastively marked in the clause. Another clear signal of an IS/discourse status is the non-finite verb preceding the finite verb: clauses with such orders are always pragmatically presupposed or treated as such. It is then rather clear that in OE the key signposts for IS/discourse interpretations are verbal elements.

7. COMPLEMENT FRONTING BEYOND OE

In the previous chapters, we have shown that in OE vP fronting and object fronting, triggered by some kind of givenness or backgroundedness, cannot be separated from predicate markings. Complements front not only because their 'givenness' needs to be marked, but also to ensure that the predicate is marked in a certain way. And both are motivated by the speaker's communicative goals. We have seen that creating a background-focus structure with the modal/auxiliary in what we have descriptively labeled 'clausal focus' crucially marks the secondary contribution of the propositional content (with a range of inferences associated with non-full-fledged assertions). Backgrounding the complement material yields a structure where the predicate is marked as focused.

Using the syntactic option of complement fronting for creating background-focus structures which are deemed by the speaker to be the most optimal way of presenting information in the discourse is not just present in the history of English. Slavic languages too have been known to employ complement fronting in earlier and not so earlier stages. Old Church Slavonic has flexible word order, with both VP and OV orders possible (Huntley 1993: 163). Non-finite verb fronting, especially that of the participle in perfect tense and passives is also present ((cf. Willis 2000, and also Pancheva 2007 for arguments that OCS had competing T-initial and T-final structures). In this chapter, I will present word order patterns with complement fronting in the mid-19th century Serbian texts. In some texts, both object fronting and non-finite vP fronting are applied so extensively, almost to the point that one might wonder if these patterns reflect a competing grammars situation But as this practice was lost by the beginning of the 20th century, I do not find it plausible that a syntactic change involving directionality of vP and TP can take place in about 50 years. It seems more likely that what actually changed is the way of IS marking.

In Section 7.1 we present a brief overview of basic word order facts in Present-Day Serbian. Non-finite vP fronted orders are discussed in Section 7.2, while object fronting is illustrated in Section 7.3.

7.1 Complement fronting in 19th century Serbian

Complement fronting is a rather striking feature of the mid-19th century Serbian, evidenced with both nominal/adjectival complements and verbal complements (verb clusters). If one were to make a descriptive generalization about the directionality of the verb phrase in a text such as *Kratka vsemirna istorija* ('A Short History of the World') by Georgije Magarašević, written in 1831 (cf. Ajdžanović & Bjelaković 2013), it would be hard to resist the temptation of calling it head/verb-final. The presence of complement fronted orders in Slavic languages is sometimes attributed to the influence of another 'verb-final' language, either Latin or German (cf. Batova 2020, for example, for complement fronting in earlier stages of Russian). I, however, believe that it is not necessary to assume such a hypothesis, which is extremely difficult to prove. The main argument for the assumption that this is a genuine, 'native' pattern of discourse marking comes from the fact that it still survives, to some extent, in the spoken variety of Serbian

Before we deal with the word order patterns involving complement fronting in the earlier stages of Serbian, we need to present some basic facts about the word order in present-day (PD) Serbian.

In PD Serbian, the unmarked word order is SVO. Unmarked position for adverbs is preverbal, while for PPs it is postverbal. Most pronouns are clitics, and together with auxiliary clitics form a special class of second-position clitics, whose special syntax and phonology require that they must occupy the second position in their intonational phrase (in most cases, this equals the second position in the clause).

(1)

a.
Maša	(mu)	je	(slučajno)	poslala	pogrešan	rad	(mejlom)
Maša	him.DAT.CL	AUX.CL	accidentally	sent	wrong	paper	by-email

'Maša accidentally sent him the wrong paper by email'

b.
Maša	neće	(sutra)	kupiti	plavu	haljinu	(iz	inata	/preko	Amazona
Maša	not-will	tomorrow	buy	blue	dress	out-of	spite	via	Amazon

do	/pet	popodne)
until	five	in-the-afternoon

'Maša will not buy a blue dress (tomorrow/out of spite/via Amazon/until 5 pm'

Rearrangements of the canonical word order are possible – every element can in principle be found in any position relative to other elements. This leads to markedness effects, which could be measured on a scale of markedness – some rearrangements will be perceived as being more marked than others. But the exact interpretation in the familiar IS terms is often unavailable, as the impression is often that 'something is emphasized', but the exact reasons are hard to elicit. Furthermore, these 'deviations' from the canonical word order are characteristic of the spoken language and informal communication styles. Object fronting occurs quite easily (2). Most importantly, such orders are compatible in context eliciting new information focus (it can be used as an answer to the question 'What did Maša do?'

(2)
Maša	je	pogrešan	rad	**poslala**
Maša	AUX.CL	wrong	paper	sent

'Maša sent a wrong paper'

Non-finite vP fronting, on the other hand, is highly marked, and possible only under the contrastive focus interpretation of the modal *neće* 'will not'. The acceptability of such fronting increases when the object is fronted as well (3).

(3)
Maša	plavu	haljinu	kupiti	**neće**

Maša	blue	dress	buy.INF	not-will

'Maša will not buy a new dress'

The morphology of Serbian is rich. Here I will only briefly comment on the morphosyntax of nominal expressions. Nominal expressions in Serbian have been successfully argued to be NPs, rather than DPs (cf. Bošković 2005, 2009). All prenominal elements (excluding some quantifiers) behave as modifiers, and definiteness/specificity issues are resolved contextually. Modifiers with (in)definiteness or (non)specificity meaning components can also be employed, but this is not obligatory. NPs are case marked, and traditionally seven cases are distinguished.

7.2 Non-finite vP fronting in 19th century Serbian

The examples presented in this chapter come from two sources: the book *Kratka vsemirna istorija* by Georgije Magarašević, and various newspaper articles, found in the University Library 'Svetozar Marković' corpus of digitized historic newspaper texts. (http://www.unilib.rs/istorijske-novine/browse). The original Cyrillic script has been transcribed to the Latin alphabet for ease of exposition. We are glossing over the fact that some of the early 19th century texts might contain features of the so-called Russian-Slavic variety, a special form of 'literary language', as these features are not assumed to pertain to word order, which is of interest here.

Let us first deal with verbal complements of modals (essentially restructuring verbs with modal flavor; the so-called phasal verbs such as *početi* 'start/begin' and *prestati* 'stop/end' exhibit a very similar syntax, and are often grouped with verbs such as *moći* 'can' and *morati* 'must'). Verb final orders are predominantly found in embedded clauses.

Examples of clause final modal *moći* 'can' are given in (4), in complement da-clauses (4a & c) and reason jer-clause (4b).

(4)

a.
objavi...	da	Papa	o	svima	ljudma	**suditi**	**može**
announced	that	Pope	about	all	people	judge.INF	can

'announced...that the Pope can judge all people'

(*Kratka vsemirna istorija*, p. 162)

b.
jer	nikad	do	samostalnosti	svoe	dospeti	**ne**	**može**
because	never	to	independence	its	reach	not	can

'because it can never reach its independence'

(*Kratka vsemirna istorija*, p. 174)

c.
da	su	to	samo	snovidenija,	koima	se	verovati	**nemože**

that	are	these	only	fantasies	which	RFL	believe-INF	not-can

'that these are only fantasies, which cannot be believed'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p. 184)</div>

(5) features a relative clause with a clause final future modal.

(5)

koi	e	svome	ocu,	kao	dete	od	9	godina	u	crkvi	učinio,
who	AUX.CL	his	father	as	child	of	9	years	in	church	made

sireč,	da	sa	Rimljani	nigda	u	ljubovi	BITI	**neće**
promise	that	with	Romans	never	in	love	be.INF	will-not

'who, as a nine-year-old child, made a promise to his father in a church that he would never be friendly with the Romans'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p. 33)</div>

Clause final deontic modal *morati* 'must' is illustrated in the reason clause in (6a) and relative clause in (6b).

(6)

a.
er	e	čovek	sa	čovekom	u	koštac	BORITI	se	**morao**
because	AUX.CL	man	with	man	in	grapple	fight.INF	RFL	had

'because a man had to fight with another man grappling'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsmirna istorija, p. 194)</div>

b.
(ednom	Episkopu),	koi	e	kao	njegov	sa	njima	zajedno
to-one	Archbishop	who	AUX.CL	as	his	with	them	together

ići	**morao**
go.INF	had

'(...to an Archbishop,) who had to go with them together as his representative'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p.111)</div>

Finally, an example of the 'phasal' verb *početi* 'start', begin' is given in (7).

(7)

koi	neznajući	jošte	za	nauku	Viklevovu,	učenike	svoe	naročito
who	not-knowing	yet	about	doctrine	of-Wycliffe	students	his	especially

k	čteniju	Biblije	uputstvovati	**počne**
towards	reading	of-Bible	direct	began

'who not knowing yet of Wycliffe's doctrine, started to direct his students towards the reading of the Bible especially'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p. 214)</div>

Compound tenses (past, future, modal future 'potential') involve clitic forms of the auxiliary *jesam/biti* 'be' or the modal *hteti* 'will'. Due to their Wackernagel clitic status, clitic auxiliaries and modals will always surface in the high ('second') position. Non-clitic auxiliaries can be observed with compound tenses such as 'past perfect' (pluperfect), where the auxiliary 'be' itself is marked for past tense and the lexical verb is in the participle form. The clause final position of the pluperfect be participle is illustrated in (8).

(8)

budući da	e	Movsei	davši	im	zakon desetoslovija	i
since	AUX.CL	Moses	having-given	them	ten-commandments	and

probavivši	s	njim	40	godina	u	pustinji	već	UMREO	**bio**
having-spent	with	them	40	years	in	desert	already	died	be.PTC

'Since Moses, having given them the Law of Ten Commandments and having spent forty years in the desert with them, had already died..'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p. 52)</div>

(9)

er	e	sada	u	Rimu	sve	za	novce
because	AUX.CL	now	in	Rome	everything	for	money

dobiti	**moguće**	**bilo**
get.INF	possible	been.PTC

'because now in Rome it was possible to get everything for money'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p. 112)</div>

vP fronted orders are also found in main clauses. The motivation for infinitive fronting in cases such as (10) and (11) seems to be driven by different reasons. Namely, non-finite verb fronting plays an important role in topicalization structures. It is often employed to mark the topic status of the non-pronominal material in the left-periphery of main clauses – usually that of switch topic.

(10)

Kakovo	e	pervi	ljudi	sostajnije	bilo,	to	se	sa
what	AUX.CL	first	peoples'	composition	been	that	RFL	with

svim	istoričeski	OPREDELITI	**nemože**
all	historically	determine.INF	not-can

'What the composition of the first peoples was, that cannot be fully determined historically'

(*Kratka vsemirna istorija*, p.42)

(11)

a. There was war all over Europe: Spain was in war with the Moors, the Greek Empire was attacked by the Moors and the Bulgarians.

b.

Anglia	se	BORITI	**morala**	sa	drugim	manjim	narodima
England	RFL	fight	must.PTC	with	other	smaller	nations

koji	su	na	nju	napadali
which	AUX.CL	at	it	attacked

'England had to fight with other smaller nations, which were attacking it'

(*Kratka vsemirna istorija*, p. 156)

In newspaper articles, non-finite vP fronting is present, but it seems to me to be less frequent and possibly subject to certain special focus marking strategies. Still, passages such as (12), (13), and (14), which seem to be free of contrastive focus marking, can be found.

(12)

a.

Ja	mislim	ovde	policiju,	koju	stari	Slaveni	POZNAVALI	**nisu**;
I	think	here	police	which	old	Slavs	know.PTC	NEG.AUX

er	u	nji	nie	bilo	skitnica,	prosijaka,
because	in	them	NEG.AUX	be.PTC	vagabonds	beggars

kradljivaca	koje	bi	ZATVORITI,	RANITI	i	KAZNITI	**morali**.
thieves	whom	would	imprison	feed	and	punish	had-to

'Here I mean the police, which the old Slavs did not know; because they had no vagabonds, beggars, thieves, whom they would have had to imprison, fee and punish'

b. Da Slaveni nisu imali prosijaka i siromaha, pojavlenije u istoriji čovečanstva redko, - to izjasnavaju novii spisatelji na osobit način, dokazajući da su Slaveni ubijali starce, decu ubogi roditeli, bogalje,

242

'That the Slavs had no beggars and the poor, something that rarely happens in the human history, - that is what recent writers report in a peculiar way, claiming that the Slavs would kill their old people, children of poor parents, cripples,'

c.
koi	nikakvog	imetka	NASLEĐIVALI	**nisu,**	i	od	posla	ruku
who	no	property	inherit.PTC	NEG.AUX	and	from	work	hands

svoji	RANITI	se	**nemogl**i;	isto	tako,	kao što	su	ubijali	životinju
their	feed	RFL	not-could	same	so	as	AUX.CL	killed	animal

koja	RADITI	**nie**	**mogla,**	er	TRPETI	mogli	**nisu,**	da
which	work	NEG.AUX	could	because	bare	could	NEG.AUX	that

zemlja	ovakii	teret	bez	ploda	vuče.
land	such	burden	without	fuit	carry

'who did not inherit any property, and could not feed themselves from the work of their hands, just like they would kill an animal which could no longer work, because they could not bear that the land carried such burden with no fruit'

(*Podunavka*, 27. 11. 1943, p. 198)

(13)

Kako	dalje	zavistnici	sa	tolikom	nepravdom	GOVORITI	**mogu,**	da	Cerna
how	still	the-envious	with	such	injustice	speak.INF	can	that	Monte

Gora,	kad	bi	samo	Porta	nju	POKORITI	**htela,**	protiv	sile
Negro	if	would.CL	only	Porte	it	subdue.INF	wanted	against	power

Turske	ne	bi	se	OBDERŽATI	**mogla**
of-Turkey	not	would.CL	RFL	defend.INF	could

'How can the envious still so unsightly speak that Monte Negro, if only the Porte wanted to conquer it, could not defend itself against the power of Turkey'

(*Serbska pčela,* 1.1. 1841, p.27)

(14)

Da	bi	se	nemir	utišao	i	istina	POZNATI	**mogla,**
in-order-to	would.CL	RFL	unrest	calm.PTC	and	truth	know.INF	could

naredi	Vladeije	pridvornu	komisiju
ordered	government	royal	commission

'In order for the unrest to cease and the truth to be seen, the government ordered a royal

commission...'

(*Serbska pčela*, 1. 1. 1836, p. 131)

The examples above all involve accounts of historical events. And it seems that this is the context where vP fronted orders are unmarked (in the sense that no observable contrastive focus interpretations are present). It is not surprising that non-finite vP fronted orders are employed in historical narratives. Presenting a proposition as presupposed/presupposable, the narrator achieves the effect of matter-of-factness, by not publicly committing to the propositional content. The narrator can also count on the hearer's/reader's readiness to accommodate whatever information is not actually shared or commonly believed, as the narrator's authority and credibility is not questioned (people choose to read historical accounts because they believe that this is where they will find factual content). So, vP fronted orders seem to be an excellent way to present secondary contributions to the main line of narrative (assertions). This is a perfect match between a discourse-type and word order.

Word orders corresponding to leaking in OE are also found. The interpretation is the same as in OE. It signals the presence of contrastive focus in a presupposed proposition (in this case, the subject *mi sami* 'we ourselves', preceded by the conjunction *i* 'and, also' functioning as a discourse particle).

(15)

a. Istinu su ispodvedali Gospoda saobštelji ovog lista, da je provincialna Hrvatska u filologičnom ogledu prava terra incognita.
    'It was true what the distinguished authors of this paper said, that provincial Croatia is a real terra incognita in the philological sense'

b. Priznaemo, da   **i**   mi   isti   do   juče   POZNAVALI   **nismo**
    we-admit   that and   we   same   till yesterday   know.PTC   not-AUX

    hrvatsko   narečje
    Croatian   dialect

    'We admit that we ourselves also did not know the Croatian dialect until recently'

(*Peštansko-Budimski Skoroteča* 1842, p. 6)

This short presentation of vP fronting is far from being a full description of non-finite vP fronting in 19th century Serbian, nor is intended to be. What is important is that some of the uses of vP fronting in this earlier stage of Serbian are similar to the ones observed for OE embedded clauses. And this way of IS marking of propositions was relatively quickly abandoned for non-fronted orders. vP fronting remained as a way of marking contrastive focus on other elements.

7.3 Object fronting in 19th century Serbian

Turning now to object fronting, both *Kratka vsemirna istorija* and newspaper texts employ word orders where the lexical verb is clause final. Examples from *Kratka vsemirna istorija* are given in (16) and (17), and from newspaper articles in (18) and (19).

(16)

a.	U	svetom	pismu	stoi	da	e	Mojsei	*70*	*Kraljeva*	**pogubio**
	in	Old	Testament	stands	that	AUX.CL	Moses	70	kings	killed.PTC

'It is written in the Old Testament that Moses killed seventy kings'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p.4-5)</div>

(17)

zato	su	svagda	pred	kraljevi	*vatru*	*kao*	*znak*	*sunca*	*i*
therefore	AUX.CL	always	before	kings	fire	as	sign	of-sun	and

božestva	**nosili**
divinity	brought

'that's why they always brought fire in front of their kings as a symbol of the sun and divinity'

<div align="right">(Kratka vsemirna istorija, p.64)</div>

(18)

kako	e	u	lonac	edan	od	cveća	*poviše*	*vode*	**nasuo**
as	AUX.CL	in	pot	one	of	flowers	too-much	water	poured

'as he poured too much water into one of the flower pots'

<div align="right">(Podunavka, 03. 03. 1856, p. 8)</div>

(19)

U selu jednom, ne daleko od Beograda, vidio sam i učiteli ednog,
'In a village not far from Belgrade, I saw a good teacher

kako	e	sa	oduševljenjem	*đake*	*svoe*	**učio**
as	AUX.CL	with	enthusiasm	pupils	his	taught

'(as he was) teaching his pupils with great enthusiasm'

<div align="right">(Šumadinka, 09. 02. 1850, p. 23)</div>

Since we have mostly focused on embedded clauses, it is difficult to clearly tease out the role of the clause final verb in them, as the clause final participle in compound past tense with a clitic auxiliary

(which obligatorily moves to its special 2nd position), also indicates that the embedded proposition is 'backgrounded' or 'secondary contribution'. Some OV orders with simple tenses are illustrated in (20-22), where we can also observe that fronted objects can be truly given (22) or inferable/plausible (20 & 21).

(20)

Kad	Ahterbal	u	Rim	dođe	i	nepravdu	Jogurtinu	Senatu	**predloži**
when	Adherbal	to	Rome	came	and	injustice	Jugurtha's	to-Senate	present

'When Adherbal came to Rome and Jugurtha's injustice presented to the Senate'

(*Kratka vsemirna istorija*, p.112)

(21)

zato što	mati	svoe	odoiče	**voli**
because	mother	her	baby	loves

'because a mother loves her baby'

(*Školski list*, 9. 12. 1850, p. 1)

(22)

Ćira	je	starcu	Milošu	isprepovedao,	kakva	e	pokušenija
Ćira	AUX.CL	old-man	Miloš	told	what	AUX.CL	attempts

učinio,	da	sebi	novaca	**pribavi**	i	po tome	trgovnu	**otvori**
made	to	himself	money	get	and	then	store	open

'Ćira told the old man Miloš what attempts he had made in order to get himself (enough) money and then open a store '

(*Podunavka*, 6. 9. 1856, p. 1)

An illustration of object fronting in main clauses is given in (23). The sentence concludes the segment where events are narrated according to Moses' account of the history of 'the first peoples'. Therefore, no CG update takes place, and the finite verb is clause final.

(23)

Ovako	Mojsej	priključenija	i	sudbine	prvi	ljudi	**opisue**
thus	Moses	life-events	and	faiths	of-first	peoples	describes

'This is how Moses describes the life events and faiths of the first peoples'

(*Kratka vsemirna istorija*, p. 52)

Preverbal PPs are subject to the same 'givenness' conditions – whatever meaning they contribute, it would have to be backgrounded, inferable, plausible, etc. In (24), St. Peter and hell are in an opposite location relation, while saying or not saying 'good night' is plausible in the bedtime context.

(24)

Mi	damo	Pasoše	toj	zloj	ženi,	od	koje	bi	svetii	Petar
we	gave	passports	to-that	evil	woman	from	whom	would.CL	Saint	Perer

u	pakao	**pobegao**.	Ona	uze	žiške	i	bez	laku	noć	**ode**,
to	hell	run-away	she	took	oil-lamp	and	without	good	night	left

'We gave our passports to the evil woman, from who St. Peter would run away to hell. She took her oil lamp and left without (saying) good night'

<div align="right">(Šumadinka, 16. 2. 1850, p. 26)</div>

7.4 Complement fronting in spoken Serbian

Remnants of the discourse 'type' where inherent predicate focus is marked by object fronting is present in the informal spoken Serbian. A sentence with fronted objects can be used as new information predicate focus (25). Again the context of past event sequencing is the most appropriate one for such orders.

(25)

A: Šta je Petar uradio juče u noćnom klubu?
      'What did Peter do in the nightclub yesterday?'

B:	Petar	je	neku	devojku	**poljubio**,	sve	čaše	sa	stola	**porazbijao**,
	Peter	aux.cl	some	girl	kissed	all	glasses	from	table	broke

	onda	se	na	kraju	sa	obezbeđenjem	**potukao**
	then	RFL	in	end	with	security	fought

'Peter kissed a/some girl, broke all the glasses on the table, and then picked up a fight with the security'

Fronted object orders can be used in questions eliciting sentence focus (26). But the preference is that only the object is fronted, while PPs remain postverbal.

(26)

A: Šta se desilo juče u noćnom klubu?
      'What happened at the nightclub yesterday?'

B:	Neki	lik	je	dve	devojke	**gurnuo**	na	podijumu,	flašu	šampanjca
	some	guy	AUX.CL	two	girls	pushed	on	dance floor	bottle	champagne

	razbio	u	separeu,	i	na	kraju	se	s	obezbeđenjem	**potukao**

broke	in	booth	and	in	end	RFL	with	security	fought

'Some guy pushed two girls on the dance floor, broke a bottle of champagne in his booth, and then finally picked up a fight with the security'

All the fronted objects in the examples above are inferable or plausible in the context of a nightclub. If the predicate is such that it introduces a new discourse referent in the object position ('meet', 'buy'), fronting becomes infelicitous under the intended new information focus interpretation (contrastive focus interpretation of the verb (*ali nije sa njom puno pričao* 'but he didn't speak to her much' for (27), *a ne pozajmila* 'not borrowed' for (28)) can save this ordering).

(27)

A: Šta je Petar uradio juče u noćnom klubu?
       'What did Peter do an the night club yesterday?'

B: ?? Petar   je   neku   devojku   **upoznao**   /**sreo**...
       Peter   AUX.CL   some   girl   acquainted   /met

       'Peter met some/a girl...'

(28)

A: Šta je Maša uradila juče?
       'What did Maša do yesterday?'

B: ??Maša   je   novu   haljinu   **kupila**
       Maša   AUX.CL   new   dress   bought

       'Maša bought a new dress'

This type of nominal complement fronting, just like in 19th century Serbian and OE, is subject to givenness of the moved material. But unlike standard Serbian, where scrambling seems to require additional features (e.g. topicality) or considerations, in earlier stages and the spoken language, object fronting is used as a way of predicate focus marking. As we have pointed out earlier for OE, using word order rearrangements to mark inherent predicate focus is not a common IS marking strategy. As focus is an inherent property of predicates, what is being marked is actually unmarked IS interpretation for predicates, and that is why it is difficult to capture the markedness effect of 'predicate final' orders. What is in fact marked by object fronting is that the predicate is the only element in focus. And in certain discourse contexts, this is the preferred way of presenting information. I called this strategy 'event highlighting', but I again admit that such characterization leaves much to be considered. What is important though is that we need to take into account that the notion of 'givenness' can be robust, and as such, it will be exploited in the discourse for various communicative goals and intentions of the speaker.

7.5 Summary

While this is just a brief insight into vP and object fronting in not-so-early stages of Serbian, one important observation is clear: the change from verb-final to verb non-final default order in PD Serbian is not related to any change in the morphosyntax of Serbian. Crucially, 19th century nominal expressions are as much NPs as they are today. The discourse-type or IS marking strategy of the mid-19th century texts was pushed aside by the more neutral SVO type, where concerns such as secondary contribution, backgroundedness of propositions, matter-of-factness, eventive narratives, and so on, no longer need to be marked. A systematic investigation of how this process actually took place is certainly needed to support our proposal for a mysterious process of 'discourse-type change'.

Even though I have only scratched the surface of complement fronting effects in earlier Serbian and PD spoken Serbian, I have managed to show that complement fronting is heavily employed and that it does not necessarily mark some kind of topicality of the fronted material or contrastive focus on the verb. It is information-structurally unmarked in the sense that the verb is interpreted as contributing new information. Non-fronted orders are of course possible, and it remains to be seen what conditions are at play when such orders arise, and to what extent they match non-fronted orders in OE.

Still, what I find to be a potentially significant contribution to the study of scrambling and IS marking in Serbian is establishing the fact that speakers use two ways of information packaging. For that reason, scrambled orders can be both marked and unmarked for most speakers. The fact that many speakers deem syntactically marked orders as appropriate answers to questions eliciting sentence focus, new information predicate or term focus becomes less mysterious now. What does remain mysterious is how to make sense of why parallel ways of discourse development still survive.

8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Having laid out the problem of complement fronting/non-fronting, in Chapter 1 we argued that the word order alternations arising from fronting or not-fronting of vP and NP/DP complements can be captured in terms of IS/discourse status marking. In Chapter 2, we have put forth the hypothesis that the interpretational effect noted in vPn fronted (Vn-Vf) clauses is closest to Stalnaker's (1973, 1974, 1978, 1999, 2002) notion of pragmatic presupposition and the Common Ground theory. Following this assumption, we have examined the interpretations of vPn-Vf orders in temporal and conditional clauses, and shown that such orders can indeed be considered pragmatically presupposed, or treated as such, via accommodation. The role of relevance has also been noted. Semantically impoverished predicates are not so much presupposed as they are non-assertive – they cannot update the common ground. What allows vP fronting and clauses with the finite verb in the final position is not so much their external syntax (the relation a certain clause type has with the main clause) nor their internal syntax (the presence or absence of certain functional categories), even though some correlations can be noted. It is the way the speaker treats the proposition with respect to its relation to the common ground. The presuppositional effect is assumed to arise when the lexical predicate is removed from the clausal focus area, i.e. area following the finite verb.

In Chapter 3 we have examined the alternative Vf-Vn order in the same clause types (temporal and conditional) to establish whether this order corresponds to 'non-presupposition'. Our hypothesis has been confirmed, as Vf-Vn orders cannot be treated as being part of the common ground. The main reason for that is the presence of contrastive focus. All Vf-Vn orders in temporal and embedded clauses arise because either the subject, the object, the adjunct, the lexical verb or the modal/auxiliary is contrastively focused. Even though such clauses are not full-fledge assertions, the presence of focus, or relevance of evoked alternatives cancels their presuppositionality. Two other factors influencing the use of non-fronted orders are discourse switches (new discourse segments, new discourse topics, etc.) and reversal of discourse subordination (main clause proposition contains CG content, embedded clause proposition is informative).

In Chapter 4 we have dealt with the second type of complement fronting – object fronting. The focus was on the OV/VO alternation, with an emphasis on the interpretation of VO orders. VO orders regularly correspond to contrastive focus on either the non-finite verb or the object, or 'decreased focus' marking on the VP elements. These interpretations clearly show that in VO orders, the predicate is always specially marked, in the sense that it is never the element that contributes new information focus. The only predicates that are 'unmarked' in this word order are those which actually introduce new discourse referents and ditransitives, for which reason they are treated as special.

In Chapter 5 we dealt with postverbal material of the following types: pronouns, adverbs and combinations of objects and adverbs. The interpretations of these orders, expectedly, matched the ones observed with nominal objects. Contrastive focus is confirmed to play a crucial role. A novel insight from these minority patterns was that VO orders with pronominal objects, as well as parallel focus constructions with contrastively focused verbs must involve non-finite verb fronting. This opens up the

question whether contrastively focused verbs in VO orders with nominal objects also involve this type of movement.

Chapter 6 was dedicated to leaking structures (Vn-Vf-O), which were shown to be information-structurally complex. After a careful and detailed examination of the interpretational effects in these order, we arrived at one common interpretation: in all leaking structures, contrastive focus is marked in presupposed propositions. The only way to mix presuppositional content and contrastive focus is to split the VP material between the area preceding and following the finite verb. The non-finite verb precedes the finite modal/auxiliary, as in presupposed, fronted vP orders, while the object follows the finite verbs, as in non-presupposed orders. We capture this split in terms of remnant vP movement, following Biberauer & Roberts 2005.

Finally, in Chapter 7, we ventured out of OE into earlier stages of Serbian, namely, early and mid-19th century Serbian, where both literary and newspaper texts exhibit heavy use of complement fronting, both vP and object fronting. Participle and infinitival vP fronting, leaving the finite (modal-like) verb in the clause final position, is used in embedded and coordinated clauses almost to the effect of being a signal of subordination. But, just as it was recorded for much earlier stages of Slavic (OCS), vP complement orders alternate with non-fronted orders, and it is unlikely that the variation is syntactic in nature. Object fronting, much like in OE, is used to obtain a configuration where the predicate is the only element in focus. The fronted object, even though primarily relationally 'given', is subject to minimal 'context givenness' conditions, as it needs to be at least treated as CG content. It was also shown that remnants of this use of object fronting exist in the spoken variety of PD Serbian, where in some specific contexts verb-final orders can be used as an answer to any question eliciting new information focus on the predicate (VP focus and sentence focus). Crucially, this use of object fronting is different from scrambled orders in Standard Serbian, which seem to indicate a more marked IS status of the moved element (object). Using complement fronting to two different interpretational effects suggests that we can possibly speak of different ways of information packaging a language can use, or two 'discourse types'.

Let us now summarize how we interpret these findings and lay out their implications both for IS/pragmatic interpretation and marking.

In Chapter 2 we have shown that in OE non-finite vP complement fronting essentially marks 'secondary content'. Creating a [background-focus] configuration, where the only element in focus is a semantically weak modal verb or auxiliary, yields the effect of a presupposed proposition, or content that is or should be treated as part of the common ground, something that is not under negotiation, something that should be accommodated matter-of-factly. Non-finite vP fronting has been shown to be present as a discourse marking strategy in the 19[th]c Serbian. Even though I have investigated the phenomenon on a relatively small set of data, and have not compared vP fronted orders with non-fronted vP orders, I believe that non-finite vP fronting in earlier Serbian is used more or less in the same way as in OE. Moving the verbal complement out of the clausal focus area creates a configuration where only the finite verb is focused. Focusing only the 'finite' part of the complex predicate reduces the predicate focus contribution to the interpretation of the whole proposition. Without the verbal complement in focus too, the finite verb's contribution is in a way reduced to signaling that the eventuality described in the proposition has taken place. We describe this effect as focus on 'event

instantiation', obviously leaving many questions regarding complex predicate focus open. But the effect is certainly present and it leads to the interpretation of the proposition as pragmatically presupposed. Pragmatic presupposition correlates with discourse subordination, and to some extent to syntactic subordination and the external and internal syntax of subordinate clauses containing 'presupposed' or 'presupposable' propositional content. There seems to be little ground to claim that vP fronting takes place (only) because the role of the conjunctions in subordinate clauses has not yet been fixed to a 'truly' subordinating role.

In Chapter 3 we have seen what conditions contribute to the non-presupposed/presupposable status of propositions in temporal and conditional clauses. As with other cases when certain content is neither presupposed nor asserted (on their classical definitions), or when content is not-at-issue, it was proved to be quite challenging to pinpoint their exact contribution as CG update. Intuitions are clear that contrastive focus, discourse switches, reversals of discourse subordination, as well as some notion of relevance, should not be compatible with characterizations of pragmatic presupposition or CG material, but a more serious theoretical stand to discourse organization is needed to formalize these intuitions. What remains as a fact is that when vP fronting does not take place, and when the whole complex predicate is in the clausal focus area, this signals a different pragmatic status of the proposition.

The major insights from Chapters 4 and Chapter 5 is how inherent (new information) predicate focus is marked, and how contrastive focus, in general, is marked and how it affects inherent focus marking on predicates. First, we summarize the relation between object-fronting and predicate focus marking. In Chapter 4 we have confirmed that object fronting with non-finite lexical verbs strongly correlates with referential givenness of the object (as shown by Struik and van Kemenade 2020). However, we proposed that the notion of givenness is more robust, as it needs to cover all kinds of 'backgroundedness' of all object-meanings. This conclusion is reached based on the interpretation of the non-fronted VO orders. Neither OV nor VO can be explained based on the IS interpretation of the object alone. Assigning [+givenness] feature to referential objects, and some other to non-referential objects, which then can be checked in the preverbal position is a reasonable assumption. The implications of such assumption are that VO orders would be unmarked, or unconcerned with IS (referential givenness) or other special ('non-referential') features, so all object types can remain in situ. This is indeed the case. If we only look at the interpretation of the object, VO orders do seem unmarked/unconcerned. All semantic types, both 'given' and 'new' objects are possible postverbally, the object can be contrastively focused but it can also serve as background of some other contrastively focused element. But what is not unmarked in VO orders is the interpretation of the predicate, or the verb. In this order, the verb is rarely inherently focused. It is usually backgrounded or contrastively focused (we always need to interpret its contribution with respect to some contrasting alternative and/or in terms of unlikelihood compared to other alternatives). And this is not what is expected of an unmarked VP. As OV orders have this 'unmarked' interpretation of the predicate, this means that object fronting is a way of marking inherent predicate focus as the part that contributes most to the update. If we need to label the motivation for leftward movement of objects in terms of interpretation of the moved material, 'givenness' can be maintained, but only we need to characterize it in much broader terms, as CG-type of content (not just presupposed, but presupposable or easily accommodated) or as relationally given (as 'topic' when 'comment' part is what the speaker chooses the highlight as the most important or most relevant part in the proposition). An alternative view in terms of incompatibility of the material with the interpretation of the 'postverbal position' may be taken. In

that case, 'givenness' can be formulated as 'being less informative than the verb'. And it is exactly this clash between how we usually interpret the IS status(es) of predicates/verbs, on the one hand, and other expressions (nominals, in this case), on the other, that makes it so hard to formulate the conditions pertaining to this apparent competition for the 'final' position. On top of that, we encounter another complication: syntactically base orders are not neutral information-structurally. Even though the correlation 'syntactically base order-IS neutral order' is a crosslinguistic tendency, it is difficult to disregard it, and put forward the claim that OE and 19th century Serbian (which has been shown to employ object fronting for the same effect) are representatives of discourses where the optimal way of information packaging is via highlighting predicates/events. Indeed, transferring the problem to the notion of 'discourse type/style' and information packaging preferences seems to open more questions than it solves. However, the empirical facts observed so far suggest that maybe we should take the risk and see how far it can get us. OE clearly shows a tendency for any truly CG or CG-like material to be properly marked, and this concern affects all types of meaning. But since this 'backgroundedness'/'givenness' marking is so robust, it is then in a way expected that novel meaning may not merely come as a consequence of marking backgrounded/given meaning, but that introduction of novel meaning will also be marked.

We have also managed to get an alternative view of how certain 'stylistic rule', such as complement fronting can be reinterpreted, without necessarily being lost due to some grammar-related changes. As argued in Chapter 7, the complement fronting strategy of the early and mid-19th century Serbian texts was rather abruptly abandoned by the end of the 19th century. I simply cannot see any motivation for this change in terms of changes in the morphosyntax of Serbian, that would suddenly impose restrictions on such IS/discourse related markings of the propositional content. PD Serbian still applies rearrangements and these rearrangements reflect some kind of [background-focus] structures at different dimensions, but written or standard language treats them as marked, as the canonical SVO order is taken to be perfectly capable of express sing all the IS/discourse notions. I should be careful to emphasize that the change in IS marking in the history of Serbian is not the scenario I propose as viable for the change in the history of English. After all, (S)VO in Serbian is not the same as (S)VO in English. But I do propose that what we see in OE is comparable to what we see in earlier stages of Serbian. In later stages of development, the reasons why IS/discourse-related markings are subsequently lost and why English becomes a rigid (S)VO type should be related. Unlike Serbian, English underwent some major morphosyntactic changes, whose impact on word order possibilities is rather obvious. However, I do not see that OE really provides us with evidence that it represents the stage where, say, changes in the functional makeup of nominals take place. Or at least, I do not see that such changes can be seen in the variation in the position of the internal argument. OE nominals, just like Serbian nominals alternate between the preverbal and postverbal position because of the way predicate focus is marked, not because of some ongoing change in their categorial status. In both languages, VO order emerges as the unmarked IS configuration once inherent focus on the predicate ceases to be marked. Subsequent morphosyntactic changes in English (both in the verbal and nominal domain) lead to the rigidity of this order. In Serbian, on the other hand, VO is 'fixed' as IS-unmarked. Scrambling remains available, but in the standard version of Serbian, it creates more marked orders. Remnants of the earlier way of information packaging are present in the spoken language, where background-focus structure created via complement (object) fronting are still used as unmarked in certain types of discourse development (narratives about past events is the one context I have noted).

The second important aspect of this study is that it offers important insights into contrastive focus interpretation and marking, both on terms and predicates. Contrastive focus on the object is one of the factors keeping the object in the postverbal position. However, some contrast interpretation can be noted on preverbal objects as well, which has led to the proposal that contrastive focus on objects can be assigned both preverbally and postverbally (Petrova & Speyer 2011). I have not been able to state the difference between contrastive focus marking with preverbal and postverbal objects, which I assume to exist, as with all other alternations. A distinction in terms of 'lexical focus' for preverbal objects and 'discourse focus' for postverbal objects has been suggested, but a formalization of this proposal will be justified only with a more thorough inspection of OV orders, which we have not been systematically investigated here.

Contrastive focus on elements other than the verb and the object also leads to VO orders, and the interpretation of the core lexical VP (verb plus object) in such cases is that it is 'given' or 'backgrounded'. As contrastive focus, or any focus for that matter, requires the backgroundedness of the non-focused material, this is, of course not surprising. What is interesting is how this is marked on the VP level, by VO order. As such VPs do not front across modals/auxiliaries, their 'givenness' status does not affect the interpretation of the whole proposition as presupposed, but their decreased contribution of novelty has motivated their characterization as 'defocused'. The lack of object fronting in such cases signals that the predicate is not to be interpreted as 'new information' focus. In that sense, the 'givenness' of the verb is marked, rather than the 'givenness' of the object. Curiously, contrastive focus on the verb is marked the same way – by lack of object fronting, and all orders where the lexical non-finite verb precedes the object, including the leaking orders, have contrastively focused verb as one of their interpretations. Orders with postverbal pronominal objects and adverbs revealed that some instances of contrastive focus on the non-finite verb must be marked by non-finite verb fronting. This option of focus marking is left open for *some* VO orders with nominal objects as well.

Contrastive focus is often present on multiple elements in a clause, and the presence of parallel focus structures is rather overwhelming., which suggests that such discourse relations are very favored by many OE authors. In parallel focus structures in our data set, we observe a restriction that a contrastively focused verb cannot be followed by a contrastively focused object or adjunct. It remains to be seen whether this is a general restriction on how parallel focus structures are built.

The main contribution of the work presented here is that it opens up the question of IS marking of predicates, and offers more information on how contrastive focus, in general, is marked in OE. Predicate meanings are also subject to 'backgroundedness' marking, as some kind of givenness, stated here in terms of pragmatic presupposition, can rather clearly be observed in non-finite vP fronted orders (vPn-Vf). Parts of the non-finite vP (verb + complement) can also be marked as 'discourse given/backgrounded'. Contrastive focus on predicates is also structurally marked, not only as a possible side-effect of leaving the object in situ, but also by non-finite verb movement to a higher clausal position. In many cases, contrastive focus on the predicate/verb signals the unlikelihood of the focused alternative. When, for instance, a contrastively focused non-finite verb moves across both the object and a vP adverb, the unlikelihood of the proposition is close to counterfactuality. Contrastive focus on terms often has the same inference.

The relation between modals/auxiliaries and predicate focus, or the question of how complex predicate focus is assigned has not been fully resolved in this study. What seems to emerge as a descriptive generalization is the following: without the lexical VP material in the area following the modal/auxiliary, the contribution of the modal/auxiliary is decreased. In many cases, especially in conditional clauses, contrastive focus on the modal or auxiliary (also) signals the unlikelihood of the focused alternative. When the modal or auxiliary is part of a presupposed proposition, the only available focus interpretation is that of verum, and this is structurally marked by the presence of the infinitive/participle in the position preceding the modal auxiliary. Such orders (leaking structures) arise via remnant vP fronting, which can clearly be motivated by contrastive focus interpretation of the lexical verb or to aid verum focus interpretation of the modal/auxiliary.

We have also opened up the question whether the base word order always reflects IS unmarked structures. If we, for instance, want to maintain that OE vP is head-initial, then we need to account for why apparently inherently focused predicates need extra marking, via an unambiguous background-focus configuration. If in OV orders, the lexical verb is interpreted as 'new information' and 'comment', then what is highlighted by its final position is related to these two interpretations. And in VO orders this is not the case. It seems then that even though the predicate normally always provides novel information about the relation between discourse participants, in certain types of discourse, most relevance is assigned to events in a proposition. V-final is then the neutral order for this type of discourse. OE shows that the informativeness of events can only be trumped by the informativeness of discourse referents, or some other discourse goals of the speaker (as not all sentences are necessarily about discourse referents). So, when the object introduces a new discourse referent – something that cannot be linked or inferred from the CG – the verb is no longer in its privileged, final position; the object is. The other way to make the verb non-final is to contrastively focus it – even though the verb/predicate still provides relevant information about the relation between the subject and the object referent, it evokes alternative relations/predicates, and is often the case, this needs to be marked.

Directions for further research in both OE and Serbian are clear. First of all, we need to expand the domain of our investigation. For OE, all the studies of the role of IS on word order variations, including this one, are limited in a way as they consider embedded clauses only. Despite the methodological challenges associated with the position of the finite verb in main clauses, it is high time to turn to main clauses as well to see whether the object non-fronting option comes with fewer restrictions compared to embedded clauses. Also, further studies of the context where object fronting does not apply in 19th century Serbian will certainly provide us with more understanding of how object-fronting as a specific type of IS/discourse marking is taken over by non-fronting. As far as non-finite vP fronting is concerned, we need to measure out the conditions for the 'givenness/backgroundedness' effects of fronted vPs in all subordinate clause types and compare them with those leading to 'defocused/backgrounded' VPs. As we at this point only have insights from the 'assertive (-like' conditional and temporal clauses, we cannot make any predictions. Each clause type comes with its own peculiarity, and they cannot/should not be ignored in uncovering the role of vP fronting. So far, the only generalization available is that complements will not front if they have some other role to perform. This 'other role' ultimately 'beats' the preferred way of presenting embedded propositions (as pragmatically presupposed) and eventualities (as 'only predicate in focus').

Finally, the issue of 'discourse-type' change remains to be formalized. The loss of complement fronting as a way of marking inherent predicate focus and discourse status of embedded propositions (presumably, via clausal focus) is similar to the loss of discourse particles. An elaborate system of discourse particles (*þa/þonne* 'then', but also *nu* 'now', *la* 'lo', *na* 'not', *eac* 'also', etc.) in OE becomes significantly reduced in Middle English (ME), cf van Kemenade & Milićev (2005/2012)).[53] The loss of discourse adverbs cannot be related to any of the factors associated with syntactic options in OE. Both the loss of complement fronting and the loss of discourse particles reflect a more radical and admittedly more mysterious change from a language highly concerned with the overt expression of discourse-pragmatic/IS meanings and relations (including topic/background-focus structure, the speaker's point of view, parallels, rhetoric, and so on) to the one where such concerns are secondary or irrelevant.

---

[53] Van Kemenade & Milićev note that the number of the adverb/particle *þa/þonne* 'then' in OE texts is 2500, while in ME it has only 177 instances.

REFERENCES

Aboh, Enoch Oladé, Katharina Hartmann & Malte Zimmermann (eds.). 2007. *Focus Strategies in African Languages: The Interaction of Focus and Grammar in Niger-Congo and Afro-Asiatic Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Abbott, Barbara. 2000. Presuppositions as nonassertions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1419–1437.

Abbott, Barbara. 2008. Presuppositions and common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31: 523–538.

Abrusan, Marta. 2016. Presupposition cancellation: explaining the 'soft–hard' trigger distinction. *Natural Language Semantics* 24(2): 165-202.

Ajdžanović, Jelena & Isidora Bjelaković (eds.). 2013. *Kratka vsemirna istorija od Georgija Magaraševića, profesora* (1831). Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

AnderBois, Scott, Adrian Brasoveanu & Robert Henderson. 2010. Crossing the appositive / at-issue meaning boundary. *Proceedings of SALT 20*. Nan Li & David Lutz (eds.), 328-346.

Antomo, Mailin. 2012. Projective Meaning and the Licensing of Embedded Root Phenomena. In *Proceedings of ConSOLE XIX*, Enrico, Boone, Kathrin Linke & Maartje Schulpen (eds.), Leiden: University of Leiden.

Ariel, Mira. 1988. Referring and accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24: 67-87.

Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London: Routledge.

Batova, Natalia Anatolievna. 2020. Russian word order: the pragmatics of unconventional verb-initial types. Doctoral thesis. University of Melbourne.

Bean, Marian C. 1983. *The Development of Word Order Patterns in Old English*. Croom Helm Linguistic Series. London: Croom Helm.

Beaver, David. 2001. *Presupposition and Assertion in Dynamic Semantics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Bech, Kristin. 2001. *Word Order Patterns in Old and Middle English: A Syntactic and Pragmatic Study*. Doctoral thesis. University of Bergen.

Belletti, Adriana. 2003. Aspects of the low IP area. In *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Vol. 2*, Luigi Rizzi (ed.), 16-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. Studia Linguistica 59:1-45.

Bošković, Željko. 2009. More on the no-DP analysis of article-less languages. Studia Linguistica 2:187-204.

Bentzen, K. Hrafnbjargarson, G.H., Hróarsdottir, Þ., and Wiklund, A.-L. 2007a. The Tromsø guide to the Force behind V2. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 79: 99-118.

Bentzen, K., Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, G., Hróarsdóttir, Þ., and Wiklund, A.-L. 2007b. Extracting from V2. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 79: 119-128.

Bentzen, Kristine. 2009. Embedded root phenomena, assertion, presupposition, and main point of utterance. Invited talk at the *Workshop on Root Phenomena*, Centre for General Linguistics (ZAS), Berlin, Germany, September 2-4, 2009. Available at http://www.hum.uit.no/a/bentzen/K.Bentzen/Bentzen09-RootsHandout.pdf.

Bergen, Linda, van. 2000. *Pronouns and word order in Old English, with particular reference to the indefinite pronoun* man. Doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester.

Bies, Ann. 1996. *Syntax and discourse factors in* Early *New High* German*: Evidence for verb-final order.* MA thesis. University of Pennsylvania.

Biberauer, Theresa & Ian Roberts. 2005. Changing EPP-parameters in the history of English: accounting for variation and change. *English Language and Linguistics* 9(1): 5-46.

Birner, Betty J. & Gregory Ward. 1998. *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Birner, Betty J. 2004. Discourse functions at the periphery: Noncanonical word order in English. In *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop, Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin, November 2003, Volume 1* (ZAS Papers in Linguistics 35), Benjamin Shaer, Werner Frey & Claudia Maienborn (eds.), 41-62. Berlin: Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1961. Contrastive accent and contrastive stress. *Language* 37: 87-96.

Bosworth, Joseph & Thomas Northcote Toller. 1898 *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, William H., Jr. 1969. Method and style in the Old English 'Pastoral Care'. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 68 (4): 666-684.

Bublitz, Wolfram. 1992. Parallelism in advertising copy. In *Cooperating with Written Texts. The Pragmatics and Comprehension of Written Texts*, Dieter Stein (ed.), 437-458. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Büring, Daniel. 1997. *The Meaning of Topic and Focus - The 59th Street Bridge Accent.* London: Routledge.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 26/5: 511-545.

Burton-Roberts, Noel. 1989. *The Limits to Debate: A Revised Theory of Semantic Presupposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Hank van Riemsdijk (ed.), 185-234. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chafe, William. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In *Subject and Topic*, Charles N. Li (ed.), 27-55. New York: Academic Press.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago/London: Chicago University Press.

Chierchia, Gennaro & Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1990. *Meaning and Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1971. Deep structure, surface structure and semantic interpretation. In *Semantics, an Interdisciplinary Reader in Linguistics, Philosophy and Psychology,* D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits (eds.), 183-216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam & Howard Lasnik. 1977. On Filters and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 425-504.

Chomsky, Noam 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 13. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A Minimalist program for syntactic theory. In *The View from Building 20*, Ken Hale & Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, Herbert & Susan Haviland. 1977. Comprehension and the given-new contract. In *Discourse Production and Comprehension*, Roy Freedle (ed.), 1-40. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Clemoes, Peter. 1966. Ælfric. In *Continuations and Beginning: Studies in Old English Literature*, Eric Gerald Stanley (ed.), 176-209. London: Thomas Nelson.

Cresswell, Maxwell & Arnim von Stechow. 1982. De re belief generalized. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5, 503–535.

Danckaert, Lieven & Liliane Haegeman. 2012. Conditional clauses, Main Clause Phenomena and the syntax of polarity emphasis. In *Comparative Germanic syntax: the state of the art*, Peter Ackema, Rhona Alcorn, Caroline Heycock, Dany Jaspers, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd, pp.133-167. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diesing, Molly 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dik, Simon C., Maria E. Hoffmann, Jan R. deLong, Sie Ing Djiang, Harry Stroomer & Lourens Devries. 1981. On the typology of focus phenomena. In *Perspectives on Functional Grammar*, Teun Hoekstra (ed.), 41-74. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dik, Simon. 1997. *The Theory of Functional Grammar I: The Structure of the Clause*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dryer, Mathew C. 1996. Focus, pragmatic presupposition, and activated propositions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26/4: 475-523.

Edmonds, Joseph. 1970. *Root and structure-preserving transformations*. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2007. *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fintel, Kai von. 2000. What is presupposition accommodation? Ms. MIT. Available at http://web.mit.edu/fintel/www/accomm.pdf

Fintel, Kai von. 2004. Would you believe it? The king of France is back! Presuppositions and truth-value intuitions. In *Descriptions and Beyond*, Marga Reimer & Anne Bezuidenhout (eds.), 315–341. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fintel, Kai von. 2008. What is presupposition accommodation, again? *Philosophy of Language* 22: 137–170.

Haan, Germen J. de. 2001. More is going on upstairs than downstairs: embedded root phenomena in West Frisian. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4/1: 3-38

Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In The Blackwell Companion to Syntax. Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), Vol II: 174-209. Boston and Oxford: Blackwell.

Hoop, Helen de. 1992. *Case Configuration and Noun Phrase Interpretation*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Groningen. Reprinted by Garland Press, New York, 1996.

Frege, Gottlob. 1892/1980. On sense and reference. In *Translations from the Philosophical Writings of Gottlob Frege*, Peter Geach & Max Black (eds.), 58-78. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gauker, Christopher. 1998. What is a context of utterance? *Philosophical Studies* 91:149-172.

Giusti, Giuliana. 2006. Parallels in clausal and nominal periphery. In *Phases of Interpretation*, Mara Frascarelli (ed.), 151-172. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Givón, Talmy. 1984. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction, Volume I*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Godden, Malcolm. 1978. Ælfric and the Vernacular Prose Tradition. In *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*. Paul E. Szarmach & Bernard F. Huppé (eds.), 99–117. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Godden, Malcolm. 2000. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary* (Early English Text Society, SS., 18). Oxford: Oxford University Press, for the Early English Text Society.

Green, Georgia. 1976. Main clause phenomena in subordinate clauses. *Language* 52: 382-397.
Green, Mitchell S. 2017. *Assertion*. Oxford Handbooks Online. Philosophy, Philosophy of Language Online Publication Date: DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935314.013.8).

Grice, Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, Peter Cole & Jerry Morgan (eds.), 43– 58. New York: Academic Press.

Grice, Paul. 1981. Presupposition and conversational implicature. In *Radical Pragmatics*, Peter Cole (ed.), 183–198. New York: Academic Press (Reprinted as Chapter 17 of Grice 1989, 269–282).

Grice, Paul. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,

Güldemann, Tom. 2013. The relation between predicate operator focus and theticity in Bantu. Paper presented at Ghent-Berlin Workshop "Information structure in Bantu", December, 10-11, 2013, Humboldt University Berlin. https://www2.hu-berlin.de/predicate_focus_africa/data/2013-12-10_G%C3%BCldemann_PCF.and.thethicity.pdf

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1988. *The Role of topic and comment in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Garland.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg & Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69: 274–307.

Gundel, Jeanette. 2003. Information structure and referential givenness/newness: how nuch belongs in the grammar? *University of Minnesota Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar Michigan State University*, Stefan Muller (ed), 122–142. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Haeberli, Eric. 1999. *Features, categories and the syntax of A-positions. Synchronic and diachronic variation in the Germanic languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Geneva.

Haeberli, Eric. 2001. Speculations on the syntax of subordinate clauses in Old English. *Reading Working Papers in Linguistics* 5: 201-229.

Haegeman, Liliane & Henk van Riemsdijk. 1986. Verb Projection Raising, scope, and the typology of rules affecting verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17

Haegeman, Liliane. 1992. *Theory and Description in Generative syntax: A Case Study in West Flemish.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. Conditional clauses: external and internal syntax. *Mind and Language* 18: 317-339.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2006. Conditionals, factives and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116: 1651-1669.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2007. Operator movement and topicalisation in adverbial clauses. *Folia Linguistica* 41 3-4: 279–325.
Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. The movement derivation of conditionals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41: 595- 621

Halliday, Michael. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English, part II. *Journal of Linguistics* 3: 199–244.

Heim, Irene. 1982. The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases. Doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusetts.

Heim, Irene & Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax,* vol. II, Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), 174–209. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hinterhölzl, Roland.2004. Language Change versus Grammar Change: What diachronic data reveal about the distinction between core grammar and periphery. In *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*, Eric Fuss & Carola Trips (eds.), 131-160. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hinterhölzl, Roland & Svetlana Petrova (eds.). 2009. *Information Structure and Language Change: New Approaches to Word Order Variation in Germanic.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Höhle, Tilman. 1992. Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen. *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik* 4:112–142.

Hooper, Joan & Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465–497.

Hooper, Joan B. 1975. On assertive predicates. In *Syntax and Semantics IV*, John P. Kimball (ed.), 91–124. New York: Academic Press.

Hopper, Paul. J. 1979. Aspect and foregrounding in discourse. In *Discourse and Syntax,* Talmy Givón (ed.), 210-241. New York: Academic Press.

Huntley, David. 1993. Old Church Slavonic. In *The Slavonic Languages*, Bernard Comrie and Greville Corbett (eds.), 125-187. London: Routledge.

Jacobs, Joachim. 2001. The dimensions of topic-comment. *Linguistics* 39/4, 641-681.

Jones, Susie. 2006. Focus in Yorùbá: a semantic/pragmatic account. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 46, 2006: 143 – 160.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1973. Presuppositions and compound sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(2): 169–193.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1974. Presupposition and linguistic context. *Theoretical Linguistics* 1(1): 181-194.

Katz, Jonah & Elisabeth Selkirk, E., 2011. Contrastive focus vs. discourse-new: evidence from prosodic prominence in English. Linguistic Society of America 87/4: 771-816.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Ms.: MIT Press.

Kelly, Richard J. 2003. *Blickling Homilies: Edition and Translation*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic (Continuum).

Kemenade, Ans van. 1987. *Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kemenade, Ans van. 1997. V2 and Embedded Topicalization in Old and Middle English. In Ans van Kemenade & Nigel. Vincent (eds.) *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 326–352.

Kemenade, Ans van, Tanja Milićev & Harald Baayen. 2008. The balance between syntax and discourse in Old English. In *English Historical Linguistics 2006: Selected papers from the fourteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 14), Bergamo, 21-25 August 2006,* Marina Dossena & Maurizio Gotti (eds.), 3-21. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kemenade, Ans van & Tanja Milićev. 2012. Syntax and discourse in Old and Middle English word order. In, *Grammatical change: Origins, nature, outcomes*. Diane Jonas, John. Whitman & Andrew Garret (eds.), 239-255. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kiparsky, Paul & Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Facts. In *Progress in Linguistics*, Manfred Bierwisch & Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.), 143–173. The Hague: Mouton.

Kiriko Sato. 2012. Ælfric's linguistic and stylistic alterations in his adaptations from the Old English 'Boethius'. *Neophilologus* 96/4: 631-640.

Kiss, Katalin, È. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 76: 891-920.
Koopman, Hilda & Anna Szabolcsi. 2000. *Verbal Complexes*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press

Koev, Todor. 2013. Apposition and the structure of discourse. Doctoral dissertation. Rutgers University.

Koopman, Wilem. 1995. Verb-final Main Clauses in Old English Prose. *Studia Neophilologica* 67: 129–144.

Koopman, Wilem. 1998. Inversion after single and multiple topics in Old English. In *Advances in English Historical Linguistics*, eds. Jacek Fisiak & Marcin Krygier, 135-149. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Krifka, Manfred. 1991. A compositional semantics for multiple focus constructions. In *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory 1*, Steven K. Moore & Adam Zachary Wyner (eds), 127-158. Linguistic Society of America.

Krifka, Manfred. 1995. Focus and the interpretation of generic sentences. In The Generic Book. Gregory Carlson & Francis Pelletier (eds.), 238–264. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Krifka, Manfred. 2001. For a structured account of questions and answers. In *Audiatur vox sapientiae. A Festschrift for Achim von Stechow*, Caroline Féry and Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), 287–319. Berlin: Akademie.

Krifka, Manfred. 2006. Association with focus phrases. In *Architecture of Focus*, Valéria Molnár & Susanne Winkler (eds.), 105–136. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Krifka, M., 2008. Basic notions of information structure. Acta Linguistica Hungarica 55, 243–276.

Krifka, Manfred & Renate Musan (eds.). 2013. *The Expression of Information Structure*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kroch, Anthony & Ann Taylor. 1997. Verb Movement in Old and Middle English: Dialect Variation and Language Contact. In *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, Ans van Kemenade & Nigel. Vincent (eds.), 297–325. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuno, S. 1972. Functional sentence perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3.3: 269-320.

Lai, Catherine 2012. *Rises All the Way Up: The Interpretation of Prosody, Discourse Attitudes and Dialogue Structure*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Chungmin. 1999. Contrastive topic: a locus of the interface. Evidence from Korean and English. In *The Semantics/Pragmatics Interface from Different Points of View* (*CRiSPI* 1), Klaus von Heusinger and Ken Turner (eds.), 317-342. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Lee, Chungmin. 2003. Contrastive topic and/or contrastive focus. In William McClure (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol. 12, 352-364. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1995. Three levels of meaning. In *Grammar and Meaning: Essays in Honor of Sir John Lyons*, Frank R. Palmer (ed.), 90-115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, David. 1979. Scorekeeping in a language game. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8: 339–359.

Links, Meta. 2018. **Correlative constructions in earlier English: Clause structure and discourse organisation. Utrecht: LOT Publications.**

Lipp, Frances Randall. 1969. Aelfric's Old English prose style. *Studies in Philology* 66: 689-718.

Lohnstein, Horst. 2016. Verum focus and contrast. The extended and shortened version of the article 'Verum focus' in *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at https://www.academia.edu/22435912/Verum_focus_and_Contrast_1

Lötscher, Andreas. 1992. The pragmatics of nonreferential topics in German (and other languages). *Linguistics* 30: 123-145

Marelj, Marijana & Tanja Milićev. 2006. Argument structure and case in the nominal domain: an Old English/Serbo-Croat perspective. *York Papers in Linguistics* 2/6: 115-142.

Milićev, Tanja. 2006. The Dative Alternation in Old English. *York Papers in Linguistics* 2/5: 81-104.

Milićev, Tanja. & Nataša Milićević. 2006. *Wh* words as polarity items. *The Annual Conference of the English Department of the University of Bucharest,* University of Bucharest, 23-24 June, 2006.

Milićev, Tanja. 2007a. Weak and strong demonstratives in Old English. *29. Jaherstagund der Deutschen Gesellschaft fur Sprachwissenschaft, AG Anaphoric uses of demonstrative expressions*, University of Siegen, 28 February-2 March, 2007.

Milićev, Tanja. 2007b. Clause- internal scrambling and focus movement in Old English. Talk presented at *Workshop on Information Structure and Word Order in Early Germanic*, Humboldt University, Berlin, 9-10 November, 2007.

Milićev, Tanja. 2008. Discourse linking in Old English: Evidence from subjects and pronouns. Manuscript. University of Nijmegen.

Milićev, Tanja. 2014. Weak demonstratives in Old English. In *Zbornik u čast Draginje Pervaz: Engleski jezik i anlgofone književnosti u teoriji i praksi*, Tvrtko Prćić Maja Marković, Vladislava Gordić Petković Predrag Novakov Zoran Paunović Ivana Đurić Paunović Ana Halas & Bojana Jakovljević (eds.), 323-337. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.

Milićev, Tanja. 2016. The syntax and information structure of the Old English Verb Phrase. Doctoral dissertation. University of Novi Sad.

Milićev, Tanja.2018. Embedded topicalization in Old English. In *Selected papers from the 4th International Conference English Language and Anglophone Literatures Today (ELALT 4), Novi Sad, Serbia, March 25, 2017*, Olga Panić-Kavgić & Arijana Luburić (eds), 39-62. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.

Molnár, Valéria 2002 Contrast – from a contrastive perspective. In *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, H. Hallelgard, Stig Johansson, Bergljot Behrens & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), 147-161. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Neeleman, Ad, Elena Titov, Hans van de Koot and Reiko Vermeulen. 2009. A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast. In *Alternatives to* Cartography, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (ed.), 15-51. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Neeleman, Ad & Reiko Vermeulen. 2013. The syntactic expression of information structure. In The Syntax of Topic, Focus, and Contrast (Studies in Generative Grammar, A. Neeleman, & R. Vermeulen (eds.), 1–38. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pancheva, Roumyana. 2007. Head-Directionality of TP in Old Church Slavonic. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, The Stony Brook Meeting, 2007. Andrei. Antonenko, John F. Bailyn & Christina Bethin (eds.), 313-332. Ann Arbour: Michigen Slavic Publications.

Petrova, Svetlana & Michael Solf. 2009. On the methods of information-structural analysis in historical texts: A case study on Old High German. In *Information Structure and Language Change, New Approaches to Word Order Variation in Germanic*, Roland Hinterhölzl and Svetlana Petrova (eds.), 251-280. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Petrova, Svetlana & Augustin Speyer. 2011. Focus movement and focus interpretation in Old English, *Lingua* 121:1751-1765.

Piñón, Christopher. 2008. Verbs of creation. In *Event Structures in Linguistic Form and Interpretation*, Johannes, Dölling, Tatjana Heyde-Zybatow & Martin Schäfer (eds.), 493-522. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pintzuk, Susan & Anthony. Kroch. 1989. The rightward movement of complements and adjuncts in the Old English of Beowulf. *Language Variation and Change* 1: 115-43.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1991. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order.* Doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1993. Verb seconding in Old English: verb movement to Infl. *The Linguistic Review* 10: 5–25.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1999. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English word order.* New York: Garland.

Pintzuk, Susan. 2002. Verb-object order in Old English: variation as grammatical competition. In *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, David W. Lightfoot (ed.), 276-299. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pintzuk, Susan. 2003. Variationist approaches to syntactic change. In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Brian. D. Joseph & Richard Janda (eds.), 509-528. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pintzuk, Susan.2005a. Arguments against a universal base: evidence from Old English. *English Language and Linguistics* 9.1: 115-138.

Pintzuk, Susan. 2005b. The syntax of objects in Old English. In *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*, Montserrat Batllori, Maria L. Hernanz, Carme Picallo & Francesc Roca (eds.), 251-266. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pintzuk, Susan & Ann Taylor. 2006. The loss of OV order in the history of English. In *The Handbook of the History of English,* Ans van Kemenade & Bettelou Los (eds.), 249–279. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Potts, Christopher. 2003. The Logic of Conventional Implicatures. Doctoral dissertation. UC Santa Cruz.

Potts, Christopher. 2005. The *Logic of Conventional Implicatures.* Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Potts, Christopher. 2007. Into the conventional-implicature dimension. *Philosophy Compass* 2/4: 665–679.

Potts, Christopher. 2015a. Presupposition and implicature. In *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, Shalom Lappin & Chris Fox (eds.), 168-202. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Potts, Christopher. 2015b. Pragmatics. Oxford Handbook of Computational Linguistics,
Prince, Ellen F. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In *Radical Pragmatics.* Peter Cole (ed.), 223-255. New York: Academic Press.

Prince, Ellen F. 1992. The ZPG letter: Subjects, definiteness, and information-status. In *Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fundraising Text*, S. Thompson, and W. Mann (eds.), 295–325. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Reinhart, Tanya 1982. 'Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics.*Philosophica* 27: 53–94.

Reinhart, Tanya. 2004. Topics and the conceptual interface. In *Context Dependence in the Analysis of Linguistic Meaning*, Hans Kamp & Barbara Partee (ed.), 275–305. Amsterdam: Elsevier Press.

Reese, Brian. 2007. *Bias in Questions*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Texas at Austin.

Repp Sophie. 2016. Contrast: Dissecting an elusive information-structural notion and its role in grammar. *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. Chapter 14, Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara (eds.).Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at http://amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~h0444n0b/pages/download/Repp_Contrast_OUPHIS_PreFinalWeb.pdf

Ritter, Elizabeth & Rosen, Sara Thomas 2001. The interpretive value of object splits. *Language Sciences* 23: 425–451.

Rizzi, Luigi 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, Liliane Haegeman (ed.), 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Roberts, Ian. 1997. Directionality and word order change in the history of English. In *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, Ans van Kemenade & Nigel. Vincent (eds.), 397-426. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, Craige. 1996. Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Working Papers in Linguistics-Ohio State University Department of Linguistics*, 91–136.

Roberts, Craige, Mandy Simons, David Beaver & Judith Tonhauser. 2009. Presupposition, conventional implicature and beyond: A unified account of projection. In *New Directions in the Theory of Presupposition, ESSLLI workshop*, Nathan Klinedist & Daniel Rotschild (eds.). Toulouse. Available at www.cmu.edu/dietrich/philosophy/.../Roberts%20et%20al.ESSLI.rev.doc

Rochemont, Michael S. & Peter W. Culicover. 1990. *English Focus Constructions and the Theory of Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Romero, Maribel & Han, Chung-Hye. 2004. On negative yes/no questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(5):609–658.

Rooth, Mats. 1985 *Association with Focus*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusets at Amherst.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 75-116.

Ross, John. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Sato, Kiriko. 2012. Ælfric's Linguistic and Stylistic Alterations in his Adaptations from the Old English *Boethius*. *Neophilologus* 96/4: 631-640.

Sawada, Miyuki & Richard K. Larson. 2004. Presupposition and root transforms in adjunct clauses. Moulton, Keir. & Matthew Wolfs (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 34*. 517–528. Amherst MA: GLSA.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation Between Sound and Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2002. Contrastive FOCUS vs. presentational focus: Prosodic evidence from right node raising in English. In *Speech Prosody 2002: Proceedings of the 1st international conference on speech prosody*, Bernand Bell & Isabel Marlien (eds.), 643-646. Aix-en-Provence: Laboratoire Parole et Langage.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2007. Contrastive Focus, Givenness and the Unmarked Status of 'Discourse-New'. *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure 6*, Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow & Manfred Krifka (eds.), 125–145. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2008. Contrastive focus, givenness and the unmarked status of 'discourse-new'. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55 (3–4): 1–16.

Simons, Mandy. 2003. Presupposition and accommodation: Understanding the Stalnakerian picture. *Philosophical Studies* 112: 251–278.

Simons, Mandy. 2006. Presupposition without common ground. Manuscript, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh. Available at http://www.hss.cmu.edu/philosophy/faculty-simons.php.

Simons, Mandy. 2007. Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition. *Lingua* 117 6: 1034–1056.

Simons, Mandy, Judith Tonhauser, David Beaver & Craige Roberts. 2010. What projects and why. *Proceedings of SALT* 20: 309–327.

Skeat, Walter W. (ed.). 1881. *Aelfric's Lives of Saints: Being a Set of Sermons on Saints' Days Formerly Observed by the English Church*. London: Early English Text Society.

Soames, Scott. 1982. How presuppositions are inherited: A solution to the projection problem. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(4): 483—545.

Soames, Scott. 1989. Presupposition. In *Handbook of Philosophical Logic, volume IV: Topics in the Philosophy of Language*, Dov M. Gabbay & Franz Guenthner (eds.), 553–616. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Stalnaker, Robert. C. 1973. Presuppositions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2: 447–457.
Stalnaker, Robert. C. 1974. Pragmatic presuppositions. In *Semantics and Philosophy*, Milton. K. Munitz & Peter K. Unger (eds.), 197–214. New York: New York University Press.

Stalnaker, Robert C. 1978. Assertion. In *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 9: Pragmatics*, Peter Cole (ed.), 315–322. New York: Academic Press.

Stalnaker, Robert C. 1999. Context and Content. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stalnaker, Robert C. 2002. Common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 701–721.

Stalnaker, Robert C. 2008. A response to Abbott on presupposition and common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31: 539–544.

Stockwell, R. 1977. Motivations for exbraciation in Old English. In *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, Charles N. Li (ed.), 291- 314. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Strawson, Peter F. 1950. Referring. *Mind* 59 (235): 320–344.
Struik, Tara and Ans van Kemenade. 2020. On the givenness of OV word order: A (re)examination of OV/VO variation in Old English. *English Language and Linguistics 24* (1): 1-22.

Sweet, Henry (ed.). 1871. King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*: With an English Translation, the Latin Text, Notes, and Introduction. London: Early English Text Society.

Taylor, Ann, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk & Frank Beths. 2003. *The York-Toronto-HelsinkiParsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE)*. York: Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York. Available through the Oxford Text Archive.

Taylor, Ann & Susan Pintzuk. 2012a. Verb order, object position and information status in Old English. *York Papers in Linguistics* 2/12a: 29-52.

Taylor, Ann & Susan Pintzuk. 2012b. Rethinking the OV/VO alternation in Old English: the effect of complexity, grammatical weight, and information status. In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*, Terttu Nevalainen & Elizabeth Traugott (eds.), 1199-1213. New York: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Ann & Susan Pintzuk. 2014. Testing the theory: Information structure in Old English. In *Information Structure and Syntactic Change in Germanic and Romance Languages [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 213]*, Kristin Bech & Kristine Gunn Eide (eds.), 53–78. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Thomason, Richmond. 1990. Accommodation, meaning, and implicature: interdisciplinary foundations for pragmatics. In *Intentions in Communication*, eds. Philip Cohen, Jerry Morgan & Martha Pollack, 325-363. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vallduví, Enric. 1992. *The informational component*. New York/London: Garland Publishers.

Vallduvi, Enric and Maria Vilkuna. 1998. On Rheme and Kontrast. In *The Limits of Syntax*, Peter Culicover &Louise McNally (eds.), 79-108. New York: Academic Press.

von Stechow, Arnim. 1982. Structured Propositions. Ms., Universitä̈t Konstanz.

von Stechow, Arnim. 1990. Focusing and backgrounding operators. In *Discourse Particles*, Werner Abraham (ed.), 37–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

von Stechow, Arnim. 1991. Current issues in the theory of focus. In Semantics – An International Handbook of Contemporary research. *Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgeno¨ ssischen Forschung Semantik*, Arnim von Stechow & Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), 804–825. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Willis, David. 2000. Verb Movement in Slavonic Conditionals. In Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms, ed. Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas, and Antony Warner, 322-348. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson & Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian that-clauses. *Lingua* 119 (12): 1914–1938.

Wurff, Wim van der 1997. Deriving object–verb order in Late Middle English. *Journal of Linguistics* 33, 485–509.

Zimmermann, Malte. 2008. Contrastive focus and emphasis. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55/3-4 : 347-360.

Predicate Focus, Verum Focus, Verb Focus: Similarities and Difference
Zimmermann, Malte & Daniel Hole. 2008. Predicate focus, verum focus and verb focus: similarities and differences. Paper presented at Workshop on Predicate Focus, University of Potsdam & SFB 632, 14-15 Nov 2008. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328857796_Predicate_Focus_Verum_Focus_Verb_Focus_Similarities_and_Difference.

Zimmermann, Malte & Caroline Féry. 2009. Introduction. In *Information Structure: Theoretical, Typological, and Experimental Perspectiv*e, Malte Zimmermann & Caroline Féry (eds.), 1-11. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zimmermann, Malte. 2016. Predicate Focus. InHandbook of Information Structure, C. Féry & S. Ishihara (eds.), Oxford. Oxford University Press.