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Polar Questions and Non-headed Conditionals in Cross-linguistic and Historical Perspective*

OLAV HACKSTEIN

1 The expression of polar questions in ancient Indo-European languages

In a typological survey, Siemund (2002:1012–8) lists six strategies for marking polar questions. In decreasing order of cross-linguistic frequency, these are intonation, interrogative particles, interrogative tags, disjunction (A-not-A construction), constituent order, and verbal inflection. A complete documentation of polar question marking in the older Indo-European languages has not been undertaken so far. The indications are, however, that ancient Indo-European accords with the typological frequency pattern described by Siemund, in that intonation is the most widespread strategy employed. For some representative examples, see the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROSODY/INTONATION → POLAR INTERROGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vedic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphologically and syntactically unmarked polar questions (Hirt 1937:35, Schwyzer 1950:628ff., Chantraine 1986:10ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tocharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see §3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hittite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second-most frequent way of marking polar questions in older Indo-European

*I am indebted to Dieter Gunkel and Ron Kim for valuable comments on a preliminary version of this paper. Glosses follow the Leipzig glossing rules (http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php). The following abbreviations are also used: VRaise = verb fronting; NegRaise = negation fronting; INPQ = inner negative polar question; ONPQ = outer negative polar question (see below §3.2.2.1).
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consists in prefixing or suffixing polar questions with rhetorical questions (i.e. the subtype of polar questions called stimulus questions, see Hackstein 2004:168f. n. 2), which may eventually develop into polar question particles via grammaticalization. Among the source structures of polar question particles are content questions (THING, MANNER) and negation particles. Following is a selective overview of examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIMULUS Q → POLAR QUESTION PARTICLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third-most frequent strategy of marking polar questions is to change the word order (cf. Hirt 1937:38–40). Particularly widespread is fronting the negator (if present) and the verb (VRaise, NegRaise). Cf. the contrasting word order in OHG SVO-declaratives (1a) versus VSO-interrogatives (1b), and Latin SOV-declaratives (2a) versus VSO-interrogatives (2b):

**OHG**

1. a. *ib fursahmu [unholdun]*.  
   isg.nom renounce.prs.isg devil.acc.sg.m  
   ‘I renounce the devil.’  
   b. *forsahhis-tu unholdun?*  
   renounce.prs.2sg=2sg.nom devil.acc.sg.m  
   ‘Do you renounce the devil?’ (Fränk. Taufgelöbnis 1; Müller 2007:98)

**Latin**

2. a. *hortum et gestationem videt.*  
   garden.acc.sg.m and promenade.acc.sg.m overlook.prs.3sg  
   ‘It (the room) overlooks the garden and promenade.’ (Plin. Ep. 2.17.13)  
   b. *vides hunc?*  
   see.prs.2sg he.acc.sg  
   ‘Do you see him?’ (Plin. Ep. 9.23.4)

The diachronic data from Indo-European languages suggest that the V1-interrogative construction, as grammaticalized in Germanic, arose from an earlier linguistic stage
where the default marking of polar questions was intonational with no verb or negation movement required, but where the negation and the verb could be fronted for semantic and pragmatic reasons, e.g. to signal the speaker’s strategic choice to highlight negator and verb as new topics. Consider the following pairs of polar questions in Latin, where the SOV order (3a) contrasts with $V_{\text{Foc}}{OV}$ (3b), and $S\text{ONEG}V$ (4a) contrasts with $\text{NEG}_{\text{Foc}}VO$ (4b):

3. a. 
   Etiam tu argentum tenes?
   also 2SG.NOM money.ACC.SG.M hold.PRS.2SG
   ‘Do you really have the money?’ (Ter. Heaut. 235)
   b. 
   Tenes$_{\text{Foc}}$ quid dicam?
   hold.PRS.2SG what say.PRS.SBJ.1SG
   ‘Do you know what I’m supposed to say?’ (Ter. Heaut. 700)

4. a. 
   Pugnantia te loqui non vides?
   contradicting.ACC.PL.N 2SG.ACC speak.INF NEG see.PRS.2SG
   ‘Don’t you see that you contradict yourself?’ (Cic. Tusc. 1.13)
   b. 
   Non$_{\text{Foc}}$ vides me ex cursurn
   see.PRS.2SG ISG.ACC out.of running.ABL.SG.F
   anhelitum etiam ducere? [ONPQ']
   breathless.ACC.SG.M also pull.INF
   ‘Don’t you see I’m out of breath from running?’ (Pl. Asin. 327)

As will emerge from the data presented in this article, this latter system is reconstructible for Proto-Indo-European. In the course of later developments in the individual Indo-European languages, some languages like German, English, and Dutch have grammaticalized verb movement as the standard syntactic means of expressing polar questions.\footnote{1} By contrast, Latin, Vedic, Tocharian, and Hittite preserve the older system, in which verb and negation fronting as a mark of polar questions was driven by semantic and pragmatic factors.

Ancient Indo-European languages that change word order to express polar questions include:

\footnote{1 = Outer Negated Polar questions, as per Büring and Gunlogson 2002 and Hartung 2006, see §3.2.2.}
\footnote{2 For typological data exemplifying the functional unity of interrogative subject-verb inversion and focus marking, see Haiman 2002.}
2 Overlap of polar questions with conditionals and complementizers

It is a well-known fact that the function of questions is not restricted to conveying interrogative speech acts, but includes non-interrogative speech acts as well as the organization of discourse.

One indication of the importance of interrogative-based discourse organization is the frequent grammaticalization of rhetorical questions as complementizers (Interrogative-to-Complementizer Shift; for an overview, see Hackstein 2004). While content questions may undergo the Interrogative-to-Complementizer shift, polar questions develop differently. Here it is not the construction marker but the structural configuration which takes on new functions. In particular, the word order template of polar questions tends to converge with the template of conditionals and complementizers.

Haiman (1978, 1993:926f.) was the first to document the cross-linguistic tendency to cast protases in the form of polar questions, and he convincingly laid out the connection between the functional affinities and the formal overlap of polar questions and conditionals as well. To begin with, “conditionals may (in a sense) be paraphrased as questions”; furthermore, they overlap functionally with questions, because “conditionals are topics,” and correspondingly “the formal mark of topic status in a number of languages is often an interrogative morpheme or construction” (Haiman 1978:371). Yet although Haiman’s explanation is persuasive, the apparent syntactic identity of
headless conditionals with polar questions alone does not prove a source-target relationship between the two constructions. In fact, the formal overlap between polar questions and conditionals is frequently not complete. Thus, German and English headless V1-conditional exhibits interrogative word order but not interrogative intonation. To maintain that questions diachronically develop into conditionals, cases like these necessitate the additional assumption of a loss of interrogative intonation.

Here we face a longstanding problem of syntactic reconstruction, and the question whether the formal similarity or identity of two functionally different constructions entitles us to cast them in a diachronic source-target relationship. By itself and without additional criteria, such conclusions may represent pitfalls; cf. Harris and Campbell 1995:84 on the marker-structure fallacy. To exclude such fallacies, additional criteria are needed. In Hackstein 2005:265, I enumerated three principal provisos:

   a. the attestation of prototypes;
   b. the existence of typological parallels;
   c. the explanatory power of the claimed source-target development in explaining constructional anomalies.

In fact, the diachronic survey of Indo-European languages to follow brings to light additional cases of interrogative-based conditionals while satisfying the criteria needed to bolster the Question-to-Conditional/Complementizer Shift proposed by Haiman (1978).

3  Data from English, German, Latin, and Tocharian

3.1  Early Modern English and Present-Day English

To express a conditional, Present-Day English may use the diachronically persistent headless V1-conditional construction alongside the innovative and standard if-clause format. As is known, V1-conditionals exhibit the same word order as interrogatives:

5.  a. *I'm wondering, could I get a convincing answer?
    b. *Could I get a convincing answer, I'd be happy.

The attested linguistic history of English indeed substantiates the claim of an underlying diachronic continuity between interrogative and conditional syntax. For instance, the interrogative origin of V1-conditionals explains a formal quirk. In English, negated headless conditional clauses demand the word order aux-subject-not, which precludes the use of the clitic form of the negation -n't, e.g.

6.  a. *Had I not seen it with my own eyes, I would not have believed it. (Quirk et al. 1985:1094)
    b. *Hadn't I seen it . . .
On closer inspection, the \text{aux-subject-not} template turns out to reflect the diachronically persistent word order that was standard in interrogatives of the Early Modern English period. Thus in Early Modern English, negated polar interrogatives require the negation to follow the auxiliary and the subject, if the subject is a pronoun, i.e. \text{aux-subject-not}, see Blake (2002:253):

7. \textit{Hadst thou not order?} (Shakespeare, \textit{Measure for Measure} 2.2.8)

Shakespeare’s V1-conditionals likewise exhibit the same word order, cf. Blake 2002: 210:

8. \textit{Had I not known those customs, I should have beene beholding to your paper.} (\textit{Henry VIII} 4.1.20–1)

In sum, the diachronic continuity between interrogative and conditional syntax offers the best explanation for the constructional anomaly of negated Present-Day English V1-conditionals.

### 3.2 Old and Middle High German

#### 3.2.1.1. Polar Q + VRAISE. Verb fronting is the diachronically persistent and standard way of marking polar questions in German, cf. Schrodt (2004:200):

**OHG**

9. \textit{furstuontut} \textit{ir} \textit{thisu} \textit{elliu?}  
\quad understand.PST.2PL you.2PL this.ACC.PL.N all.ACC.PL.N  
‘Did you understand all of this?’ (\textit{T.} 77.5; \textit{Matt.} 13:51)

**MHG**

10. \textit{tuont} \textit{si} \textit{dir} \textit{ibt}?  
\quad do.PRS.3PL they you.DAT.SG something  
‘Are they doing something to you?’ (\textit{Iwein} 491)

11. \textit{kumet} \textit{uns} \textit{Kriemhilt?}  
\quad come.PRS.3SG we.DAT Kriemhilt  
‘Is Kriemhild coming to us?’ (\textit{Nib.} 768.2)

12. \textit{wil} \textit{du} \textit{mir helfen, edel Sivrit,} \textit{werben}  
\quad want.PRS.2SG you.SG I.DAT help.INF noble Siegfried court.INF  
\quad \textit{die} \textit{minnedlichen}?  
\quad ART.ACC.SG.F lovely.ACC.SG.F  
‘Do you want to help me, noble Siegfried, to court the lovely maid?’ (\textit{Nib.} 332.1–2)
3.2.1.2. **Conditional + VRaise (V1-Conditional).** The V1-conditional construction prevails in OHG and MHG. For a minimal pair contrasting question and conditional, cf. (12) above and (16) below.

**OHG**

13. *far ib uf ze bimile, dar pist-tu mit*
   move.prs.1sg I up to heaven.dat.sg.m there be.prs.2sg-you with
   herie
   arm.y.dat.sg.n
   ‘If I ascend to heaven, there you will be with an army.’ (O. 1.7.3)

**MHG**

14. *solt-tu immer herzenliche zer werlde*
   shall.prs.2sg-you ever very on.dat.sg.f world.dat.sg.f
   werden vro/ daz geschiht von mannes minne.
   become.inf happy this happen-pres.3sg through man.gen.sg love.dat.sg.f
   ‘Should you ever become happy on this earth, this would come about through
   the love of a man.’ (Nib. 14.2–3)

15. *erloubet mir-z min herre, ich getuo im*
   allow.prs.3sg I.dat-it.acc.sg my master.nom.sg.m I do.prs.1sg he.dat
   leit.
   woe.acc.sg.n
   ‘If my master allows me to, I’ll kill him.’ (Nib. 866.3)

16. *wil-tu niht eigen sin, so muost(t)u dich*
   want.prs.2sg-you neg owned be.inf so must.prs.2sg-you you.acc.sg
   scheiden
   separate.inf
   ‘If you don’t want to belong to the servants, you have to separate.’ (Nib. 830.
   1–2)

3.2.1.3. **Anomaly: Main clause phenomenon.** The interrogative origin of the conditional and its erstwhile syntactic autonomy explains the uninveted subject-verb word order of the matrix clauses immediately following the conditional, as in MHG *daz geschiht* (14) and *ich getuo . . . leit* (15). The uninveted subject-verb word order, which reflects two juxtaposed root clauses, namely interrogative plus declarative, later yields to the obligatory inversion in Present-Day German, thus indicating that the clausal fusion has been accomplished. An example is the Modern German rendering

### 3.2.2.1. Neg polar Q + NegRaise + VRaise

**OHG**

17. *nihil-ne aliud te esse meministi?*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{né-uuéist } \text{tu } \text{dánne } \text{díh } \text{ieht} \\
\text{NEG-know.PRS.2SG you.NOM.SG otherwise you.ACC.SG something} \\
\text{ánderes } \text{sin?} \\
\text{other.GEN.SG be.INF}
\end{array}
\]

‘Don’t you know you’re nothing else?’ (Notker Nb03826, Boethius, *Cons.)*

18. *ne mag iuuib oub taz irren na?*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{NEG can.PRS.3SG you.ACC.PL also this disconcert.INF Q} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Won’t this disconcert you?’ (Notker Nb09903, Boethius, *Cons.*)

It can be observed that negation raising is often a mark of rhetorical questions, in which the interrogative negation of a proposition conveys a strong assertion of the same proposition. It is possible to integrate the phenomenon of interrogative negation reversal into the context of inner and outer negated polar questions. Inner polar questions involve the neutral questioning of a negated proposition (¬p) with no expectation of either a positive or negative answer on the part of the speaker.

a. Inner negated polar question (INPQ = neutral yes/no question) + low (= post-subject) negation, e.g.

19. *Is Jane not coming?* Possible answers are: *Yes, she is./No, she isn’t.*

By contrast, outer negated polar questions instantiate the *counterexpectational* questioning of a negated proposition (¬p), thereby reversing the negation and asking the addressee for confirmation of the positive proposition.

b. Outer negated polar question (ONPQ = rhetorical question) + high negation, e.g.

20. *Isn’t Jane coming too?* Expected answer: *Yes, she is.*

For this important distinction, see inter alia Büring and Gunlogson 2000 and Hartung 2006, both of which have elaborated on the possible morphosyntactic differentiation of the two types of negative polar question. For instance, Hartung (2006:3)

---

1For OHG Notker *ne . . . na*, see Lühr 1997:329–31; on the etymology of OHG *na*, see ibid. 332.
points out the formal difference between high and low negation, which formally corresponds to the outer and inner negated polar question types (= ONPQ, INPQ). In fact, there are diachronic data which support this distinction and suggest that older Indo-European languages made use of negation fronting in polar interrogatives to formally differentiate outer negation polar questions (= rhetorical questions) from inner negation polar questions.

3.2.2. NEG CONDITIONAL + NEGRAISE + VRAISE. Negated conditionals exhibit the same word order pattern as negated polar questions. In OHG, the fronted negation ne/ni serves a double function, as negation and conditional complementizer (Schrodt 2004:181, 195). In fact, the employment of fronted sentential negation as a negated conditional complementizer is common to at least three branches of Indo-European, being attested in Latin and Tocharian in addition to Germanic (see §§3.2.2, 3.4.2.2).

As seen above in (3) and (4), the fronting of negation in polar questions corresponds to a pragmatically conditioned option in some of the older-attested Indo-European languages. Negation fronting in polar questions serves (inter alia) to establish contrasting counterexpectational topics, e.g. Don’t you agree? [I hope you DO.] This latter function is shared by negated counterfactual conditionals, e.g. if you agree, that’s fine; [if not] ContrFoc, time to start an argument. Here the counterfactual if not allows a paraphrase as a topic-raising question Don’t you agree? It can be hypothesized that this functional overlap of negated polar questions and negated conditionals (expressing counterexpectation) explains the conflation of negation fronting and counterfactual conditional, which is attested in (older) Gemanic, Latin and Tocharian.

21. kuning nist in worolti, ni sî imo thiononti
   king NEG-be.PS.3SG in world NEG be.PS.SBJV.3SG he.DAT.SG serving
   ‘There is no king on earth, unless he be a servant of his.’ (O. 1.5.48; Schrodt 2004:182)

The type of negative conditional with a raised negation (and raised verb) is superseded in Middle High German by conditional SVO clauses with a negated verb, marked by prefixed verbal negation en- followed by the adverb danne, denne ‘otherwise’.

22. wir sin vil ungescheiden, ez en-tuo dan
   we be.PS.3PL very unseparated it NEG-do.PS.SBJV.3SG otherwise
der tot
   ART.NOM.SG.M death.NOM.SG.M
   ‘We firmly stand by you, unless death separates us.’ (Nib. 1281.3)

4 There is a tendency to elide the negation, thereby transferring its negative polarity to denn; cf. the Modern German idiom es sei denn ‘were it not that; except if’, and see Paul, Wiehl, and Grosse 1998:410f.
However, the raised negation construction persists in old formulae, most prominently in the phrase

23. OE ne-wēre
    OHG ni-wâri
    MHG ne-wære
    NEG-be.pst.sbjv.3sg
    ‘were it not (that)’


3.3 Latin

The syntactic convergence in word order of polar questions and conditionals recurs in Latin and Tocharian. In contrast to Germanic, however, the raising of the negation and verb in these two languages is not grammaticalized as an obligatory mark of polar questions, but is rather conditioned by information structure.

3.3.1.1. POLAR Q + VRAISE. In polar questions without the polar question particle -ne (see Hofmann and Szantyr 1972:460, Kühner and Stegmann 1976:501f.), there is a tendency to raise the verb and the negation, e.g.

Old Latin

24. ibo igitur intro?
    go.fut.1sg thus inside
    ‘Will I thus go inside?’ (Pl. Truc. 205)

25. Prompsisti tu illi vinum?
    serve.perf.2sg you.sg that.one.dat.sg wine.acc.sg.n
    ‘Did you serve him wine?’ (Pl. Mil. 829)

However, SOV is also attested, e.g.

26. hoc pueri possunt, viri non potuerunt?
    this.acc.sg.n boy.nom.pl.m can.prs.3pl man.nom.pl.m neg can.perf.3pl
    ‘Boys are capable of this, and men haven’t been capable of achieving it?’ (Cic. Tusc. 2.34)
3.3.1.2. Conditional + VRaise (VI-Conditional)

27. voltis, empta-st;  
    want.prs.2pl buy.perf.ptcp.nom.sg.fem-cop.prs.3sg  
    nolitis, non empta-st.  
    neg.want.prs.2pl neg buy.perf.ptcp.nom.sg.fem-cop.prs.3sg  
    ‘You want, she’s bought; you don’t want, she’s not bought.’ (Caecil. com. fr. 4, Warmington 1956–61:1.470)

28. tepeat satis est  
    be.warm.prs.sbjv.3sg enough cop.prs.3sg  
    ‘Should [the barrel] be warm, it is sufficient.’ (Cato Agr. 69.2)

3.3.2.1. Neg Polar Q + NegRaise + VRaise. The sentence negation nōn may be raised to indicate a rhetorical question (Kühner and Stegmann 1976:503, 516). The same applies to the coexisting sentence negation nī in Old Latin (e.g., *quid*-nī ‘why not’), which is the standard negation in Oscan and persists in Classical Latin in idioms such as *nī-mīrum* ‘no surprise, no wonder’.

29. non tu tenes?  
    neg you.nom.sg hold.prs.2sg  
    ‘Don’t you realize it?’ (Pl. Men. 824)

Raised nōn frequently carries a flavor of disapproval and astonishment, as in the following examples (Kühner and Stegmann 1976:516f.):  

30. Quid? Non sciunt ipsi viam?  
    what neg know.prs.3pl self.nom.pl.m way.acc.sg.f  
    ‘What? They don’t know the way themselves?’ (Ter. Hec. 360)

31. Non mi-st laterna in manu?  
    neg i.dat-cop.prs.3sg lamp in hand.abl.sg.f  
    ‘Don’t I hold a lamp in my hand?’ (Pl. Amph. 406, preceded by *nonne* questions)

3.3.2.2. Neg Conditional + NegRaise. The same raising is found in Old Latin negated conditionals with *nī* (Kühner and Stegmann 1976:421f.), e.g.

32. si in ius vocat, ito.  
    if to court call.prs.3sg.act go.prs.impv.3sg.act  
    ‘If somebody summons someone to appear in court, (the defendant) shall go.’  
    nī it, antestamino.  
    neg go.prs.3sg.act call.for.witness.prs.3sg.mp  
    ‘If he doesn’t go, they shall call for a witness.’ (Leg. XII. tab. 1.1)
3.3.3. Anomalies: Latin $n\bar{i}$ and negation reversal as persistent ONPQ property.

Old Latin $n\bar{i}$ is also used to introduce sentential complements after verbs meaning 'to pledge, bet' (Kühner and Stegmann 1976:422), an anomalous use, since we expect $n\bar{i}$ to express negation, which it does not here. This is best explained under the assumption of a diachronically underlying biased polar question. Biased polar questions scope over the negation in calling the negation into question, thus reversing the negation into a strong affirmation. In both examples (33) and (34), it is possible to render the $n\bar{i}$-clause as a negated polar question:

33. $ni\ ergo\ matris\ filia\ est[?]\ [ONPQ + NegRaise]
    neg\ in.fact\ mother.gen.sg\ daughter.nom.sg\ cop.prs.3sg
    in\ meum\ nummum,\ in\ tuum\ talentum
    in\ my.acc.sg.n\ coin.acc.sg.n\ in\ your.acc.sg.n\ talent.acc.sg.n
    pignus\ da!
    pledge.acc.sg.n\ give.prs.impv.2sg
    'Isn't she really her mother's daughter? Bet a talent for my coin [that she is]. =
    Bet that she is her mother's daughter!' (Pl. Ep. 700f.)

34. $da\ hercle\ pignus,\ ni\ memini$
    give.prs.impv.2sg\ by.Hercules\ pledge.acc.sg.n\ neg\ recall.perf.1sg
    omnia\ et\ scio
    all.acc.pl.n\ and\ know.prs.1sg
    'Give, by Hercules, your pledge that I recall and know everything.' (lit. 'Give,
    by Hercules, your pledge: Don't I recall and know everything?') (Pl. Pers. 186)

3.4 Tocharian

In Tocharian, neither a change in the basic SOV word order nor the use of interrogative particles such as Tocharian A $a\bar{s}\bar{i}$ (38, 39) and te (38) is obligatory. Given the typological studies and Indo-European comparanda noted above (§1), the default way of marking polar questions in Tocharian was in all likelihood by intonation (35–7), which, however, is no longer recoverable from the texts.

3.4.1.1. Polar Q without VRaise

35. $pa\bar{n}\acute{a}kte\ wat\ yopsa,\ n\acute{a}nde\ wat$
    Buddha.nom\ either\ enter.prt.3sg\ Nande.nom\ or
    'Has Buddha or Nanda [just] entered?' (B HMR 2 b2)

36. $ate\ kamp\acute{a}l\ yama\bar{s}\acute{a}sta$
    away\ coat.acc\ do.prt.2sg
    'Have you put [your] coat away?' (B337 a5)
37. ğerskana, se nomiyesse bhajam
sister.VOC.PL this.NOM.SG.M jewel.NOM.SG.M bowl.NOM.SG.M
veri nu star-me epe mā
leave.PST.PTCP.NOM.SG.M COP.PRS.3SG=YOU.PL OR NEG
‘Sisters, have you left this jewel-bowl for me or not?’ (B107 b8)

38. ynâlek te lo kâlk aṣsi
elsewhere Q away GO.PRT.3SG Q
‘Has he gone somewhere else?’ (A119 b4)

39. pâshune ypmâm wrasâl śā aṣsi
protection do.PRS.PTCP.MP suffering bring.PRT.1SG Q
‘Did I perhaps bring you suffering by providing you protection?’ (A79 b2)

3.4.1.1.2. POLAR Q + VRAISE. If the verb receives contrastive information focus, as
in alternative questions (40), or Verum focus (42), the verb is raised, e.g.

40. kârsanoyem toyâ tu epe mā
know.IMPF.3PL they this.ACC.SG OR NEG
‘Did they [the animals] know this or not?’ (B375 a5f.)

Cf. the contrast with the alternative question in (41), where the subject rather than
the verb is focused and consequently fronted:

41. sâr châcâr epe śâm epe spaktânik epe nṣâkk oki lokit
sister.NOM daughter.NOM or wife.NOM or servant.NOM or I like guest
kakmus nā-m
COME.PRT.PTCP.NOM.SG.F COP.PRS.3SG=3SG.PRN
‘Has she come as the sister, or the daughter, or the wife, or the servant? Or like
me, as a guest?’ (A6 a2f.)

42. arar-câ po sâ(r)m(a)n(a)
case.PRT.3PL=2SG.PRN all CAUSE.NOM.PL.F
‘Have all causes ceased [to exist]? = Is it true that all causes ceased [to exist]?’
(B45 a1)

In Tocharian, both headless conditional clauses and polar questions exhibit pragmat-
ically conditioned verb fronting.

3.4.1.2.1. CONDITIONAL WITHOUT VRAISE (SVX/SOV)

43. sukâyo yomnâs ksâlune, mânt mâ kâckal
joy.INSTR reach.SBJV.3SG extinction how NEG rejoice.VER2.NOM
‘If he happily reaches extinction, why should a giver not rejoice?’ (MSN 29
[I.2] a5, JWP 28f.)

III
44. ārkwi parsī -ne -ks -ārkwi watkässi
white ask.OPT.3SG 3SG.PRN -INDEF -white decide.CAUS.OPT.3SG
‘If somebody asked him about “white”, he would decide “white”.’ (B28 b4)

45. suwisa yāmām nano kartse
suwī.PERL do.SBJV.3SG again good
‘If he does it with suwī, it is also good.’ (B Fill. Y2 b6)

3.4.1.2.2. CONDITIONAL + VRaise (V1-CONDITIONAL)

46. smeñ-ats daksinakī tmāk korpac
come.SBJV.3PL-INDEF receiver-of-alms.NOM.PL then together
ys-lām
go.PRS.3SG=3PL.PRN
‘When the receivers of alms arrive, he goes to meet them.’ (A YQ19[III.11]b4)

3.4.2.1.1. NEG POLAR Q + NegRAise + SOV. In negated polar questions, Tocharian shows a tendency to front the negation alone, leaving the verb in sentence-final position, e.g.

47. tämme mā te nās smā(wā) [ONPQ]
so NEG Q I sit.1MPF.1SG
‘Wasn’t I sitting like that?’ (A91 b5)

48. mā te tam ni stmo [ONPQ]
NEG Q then I.DAT stand.PRT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M
‘Didn’t he then stand by me?’ (A342 a2)

3.4.2.1.2. NEG POLAR Q + NegRAise + VRaise. Alternatively, both the negation and the verb may be raised, especially if the verb is under constrastive focus as in alternative questions, as in (50–1) (A-not-A construction, see Siemund 2002:1016).

49. sne klap mā t[e] pkāte tu ārkiśōsi [ONPQ]
without suffering NEG Q intend.PRT.3SG.MP you.NOM.SG world
lutkāssi
become.PRS.SBJV.CAUS.INF
‘Didn’t you intend to free the world from suffering?’ (A221 a2)

50. māmt nu tsitim tālo nās mā te tsinām [ONPQ]
how now touch.OPT.1SG miserable.NOM I NEG Q touch.PRS.1SG
‘How could I the miserable one touch it?’ Or don’t I touch it? (A23 b6–24 a1)
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51. cämpäl te nasam cesām wrasaśśi waste
be.able.GER.NOM Q COP.PRS.ISG this.GEN.PL being.GEN.PL refuge
māskatsi, mā te cämpāl (na) sam
be.INF NEG Q be.able.GER2.NOM Q COP.PRS.ISG [ONPQ]
‘Am I able to provide refuge to the beings, or am I not able?’ (A69 b4)

3.4.2.2.1. Neg Conditional + NegRaise + SOV

52. mā spā akālk knelle star-n
NEG and wish.NOM fulfill.GER2 COP.PRS.3SG=ISG.PRN
‘and if the wish cannot be fulfilled for me’ (B100 a5)

The following example, the syntactic parsing of which has been a matter of controversy, is best subsumed under the same conditional construction, as exemplified below:

53. mā (t)e nātāk cam brā[mam] e[pe] mā (t)e was
NEG Q master this.ACC.SG Brahman or NEG Q IPL.ACC
entsatrā, was nu tamme-wkāmyo nātkis yāsluntaśśāl
keep.SBJV.3SG.MP we now thus master.GEN.SG enemy.PL.COM
mā cāmplye [na][amās cam ypeyam māskatsi]
NEG be.able.GER2.NOM.PL COP.PRS.IPL this.LOC country.LOC be.INF
‘Does the master not keep this Brahman or does he not keep us? [Regardless of this,] we will not be capable of staying in this country thus, with such enemies of the master.’ (A342 b2f.)

54. mā nw ayu-ne mākte yaṃ (pāst) . . . aikre
NEG now give.SBJV.1SG+3SG.PRN how go.sbjv.3SG.ACT (away) . . . empty
wrote rssēke
great sage
‘But if I don’t give him [alms], how should the great sage go away empty[-handed]?’ (B25 a7f.; cf. Sieg and Siegling 1949:42, Peyrot 2013:721.)

3.4.2.2.2. Neg Conditional + NegRaise + VRaise

55. kāṭtsi no wnlome šate māsketvu mā
how now being.NOM.SG.M rich be.PRS.3SG NEG
cāñcan-ne spā āyor aitsi?
be.pleased.PRS.3SG=3SG.PRN and gift give.SBJV.INF
‘How can a being be rich, and not be pleased to give alms? = How can a being be rich, if it doesn’t take pleasure in giving alms?’ (BK 645)

1 Cf. the rendering by Thomas 1993:196 as an indirect interrogative: “Ob der Herr diesen Brahmanen oder uns behält . . . ”
4 Conclusion

Latin, Hittite and Tocharian almost certainly made use of intonation to mark polar questions, leaving preverbal negation and SOV intact, but raised the negation and verb if these constituents were assigned information focus. Focusing the negation in interrogatives is employed inter alia to express outer negative polar questions (ONPQ, rhetorical questions). Thus in Latin, raising the negation non in polar questions is typically associated with rhetorical questions (Kühner and Stegmann 1976:503, 516). Likewise, Hittite tends to front the negation natta in rhetorical questions (Höffner 1986:89f., Höffner and Melchert 2008:342f.). Vedic also often attests a contrast between non-rhetorical inner negated polar questions without NegRaising and rhetorical outer negated questions with NegRaising, cf. e.g.

56. a. kathá grámam ná prcchasi? [INPQ, non-rhet. Q - NegRaise]
   How village.acc.sg.m NEG ask.prst.2sg
   ‘Why do you not ask for the village?’ (RV 10.146.1c; Etter 1983:120)

   b. ná tvā bhīr iva vindatī? [ONPQ, rhet. Q + NegRaise]
   NEG you.acc.sg. fear.nom like grip.prst.3sg
   ‘Doesn’t something like fear grip you?’ (RV 10.146.1d; ibid.)

In sum, the interrogative origin of the headless conditionals, along with the focus-driven negation raising in polar interrogatives, explains both cross-linguistic phenomena, namely,

- the tendency to front negation and verb in conditionals (semantic and pragmatic focus in polar questions);

- the tendency of the negation to occupy the complementizer position in negative conditionals, and the conflation of conditional negation and conditional complementizer (Germanic, Latin, Tocharian);

and language-specific peculiarities of headless conditionals, which may be explained as persistent properties of the diachronically underlying polar questions:

- the Aux-S-Neg-V pattern in English V1-conditionals (§3.1);

- main clause phenomena in the OHG and MHG V1-conditionals (conditional plus independent matrix clause) (§3.2.1.2); and

- the occurrence of Latin negated nī as an affirmative complementizer with verbs of betting and pledging (§3.3.3).
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